



WHAT IS SOFT POWER CAPABILITY AND HOW DOES IT IMPACT FOREIGN POLICY?

By Judit Trunkos, PhD Student-Prospectus Proposal
University of South Carolina



JANUARY 6, 2013
trunkos@email.sc.edu

Background and Significance-Research Question

Hard power has been the traditional form of foreign policy tool, but in the 21st Century, soft power has been emerging according to some scholars. Many scholars have studied soft power as a behavior influence outcome in the post September 11 period (Nye 2004, Schneider 2005, Arndt 2005, Chong, 2005, Gray 2011). With this research, I will look at soft power as national capability and study how much of their soft power capabilities do countries actually utilize in their foreign policies. Using mixed methods, I will investigate whether countries with high soft power capabilities actually rely on their soft power resources in the foreign policies?

With this research proposal, I will ask the question:

What is soft power capability and how does it influence countries foreign policy? Further, I will:

- 1) clarify the concept of soft power capabilities in foreign policy;
- 2) create a Global Soft Power Capability Index;
- 3) study high Soft Power Capability countries' foreign policy to find to what degree do they utilize this power.

After evaluating the leading soft power scholars' definitions of soft power, I decided to focus on the resource aspect of it so I can create the appropriate dimensions and develop a summation of variables that would provide the national soft power capability measure for each country. By deconstructing soft power, I will be able to identify its parts including the influence attempts and the influence outcomes. Similarly to the hard power scholarship (Singer, 1963) the difficulty relies in the aggregate measurement of such capabilities. With this research, I will list soft power capabilities and create a Global Soft Power Index.

Finally, I will also study the foreign policy implications of countries that use more soft power. By combining the resource capabilities and the actual foreign policy outcomes of different states, I will be able to describe if high soft power capability countries make different foreign policies from their low counterparts. With this addition, I hope to aid all scholars who would like to study soft power and further develop its role in foreign policy.

Literature Review

The definition of soft power has been closely linked with Joseph Nye, Jr. (1990, 2002) who first coined this term. Despite Nye's concept's popularity, current power scholarship is still divided about the nature of power. Some scholars see capabilities (Singer, 1963) as the most important factor and others see it as a behavior outcome (Nye 2002, 2004, 2011). Nye (2011, p.11) built his concept as a behavior outcome, or as he calls it "relational power concept" on the multiple faces of power. For Nye, soft power is really the combination of second and third faces of power together.

As power literature has developed, so did Nye's initial definition of soft power. Earlier versions of Nye's soft power definition were: "the ability to get what you want through attraction rather than coercion or payment" (Nye, 2004, p. x) which included "culture, values and foreign policies" (Nye, 2004, p. 11). Later, Nye extended his definition into "the ability to affect others through the co-optive means of framing the agenda, persuading, and eliciting positive attraction in order to obtain preferred outcomes (2011, p.20-21)" While further developing his concept of soft power, Nye (2002, 2004, 2011) has been focusing on the outcome of soft power. In my research, I will look into the capabilities aspect to better understand how soft power is generated within the country and later how much it is used in foreign policy.

Hard Power versus Soft Power

Soft power and hard power literature has also been divided about the effectiveness and usefulness of such capabilities. Some scholars argue that soft power is effective and it sometimes reinforces and sometimes interferes with hard power, but in any case, soft power does not depend on hard power (Nye, 2004). Others feel that soft power would be more effective if more money was spent on it (Schneider 2005). Another line of literature feels that soft power is emerging and getting more influential in today's global information space and it has less hard power support (Chong, 2005). I strongly believe that by further developing the concept and separating influence attempts and outcome from the resources, scholars will be able to agree more on the definition of soft power and its elements.

Just as Nye's developing soft power definition demonstrated, the concept of power has been evolving for a long time. Power scholars from the early 1960 have studied the various layers of power. Dahl (1961) focused on the coercive influence of power, but as a reaction, some scholars started to search for additional levels or faces of power. Bachrach and Baratz (1962) and Steve Lukes (2005) identified the second face of power, which is agenda setting. Steven Lukes (2005), while warning about the other dimensions of power also suggested to examine power in a broader way to include powers that are difficult to observe or measure including agenda setting and belief changing outcomes.

Lukes (2005) distinguishes a third face of power, namely the preference setting and belief shaping influences. As Bachrach and Baratz (1962) examined the influential face of national power in targeted communities, they began to focus on previously unmeasurable variables, which are so often ignored by power literature. Even though both Lukes (1972, 2005) and Bachrach and Baratz (1962) studied domestic national power and did not make references to IR, it is still an important literature in terms of defining the multiple faces of it. While the concept of power is developing, scholars who try to combine all faces of power to measure soft power may run into causation and measuring issues.

Skeptics

Skeptics of soft power argue that hard power is the most effective foreign policy tool. Gray (2011, p. ix) states that hard power must remain the essential instrument of policy as soft power is unsuitable for policy directions and control as it relies too much on the foreign countries' perception. Others, such as Ferguson (2004) states that there is nothing new about the soft power, it used to be called imperialism. Further, he feels that soft power's reach is limited, and argues that cultural imperialism's real engine is hard power. As Ferguson (2004, p.24) explained, "Soft Power is merely the velvet glove concealing an iron hand."

Foreign Policy Instruments

Lasswell's (1958) classic creation of his fourfold foreign policy instruments already distinguished the political (propaganda), diplomatic, economic and military instruments and discussed the different value outcomes and the institutions of society sharing them (Lasswell, 1958 p.202). Other scholars such as the political economist Baldwin (1985) pointed out that the techniques of power need to be further studied to better understand their function. While Baldwin (1985) built on Lasswell's (1958) classifications, he pointed out that some scholars reduce these four instruments into two, namely war and diplomacy, which reduction is deficient in terms of alternative policy options (p.13). My argument is that I will learn more about country's foreign policy from its soft power capabilities than its intended influences such as agenda setting, as it can be more objectively measured.

Further breaking up the instruments of foreign policy into elements, Brighi and Hill's (in Smith Ed. 2008) ascending scale of foreign policy instruments is also useful. In their foreign policy taxonomy, they formed five main groups, namely, Military Action, Political Intervention, Negative Sanctions, Positive Sanctions and Diplomacy. The ascending scale also indicates the seriousness of the country's decision makers and separates hard power (Military Action) from all the other soft power instruments. As the previously listed literature shows, the behavior influence attempt line of power literature has been facing difficulties in terms of objective measurements.

For the previous reasons, I decided to study the soft power capability and its usage in foreign policies. By creating the Global Soft Power Capability Index, I can further analyze foreign policy through its soft power capability.

Theory

Power in foreign policy has been a well-researched concept and as such, it has been developed greatly. From Dahl's (1968) one face power definition advanced into three faces of power and into the distinction of hard and soft powers. One of the complications of soft power literature is that they focus on the influence attempt and/or the outcome of soft power and not the capabilities. Both of those can be difficult to measure, especially the agenda setting and

preferences setting powers as we cannot know for sure what lead to the changed preferences or to the renewed agenda in other countries.

The other downside of the intended influence literature is that scholars cannot be sure what the intended result were and how do those differ from the actual results or outcomes. Also, focusing on the measurable and objective parts of soft power helps to avoid issues such as the difficulties of measuring perceived powers of countries or their deterrence powers. In other words, showing causation can be a serious issue in this literature. My approach hopes to create a less confusing and more objective measurement.

Observing soft power from the national resources perspective will allow me to objectively separate the resources from the outcomes. This way the role of foreign policy instruments such as public diplomacy, cultural diplomacy and financial aid can be better understood. By studying the available soft power capabilities, I will have a better understanding of the available choices of the foreign policy decision makers. Since hard power data is available for all countries (COW), by creating the second half of the power capability resources, I will be able to see when and why diplomats or decision makers chose soft power over hard power. I will also be able to detect variations among countries in their soft power capabilities as well as in their actual foreign policy usages.

Conceptualizing capabilities (Singer, 1963, Tellis, 2010 et, al.) proved to be an effective way in hard power and I chose to do the same in soft power. A single measure will not provide an accurate result, so I will have to use multiple variables to create the national level capability measurement. This number later can be taken further to be analyzed how these resources are converted into foreign policy (outcome). While the budget spending on education and cultural programs for instance, will not provide a holistic picture of the national soft power capabilities, adding manpower, infrastructure would do a better job.

Using summational variables similarly to COW, I will be able to study the impact of the national soft power capability on both the involvement and outcome foreign policy decisions. By summing up the national level demographic, cultural, facilities and government budget capabilities, I will be able to create the total soft power capability of each examined country. In many ways, capabilities are the objective aspects of national soft power, and ones they are created, the outcome of such capabilities can also be observed.

Current Concepts

Soft Power: The national resources that can lead to a country's ability to affect others through the co-optive means of framing the agenda, persuading, and eliciting positive attraction in order to obtain preferred outcomes.

Hard Power: Using military or economic coercion to get others to change their position (Nye, 2004, p.5).

Foreign Policy Instruments: Forms of pressure and influence available to decision makers, represent an ascending scale of seriousness in terms of the commitment of resources, the impact of third parties and the degree of risk in use. (Brighi, Hill 2008, p.131)

Foreign Policy Techniques: refer to the policy options available to decision makers pursuing a given set of objectives. (Baldwin, 1985, p. 12)

Project Design

In this research I will use mix methods to define and measure soft power capabilities in foreign policy.

- 1) I will start my research with the conceptualization of power as a national resource and identify the elements of such resource.

Soft power as an outcome has been traditionally measured with polls as surveys (Nye 2004). The only existing index; the International Soft Power Index (2010) is the main dataset available today for further study. It is not a survey but instead a quantitative measure of soft power. One of the main limitation of this index is that it does not separate the resource variables (foreign aid, language, etc.) from the outcome variables (national branding, tourism, etc.). In addition, the British index only looks at 26 of its own strategic partners and excludes all other countries.

- 2) Create Global Soft Power Capability Index.
- 3) Using this index, I will further study the high soft power capability country's foreign policy to find out which countries utilize their capabilities and which still rely more on traditional foreign policy tools such as hard power.
 - I plan to conduct elite-interviews with diplomats of other countries to ensure that I have not ignored any soft power capabilities that should have been included.
 - I will also conduct content analysis of selected high soft power capability countries' foreign policies to find out to what degree they utilize their capabilities.

Data Collection

There is currently only one international Soft Power Index. "THE NEW PERSUADERS: An International Ranking of Soft Power 2010." It was created by Jonathan McClory with the goal in mind to study the UK's ranking in the world in terms of soft power and to find out what the UK's strategic partner countries are doing in soft power. McClory's other motivation was to provide a report for the British government that would support the global importance of soft power in order to avoid budget cuts in diplomacy and other soft power instruments.

Limitations:

McClory's 2010 index has a political bias as it only includes the UK's 26 strategic partners in the sample group. The index reflects only one year of data 2010 and is limited to 26 countries. In this

case, due to the function of the research, all 26 countries are strategic partners of the UK. It is still a good guideline as most of its indicators are very useful for future soft power research.

There is, however, an even more significant limitation of this index namely, that it mixes the soft power resources and the outcomes and merges them into one outcome index. According to McClory (2010), he was creating a map of soft power landscapes. McClory (2010)'s conceptualization also builds on Nye's (2004) work, but claims to add more quantitative measurements to the index. Interestingly, both Nye (2004, 2011) and McClory (2010) follow the intended influence line of the power literature therefore, attempt to measure all the second and third faces of power, and do not separate resources from behavior outcomes.

Interestingly, however, McClory (2010) also theorizes that this study reflects upon the governments' capabilities and soft power advantages. While, the British scholar acknowledges that his index includes both the objective and the subjective sides of soft power, he does not distinguish between them. So with my Global Index of Soft Power Capability, I would like to further develop McClory's objective attempt of the operationalization by separating the intended influence and the outcome variables from the resources.

Finally, I would like to discuss the conceptualization and operationalization of measuring such difficult concept. McClory (2010) does a good job expanding the dimensions of soft power earlier defined by Nye (2002) by adding three more (culture, education and business). I would like to continue this work by further developing a multivariable index with more dimensions such as internet resources and number of cultural institutions at home (See Appendix B). With these expansions of soft power resources, I hope to avoid any cross pollination of the influence attempt variables, the outcome variables and the actual resources available.

Operationalization

The first step of my data analysis is to separate the resource and the outcome variables and use McClory's (2010) resource variables as foundations of my own Global Soft Power Capabilities Index (Appendix B). Later, I will add my own resource variables that were not present in the Soft Power Index 2010 to extend the measurement. Finally, I will extend the study to all countries including those that were excluded from the existing index.

By creating the main dimensions of soft power capability and list the indicators, I will be able to better qualify the capability and the outcome indicators. McClory (2010) for instance, uses both foreign aid (resource) and level of corruption (outcome) in his business dimension of his index. This inconsistency can be found in most other dimensions as well. With my index, I will avoid this problem by collecting and measuring the resource indicators, and conducting a different analysis on the outcome.

The new dimensions of soft power capabilities such as (demographic, cultural, infrastructure and budget) will help me to clearly and objectively define the soft power resource capabilities.

Content analysis and elite interviews will give me the data for the involvement and outcomes of foreign policy decisions. The final methodological step will be to interpret the findings. Using the Global Soft Power Capability Index, and the results of the qualitative part of the design will provide me with a clear picture of what countries capabilities are, and how they end up using them. I am interested in identifying indicators that would systematically explain the soft power capability variation among nations. Just as the early works of Singer (1963) and the first COW Project emphasized, measuring the country's resources is an objective way which further studies can be developed.

The second part of the data will come from qualitative research methods. By analyzing the foreign ministries and foreign relations committees' documents about the undergoing discussion about foreign policy tools with strategic partner's countries, I will have a clear picture of why decision makers ended up with their foreign policy choices. In addition, semi-structured interviews will allow me to ask the same questions from all interviewed Foreign Policy Attachés and Cultural Attachés, but at the same time allow for some room of free discussion of other important soft power instruments possibly not included in my research.

With all my data collection, I decided to focus on the last ten years (2002-2012). This way, I will be collecting information in the post-9/11 period and I will have enough data to see variations and patterns between soft power capabilities and foreign policy outcomes.

At the end, I will also need hard power data, which is available at COW Project. This data will provide the hard power resource data on countries, which I can control for in my models. Hard power data (military capabilities) will help me to effectively compare countries complete foreign policy resources, which is the sum of their hard and soft power capabilities and then isolate the soft power resources, and finally study their foreign policy choices.

So What?

Clarifying soft power capabilities for foreign policy can provide those alternative choices Baldwin (1985) was writing about. When foreign policy decision makers have clear and applicable capabilities and thus instrument choices for decision making, they will not be limited to the diplomacy or war choices (Baldwin 1985). By focusing on the soft power capabilities, I hope to provide more answers to countries' foreign policy choices. Learning if a country is high in soft power capabilities, and then studying the rate of which she is actually using it will provide a unique insight into Foreign Policy Analysis.

Also, by creating the first Global Soft Power Capability Index, I hope to continue the development of the soft power literature. This index will provide an objective measurement of capabilities which I use to look at the impact of such resources on the involvement and outcome of foreign policy. My ultimate goal with this project is to provide better causation between soft power resources and foreign policy outcomes than the previous literature has done while they were trying to measure intended influences and agenda setting.

With this project, I hope to create a clean division between the soft power resource indicators and the soft power outcomes. One of the most difficult tasks of soft power and public diplomacy literature is that they have been relying on Nye's concept of power as a behavior influencing outcome. With my measures, current soft power literature will be able to further study the concepts including the tools of soft power, such as cultural diplomacy and foreign aid, and being able to clearly separate the influence attempts and the outcomes.

Further, this study will complete the existing power literature by adding the missing soft power capability side to it. Power scholars in the future will be able to use both hard and soft power data sets to study countries and their foreign policies as well as other outcomes.

Prospective Chapters

Chapter 1: Intro to Research Question and Theory of Soft Power

- Defining soft power capabilities-theoretical framework

Chapter 2: Hard Power and Soft Power

- Studying soft power capabilities through hard power capability index (COW)
- Creating the dimensions of soft power capability-conceptualization

Chapter 3: Soft Power Instruments and their Usage

- Public Diplomacy
- Cultural Diplomacy
- Financial Aid

Chapter 4: Quantitative Analysis of Soft Power

- Global Soft Power Capabilities Index (2002-2012)

Chapter 5: Qualitative Analysis of Soft Power

- Elite Interviews with diplomats (involvement and outcomes)
- Content Analysis of foreign policy involvement and outcomes

Chapter 6: Results and Finding

- Combining the Global Soft Power Capability Index with the qualitative findings of the soft power outcomes

Chapter 7: Future of Soft Power/Smart Power

Appendix A- Soft Power (McClory Int. Soft Power Index 2010)

Yellow highlight indicates the soft power resource indicators

Business/Innovation:

- International Patents; World Intellectual Property Organization
- Business competitiveness corruption: Schwab, K. (2010) Global Competitiveness Report 2010-11, World Economic Forum
- Level of Corruption: Transparency International Corruption Perception Index
- Innovation: BCG and NAM Innovation Index
- Foreign Investment: United Nations Conference on Trade and Development Statistic

Culture:

- Tourism: UN World Tourism Organization
- Reach of State Sponsored Media Outlet : Monocle research, various sources
- Foreign Correspondents: Press Association and other sources
- Language: George Weber, “The World’s Ten Most Influential Languages”, Language Monthly, 3: 12-18, 1997
- Sporting Success Number of Olympic Gold Medals won in last Summer and Winter Games: International Olympic Committee Database

Education:

- Think Tank Presence: McGann, J. (2009) “The Global Go-To Think Tanks”
- Quality of Universities: Global Universities Top 200
- Foreign Students: UNESCO Institute for Statistics

Government:

- UN HDI Score Index: United Nations Human Development Index
- Good Governance Index: World Bank Good Governance Index
- Freedom Score Index of political freedom and personal liberty: Freedom House Index
- Trust in Government: World Economic Forum Trust in Government Index
- Life Satisfaction: White, A. (2007) “A Global Projection of Subjective Well-being: A Challenge To Positive Psychology?”

Diplomacy:

- Foreign Aid Overseas: OECD and UN Development Statistics
- Languages Spoken by Leader: (no central database)
- Visa Freedom: The Henley Visa Restrictions Index
- Strength of National Brand: Anholt-GFK Nation Brand Index
- Number of Cultural Missions-Direct government or embassy contacts

Appendix B-Global Soft Power Capability Index (draft)

Economic

- Foreign Aid

Innovation/Internet Presence

- Number of international patents
- Number of software patents
- National internet usage

Education

- Number of Universities
- Number of Academic Publications
- Number of Professors in Higher Education

National Culture

- Language
- Number of people speaking two or more languages
- Number of World Known Tourist Attractions

Diplomacy

- Number of Embassies
- Number of Cultural Missions
- Number of Cultural Institutions Abroad
- Number of Cultural Institutions at Home

Work Cited

- Arndt**, Richard T., (2005) "The First Resort of Kings: American Cultural Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century" paperback, Potomac Books, Inc. Washington DC, ISBN 1-57488-587-1.
- Chong**, Alan. (2007) "Foreign Policy in Global Information Space. Actualizing Soft Power". Palgrave MacMillan.
- Baldwin**, David A. (1985). "Economic Statecraft". Princeton University Press.
- Bachrach**, Peter and **Baratz**, Morton S. (1962). "Two Faces of Power". The American Political Science Review, Vol. 56, No. 4 (Dec., 1962), pp. 947-952.
- Dahl**, Robert (1961) "Who Governs: Democracy and Power in an American City" (New Haven, CT; Yale University Press).
- Dahl**, Robert (1968). "Power" Encyclopedia of Social Sciences. Ed. David L. Sills, Vol. 12 (pp. 405-415).
- Ferguson**, Niall. (2004) "Colossus: The Price of America's Empire." New York: Penguin Press. Intro
- Gelb**, Leslie (2009) "Power Rules: How Common Sense can Rescue US Foreign Policy."
- Lasswell**, Harold (1958) "Politics: Who Gets What, When, How?" Meridian Books.
- Lukes**, Steven. (2005). 2nd Ed "Power: A Radical View". London McMillan. (Original 1974)
- Nye**, Jr. Joseph. (2002) "The Paradox of America Power. Why the World's Only Superpower Go It Alone" Oxford University press pp. 8-9.
- Nye**, Jr., Joseph. (2004) "*Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*" New York Public Affairs.
- Nye**, Jr., Joseph and Armitage, Richard L. Hon. (2008, April 24). "Implementing Smart Power: Setting an Agenda for National Security Reform". Committee on Foreign Relations United States Senate. Second Session
- Nye**, Joseph Jr. (2011) "The Future of Power" Public Affairs, New York.
- Schneider**, **Cynthia** (2005). "Culture Communicates: US Diplomacy that Works," in Jan Melissen, Ed., 2005. *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, Palgrave Macmillan. (Pgs.147-168).

Schneider, Cynthia. (2009) "The Unrealized Potential of Cultural Diplomacy: Best Practices and What Could Be, If Only..." Heldref Publications Vol. 39. No. 4.

Smith, Steve, Hadfield, Amelia, Dunne, Tim (eds.) (2008) "Foreign Policy. Theories, Actors, Cases." Oxford University Press.

Singer, J. David. (1963) "Inter-Nation Influence: A Formal Model" American Political Science Review. Vol. 57, No. 2 (Jun., 1963).

Singer, J. David (ed.). (1979). *The Correlates of War I: Research Origins and Rationale*. New York: Free Press.

Tellis, Ashley, J, Bially, Janice, Layne, Christopheher, McPherson, Melissa. (2010) "Measuring National Power in the Postindustrial Age" Rand Arrayo Center.

Indexes:

1. THE NEW PERSUADERS: An International Ranking of Soft Power. 2010. By Jonathan McClory. Institute for Government GB.
2. (COW) National Material Capabilities (military expenditure per state) 1816-2007