

THE ARCHITECTURE OF CULTURAL COMMUNICATIONS IN SOFT POWER DIPLOMACY: INSIGHTS FROM LEADING STATES

Purpose. This article aims to analyze the experience of leading states in structuring and institutionalizing cultural communications as an integral component of soft power diplomacy. The study seeks to identify the key structural elements of communication architecture, examine the mechanisms of their integration into foreign policy strategies, and assess their role in strengthening sustainable international positioning. Particular attention is devoted to the systemic organization of cultural instruments and their strategic coordination within contemporary international relations.

Methods. The research is based on an interdisciplinary methodological framework combining structural-functional, comparative, and institutional analysis. The structural-functional approach was applied to determine the core components and internal logic of cultural communication architecture. The comparative method enabled the examination of national models and the identification of common patterns and distinctive features in their implementation. Institutional analysis was used to explore governance mechanisms, coordination processes, and interaction between state and non-state actors. In addition, content analysis of strategic documents and cultural diplomacy programs was conducted to reveal dominant priorities, narratives, and operational instruments.

Results. The findings indicate that cultural communications function as a multi-level and systematically organized structure integrating governmental institutions, educational and research organizations, civil society actors, creative industries, and digital platforms. The study identifies strategic planning, institutional coherence, symbolic resources, international outreach mechanisms, and evaluation tools as key elements of this architecture. It is established that the effectiveness of soft power strategies depends on long-term policy consistency, institutional sustainability, and adaptability to transformations in the global information environment. The combination of traditional diplomatic practices with digital communication technologies significantly enhances international engagement and visibility.

Conclusions. The experience of leading states in developing the architecture of cultural communications demonstrates the effectiveness of a systemic and strategically coordinated approach to soft power implementation. The structured organization of cultural instruments contributes to strengthening international reputation, expanding global outreach, and increasing trust among international partners. The study substantiates the important role of cultural communications in ensuring sustainable international positioning and reinforcing state influence under conditions of global transformation. The obtained results confirm the relevance of further studying and adapting successful international practices to contemporary foreign policy priorities.

Key words: public diplomacy, international positioning, strategic communications, institutional governance, cultural engagement, symbolic capital, foreign policy instruments, global outreach mechanisms.

JEL Classification: F50; F52; F55, Z18; Z19.

Viktoriia YATSYNA,

Senior Lecturer at the Department of
General Economic Theory
National Technical University «Kharkiv
Polytechnic Institute»
Candidate of Economic Sciences,
Associate Professor
Viktoriia.Yatsyna@khp.edu.ua
orcid.org/0000-0002-4440-976X

Svitlana KLYMOVA,

Senior Lecturer at the Department of
General Economic Theory
National Technical University «Kharkiv
Polytechnic Institute»
Candidate of Economic Sciences,
Associate Professor
Svitlana.Klymova@khp.edu.ua
orcid.org/0000-0002-0041-6845

Introduction. In the context of the ongoing transformation of the global order and the intensification of geopolitical competition, cultural communications have acquired particular significance as instruments of influence in contemporary international relations. The growing role of non-military and non-coercive mechanisms of interaction has strengthened the relevance of soft power diplomacy as a strategic component of foreign policy. States increasingly rely on culture, language, education, media, and digital platforms not merely as channels of representation, but as structured mechanisms for shaping international perceptions, constructing national images, and fostering long-term trust.

In the 21st century, cultural diplomacy has evolved beyond traditional exchange programs and symbolic initiatives into a complex, multi-level system embedded in broader strategic communications. Contemporary interpretations of public diplomacy emphasize its transformation from traditional state-centered messaging to a

multidimensional system of engagement that integrates cultural, educational, digital, and societal actors. As Nicholas J. Cull argues, modern public diplomacy functions as a long-term process of relationship-building rather than episodic communication campaigns (Cull, 2019). According to Joseph Nye, soft power is based on attraction rather than coercion (Nye, 2004). Leading global actors, particularly the United States and China, demonstrate distinct yet equally systematic approaches to the institutionalization of cultural influence. Their models reflect different political traditions, governance structures, and value orientations, while simultaneously revealing common trends in the instrumentalization of culture within global competition.

The systemic nature of cultural communications is also emphasized in European analytical practice. The British Council conceptualizes cultural relations as a long-term process of trust-building grounded in reciprocity, institutional continuity, and sustained people-to-people engagement. According to the analytical report *The Value of Cultural Relations*, durable international influence depends not only on symbolic visibility but on stable institutional frameworks capable of maintaining dialogue over time (British Council, 2019). This perspective reinforces the understanding of cultural diplomacy as an integrated and sustainable communicative architecture rather than a set of isolated initiatives.

Against this background, a comparative analysis of contemporary practices of cultural communications as tools of soft power diplomacy becomes especially relevant for understanding the dynamics of influence in modern international relations.

The purpose of the article is to analyze the modern practices of cultural communications as instruments of soft power diplomacy in international relations, with particular emphasis on the comparative examination of the United States and China. The research aims to identify the institutional foundations, strategic priorities, communicative mechanisms, and geopolitical orientations of their respective models, as well as to determine their role in shaping international perception and influence.

Methods. The study employs a combination of general scientific and specialized methods of international relations research. A comparative method is applied to identify similarities and differences between U.S. and Chinese models of cultural diplomacy. Structural-functional analysis is used to examine the institutional frameworks and mechanisms of implementation. The systemic approach allows cultural communications to be considered as an integrated multi-level architecture combining institutional, programmatic, digital, and symbolic dimensions. Elements of discourse analysis are employed to explore value narratives and image-building strategies embedded in soft power practices.

Results. The findings of this study demonstrate that contemporary cultural communications function as structured and strategically coordinated instruments of soft power within the foreign policy frameworks of leading global actors. The empirical analysis reveals that both institutional design and communicative narratives play a decisive role in shaping international influence. In order to identify the operational logic and distinctive features of soft power implementation, it is necessary to examine the practical mechanisms through which states translate values, cultural symbols, and educational models into instruments of geopolitical positioning.

The first case under consideration is the United States, whose approach to cultural communications is largely grounded in the universalization of normative values and the global dissemination of its socio-cultural model.

U.S. Cultural communications: soft power through the universalism of values

The United States has historically been one of the most influential actors in the field of soft power (Cull, 2008). Following the Second World War, the U.S. actively consolidated its global presence not only through economic and military strength but also by promoting American values such as democracy, freedom of speech, innovation, and individualism through culture, education, technology, and mass media.

During the period 2000-2025, the United States consistently employed cultural communications as a strategic instrument for shaping soft power within the global environment. This encompasses not only institutionalized cultural diplomacy, but, more importantly, a broad range of channels for transmitting cultural meanings, symbols, ideas, and values that contribute to a favorable perception of the United States worldwide. American cultural communications possess a multi-level structure that integrates governmental initiatives, educational exchange programs, digital platforms, media systems, popular culture, and informal networks of interaction.

One of the key organizations responsible for implementing U.S. cultural diplomacy is the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) of the U.S. Department of State (U.S. Department of State, n.d.).

Through this institutional framework, dozens of international programs are administered, the most well-known are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

U.S. cultural programs (2000–2025)

Program	Program description	Communicative role
Fulbright Program	Academic exchange programs for students, faculty members, and researchers from more than 160 countries. The goal is to foster mutual understanding among nations through shared education and research	Contributes to the formation of academic and cultural bridges through direct interpersonal interaction; enhances the prestige of the United States as an intellectual center
International Visitor Leadership Program (IVLP)	Invitational programs for emerging leaders and professionals to visit the United States and gain first-hand insight into the country's political, economic, and cultural systems through live communication	Establishes personal connections between future leaders and the United States, laying the groundwork for long-term engagement and loyalty
American Spaces	A network of cultural centers abroad hosting lectures, film screenings, workshops, and language clubs, serving as platforms for cultural dialogue with local communities.	Provides an accessible U.S. cultural space in foreign countries; promotes bilateral cultural interaction and dialogue.
Education USA	An information network assisting international applicants with admission to U.S. higher education institutions, thereby strengthening trust in the American educational system and its values.	Communicates the U.S. educational model as open, high-quality, and inclusive; cultivates a positive national image through education
English Access Microscholarship	A scholarship program for students aged 13-20 from developing countries, focused on English language acquisition, critical thinking, and civic values.	Engages youth with the values of openness, democracy, and self-development through linguistic and cultural interaction
MOOC-platforms (Coursera, EdX)	Free online courses offered by leading American universities and accessible globally, serving as a mechanism for disseminating academic standards and language models.	Promotes U.S. knowledge production, academic mobility, and linguistic culture within the digital environment.
Peace Corps	A volunteer program placing Americans abroad to support education, community development, intercultural interaction, and local initiatives in education and public health	Utilizes personal example and everyday communication as channels of influence within local communities.
English Language Fellow / Teacher Programs	Programs for English language instructors teaching in various countries worldwide, fostering long-term educational and cultural ties while disseminating American pedagogical approaches	Promotes U.S. linguistic and educational culture; establishes sustainable interpersonal and institutional linkages

Source: compiled by the authors on the basis of: (U.S. Department of State (n.d.), U.S. Agency for Global Media (n.d.), Institute of International Education (2024)).

A distinct role is played by the U.S. Agency for Global Media (USAGM), which coordinates U.S. international broadcasting, including Voice of America, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Alhurra, and other outlets. These media function as instruments for promoting the American worldview, democratic values, and human rights, while simultaneously serving as channels for cultural transmission (U.S. Agency for Global Media, n.d.).

Among the key instruments of U.S. cultural communication, the following may be identified.

First, mass culture as a global language. Through film, music, television, and online content, the United States communicates with the world in an informal yet systematic manner. Hollywood films, Netflix series, and the music of American artists construct images of the “American Dream,” freedom, and innovation. These narratives are perceived by millions not as political messages, but as elements of cultural reality.

Second, digital communication platforms. Since the 2010s, the United States has intensified its presence on social media as a means of engaging with youth in other countries. Government institutions,

universities, and cultural foundations actively communicate via YouTube, Instagram, Twitter (X), and TikTok. Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) such as Coursera and EdX have provided access to American academic culture for millions of students in countries where the United States has no physical presence (Nazaruk, 2021).

Third, public volunteering and interpersonal interaction. The Peace Corps and similar programs are built on trust and shared experience. Volunteers learn local languages and cultures while simultaneously transmitting American norms of cooperation, civic engagement, education, and innovation. This form of cultural communication operates through everyday practice rather than formal messaging.

Fourth, the English language as a key channel of cultural interaction. Through programs such as the English Access Microscholarship Program, the Teachers of Critical Languages Program (TCLP), and the English Language Fellow Program, the United States expands communicative opportunities in the global environment. These initiatives generate millions of individual acts of communication that reinforce perceptions of the United States as an open, educated, and leadership-oriented nation.

Additional instruments of U.S. soft power include:

- Hollywood and mass culture (the film industry, music, global brands, and show business);
- MOOCs and educational platforms (Coursera, EdX);
- technological giants as cultural intermediaries (Google, Meta, Apple).

U.S. cultural diplomacy is characterized by a high degree of non-governmental partnership. For example, American universities independently implement hundreds of exchange programs with foreign partners. Initiatives such as Open Doors and Education USA support sustained interest in American education as a cultural product (Institute of International Education, 2024).

In a geostrategic context, the United States employs cultural diplomacy as part of its strategic communication, particularly in post-Soviet countries, the Middle East, Africa, and Asia. U.S. cultural programs in Eastern Europe (including Ukraine) are aimed at strengthening civil society, promoting media literacy, and supporting independent journalism – all within the framework of the democratic “export of values”.

At the same time, American cultural diplomacy is frequently criticized for its global universalism, which at times borders on cultural hegemony. The promotion of the “American way of life” is occasionally perceived as imposition rather than intercultural dialogue. For this reason, since the 2010s the United States has increasingly turned to the concept of smart power, combining soft power with elements of hard influence in more nuanced and flexible formats.

Thus, U.S. cultural diplomacy is deeply institutionalized, multi-channel, and highly technological. It is grounded in the attractiveness of values, cultural products, and educational opportunities. However, under contemporary conditions, the United States faces challenges related to cultural pluralism, information competition, and new forms of hybrid confrontation, which necessitate a more flexible and localized approach to soft power.

U.S. cultural communications cannot be reduced to official diplomacy alone; rather, they function as a multi-channel system of symbolic interaction. These communications operate simultaneously on a vertical level (through state programs) and a horizontal level (through educational exchanges, volunteering, and digital networks). It is precisely through the continuous and consistent transmission of cultural codes, identities, and value matrices that the United States establishes a profound “background presence” within the global cultural space.

China's Soft Power Strategy through Cultural Communications

Over the past two decades, the People's Republic of China (PRC) has transformed cultural communications into a strategic instrument of its foreign policy, actively employing them to shape a positive international image, expand its global influence, and promote a civilizational model positioned as an alternative to the Western paradigm (Shambaugh, 2013). Within the framework of the soft power concept proposed by Joseph Nye, China has adapted cultural diplomacy to its own political context, combining traditional elements (language, heritage, values) with contemporary tools such as digital technologies, youth exchanges, symbolic diplomacy, and infrastructure projects.

China's understanding of soft power is based not solely on the attractiveness of culture per se, but also on the demonstration of social stability, historical continuity, and global initiative. Consequently, the PRC's cultural communications possess a comprehensive character: they integrate elements of public diplomacy, cultural infrastructure development, educational export, and a strategic narrative centered on

the “peaceful rise of civilization.” A particularly significant role in this process is played by Confucius Institutes, international cultural festivals, projects implemented within the framework of the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), as well as China’s active presence in the global media space (Callahan, 2016), (Huang, 2021).

China’s cultural presence worldwide is expanding in a systematic manner and according to clearly defined geopolitical priorities, including Africa, Southeast Asia, Latin America, and Central Europe. This indicates not only a commitment to intercultural dialogue, but also an aspiration to compete for influence with Western models of soft power.

The instruments of the PRC’s cultural communications are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Key instruments of China’s cultural diplomacy

Type of Instrument	Components	Examples / Cases
Institutional	Language centers; university-based platforms	Confucius Institute
Programmatic	Scholarships; educational exchanges; grant schemes	Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) Cultural Exchange Programs; Chinese Government Scholarships
Digital	Social media platforms; influencers; online communication ecosystems	China – Global Youth Influencer Exchange Programs
Media-Based	International broadcasting; streaming platforms; film and television production	China Global Television Network (CGTN); StarTimes (Africa); Chinese television dramas
Symbolic	Diplomatic gestures; cultural gifts; traditional symbols	“Panda diplomacy”; calligraphy; tea culture
Infrastructure-Based	Cultural centers; theatres; stadiums; public venues	Stadium diplomacy in Africa; Cultural Center in Laos

Source: compiled by the authors on the basis of: (Shambaugh (2013), Callahan (2016), Huang (2021), Fedasiuk (2020), official data of the Center for Language Education and Cooperation (n.d.).

One of the most extensive and systematic instruments of the People’s Republic of China’s (PRC) cultural diplomacy is the global network of Confucius Institute. Since its establishment in 2004, the initiative has evolved into a central mechanism for the international promotion of Chinese language and culture. At its peak (2018–2019), more than 500 Confucius Institutes and over 1,000 Confucius Classrooms operated in more than 100 countries, ensuring a sustained presence of Chinese cultural outreach within the global educational sphere. In the early 2020s, however, the number of institutes declined, particularly in North America and Europe (Huang, 2021).

The institutes traditionally functioned through a tripartite cooperation model involving a Chinese government-affiliated body (formerly Hanban, reorganized in 2020 into the Center for Language Education and Cooperation), a partner Chinese university, and a host foreign educational institution. Their activities include language instruction, cultural programming (competitions, exhibitions, concerts), academic exchanges, and scholarships for study in China. Large-scale cultural events, such as Lunar New Year galas, have been organized simultaneously across dozens of countries, attracting broad public participation (Center for Language Education and Cooperation, n.d.). These institutions exemplify China’s model of soft power, which combines cultural appeal with narratives of social stability, historical continuity, and global engagement.

At the same time, Confucius Institutes have faced substantial criticism. In several Western countries, they have been accused of undermining academic freedom, limiting discussion of politically sensitive topics (including human rights, Taiwan, Xinjiang, and Tibet), and potentially facilitating state influence. A frequently cited case is the 2014 “Braga incident” in Portugal, where conference materials were reportedly altered to remove references to Taiwan. Between 2013 and 2021, a significant number of institutes were closed or restructured in the United States, Canada, Sweden, Australia, and other countries; for example, the University of Chicago terminated its Confucius Institute partnership in 2014, and Stockholm University closed its institute in 2015.

Following a decline in its popularity across parts of the West, China redirected elements of its cultural outreach toward the Global South, particularly Africa, Southeast Asia, and Latin America, integrating Confucius Institute activities into the educational and people-to-people dimension of the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI). This shift has enabled Beijing to consolidate influence in strategically significant regions while compensating for institutional closures in North America and Europe (Callahan, 2016).

Confucius Institutes thus function not merely as language centers but as components of China's broader communication strategy. Their effectiveness depends on adaptation to local contexts, academic transparency, and the maintenance of host-community trust.

China also combines cultural diplomacy with infrastructure support, often described as "stadium diplomacy." In several BRI partner countries, Beijing has financed or constructed cultural centers, theatres, and sports facilities alongside transport and industrial projects. Examples include the National Cultural Centre in Uganda and the National Theatre in Laos, which operate both as venues for cultural exchange and as symbols of strategic partnership. In this sense, the BRI represents a multi-layered system of cultural communication that merges state strategy, symbolic resources, and pragmatic diplomacy. Compared to Western soft power models, China's approach emphasizes long-term infrastructural embedding of culture within partner societies, thereby generating sustained communicative leverage.

In the digital era, the People's Republic of China (PRC) has expanded cultural diplomacy through online platforms, transforming traditional outreach into a multi-level system of digital engagement. This strategy forms part of a broader public diplomacy framework aimed at shaping China's international image, influencing narratives, and projecting a distinct value model globally.

Chinese platforms such as Douyin and WeChat, alongside the international activities of China Global Television Network and other state-affiliated media, disseminate cultural content highlighting everyday life, heritage, education, and technological development. Content is frequently localized for audiences in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Cooperation with foreign influencers, through sponsored study tours and exchange initiatives, has become another visible instrument, leveraging peer-to-peer credibility to enhance affective engagement.

Digital cultural diplomacy also includes virtual exhibitions, online museum projects, and Chinese MOOCs, which expanded significantly during the COVID-19 pandemic. At the same time, China's digital strategy reflects a dual orientation: proactive cultural promotion combined with an emphasis on "digital sovereignty", including regulatory control over online narratives. This has generated criticism concerning content filtering and the management of politically sensitive topics.

Despite such critiques, China's digital diplomacy demonstrates adaptive capacity within the evolving global information environment, integrating cultural soft power with technological instruments and advancing a model of communication that blends official messaging with personalized and emotionally resonant forms of intercultural engagement.

Symbolic diplomacy constitutes a significant component of soft power, as it appeals primarily to emotional rather than purely rational perceptions of culture and statehood. One of the most enduring examples in modern international relations is China's "panda diplomacy" – the transfer or long-term loan of giant pandas to foreign zoos as a gesture of friendship and partnership. In 1972, following U.S. President Richard Nixon's visit to China, the Chinese government gifted a pair of pandas (Ling-Ling and Hsing-Hsing) to the Smithsonian National Zoo, an act widely interpreted as symbolizing the normalization of U.S. – China relations.

Since the mid-1980s, panda diplomacy has operated primarily through regulated loan agreements rather than permanent gifts. Typically concluded for ten-year terms, such agreements involve substantial annual payments (commonly reported at around USD 1 million per pair), while all offspring remain the property of the People's Republic of China (PRC) and are eventually returned to China. Animal care standards and veterinary supervision are also strictly defined within bilateral contracts.

Panda diplomacy represents an effective form of symbolic soft power, combining the universally positive image of the animal with a deliberate diplomatic context. Unlike language programs or digital outreach, this instrument relies on emotional resonance, which enhances its impact among broader publics. The practice remains active: in 2023–2025, China renewed or initiated panda cooperation agreements with several countries, including Germany and Thailand.

At the same time, panda diplomacy is not without controversy. Critics argue that panda loans may function as instruments of political signaling, as agreements often reflect the broader state of bilateral

relations. In some host countries, public debate has emerged when pandas were returned to China at the end of contracts, illustrating both strong emotional attachment and the diplomatic sensitivity surrounding such arrangements.

Overall, the PRC demonstrates a multi-layered model of cultural diplomacy encompassing institutional (Confucius Institutes), programmatic (scholarships and exchanges), digital (social media and influencer engagement), and symbolic (panda diplomacy, infrastructure projects) instruments. Within the framework of the Belt and Road Initiative, these tools are integrated into a long-term geocultural strategy. By combining traditional values with contemporary communication formats, China seeks to cultivate a favorable image, particularly across the Global South. Nevertheless, its cultural diplomacy remains contested due to concerns over political conditionality and narrative control. Despite these tensions, cultural communications have become central to China’s effort to articulate an alternative model of soft power in the contemporary international system.

In summary, it can be argued that cultural communications and soft power diplomacy constitute an integral component of the strategic foreign policy toolkit of the world’s leading states. Despite differences in their modes of implementation, the United States and China employ culture, language, education, and values as channels of influence directed toward international audiences. The specific features and priorities of each model and their key characteristics are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Comparative characteristics of U.S. and Chinese cultural diplomacy

Country	Key Institutions	Primary Focus	Mode of Implementation	Geographic Scope of Influence
United States	State Department, Fulbright Program, American Spaces, IVLP	Global presence; promotion of freedom, democracy, and national branding	Grants, exchange programs, embassy-based cultural centers, soft promotion mechanisms	Worldwide (particularly the Global South and Europe)
China	Confucius Institutes, Chinese Cultural Centers, Hanban	Promotion of language and traditions; projection of an image of a civilizational state	State-led institutions under party oversight; language expansion strategies	Asia, Africa, Latin America, and Western countries

The comparative analysis makes it possible to systematize the key parameters of U.S. and Chinese cultural diplomacy and to identify the structural features of each model. At the same time, the table reflects primarily the institutional and strategic dimensions, whereas the actual impact of soft power is shaped through the complex interaction of state, societal, and digital actors. It is precisely this multidimensional character of cultural communications that explains their growing significance in contemporary international politics and underscores the need for further conceptual elaboration.

Conclusions. The conducted analysis of U.S. and Chinese cultural communications demonstrates that soft power diplomacy has evolved into a systemic and strategically institutionalized instrument of contemporary international relations. Both states exhibit clearly articulated models of influence that integrate cultural, educational, linguistic, digital, and symbolic resources into a coherent communicative architecture.

The American model is grounded in the universalism of values, global branding, and an extensive network of partnerships in which the state cooperates with non-governmental actors, universities, media institutions, and digital platforms. Its defining characteristics include multi-channel outreach, flexibility, and a high level of technological integration. In contrast, the Chinese model is characterized by centralized coordination, long-term strategic planning, and the combination of linguistic-cultural expansion with infrastructural and symbolic projects (notably within the framework of the Belt and Road Initiative). While the United States emphasizes the promotion of freedom, democracy, and the “American Way of Life,” China advances a narrative of civilizational continuity, stability, and an alternative development model.

Despite these differences, both countries employ targeted image-building narratives and seek to influence public opinion, emotional perception, and the formation of international trust. Cultural communications operate as a multi-level system integrating institutional, programmatic, digital, and symbolic dimensions, thereby establishing a sustained “background presence” of states within the global information space.

Thus, in the contemporary international environment, cultural diplomacy functions not only as a mechanism for transmitting values but also as a competitive arena for attention, loyalty, and the sympathies of global communities. It is increasingly embedded within strategic communications and has become an essential component of geopolitical rivalry.

Future research perspectives should focus on assessing the effectiveness of digital cultural diplomacy in the era of artificial intelligence and algorithm-driven media, examining the role of cultural communications in strengthening societal resilience to disinformation, and conducting comparative analyses of soft power strategies employed by middle powers. Particular attention should also be devoted to the adaptation of cultural diplomacy instruments to conditions of hybrid conflict and the ongoing transformation of the global order.

References:

1. British Council. (2019). *The value of cultural relations*. London, UK: British Council. Retrieved from <https://www.britishcouncil.org>
2. Callahan, W. A. (2016). China's "Asia dream": The Belt and Road Initiative and the new regional order. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 1(3), 226–243. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2057891116647806>
3. Center for Language Education and Cooperation. (n.d.). *Confucius Institute Headquarters*. <https://www.chinese.cn/page/#/pcpage/mainpage>
4. Cull, N. J. (2008). Public diplomacy: Taxonomies and histories. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1), 31–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716207311952>
5. Cull, N. J. (2019). *Public diplomacy: Foundations for global engagement in the digital age*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
6. EducationUSA / Institute of International Education. (2024). *Open Doors 2024 report*. <https://opendoorsdata.org>
7. Fedasiuk, R. (2020). *The China Scholarship Council: An overview*. Washington, DC, US: Center for Security and Emerging Technology, Georgetown University.
8. Huang, Z. A. (2021). China's public diplomacy and Confucius Institute. In P. Surowiec & I. Manor (Eds.), *Public diplomacy and the politics of uncertainty*. Cham, CH: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-54552-1>
9. Nazaruk, Z. (2021). TikTok as a source of China's soft power. *Journal of Political Risk*, 9(8).
10. Nguyen, M. T., & Wu, T. D. (2025). Cultural diplomacy and soft power of China: Theory, strategy and application in South East Asia. *Asian Online Journal*.
11. Nye, J. S. (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. New York, NY, US: PublicAffairs.
12. Nye, J. S. (2011). *The future of power*. New York, NY, US: PublicAffairs.
13. Shambaugh, D. (2013). *China goes global: The partial power*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
14. U.S. Agency for Global Media. (n.d.). <https://www.usagm.gov>
15. U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. (n.d.). <https://eca.state.gov>

АРХИТЕКТУРА КУЛЬТУРНИХ КОМУНІКАЦІЙ У ДИПЛОМАТІЇ М'ЯКОЇ СИЛИ: ДОСВІД ПРОВІДНИХ ДЕРЖАВ

Вікторія ЯЦИНА,

доцент кафедри загальної економічної теорії
Національного технічного університету
«Харківський політехнічний інститут»
кандидат економічних наук, доцент
Victoriia.Yatsyna@khpi.edu.ua
orcid.org/0000-0002-4440-976X

Світлана КЛИМОВА,

доцент кафедри загальної економічної теорії
Національного технічного університету
«Харківський політехнічний інститут»
кандидат економічних наук, доцент
Svitlana.Klymova@khpi.edu.ua
orcid.org/0000-0002-0041-6845

Метою статті є дослідження практик провідних держав щодо формування та інституціоналізації культурних комунікацій як складової стратегії м'якого впливу. Дослідження спрямоване на виявлення структурних характеристик архітектури культурної взаємодії, визначення механізмів її інтеграції у систему зовнішньополітичного планування та оцінку її ролі у формуванні стійкої міжнародної репутації держави. Особливу увагу приділено системності організації культурних інструментів та їх стратегічній координації.

Методи. Методологічну основу становить міждисциплінарний підхід, що поєднує структурно-функціональний, порівняльний та інституційний аналіз. Структурно-функціональний метод застосовано для визначення ключових елементів архітектури культурних комунікацій та їх взаємозв'язків. Порівняльний аналіз дозволив зіставити національні моделі реалізації стратегій впливу та виокремити спільні закономірності їх розвитку. Інституційний підхід використано для дослідження механізмів координації діяльності державних органів, культурних інституцій і недержавних акторів. Також проведено контент-аналіз стратегічних документів, програм культурної дипломатії та комунікаційних ініціатив.

Результати. Визначено, що культурні комунікації функціонують як багаторівнева система, яка об'єднує державні структури, освітні та наукові інституції, громадські організації, креативні індустрії та цифрові платформи. Визначено основні складові цієї архітектури: стратегічне планування, інституційна узгодженість, використання символічного ресурсу, механізми міжнародного залучення та інструменти моніторингу ефективності. Доведено, що результативність стратегій м'якого впливу залежить від довгостроковості програм, їх інтеграції у зовнішньополітичні пріоритети та здатності адаптуватися до трансформації глобального інформаційного середовища. Важливим чинником є поєднання традиційних дипломатичних практик із цифровими форматами комунікації.

Висновки. Досвід провідних держав у формуванні архітектури культурних комунікацій свідчить про ефективність системного підходу до реалізації стратегій м'якого впливу у міжнародному середовищі. Узгодженість інституційних механізмів, стратегічне планування та довгострокова підтримка культурних ініціатив сприяють зміцненню міжнародного авторитету та розширенню глобальної присутності держави. Обґрунтовано важливу роль культурних комунікацій у забезпеченні стійкого міжнародного позиціонування та формуванні довіри в умовах трансформації світового порядку. Отримані результати підтверджують доцільність подальшого розвитку та адаптації ефективних моделей культурної взаємодії з урахуванням національних інтересів і сучасних викликів.

Ключові слова: публічна дипломатія, міжнародне позиціонування, стратегічні комунікації, інституційне управління, культурна взаємодія, символічний капітал, інструменти зовнішньої політики, глобальні механізми інформаційно-просвітницької роботи.



Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії відкритого доступу (CC BY 4.0)

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 05.03.2026
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 26.03.2026
Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 07.05.2026