

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2956-333X/2025-4-6>

NATION BRANDING AS A MECHANISM OF PUBLIC GOVERNANCE: INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE OF THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER COUNTRIES FOR UKRAINE'S IMAGE POLICY

Alla Dakal,

*Doctor of Public Administration, Associate Professor,
Professor at the Department of Public Administration,
Institute of International Relations and Social Sciences,
Private Joint-Stock Company "Higher Educational Institution
"Interregional Academy of Personnel Management", Ukraine
orcid.org/0000-0003-3221-353X
alladakal@gmail.com*

Olga Denysiuk,

*Postgraduate Student at the Department of Public Administration,
Institute of International Relations and Social Sciences,
Private Joint-Stock Company "Higher Educational Institution
"Interregional Academy of Personnel Management", Ukraine
orcid.org/0009-0006-1761-3921
olgadenysiuk5@gmail.com*

Summary. The article examines the international experience of nation branding as an instrument of public governance for Ukraine based on case studies from the United States, Canada, Japan, and South Korea. It analyzes institutional models of image-making, mechanisms of public diplomacy, and communication strategies aimed at enhancing a state's reputation and global trust. The study emphasizes how image management has evolved from a cultural activity into a structural component of statecraft – a measurable function of governance that ensures soft power, legitimacy, and sustainable development. It further conceptualizes nation branding as a form of "reputation governance," in which communication becomes an operational tool of policy performance, crisis response, and international positioning. The comparative approach allows the identification of universal principles of successful branding – long-term institutional continuity, strategic coherence, and social inclusivity – that enable states to convert symbolic capital into diplomatic and economic advantage.

Special attention is paid to Ukraine's image transformation before and after 2022, showing how crisis diplomacy and cultural resilience shaped the country's new brand identity. The research highlights Ukraine's transition from a peripheral post-Soviet perception to a central narrative of democratic leadership and civic bravery within the European political imagination. This transformation is viewed as part of a broader paradigm shift – from reactive image management to proactive trust governance – demonstrating how public communication, digital diplomacy, and cultural policy can reinforce national legitimacy during wartime and reconstruction.

The article concludes that the institutionalization of image policy through strategic coordination and reputation analytics can strengthen Ukraine's standing in global communications and integrate its national brand into the European and transatlantic discourse. It recommends the creation of a National Branding Office, the application of data-driven performance metrics (KPI and soft power indices), and the systematic inclusion of civil society in image governance processes. Ultimately, the research argues that for Ukraine, nation branding is not merely an element of external communication but a strategic infrastructure of resilience, credibility, and post-war recovery.

Keywords: nation branding, public governance, soft power, strategic communication, Ukraine, international image, public diplomacy.

1. Introduction

In the twenty-first century, the reputation of a state has become a strategic asset comparable to economic or military power. The construction and management of national image – or nation branding – are now integral elements of public governance, shaping how countries position themselves in global systems of trust, influence, and cooperation. Governments increasingly recognize that communication, culture, and identity are not auxiliary aspects of diplomacy but core mechanisms of legitimacy, governance performance, and long-term competitiveness.

The concept of nation branding emerged from marketing theory but has since evolved into a complex interdisciplinary field that combines political communication, international relations, and public administration. Within this paradigm, the state acts as both a communicator and a brand, projecting values, behaviors, and narratives that influence global perceptions. This conceptual shift has led to the development of national branding offices, cross-sector councils, and reputation analytics systems that align image policy with governance outcomes.

Nation branding is increasingly viewed as a form of strategic public management – a mechanism that allows governments to translate political objectives into communicative influence. By using cultural diplomacy, digital engagement, and participatory communication, states not only promote their image abroad but also consolidate social cohesion at home. The effectiveness of such policies depends on both symbolic and operational capacities: symbolic, in constructing narratives of identity and purpose; operational, in embedding these narratives into measurable, policy-driven frameworks.

In this context, the study of international practices in nation branding acquires special relevance for countries undergoing systemic transformation or crisis. The United States and Canada, for example, demonstrate how national identity can be translated into global influence through structured public diplomacy, creative industries, and media ecosystems. Similarly, Japan and South Korea have institutionalized cultural diplomacy – from Cool Japan to Korean Wave – as a pillar of economic soft power and cultural export.

For Ukraine, the question of nation branding has become particularly critical since 2014 and has reached an unprecedented level of urgency after 2022. The country's international image has undergone a profound transformation: from a post-Soviet transition state to a symbol of resilience, democracy, and civic courage. This transformation underscores the need for a permanent institutional mechanism of image governance, capable of integrating cultural diplomacy, strategic communication, and public administration into a single coherent framework. In the broader context, Ukraine's case represents an emerging model of "crisis branding," where reputation becomes a resource of national resilience and geopolitical legitimacy.

2. Purpose of the article

The article aims to analyze nation branding as a mechanism of public governance through a comparative examination of international practices and to identify institutional models relevant to Ukraine's image policy. The study focuses on the role of public diplomacy and strategic communication in shaping national reputation as a governance function and explores how the experience of the United States, Canada, Japan, and South Korea can inform the development of a synthetic nation branding model for Ukraine that enhances international trust, resilience, and legitimacy.

3. Analysis of recent research and publications

Numerous scholars, both foreign and domestic, have focused their research on various aspects of nation branding. Scholars such as S. Anholt, M. Aronczyk, K. Dinnie, O. Garcia, M. Leonard, J. Melissen, J. Nye, G. Szondi [1–8] as well as I. Bezotosny, P. Kozłowski, T. Madryha, V. Melnyk, O. Radchenko, and I. Semenenko [9–12] emphasize that effective branding requires institutionalized coordination between domestic policy, foreign affairs, and the creative economy, ensuring that what a state does is consistent with what it says. The research integrates qualitative methods such as case study analysis, content analysis of official documents, and secondary data review from international indices (Brand Finance, FutureBrand, Anholt-Ipsos). The comparative dimension allows identification of structural similarities and differences among the U.S., Canadian, Japanese, South Korean, and Ukrainian models of public diplomacy. The analytical component focuses on the evolution of nation branding from cultural representation to a form of "reputation governance," where states actively manage symbolic capital through coordinated communication, institutional continuity, and measurable performance indicators (KPI, reputation metrics, global rankings). The Ukrainian case is examined using the concept of resilience diplomacy – the adaptive use of image and narrative during crisis as an instrument of strengthening international legitimacy.

Numerous reports of the countries were analyzed to identify institutional mechanisms and communication models in practice. Content analysis was performed on government strategies, brand reports, and media

discourse, with attention to key narrative shifts and framing strategies. This approach made it possible to trace how nation branding evolves in response to geopolitical pressures, crises, and technological transformation.

In addition, discourse analysis was employed to examine how national identity and political values are articulated through strategic communication, cultural diplomacy, and crisis messaging. The research uses the theoretical framework of “soft power” (Nye, 2004) and the governance model of image policy (Anholt, 2020; Dinnie, 2022) to conceptualize nation branding as a governance function rather than a promotional tool. The study also applies the principle of policy benchmarking – comparing Ukraine’s emerging image strategy to established international models – in order to identify institutional gaps and potential pathways for adaptation.

The empirical analysis combines both macro-level evaluation (international rankings, trust indices, media visibility metrics) and micro-level examination (institutional case studies, digital diplomacy campaigns, and public opinion surveys). This multi-layered methodology ensures that the study captures not only formal structures of branding policy but also the dynamic processes of perception management, cultural resonance, and trust-building.

4. Discussion

The formation of a state’s image in the international arena—especially a positive one, which is the ultimate goal of a national image-building policy—is a complex and long-term process. Each state develops its own strategy for promoting its image, relying on its history, culture, economy, and political system. Drawing on international best practices, Ukraine may develop a synthetic nation branding model that integrates strategic approaches. In the context of globalization, image-making becomes a form of geopolitical competition, where states seek not only visibility but also moral and symbolic legitimacy. A country’s image is no longer an abstract perception—it functions as an instrument of influence, a soft form of political and economic capital that determines access to international partnerships, investments, and global trust (Anholt, 2020).

Public diplomacy plays a decisive role in nation branding, as it combines elements of strategic communication, cultural diplomacy, and international cooperation. It transforms political power into cultural narrative and emotional credibility, constructing what J. Nye defines as “soft power” – the ability to shape preferences through attraction rather than coercion (Nye, 2004). Through public diplomacy, countries shape their symbolic capital and transform it into political, economic, and reputational influence. According to the British researcher Mark Leonard, public diplomacy is a form of diplomacy that interprets a nation’s image or reputation as a public good – one that can either improve or worsen the international environment in which individuals and institutions operate (Leonard, 2002).

It should be noticed that Leonard identifies the key objectives of public diplomacy as (Leonard, 2002): raising awareness and knowledge about a country in the global public sphere; forming positive attitudes and associations among international audiences; promoting interest in cooperation across economic, cultural, and scientific fields; attracting foreign investment and strengthening the image of a reliable partner.

One of the main instruments of public diplomacy is mass media and digital communication, which allow governments to build narratives, mobilize empathy, and maintain a constant presence in global information spaces. Today, the most successful states integrate traditional media, social networks, and influencer diplomacy into holistic communication ecosystems. Platforms such as Twitter (X), YouTube, and TikTok have become arenas of real-time diplomacy, where political leaders directly engage with global audiences (García, 2021). The modern information ecosystem transforms every media channel into a platform for image-making, where cultural industries and creative storytelling become decisive factors of national reputation.

Nation branding, as developed in the works of S. Anholt and K. Dinnie, emphasizes the integration of governance, identity, and reputation. A successful brand depends on three interrelated dimensions: policy (the content of national actions), communication (the way they are expressed), and consistency (the degree to which words align with deeds) (Anholt, 2020; Dinnie, 2022). Countries that fail to align these dimensions face image volatility and reputational risk.

The United States represents a paradigmatic case of institutionalized image-making embedded within a broader system of cultural diplomacy. Historically, the U.S. has been among the earliest and most systematic adopters of public diplomacy instruments aimed at shaping international perceptions. From educational exchange programs such as Open Doors and Fulbright to the cultural dominance of Hollywood, jazz, and modern technology brands, the U.S. has systematically built an image of openness, freedom, and innovation (Melissen, 2005). In the American model, image-making functions as a structured system that integrates government, media, business, and civil society under the umbrella of “soft power” (Nye, 2004).

The findings of this study indicate that success of the American brand stems from its institutional stability. The United States has maintained a multi-decade network of agencies and programs that ensure brand coherence – the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Broadcasting Board of Governors (Leonard, 2002). These institutions coordinate thousands of cultural exchanges, fellowships, and public information projects worldwide.

The institutional foundations of U.S. public diplomacy emerged during the Cold War and continue to shape policy today. The State Department’s Bureau of Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs coordinates international communication through Voice of America, Radio Liberty, and cultural missions worldwide. A particularly influential initiative was the U.S. Information Agency (USIA), which conducted global campaigns to explain American values, democracy, and economic opportunity.

Within a comparative analytical framework, a landmark innovation was WorldNet, launched in 1983, which connected the U.S. with over 80 countries through satellite TV dialogues featuring government officials, business leaders, and scholars. It was one of the first examples of interactive image diplomacy – where foreign publics could directly engage with American representatives, creating transparency and trust (Leonard, 2002). During the broadcast of the first press conference in 1983, more than a thousand dialogues were conducted involving political leaders from numerous countries, U.S. Secretaries of State, and economists from both the United States and Latin America. The network featured programs addressing major environmental problems and their consequences, as well as various discussion broadcasts on political topics and other issues. Today, this network connects the United States with 80 countries around the world. A similar network operates in Western Europe under the name “EuroNet.” Through this system, various American programs are transmitted, showcasing U.S. culture, traditions, and values. Media management puts great emphasis on cooperation with foreign media, which facilitates the coverage of significant international events and encourages collaboration between local and foreign media outlets. From a psychological perspective, foreign audiences tend to be far more receptive to positive information disseminated by global and local mass media.

Within the framework of this research, strategic communication actions involve the implementation of medium-term objectives and activities such as organizing art events by diplomatic representatives, conducting cultural and educational programs, presenting national cinema, and showcasing creative achievements and sports successes. Establishing long-term relationships includes the exchange of specialists, scientists, and professionals. Such an instrument – the development of enduring partnerships – consistently has a positive effect on a country’s image over time, as cultural and educational programs are typically funded by both the state and private individuals or foundations.

Using the United States as an example, such initiatives prove effective when several key factors are met: the state selects the most talented representatives who will later play a significant role in shaping domestic and foreign policy; exchange programs, as well as diverse cultural, sports, and educational initiatives, are conducted specifically in regions of strategic interest to the United States; interviews with psychologists are held and program plans and conditions are developed, as their structure largely determines future outcomes. The program framework includes a range of conditions – from survival training in challenging environments to free access to technological resources and libraries – reflecting a comprehensive approach to fostering cross-cultural understanding and influence.

From the standpoint of both public administration and branding, cultural diplomacy remains the core of American image management. Hollywood’s global dominance constructs emotional affinity for American ideals such as freedom, equality, and creativity (Anholt, 2020). Technology corporations – Apple,

Microsoft, Tesla, and Google – extend this image into the realm of innovation and leadership. In essence, the U.S. brand combines narrative consistency (“freedom through innovation”) with institutional continuity (Dinnie, 2022).

From an analytical perspective, following the events of September 11, 2001, U.S. diplomacy entered a new phase – the “transformational diplomacy” doctrine of Condoleezza Rice. It emphasized reallocation of diplomats, development aid, and democratization as instruments of influence. Public diplomacy after 9/11 began to blend crisis communication with nation branding – presenting the U.S. as both a target and a defender of freedom. This duality remains a defining feature of its image strategy.

It should be indicated that today U.S. image-making increasingly relies on digital tools and analytical intelligence – from sentiment monitoring to predictive data analysis. Public diplomacy has evolved into “reputation governance,” where image management is a measurable function of statecraft (García, 2021).

If we analyze the process of image formation of the United States, several key stages can be identified as the following. The entire world can be conditionally divided into specific regions based on particular characteristics that are used in various strategic contexts. These characteristics may include geographic location, culture, historical background, set of religious and national features, the effectiveness of the political system, the direction of state policy, and the degree of U.S. interest in that region. Conventionally, the United States distinguishes the following areas: Latin America, “New Europe,” “Old Europe,” the CIS countries, the Russian Federation, the Muslim world, the Middle East, and underdeveloped countries of Africa. Each of these regions is further segmented into specific groups according to age, social status, political orientation, level of awareness, openness, and the degree of U.S. strategic interest in that group. Familiarization and detailed examination of factors that may influence the image of the United States in a particular region or among a specific target audience. In-depth analysis of the selected group and its perception of the United States. Determination of the direction of image policy for the chosen group and forecasting potential obstacles that may arise in the process. Summarizing all results, conducting analysis, and identifying possible solutions to weaknesses that emerged during the study. Thus, the image policy of the United States is highly dependent on the communication strategy chosen by government representatives, as it determines not only how messages are transmitted but also how they are interpreted and internalized by foreign audiences.

Within a comparative analytical framework, Canada has the Humanistic Model of Branding. Canada’s international image is grounded in multiculturalism, environmental sustainability, and peacekeeping (Brand Finance, 2023–2025). Canadian identity is built around the principle of the “cultural mosaic,” contrasting with the American “melting pot,” emphasizing respect for diversity and inclusivity. The Canadian model integrates governmental institutions, cultural industries, and civil initiatives. The Department of Canadian Heritage, the National Film Board, and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) serve as soft power instruments.

This interpretation highlights that Canada has institutionalized image-making as a component of public policy. The federal initiative “Brand Canada” coordinates communication across ministries, provinces, and embassies, promoting a unified narrative of inclusivity and innovation (Brand Finance, 2023–2025). Canada’s image of “a fair and caring nation” is reinforced by its foreign aid policies, refugee resettlement programs, and leadership in peacekeeping missions.

Canada also actively uses cultural diplomacy through literature, film, and visual arts – from the Toronto International Film Festival (TIFF) to the Canada Council for the Arts. Education is another key channel: Canadian universities like McGill and the University of Toronto act as “intellectual embassies” that strengthen the brand of Canada as a progressive and tolerant nation (Melissen, 2005).

This analysis supports the view that Canadian image-making rests on transparency, dialogue, and a high level of social trust – traits that contribute to the country’s stable reputation as a “moral power.” According to FutureBrand Country Index (2023) (FutureBrand, 2023), Canada consistently ranks among the top ten countries for quality of life, trust, and governance. In essence, Canada has created a model of ethical nation branding, where values of empathy, diversity, and civic responsibility become instruments of global influence.

From an analytical perspective, Japan represents one of the most successful examples of integrating traditional culture with modern technological advancement within nation branding strategies. This

fusion enables the country to project both historical authenticity and future-oriented innovation, thereby reinforcing its international image (Aronczyk, 2013). Its Cool Japan strategy emphasizes national creativity, authenticity, and emotional connection with audiences. Japanese cultural exports – anime, cuisine, design, and architecture – are part of a coherent global policy. Institutions such as the Japan Foundation and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs implement cultural diplomacy programs that combine heritage with future-oriented innovation (Anholt, 2020).

The Japanese model demonstrates how a nation can project cultural uniqueness while remaining at the forefront of technological progress. The state strategically invests in symbolic industries – from robotics and green energy to fashion and fine arts – making its culture both high-tech and human-centered (Dinnie, 2022). The Japanese government also applies branding in public policy through “Society 5.0” – a national vision that merges digital transformation with human-centered development. Thus, Japan’s brand is not only aesthetic but also philosophical, representing balance between modernity and moral consciousness.

From a public governance perspective, South Korea illustrates how state-supported cultural industries can be mobilized as tools of creative diplomacy. By integrating cultural policy, media industries, and international promotion, the country has institutionalized the “K-Brand” as a component of its broader soft power strategy. The global expansion of K-pop, K-drama, and K-beauty has made South Korea synonymous with innovation and creativity (Szondi, 2010). The Korea Foundation for International Cultural Exchange (KOFICE) and the Korean Culture and Information Service (KOCIS) coordinate the state’s branding activities. The success of “Hallyu” (the Korean Wave) shows how a nation’s image can be transformed through pop culture, creative economy, and digital diplomacy. In this model, the entertainment industry becomes a diplomatic agent, while artists act as cultural ambassadors.

This study demonstrates that Korea’s model has strategic depth: the government links cultural exports to economic policy, supporting small creative enterprises and using global fandom as a foreign policy tool. The Korean case proves that branding can function as national economic diplomacy (Melissen, 2005).

Comparing the models of the U.S., Canada, Japan, and South Korea reveals a key trend: the transition from static image-building to dynamic, multi-channel brand governance. The U.S. model is based on institutionalization and global communication; Canada emphasizes social trust and human rights; Japan combines cultural refinement with technological progress; and Korea relies on creativity and digital engagement.

These states demonstrate that the success of national branding depends not only on financial investment but on coherence – alignment between internal governance and external communication (Dinnie, 2022). Image becomes credible only when it mirrors reality. Therefore, reputation management must evolve from PR activity into a policy discipline embedded in public administration.

For Ukraine, this comparative perspective offers a roadmap. Since 2014, and especially after 2022, Ukraine’s image has undergone a historic transformation. From being perceived as a post-Soviet transition state, Ukraine has emerged as a global symbol of courage, freedom, and resilience. The campaign *Be Brave Like Ukraine* became an emblem of collective strength, authenticity, and emotional diplomacy.

The global narrative around Ukraine now embodies three core attributes: bravery (moral capital), resilience (institutional capacity), and creativity (cultural vitality). This triad forms the foundation of Ukraine’s modern brand identity. Ukraine’s global communications – from speeches by President Zelenskyy to creative initiatives by Banda Agency – exemplify the synergy between crisis leadership and cultural innovation.

In the context of post-crisis recovery and international positioning, Ukraine’s challenge lies in consolidating its symbolic capital into a sustainable governance framework. A National Branding Office could coordinate communication between ministries, cultural institutions, and international partners. Developing a permanent system for reputation measurement – using global indices like Brand Finance, FutureBrand, and Anholt-Ipsos – would institutionalize Ukraine’s image policy as part of its public governance system (Brand Finance, 2023–2025; FutureBrand, 2023).

Furthermore, Ukraine’s experience enriches the global theory of nation branding by introducing the concept of “crisis image resilience” – the ability of a nation to strengthen its reputation through

adversity. Unlike traditional branding, which relies on stability, Ukraine's brand thrives on transformation, solidarity, and authenticity under pressure. This makes it a pioneering case in the emerging field of resilience diplomacy.

Ultimately, the transformation of Ukraine's international image illustrates the broader paradigm of crisis-driven nation branding. In times of war and uncertainty, image-making becomes not merely a communication process but a moral and political act – a manifestation of identity, resilience, and shared values. The Ukrainian case thus expands the boundaries of the global theory of nation branding, demonstrating how strategic communication, public diplomacy, and civic solidarity can together form a new model of reputational leadership.

5. Conclusion

As a result, the nation branding has evolved from a peripheral communication practice into an essential paradigm of modern public governance. The experience of countries such as the United States, Canada, Japan, and South Korea demonstrates that reputation management can function as a measurable, institutionalized system that supports strategic interests, diplomatic influence, and national identity. These cases illustrate how effective image policy combines governance coordination, innovation, and the cultural dimension of diplomacy into a unified soft power strategy.

For Ukraine, the relevance of nation branding has significantly increased since 2022, when the country's resilience, solidarity, and democratic values became core components of its international image. The redefinition of Ukraine's brand from a transitional post-Soviet state to a global symbol of courage and moral leadership represents a major reputational shift.

From a public governance perspective, this transformation has not been spontaneous but rooted in deliberate communication efforts, cultural diplomacy, and international advocacy. It reveals that successful image-making requires systematic cooperation among governmental institutions, civil society, and creative industries – forming a polycentric communication ecosystem that aligns domestic identity with external perception.

Thus, Ukraine's future success in strengthening its image depends on three key directions: the institutionalization of state branding through a dedicated national branding office responsible for research, coordination, and monitoring; the integration of reputation analytics (Brand Finance, Anholt–Ipsos, FutureBrand indices) into public policy evaluation systems; and the enhancement of international partnerships through cultural diplomacy and digital engagement. As a result, the paradigm of crisis public governance transforms national image-making into a tool of trust management, strategic resilience, and international legitimacy. It is proposed that Ukraine adopt a synthetic nation branding model combining strategic approaches. By applying global experience and fostering its own brand of democratic strength and cultural authenticity, Ukraine can consolidate its global position not only as a participant but as a moral and strategic leader in the international community.

Bibliography

1. Anholt, S. (2020) *The Good Country Equation: How We Can Repair the World in One Generation*. Oakland: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2020. 256 p.
2. Aronczyk, M. (2013). *The Global Business of National Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 320 p.
3. Dinnie, K. (2022). *Nation Branding: Concepts, Issues, Practice*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 2022. 302 p.
4. García, O. (2021). Digital Tools and Nation Brand Protection in Crisis Situations. *International Journal of Communication*. 2021. Vol. 15. P. 92–113.
5. Leonard, M. (2002). *Public Diplomacy*. London: The Foreign Policy Centre, 2002. 86 p.
6. Melissen, J. (2005). *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2005. 221 p.
7. Nye, J. (2004) *Public Diplomacy in the 21st Century*. What factors need to be considered to explain U.S. policy to audiences abroad? *The Globalist*. 2004. URL: <https://www.theglobalist.com/public-diplomacy-in-the-21st-century/>
8. Szondi, G. (2010). Central and Eastern European Public Diplomacy: A Transitional Perspective. In: Melissen, J. (ed.) *Public Diplomacy and Nation Branding: Conceptual Similarities and Differences*. The Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael', 2010. Pp. 81–102.
9. Bezotosnyi, I. (2019). "The image of a country" as a reflection of social and cultural reality. *Scientific Works. Political Science*, Vol. 305, pp. 5–20.

10. Madryha, T. (2024). The national brand of Ukraine as a means of communication under conditions of full-scale war. *Bulletin of the Precarpathian University. Series: Political Science*, No. 17, pp. 97–105.
11. Melnyk, V., & Radchenko, O. (2023). Problems of information security and the formation of Ukraine's national brand under current challenges. *Public Administration: Theory and Practice*, No. 2, pp. 45–53.
12. Semenenko, I. H. (2021). *National Identity in a Globalized World: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. Kyiv: Institute of Political and Ethno-National Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. 312 p.
13. U.S. Department of State. URL: <https://exchanges.state.gov/us/program/fulbright-specialist-program>
14. Rice, C. (2006). Transformational Diplomacy. Address by U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, 18 January 2006. U.S. Department of State. URL: <https://2001-2009.state.gov/secretary/rm/2006/59306.htm>
15. Brand Finance. (2023-2025) Nation Brand Value 2025. URL: <https://brandfinance.com/insights/nation-brand-value-2025-key-trends-ranking-shifts-and-economic-insights>
16. FutureBrand. (2023). *Country Index 2023*. London: FutureBrand, 2023. 88 p. URL: <https://www.futurebrand.com/futurebrand-index-2023>
17. Kaneva, N. (2011). Nation Branding: Toward an Agenda for Critical Research. *International Journal of Communication*, 2011, 5: 117–141.