

**UNIVERZITA KARLOVA V PRAZE**

**FAKULTA SOCIÁLNÍCH VĚD**

Institut politologických studií

**Petra Felknerová**

**Nation Branding as a Soft Power Building  
Tool. The Case of Germany.**

*Diplomová práce*

Praha 2014

Autor práce: **Bc. Petra Felknerová**

Vedoucí práce: **Mgr. Eliška Tomalová, Ph.D.**

Datum obhajoby: 2014

## **Bibliografický záznam**

FELKNEROVÁ, Petra. *Nation Branding as a Soft Power Building Tool. The Case of Germany*. Praha, 2014. 105 s. Diplomová práce (Mgr.) Univerzita Karlova, Fakulta sociálních věd, Institut politologických studií. Katedra mezinárodních vztahů. Vedoucí diplomové práce Mgr. Eliška Tomalová, Ph.D.

## **Anotace (abstrakt)**

Tato diplomová práce se zabývá konceptem nation branding a jeho aplikací v domácí a zahraniční politice Německa jako nástroje pro budování měkké moci. Nation branding je poměrně nový koncept využívaný v mezinárodních vztazích, který zasahuje do mnoha disciplín jako veřejná diplomacie, kulturní diplomacie, marketing a public relations. S pomocí nation branding si státy vytváří pozitivní image, kterou následně prezentují zahraničnímu publiku s cílem stát se více atraktivním a konkurenceschopným na mezinárodním poli. Diplomová práce se skládá ze dvou hlavních částí. První část tvoří teoretický rámec pro následnou analýzu. Definuje pozici nation branding v oboru mezinárodních vztahů a představuje teorii kompetitivní identity. Druhá část se zabývá analýzou budování německé národní značky, která je analyzována prostřednictvím teorie kompetitivní identity. Německo si buduje svojí image dvěma způsoby – prostřednictvím nation brandingových kampaní a prostřednictvím šesti dimenzí své kompetitivní identity. Oba způsoby a německá značka jako celek jsou náležitě analyzovány a jsou identifikovány její silné a slabé stránky. Závěrečná část diplomové práce shrnuje nejdůležitější fakta a stanovuje závěr.

## **Abstract**

This master thesis deals with the concept of nation branding and its application in German domestic and foreign policy as a soft power building tool. Nation branding is quite a new concept in the international relations that extends into many fields like public diplomacy, cultural diplomacy, marketing or public relations. With its assistance, states create a positive image which they promote to the foreign public in order to become more attractive and competitive at the international level. The thesis is divided

into two parts. The first part creates a theoretical background for the analysis. It concentrates on defining the position of nation branding in the field of international relations and introduces the theory of competitive identity. The second part analyses the German nation image building while using the theory of competitive identity. Germany manages its image in two ways – via nation branding campaigns and via six dimensions of its competitive identity. Both ways as well as the German brand as a whole are properly analyzed and simultaneously their strengths and weaknesses are identified. The final part of the thesis summarizes the most important findings and draws the conclusion.

### **Klíčová slova**

měkká moc, moc z přitažlivosti, nation branding, Německo, kompetitivní identita, budování národní image

### **Keywords**

soft power, power of attraction, nation branding, Germany, competitive identity, nation image building

**Rozsah práce:** 213 000 znaků (včetně mezer), 34 131 slov

## **Prohlášení**

1. Prohlašuji, že jsem předkládanou práci zpracovala samostatně a použila jen uvedené prameny a literaturu.
2. Prohlašuji, že práce nebyla využita k získání jiného titulu.
3. Souhlasím s tím, aby práce byla zpřístupněna pro studijní a výzkumné účely.

V Praze dne 6. ledna 2014

Petra Felknerová

## **Poděkování**

Na tomto místě bych ráda poděkovala Mgr. Elišce Tomalové Ph.D. za cenné rady, trpělivost a odborné vedení práce a Dr. Rainerovi Hülsemu za poskytnutí potřebných materiálů a odborných rad.

# **Institut politologických studií**

## **Teze diplomové práce**

Datum odevzdání: 15. 9. 2012

### **I. Introduction**

#### **Theme**

Every state struggles for power. The power represents the central point in the world politics and also an object of study (not only) in the field of international relations. There are many theories and concepts referring to power. The significant theory of power was introduced by Joseph Nye in 80's. He distinguishes two kinds of power: hard power and soft power. In my thesis I will analyze the theory of soft power. While hard power uses military and economic means for coercion, soft power relies just on the ability to attract and to persuade. The soft power resources are based on values, culture, ideas, thoughts or opinions. The state builds its image and influences the foreign audience in order to become attractive.

The pressure of globalization and increased mass media coverage in the last few years has forced states to focus on a strategic image building. States have been building their image for centuries. A lot of factors such as historical events, personalities or culture influence the image building. However, never before has there been so much attention paid to image formation. One of the important tools for soft power building is a nation branding. It is a quite new method used in foreign policy which extends into many fields such as marketing, PR, public diplomacy, culture diplomacy and international relations. In the same way as the companies create their image for customers, states struggle for the strong, credible and reliable brand which helps to reach a positive perception at international level (rectification or reputation, publicity stunt) and to gain a lot of benefits (inflow of foreign investment, arrival of foreign students, acquisition of new business partners etc).

The purpose of this work is to introduce the concept of nation branding and his significance for soft power building. I will try to show, how the nation branding works in practice. For this purpose I will analyze the German nation branding campaigns.

The thesis will be divided into four parts. The first part will be mostly theoretical. I will analyze the theory of soft power and the concept of nation branding in the framework of international relations. Then I will focus on strategies, tools, methods and theories with which nation branding works. Next chapters will be addressed to the particular case, which is the brand “Germany”. I will introduce German nation branding strategies at that point and their significance for the soft power building of Germany.

In the last part of my thesis I will summarize the important facts and I will take a critical view. I will evaluate the practice of nation branding and I will try to prove that it is a useful tool for soft power building. I will also verify the statement that claims there were noticed some direct results in connection with the campaign (increase in foreign direct investments, acquisition of new business partners, growth of tourism, growth of foreign student’s number, workers, the change in perception of the state at the international level etc.) Furthermore I will analyze the German nation branding campaigns and I will try to find their outcomes. I will also introduce concrete outcomes and losses that were noticed. For this purpose I will measure the successfulness of the campaigns by using Anholt Nation Brand Index and Nation Brand Hexagon, I will also introduce the concept of rival identity. I will follow the theory of Joseph S. Nye for the purpose of determination the significance of the nation branding as a soft power tool. In the end I will draw the conclusion and lay down the recommendations. .

### **Reasons given for the choice and the meaning of the theme**

In the last two decades the revolution in communicative technologies, in information technologies and the wave of democratization in the world have been running. Consequently the role of soft power in the foreign policy has become very significant. The choice of power building tolls made by states is a very interesting topic for research, which is in the literature often ignored. More attention is still paid to the hard power of the state. In the Czech academic literature nearly nobody is interested in this topic, although it is a current issue discussed in the whole world. That is also the reason why I decided to address this topic.

### **Assumed method of the research**

In my thesis I will use the empirical analysis of the primary and secondary resources. On the ground of the hypothesis I will try to find an answer to the research

questions. For this purpose I will analyze the scientific publications and articles, graphs, statistic data and I will also use the electronic informative resources and official websites of the institutions. I will work mostly with English and German literature.

The thesis consists of the descriptive and the analytical part. In the framework of the description I will introduce the theories. I will show what position the nation branding has in the international relations and I will compare it with public diplomacy, culture diplomacy and soft power. I introduce the key methods, strategies and tools with which the nation branding works.

In the analytical part I will show the influence of the nation branding on the concrete case. I will not find the general phenomena or some abstract construction, but I will try to achieve complex understanding of the case. The aim is to analyze deeply the topic and thus provide a detailed explanation. It will be a unique case study. One of the main characteristics of the case study is that it is topic and time limited. This condition will be fulfilled in my thesis. The nation branding as a tool for soft power building will be studied as a general phenomenon. The nation branding strategies of the German foreign policy in the last 20 years will be examined as a concrete case.

### **The hypothesis and the research questions**

The assumed hypothesis of my thesis, which I will try to confirm, is:

*“The Nation branding is a suitable tool for soft power building. The states are using the nation branding in order to influence positively their perception at the international scene and thus increase their attraction. The result lies in the breaking down the prejudices, economical growth and increase of political influence.”*

Research Questions:

*Is nation branding a significant tool for soft power building? Is it actually possible to measure soft power?*

*Which position has nation branding in the field of international relations?*

*Could we still find prejudices about Germany in the perception of other states? Which ones?*

*Which role does the German government play in self-promoted campaigns?*

*How did the domestic and foreign public react on the branding campaigns?*

*Which actors and which tools did Germany use for the purpose of the branding campaigns?*

*Did Germany notice some changes after the launching the campaigns? Is it possible to prove these changes?*

*How do the German campaigns differ from the campaigns of other states?*

## **II. Assumed structure and outline of the dissertation**

### Introduction

- topic specification
- methodology
- literature
- research questions, hypothesis

### Treatise

- 1. Nation Branding as a part of the foreign policy
  - specification and terminology
  - its position and significance in the field of international relations
    - Gudjonsson: nation branding versus culture diplomacy (absolutists, royalists, moderated)
    - Mellisen, Leonard: nation branding versus public diplomacy
    - Nation branding as a soft power tool, is it possible to measure soft power? (The theory of Joseph S. Nye)

- the role of the government in the process of construction and managing of the brand
- 2. Strategies, tools and theories of nation branding
  - methods and theories
    - Anholt: the method of brand evaluation – Anholt Nation Brand Index – measurement of the brand successfulness
    - Anholt: conceptualization of the brand: Nation Branding Hexagon, concept of competitive identity
  - marketing instruments – logo, slogan, advertisement
  - phases: the brand launching, aiming the audience, correction of the brand perception
  - criticism of the nation branding
- 3. The Brand Germany – Analysis of the German Presentation in abroad
  - the history of the brand Germany
  - the main characteristics of the German branding strategy: elements, actors, tools, aims, imperfections, position in Nation Brand Index and Nation Brand Hexagon of the Germany
  - the comparison with branding campaigns of the other states (Great Britain, Japan, US)
  - analysis of German nation branding campaigns: Du bist Deutschland (2005), Deutschland – Land der Ideen (2005/2006), Land der Dichter und Denker, Made in Germany, outcomes, imperfections, implications for the perception of Germany at the international scene
- 4. Evaluation of the using nation branding as a soft power tool in the foreign policy of Germany

## Conclusion

- Summarization and evaluation of the researched facts
- confirmation or disproval of the hypothesis and researched questions
- outline of the development

## III. Bibliography:

### Monographs:

ANHOLT, S. (2003). Brand New Justice. The upside of global branding, Butterworth-Heinemann Oxford, 2003.

ANHOLT, S. (2007). Competitive Identity (The New Brand Management for Nations, Cities and Regions), Palgrave Macmillan, New York

DINNIE, K. (2008). Nation branding. Concepts, issues, practice, Butterworth-Heinemann, London

HEALEY, M. (2008): Co je branding?, Praha, Slovart.

HÜLSSE R. (2009). The Catwalkpower. Germany's New Foreign Image Policy

KELLER, K. L. (2007): Strategické řízení značky, Praha, Grada.

KÖHLER, M., SCHÜSTER, K. (2006). Handbuch Regierungs-PR: Öffentlichkeitsarbeit von Bundesregierungen und deren Beratern, Vs Verlag Für Sozialw., Wiesbaden

LEONARD, M. (2002). Public Diplomacy, The Foreign Policy, London

MELLISEN, J. (2007). The New Public Diplomacy. Soft Power in International Relations, Palgrave MacMillan, New York

NYE, J. (2004). Power in the Global Information Age: from Realism to Globalization, Routledge, New York

NYE, J. (2004). *Soft Power. The means to Success in Word Politics, Public Affairs*, New York

NYE, J. (1990). *Bound to lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*, Basic Books, New York

OLINS, W. (2009): *O značkách.*, Praha, Argo a Dokořán.

PETERKOVÁ, J. (2008): *Veřejná diplomacie*, Plzeň, Vydavatelství a nakladatelství Aleš Čeněk.

TAYLOR, D. (2007): *Brand Management, Řízení značky*, Plzeň, Computer press.

TOMALOVÁ, E. (2008): *Kulturní diplomacie. Francouzská zkušenost*, IRR, Praha

WHEELER, A. (2009). *Designing Brand Identity: an Essential Guide for the Entire Branding Team*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New Jersey

#### **Articles from scientific magazines and electronic resources:**

AAKER, D. A. (2003): *Brand building (budování obchodní značky)*, Brno, Computer press.

Cultural Diplomacy Outlook Report, 2011, online:

[http://www.culturaldiplomacy.org/culturaldiplomacynews/content/pdf/Cultural\\_Diplomacy\\_Outlook\\_Report\\_2011\\_-\\_04-01.pdf](http://www.culturaldiplomacy.org/culturaldiplomacynews/content/pdf/Cultural_Diplomacy_Outlook_Report_2011_-_04-01.pdf)

FAN, Y. (2009) – *Branding the nation: towards a better understanding*, on-line:

(<http://bura.brunel.ac.uk/bitstream/2438/3496/1/NB%20Towards%20a%20better%20understanding.pdf>)

EBERL, N. *Germany powers ahead to World Cup Victory in Nation Branding*, online:

<http://openpr.com/pdf/16287/Brand-Germany-powers-ahead-to-World-Cup-Victory-in-Nation-Branding.pdf>

FAN, Y. (2008). „Soft power: Power of attraction or confusion?.“ *Place Branding and Public*

*Diplomacy*, Vol. 4, No. 2, p. 147 – 158.

GREENWALD, A. (2010). "Soft power fallacy," Commentary Magazine, Vol. 13, No. 1 p. 75 – 80

GUDJONSSON, H. (2005): „Nation Branding“. Place Branding, Vol. 1, No. 3, p. 283 - 298

HAM, P. van (2001): The Rise of the Brand State. The Postmodern Politics of Image and Reputation. Foreign Affairs, Vol. 80, No. 5

MELISSEN, J. (2005). Wielding Soft Power: The New Public Diplomacy. The Hague, Netherlands Institute of International Relations Clingendael

NYE, J. (2007): „Notes for a soft-power research agenda.“ In Power in Word Politics, edited by Berenskoetter, Felix – Williams, Michael J., Routledge: p. 162 – 172

OLINS, W. (2007). "Making a national brand." In The New Public Diplomacy. Soft Power in International Relations, edited by Mellisen, J., Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan., p. 169-179

KYRIACOU, S. H., CROMWELL, T., „The Concept and Benefits of Nation Branding.“ East- West Communications, on-line text:  
<http://eastwestcoms.com/Concepts-and-benefits-of-nation-branding.htm>

TREVERTON, G., JONES, S. (2005). „Measuring National Power“, RAND Corporation, on-line text:  
[http://www.rand.org/pubs/conf\\_proceedings/2005/RAND\\_CF215.pdf](http://www.rand.org/pubs/conf_proceedings/2005/RAND_CF215.pdf)

SZONDI, G. (2008): Public Diplomacy and Nation Branding: Conceptual Similarities and Differences (Discussion Papers in Diplomacy), Netherlands Institute of International Relations „Clingendael“, on-line:  
[http://www.nbiz.nl/publications/2008/20081022\\_pap\\_in\\_dip\\_nation\\_branding.pdf](http://www.nbiz.nl/publications/2008/20081022_pap_in_dip_nation_branding.pdf)

### **Internet Resources:**

Brandchannel.com: [http://www.brandchannel.com/features\\_profile.asp?pr\\_id=144](http://www.brandchannel.com/features_profile.asp?pr_id=144)

Branding Strategy Insider – The Branding of Nations:  
<http://www.brandingstrategyinsider.com/2007/06/the-branding-of.html>

Culturdiplomacy.org: [www.culturdiplomacy.org](http://www.culturdiplomacy.org)

Futurebrand.com: [www.futurebrand.com](http://www.futurebrand.com)

Nationbranding.info: <http://nation-branding.info>

Nationbranding.de: <http://www.nationbranding.de/>

Official website of Germany: [www.deutschland.de](http://www.deutschland.de)

Official website of the campaign: Du bist Deutschland: <http://www.du-bist-deutschland.de/>

Official website of the campaign: Deutschland – Land der Ideen: <http://www.land-der-ideen.de/node/514>

Simon Anholt – Website: [www.earthSpeak.com](http://www.earthSpeak.com)

Simon Anholt – Nation Brands Index: <http://www.simonanholt.com/Research/research-introduction.aspx>

# Table of Contents

<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. POWER AND NATION BRANDING: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1. POWER AND ITS ROLE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS .....	9
1.2. SOFT POWER.....	10
1.2.1. <i>Sources of Soft Power</i> .....	13
1.2.2. <i>Wielding Soft Power</i> .....	14
1.2.3. <i>How to Measure Soft Power</i> .....	15
1.2.4. <i>Limits and Criticism of Soft Power</i> .....	16
1.3. NATION BRANDING AS THE THEORY OF COMPETITIVE IDENTITY .....	18
1.3.1. <i>External Competitive Identity Building</i> .....	28
1.3.2. <i>Internal Competitive Identity Building</i> .....	34
1.3.3. <i>Role of Government in Nation Branding</i> .....	39
1.3.4. <i>Nation Brands Measurement</i> .....	40
1.3.5. <i>Criticism of Nation Branding</i> .....	41
<b>2. THE BRAND GERMANY – ANALYSIS OF GERMAN COMPETITIVE IDENTITY .....</b>	<b>44</b>
2.1. HISTORY OF GERMAN NATION IMAGE BUILDING .....	45
2.1.1. <i>Globalisation (1990 – 1997)</i> .....	46
2.1.2. <i>The first attempts (1998 – 2000)</i> .....	46
2.1.3. <i>After the 9/11 (2001 – 2005)</i> .....	49
2.1.4. <i>Brand Germany (since 2005)</i> .....	51
2.2. HEXAGON OF GERMAN COMPETITIVE IDENTITY .....	61
2.2.1. <i>Tourism</i> .....	62
2.2.2. <i>Brands</i> .....	68
2.2.3. <i>Policy</i> .....	73
2.2.4. <i>Culture</i> .....	81
2.2.5. <i>Investment &amp; Immigration</i> .....	86
2.2.6. <i>People</i> .....	92
2.3. FINAL EVALUATION .....	96
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>107</b>
MONOGRAPHS AND CHAPTERS IN COLLECTIONS: .....	107
ARTICLES .....	110
INTERNET RESOURCES .....	114

## List of Tables

- Table 1: Comparison of hard and soft power  
 Table 2: Hexagon of Competitive Identity  
 Table 3: SWOT Analysis for Nevis  
 Table 4: Overall Results of the Anholt-GfK Nation Brands Index  
 Table 5: A list of Germany's major nation branding campaigns  
 Table 6: Logo of the campaign Du bist Deutschland  
 Table 7: Photo from the city archive of Ludwigshafen  
 Table 8: Logo for the "Germany – Land of Ideas" campaign  
 Table 9: "Walk of Idea's" Sculptures  
 Table 10: Poster of Claudia Schiffer promoting initiative "Invest in Germany – Land of Ideas"  
 Table 11: Tourism Index  
 Table 12: Tourism Question Rankings  
 Table 13: Tourism World Associations  
 Table 14: Tourism Index 2008 – 2013  
 Table 15: Brands Index  
 Table 16: Brands Question Rankings  
 Table 17: Brands World Associations  
 Table 18: How people in 20 different countries saw the German products in 2008 and 2009  
 Table 19: Brand Index 2008 – 2012  
 Table 20: Election Campaign Poster of CDU featuring the hands of German chancellor Angela Merkel  
 Table 21: Policy Index  
 Table 22: Policy Question Rankings  
 Table 23: Policy World Associations  
 Table 24: How people in 20 different countries saw the policy of Germany in 2008 and 2009  
 Table 25: Policy Index 2008 – 2012  
 Table 26: Culture Index  
 Table 27: Culture Question Rankings  
 Table 28: Culture World Associations  
 Table 29: How people in 20 different countries saw the German culture in 2008 and 2009  
 Table 30: Culture Index 2008 – 2012  
 Table 31: Investment Index  
 Table 32: Investment Question Rankings  
 Table 33: Investment World Associations  
 Table 34: How people in 20 different countries saw the immigrating to Germany in 2008 and 2009  
 Table 35: Investment Index 2008 – 2012  
 Table 36: People Index  
 Table 37: People Question Rankings  
 Table 38: People World Associations  
 Table 39: How people in 20 different countries saw the Germans in 2008 and 2009  
 Table 40: People Index 2008 – 2012  
 Table 41: German Hexagon of Competitive Identity  
 Table 42: BBC World Service Country Ratings Poll  
 Table 43: SWOT Analysis for German Nation Brand

## Introduction

Germany's notorious history, mainly the Nazi era, deeply influenced the German image in the world. After the reunification in 1990, a new state basically emerged with need to define its position in the global world, to boost its confidence, to remedy its reputation and to become more competitive and attractive in the contemporary interconnected world that Joseph Nye calls global information age (Nye, 1990).<sup>1</sup>

The world has become one market on which Germany has to compete with other countries for the world's attention and respect of the international media, of other governments, and the people from other countries. For this reason, Germany had to become attractive and thus gained what Joseph Nye calls soft power. Soft power is an ability to get what one wants via inducement and attraction rather than by using coercive means (hard power) (Nye, 1990). Soft power is a supplement or balance to hard power which seems to lose its effectiveness in the contemporary global information age. In order to gain soft power, states struggle for a good image, positive reputation and a credible nation brand that provide them with higher attractiveness and competitiveness at the global level.

Germany adopted this strategy too. It had to react to the new situation and changes in the world. In order to be able to manage its international relations by using soft power and thus avoid using coercive means (hard power), Germany implemented new instrument. Nation branding was chosen as this tool for soft power building. It is quite a new method used mainly in foreign policy, but it also extends into many fields such as marketing, public relations, public diplomacy, culture diplomacy and international relations. In the same way the companies create their image for customers, states struggle for strong, credible and reliable brand which helps them to reach a positive perception at the international level and to gain a lot of other benefits (inflow of foreign investment, arrival of foreign students and experts, tourists, acquisition of new business partners etc.).

Germany as well as other states has been building its image since its origin. There were many factors such as historical events, personalities or culture influence that

---

<sup>1</sup> Global information age is characterized by the increasing importance and availability of information that is broadly accessible for almost all via computer technology (Nye, 1990).

formed its identity and reputation in the world, however, its new situation after the reunification, its infamous history, the pressure of globalization, revolution in communicative and information technologies and increased mass media coverage in the last years have forced it as well as other states to focus on strategic image building. Country's image is not formed by coincidence anymore, but it has become a point of government's interests that is handled strategically and purposefully.

The choice of nation branding as a soft power building tool is a very interesting topic for research, which is often ignored in the literature. More attention is still paid to the state's hard power. In the Czech academic literature, just two academics are interested in this topic (Peterková, 2006, Tomalová, 2008), although it is a current issue discussed in the whole world. In general, it is also very interesting to analyse how a state such as Germany (regarding its historic experience that resulted in its infamous image at the beginning of 1990s) tries to become more powerful without using forcible means and to adapt to the new conditions in the world.

The purpose of this work is to examine the current practice of up to date international relations and introduce the concept of nation branding and its significance for soft power building in foreign and domestic policy. Its practice will be demonstrated on the case of Germany. I have chosen the German case, mainly because it serves as an illustrative example of how nation branding can be implemented and used not only in foreign but also in domestic policy. After the reunification in 1990, a "new" state emerged in Europe still unpopular for its Nazi past, with low-confidence scaring the world with its possible re-strengthening. After twenty years, from the feared and diffident nation, Germany has become an attractive and competitive state that is, according to the last surveys (GFK, ©2013, FutureBrand ©2013, BBC, 2013) admired in the whole world. The role of nation branding in the German image improvement will be the focal point of my analysis. The German nation image building is very specific and complex. Not only Germany as a whole, but also each of the federal lands has its own nation branding strategy. Because of the limits of this master thesis, I will concentrate just on the nation brand building at the federal level.

In my thesis, I will address these research questions: a) *Why did Germany choose nation branding?* b) *How is nation branding practiced in Germany and how has it become a part of German foreign policy?* c) *Which were the real results of German*

*nation branding campaigns? d) How does the current German nation brand look like – which weaknesses and strengths does it have?* These and many other related questions will be answered in my analysis. The first hypothesis of my thesis which I will try to prove via German case is that *states want to become more attractive and competitive at the international scene and thus increase their soft power*. The second hypothesis claims that *nation branding is a suitable tool for soft power building in contemporary global world* and the third one that *application of nation branding helps to break down the prejudices, encourage economic growth and increase political influence*.

For the purpose of my research, I will use the empirical analysis of the primary and secondary resources as a methodology. My aim will be to find an answer to the research questions on the ground of the hypothesis. For this purpose I will analyze the scientific publications and articles, graphs, statistical data, public opinion surveys and I will also use the electronic informative resources and official websites of the institutions. In the analytical part of my thesis, I will mostly analyse primary resources such as governmental documents and public opinion surveys. The problem is that these resources are not always free of charge and available, therefore I will have to work with surveys that are accessible on the internet even though they are not the most up to date. It concerns mainly the Anholt-GfK Roper Nation Brands Index Report. The most topical one available comes from 2009 and was prepared for Holland. However, Holland is in this report compared with Germany, which provides me with the crucial data. Primarily, I will work with English and German literature; however, I do not neglect the Czech authors specialising on nation branding, public diplomacy and soft power either. Nation branding is quite an under researched topic. For this reason, I will mainly refer to the work of Simon Anholt (Anholt, 2007) and Wally Olins (Olins, 2003) who are the world respected specialists on this topic.

I will not find the general phenomena or some abstract construction, but I will try to achieve complex understanding of the case. The aim is to analyze deeply the topic and thus provide a detailed explanation. It will be a unique case study. One of the main characteristics of the case study is that it is topic and time limited. This condition will be fulfilled in my thesis. The nation branding as a tool for soft power building will be studied as a general phenomenon. The nation brand building in the German domestic and foreign policy in the last 20 years will be examined as a concrete case.

The thesis will be divided into two main parts. The first one will be the theoretical framework for the analysis. In this section I will theoretically anchor the concept of nation branding within the field of international relations. I will begin with the general category which is the theory of power. Power represents the central point in the world politics and also one of the main objects of study in the field of international relations. Even though power has been here ever since the beginning of humankind, it is still one of the most discussed topics in this scientific field. There are many theories and concepts referring to power. The significant theory was introduced by Joseph Nye at the beginning of 90s. He distinguishes between two kinds of power: hard power and soft power (Nye, 1990). In my thesis I will analyze the theory of soft power. I will introduce its sources, explain how it is wielded, and discuss if it is possible to measure it. I will not forget to mention its limits and criticism either.

After that, I will define the concept of nation branding as a soft power building tool and explain the basic terminology. Since it is quite a new and broad concept that extends into many fields, I put it in the context with other disciplines from the field of international relations like public diplomacy or culture diplomacy. I will also clarify the relation between nation branding and soft power and discuss the role of government in nation branding.

There are not many authors studying this topic. Simon Anholt offers one of the best explanations of nation branding. He calls it the theory of competitive identity with which I will work in my thesis. I will use the terms, nation brand building, nation image building and competitive identity building interchangeably. Since the world is one global market and states are forced to increase their competitiveness, they have to communicate with the world public and thus attract their attention. The aim is to create a positive image of the country in the eyes of the foreign audience and to draw them in. For this purpose, states use six communication channels that together create a nation brand of the state. These six nation brand elements will be analysed in my work: tourism, brands, policy, culture, investment/immigration and people (Anholt, 2007). Afterwards I will also discuss nation brands measurement. Is it actually possible to measure nation brands, respectively, soft power? At the end I will also mention the main critics of this theory.

In the analytical part, firstly, I put the German case in the theoretical framework. I will analyse the German strategic image building while applying the theory of competitive identity. I will start by outlining the brief history of German image building showing how, when and why Germany implemented nation branding as a soft power building tool in its domestic and foreign policy.

After that, I will concentrate on the ways Germany use nation branding. The first way Germany promotes its nation in the world is with the assistance of nation branding campaigns. In my work, I will research the nation branding campaigns that have been held in Germany since its reunification and after that I will focus on the two biggest and most significant ones: “You are Germany” and “Germany – Land of Ideas”. The second way Germany builds its image is via six dimension of German nation brand. I will analyse each of them.

In the last part of my thesis I will evaluate the brand as a whole and show which position Germany holds in the global nation brands measurements. On the basis of my analysis I will define the strengths and weaknesses of the German brand. Last but not least, I will summarize the important facts and take a critical view.

## **1. Power and Nation Branding: Theoretical Background**

Before I start to analyse nation branding on the German case, I want to theoretically set this concept into the field of international relations. In order to do that I will begin with the general category that is the theory of power. Even though power is one of the oldest concepts in the field of international relations, it is still discussed by experts. In the course of time, there has been introduced many different concepts of power. I will focus on one of the modern approaches that was introduced by Joseph Nye at the beginning of the 1990s (Nye, 1990). Traditionally, states demonstrated their power by using their armed forces. It was simple and fast. However, nowadays, when the world is interconnected, equipped with modern technologies and filled up with information, hard power seems to be losing its effectiveness. In the age of globalisation, the power to attract becomes significant. Soft power will be my first point of interest in the first part of this chapter. I will concentrate on wielding soft power, its resources and limits.

In order to become attractive, states use a lot of instruments. One of them is nation branding which will be the second focal point of this chapter. It is quite a new concept that became popular and has been employed by states in recent years. What it is, how it is used and which position it has in the field of international relations - these are questions I am going to answer in this chapter. There are many explanations of nation branding; however, in the first place I will concentrate on the theory of competitive identity which is one of the most discussed and popular approaches to nation branding. I will analyse its external and internal dimension and the role of government by nation brand building. I also want to examine if it is possible to evaluate or measure nation brands and what the opponents have to say about it.

## 1.1. ***Power and its Role in International Relations***

Everyone talks about it but nobody really knows what it is. The concept of power is one of the fundamental concepts in the field of international relations (IR). The entire history of IR has turned around power – the debates between liberalists and realists<sup>2</sup> about hegemony, sources of power, gaining and wielding power, distribution of power in the system etc. Until today, power remains a frequently discussed, but still not clarified topic. Robert Gilpin depicts this, when he says that the conception of power is “one of the most problematical in the field of international relations” (Gilpin, 1981: 13).

Some general definitions of power can be found in the Oxford Dictionary. According to this book, power is: a) the ability to do something or act in a particularly way, b) the capacity to influence other people or the course or events, c) a right or authority given or delegated to a person or body, d) political authority or control, e) physical strength or force, f) a country viewed in terms of its international influence and military strength (Oxford Dictionary, Thesaurus, and World Guide, 2001: 1002).

Political scientists have brought many various definitions, but they have not yet agreed on one specific. Already Niccolo Machiavelli considered power as a main attribute of political life. According to him we have to do everything (use every possible means) for keeping and strengthening power. That is a sufficient condition for becoming a prince, says Machiavelli (Machiavelli, 1997: 27). Michel Foucault, following Machiavelli, sees then power as "a complex strategic situation in a given society social setting" (Foucault, 1980: 146) or Hans Morgenthau as “the control of man over man”. According to him “power covers all social relationships which serve that end, from physical violence to the most subtle psychological ties by which one mind controls another” (Morgenthau, 1973: 9). Often mentioned definition comes also from Robert Dahl who considers power “as the ability to make somebody do something that otherwise he or she would not have done” (Dahl, 1957: 202-203).

A comprehensive explanation of power can be found in Steven Lukes work *Power: A Radical View* where he discusses three dimensions of power. He defines concept of power by saying that “A exercises power over B when A affects B in a

---

<sup>2</sup> Mainly for realists, power is a crucial determinant for relations between political players and also crucial for understanding of the dynamics of war and peace. According to them, international politics is a continuous struggle for power. (Schmidt, 2007: 43-44).

manner contrary to B's interests” (Lukes, 2005: 37). In the one-dimensional view: “power is a behavioural attribute that applies to individuals to the extent that they are able to modify the behaviour of other individuals within a decision-making process” (Lukes, 2005: 18). In the two-dimensional view of power he incorporates the question of control over the agenda of politics and of the ways in which potential issues are kept out of the political process (Lukes, 2005: 25). The three-dimensional view turns to the fact that people sometimes act willingly in ways that appear to be contrary to their most basic interests. The third dimension is the set of methods by which the powerful transform the powerless in such a manner that the latter behave according to the will of the former without coercion or forcible constraint - for example, by creating a pervasive system of ideology or false consciousness (Lukes, 2005: 26-29). The concept of power was also a point of interest of Raymond Aron, Edward Hallet Carr, Anthony Giddens, John Lock, Max Weber etc. (Aron, 1967, Carr, 1993, Giddens, 2007, Locke, 1988, Weber 2011).

Joseph S. Nye offers one of the most popular concepts of power to which I want to refer in my thesis. He gives us a simple definition of power. It is an ability to influence behaviour of others to get the outcomes one wants, or it is the possession of capabilities or resources that can influence outcomes. However, we need to be careful with the second definition. The fact that someone has the power resources does not guarantee that he will always get the outcome he wants. For example, the USA lost the Vietnam War despite they had had much more resources than Vietnam. Having the resources is not enough, one has to have also well-designed strategies and skilful leadership. The context in which the relationships exist is also crucial. One has to understand what game he is playing and how the values of the cards may be changing (Nye, 2004: 2-4).

## **1.2. Soft Power**

One of the first policy advisors was Niccollo Machiavelli who gave a piece of advice to the prince in Italy that it is more important to be feared than to be loved. Nowadays, in a global information age, it is quite contrary. “Winning hearts and minds” started to be more significant. Political leaders have been racking their brains trying to figure out how to incorporate the soft dimension into their strategies for wielding power in order to become even more powerful (Nye, 2004: 1).

The term soft power became popular in recent years thanks to Joseph Nye who is considered to be the “father of this concept”. But in fact, the whole concept originates in works of Hans Morgenthau, Klaus Knorr or Ray Cline. Already E. H. Carr wrote that power over opinion is just as significant for political purposes as hard power (Fan, 2008: 3). Hans Morgenthau identified nine elements of national power already in the 1960s. Four of these refer to soft power: national morale, national character, quality of diplomacy and quality of government (Morgenthau, 1973: 128-144). There is also a concept of “the second face of power” from Bachrach and Baratz from the 1960s to which Nye refers in his book *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power* (Nye, 1990: 31). They include agenda setting as a form of power<sup>3</sup> as well as directly influencing decision. “To the extent that a person or group – consciously or unconsciously – creates or reinforces barriers to the public airing of policy conflicts, that person or group has power” (Bachrach, Baratz, 1962: 949).

Although Joseph S. Nye is considered to be the “father” of the whole soft power concept, he actually just summarized and expanded the old ideas right in the time of globalization. Nye introduced the term soft power for the first time in his book *Bound to Lead* in 1990 (Nye, 1990). Now, in a global and information age, soft power plays a vital part in the world. According to him, soft power is “the ability to get others to want the outcomes that you want by co-opting people”. Soft power shapes the preferences of others. It is the ability to attract. Attraction often leads to acquiescence. Simply, soft power is an attractive form of power. If somebody succeeds in persuading others to go along with his purposes without any threats or exchanges and his behaviour is influenced by observable but immaterial attraction, then the soft power works perfectly (Nye, 2004: 6-7). Later, Nye extended his definition and described soft power as “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” (Nye, 2011: 38).

There are different ways of how to influence behaviour of others. Either, we can coerce somebody with threats, prompt with payments (hard power), or simply attract and co-opt him to want what we want (soft power). Nearly everybody knows what hard power is. Threatening military force or economic sanctions might often get others to change their positions. But sometimes it is possible to achieve these goals without

---

<sup>3</sup> Lately, their concept was discussed by Steven Lukes as the two-dimensional view of power which I have already mentioned above (Lukes, 2005: 20-25).

threats or payoffs. A state could obtain the outcomes it desires because other countries admire its values, emulate its example, or aspire to its level of prosperity and openness. Soft power can attract, co-opt or entice. These are the reasons that make other states want to follow the state utilizing this tool. Attraction is powerful. If one can get somebody to do what he wants, then he does not have to use military or economic coercive means which is more cost-effective. Whereas leaders in authoritarian regimes can use coercion and issue commands, politicians in democratic states need to rely more on a combination of inducement and attraction (Nye, 2004: 5-6).

There are two types of power: the command power - an ability to achieve one's goals by coercion or inducement (normally associated with hard power) and the co-optive power - an ability to do so by applying attractiveness of one's culture and values which is usually associated with soft power (Nye, 2008: 30). Soft power comes often from immaterial assets such as an attractive personality, culture, values or moral authority. If a leader has values that are recognized and potentially followed by the others, it allows the leader to save on costs of coercion or inducement. For instance, some of the radical Muslims previously supported Osama bin Laden because they believed in legitimacy of his aims, and not because of threats or sanctions. What is more, there are entire organisations in the world that follow the ideas of bin Laden and that organize themselves according to his image and ideas, without even being in contact with him (Nye, 2008: 31). The table below, made by Ying Fan, gives us a clear overview of the main differences between soft power and hard power.

**Table 1: Comparison of hard and soft power (Fan, 2008:22)**

<b>Hard Power</b>	<b>Soft Power</b>
Ability to change others position by force or inducement	Ability to shape the preferences of Others by attraction
Military and economic power	Cultural power
Coercion, force	Co-option, influence
Absolute	Relative, context based
Tangible, easy to measure, predictable to certain degree	Intangible, hard to measure, unpredictable
Ownership specified	Unspecified, multiple sources
Controlled by State or organisations	Mostly non-state actors, uncontrollable
External, action, push	Internal, reaction/response, pull
Direct, short term, immediate effect	Indirect, long term, delayed effect
Manifested in foreign policies	Communicated via nation branding

In Nye's opinion, a state should develop deeper understanding of the role of soft and hard power and combine the tools of both or find balance between them in its foreign policy – then the state achieves so-called smart power (Nye: 2009: 160).

The concept of power is a core topic of realism in the field of international relations. But some authors portray the difference between hard and soft power as realism vs. idealism. Nye refuses that and says that already traditional realists considered soft power as a part of the whole concept of power. For example, already in the 1940s, E. H. Carr divided power into three categories: military power, economic power and power over opinion. According to Nye, soft power is not a form of idealism or liberalism, it is simply a form of power helping to achieve the outcomes one desires (Nye, 2007: 170).

### **1.2.1. Sources of Soft Power**

The sources of soft power are assets which cause attraction. They help states to influence the preferences of others. Nye introduces three resources of soft power: culture, political values and foreign policy. In the context of soft power, "culture is the set of values and practices that create meaning for a society". This includes both "high" culture like literature, art or education that appeals to elites as well as television, cinema and pop music aimed at mass entertainment markets. "In the case of America, it ranges from Harvard to Hollywood", says Nye. It is important that a state promotes values and interest that others share. It raises the probability of gaining its desired outcomes because it helps to create attraction. But it would be misleading to consider soft power simply as popular cultural power. Cultural resources just help to produce soft power (Nye, 2004: 11-15).

Political values, from democracy and freedom of speech to opportunity, are the second source of soft power. If governmental institutions effectively promote values that are generally highly regarded, such as transparency, justice or equality at home (via domestic policies), then they become also more attractive abroad. A third one is the legitimacy of a country's foreign policy. If a foreign policy is considered to be legitimate by other nations, then the state becomes more persuasive. Contrary, a foreign policy that is found to be illegitimate can destroy the power of political values and culture. Domestic and foreign policies can undermine country's soft power when they are indifferent to the opinion of others. The activities of government at home, in international institutions, and in foreign policy strongly influence the preferences of

others. They can attract or repel others by their own example. Soft power resources are interconnected. When country's culture promotes universal values that other nations can readily identify with, it makes itself naturally attractive to others. However, soft power resources are more separate from government than hard power's. Some hard power assets, as for instance armed forces, are strictly governmental, whereas soft power works more outside the control of government in a liberal society (McClory, 2010: 3, Nye, 2004: 11-15).

### **1.2.2. Wielding Soft Power**

Government is the main soft power maker and the only subject that has both soft and hard power, however, in comparison to hard power, soft power is difficult to wield because its sources are often outside the control of governments and their effects derive from acceptance of a target audience. Soft power sources work indirectly and it can last years to get desired outcomes. Governments are able to control policy, but culture and values are embedded in civil societies. Activities that can help governments to produce soft power are educational exchanges, broad-casting, development assistance, disaster relief etc. that are organized by different departments, organisations, agencies etc. Their activities are not fully under the control of governments, but governments could influence, restrict or use them to their advantage (Nye, 2004: 99, Nye, 2007: 171).

There are many communication channels that help governments to appeal to foreign audience. Since postmodern public is quite sceptical about authority, governments are often mistrusted. Therefore, they have resorted to work with non-state actors. For example NGOs can be a useful channel of communication because they enjoy more trust than governments do. However, also communication through the governmental bodies can be successful. For example, Germany is a pioneer in building relationships between political parties in different countries. In Germany, the major parties have foundations for building and maintaining foreign contacts that are also partly supported by governmental funds (Nye, 2004: 113-114).

Another way for the governments to influence a foreign audience is through companies. They communicate with foreign people via their brands and sometimes even participate on some specific public diplomacy projects. For example, German companies sponsor the German nation branding campaign "Land of Ideas" (Walsh,

Wiedmann, 2007: 157). Next channel of communication are intelligence agencies. For example – during the Cold War, CIA supported the budgets of cultural organisations. The development and keeping of long-term relationships with foreign intelligence agencies and sharing of intelligence can have a powerful effect on other countries' perceptions. Nye assigns importance also to the military which could help to build soft power. The military organizes a lot of officer exchanges, joint-training, and assistance programs with other states (Nye, 2004: 115-116).

Another important way of how to communicate with foreign public is simply by using information. According to Nye, information is power. Technological progress has led to dramatic exchange of information in the world. Nye calls it “paradox of plenty”. People are overwhelmed with the volume of information and those who can distinguish valuable information gain the power. Credible information is very powerful and can change another government's policy. However, it could have also a negative effect and governments can become seen as manipulative, propagandistic and indoctrinated (Nye, 2004: 105-106, Nye, 2007: 171).

### **1.2.3. How to Measure Soft Power**

It is not easy to measure soft power. Traditionally, soft power as an outcome has been measured with polls and surveys. Nevertheless, also Nye admits that polls are an imperfect measure of soft power, because of the way the questions are formulated and asked, and unless the same questions are put constantly for some time, they could not represent a continuous picture. Opinions change and such variability cannot be captured by any poll. Nevertheless, polls are good first estimation of attractiveness of a country (Nye, 2004: 18).

Currently, there is just one international soft power measurement that is called IfG-Monocle Soft Power Index and was created by Jonathan McClory and Institute for Government in 2010. McClory's aim was to study the United Kingdom's ranking in the world regarding soft power and prepare a report for the British government that would promote the global significance of soft power in order to avoid budget cuts in diplomacy and other soft power instruments (Trunkos, 2013: 5). McClory is aware of the difficulty to measure soft power. Unlike in the case of hard power, soft power does not have any commodity that a country can store up and deploy in order to pursuit specific objectives.

Therefore, as a relative and intangible concept, soft power is very difficult to quantify (McClory, 2010: 1).

The IfG-Monocle Soft Power Index measures the soft power resources of 26 countries. It collects a broad set of statistical data and subjective metrics (50 metrics in total), comparing countries according to the quality of their standard of government, diplomatic infrastructure, cultural output, capacity for education and appeal to business. The aim of the project is to improve the overall understanding of soft power, and draw attention to how important resources have been contributing to states' soft power (McClory, 2012: 5).

The Index serves as a useful dataset that can be practical for future research. But it has also a lot of weaknesses. One of the main problems is that it does not separate statistical data (foreign aid, number of cultural missions, media presence etc.) from subjective metrics (cultural output, commercial brands etc.) and it mixes them in one outcome index. What is more, every year the Index works with different data and metrics from different resources. The Index has also political bias as it only works with 26 strategic partners of the United Kingdom and excludes all other countries (Trunkos, 2013: 5-6, McClory, 2010, 2011, 2012).

There are also nation brands measurements that some experts find to be soft power measurements, because they consider a nation brand to be a modern example of soft power (Anholt, 2003: 13). Nation brands measurements will be analysed in the next part of the thesis. To sum it up, there is no proper way of how to measure soft power. Opinion polls seem to be a useful instrument, but the formulation of questions could be misleading. Moreover, there are no continual polls that ask the same questions for a longer period. The soft power index created by McClory which mixes quantitative data with subjective metrics is a very good source of information for research but it could not be considered as relevant state's soft power measurement because of the limited number of examined countries and different data and sources.

#### **1.2.4. Limits and Criticism of Soft Power**

Nye himself points out the limits and critics of soft power. He says that some critics do not see soft power as a sort of power. For them power is a synonym for coercion and command. Imitation and attraction are something else but definitely not power. These

critics ignore the “structural” face of power – “the ability to get the outcomes you want without having to force people to change their behaviour through threats and payments“, says Nye (Nye, 2004: 15).

Other sceptics do not consider soft power as power, because attraction is not under full control of governments. Nye admits that majority of soft power has been produced by culture societies, companies, universities, foundations, churches, celebrities etc., but “the fact that civil society is the origin of much soft power does not disprove its existence”. Moreover, a government could not control culture in a liberal society (Nye, 2004: 17-18).

Others, for example Janice Bially Mattern, have a problem with the sources of soft power which lie in the attractiveness of political and cultural values, ideals and visions. Mattern says that Nye is not able to explain “why universal values are the “right” one or how one acquires such values” (Mattern, 2007: 101).

Another political scientist, Ying Fan, says that soft power is more power of confusion than power of attraction. According to him, it is not sure if attraction could affect policy of a target state. It depends on which groups in that state consider it attractive (political elite, general public or a marginal group) and how much they are able to control policymaking. Moreover, policy-making on the state level is more complicated than on a personal level and it has also different dynamics that puts emphasis on the rational considerations. Only a little room remains for emotions which significantly reduces the effect of soft power (Fan, 2008: 11-12).

Niall Ferguson writes that soft power is nothing new and that it should be called imperialism. He says that soft power is limited and argues the real engine of the cultural imperialism is hard power. According to him: “Soft power is merely the velvet glove concealing an iron hand” (Ferguson, 2004: 24). Finally, there are also critics of measurement of soft power (Trunkos, 2013).

In the first part of this chapter, I introduced the general concept of power in the field of international relations and the Nye’s theory of soft power which he puts into context along with hard power. Whereas hard power rests on inducements and threats, soft power convinces others through attraction. The best possibility is then so-called smart power – well-balanced combination of soft and hard power.

In order to perform successful foreign policy, it is necessary to wield soft power which is more complicated than to wield hard power. States can use hard power with immediate effect – they can use military forces or impose economic sanctions. However, the effect of soft power depends on whether the target audience accepts it or not. Only they decide whether it is or is not still attractive for them. Soft power is no propaganda. Foreign public cannot think that it has been manipulated.

The main soft power maker is government; however, majority sources of soft power are often outside the control of governments. They handle this problem by influencing non-state players that also participate on soft power building. Soft power works indirectly, it is not sure, if it would work the way the government wants, and it can last years to get desired outcomes. Measurement of soft power is also problematical since it is still imperfect.

### **1.3. *Nation Branding as the Theory of Competitive Identity***

As I have already mentioned, to wield soft power is much more difficult than to wield hard power. However, it did not stop states from trying. Nye gives us an example of France. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, France tried to promote its culture and revolutionary ideology across Europe and it was really successful. French became the language of diplomacy and French culture spread in the whole Europe. Shortly after that Italy and Germany followed French activities by founding institutes that promoted their culture overseas. Soft power was massively deployed after the outbreak of the World War I. Since then, soft power became a part of state's foreign policy (Nye, 2004: 100).

Over time, states have been building their soft power via many communication channels and tools like culture diplomacy, public diplomacy, propaganda, nation branding etc. The aim of this work is to explore the concept of nation branding. Firstly I will introduce it and explain its relation to soft power, country of origin effect, public diplomacy, culture diplomacy and propaganda. Secondly I will focus on Simon Anholt's theory of nation branding called "the theory of competitive identity" (Anholt, 2007). In the end, I will discuss the possibility of its measurement and its critics.

As a result of globalization, countries compete with each other in order to lure the world's attention. They strive for respect, trust of investors, tourists, consumers, immigrants, media and governments of other states. The reputation of countries became as important as the brand images of companies and products. Strong and positively perceived brand can provide the states with substantial and competitive benefits. Therefore, image and reputation have become essential parts of the state's foreign and domestic policy.

Nation branding as a concept is a quite unexplored topic that extends into many fields such as marketing, public relations, public diplomacy, culture diplomacy and international relations. Two British authors are considered to be the fathers of this concept: Simon Anholt (Anholt, 2007) and Wally Olins (Ollins, 2003) In the Czech Republic there are just two academics who research this concept: Eliška Tomalová (Tomalová, 2008) and Jana Peterková (Peterková, 2006).

Firstly, it is important to clear up the terminology. There is a distinction between "brand" and "branding". The English word "brand" comes from the Old Norse word "brandr" or Germanic "brant" meaning "to burn". Originally, people used it literally when they talked about burning or marking an animal or an amphora of wine in order to indicate its owner. As time passed, this expression extended into many fields where it became important when pointing out the owner or the producer. Branding, as a meaning of building and strengthening a brand, comes from business and was extended into politics, culture, sport, travelling or into non-profit sector. Nowadays, not only products, companies or organisations, but also people, places and states can have their own brand. However, brand must be credible and managed on a trustworthy basis. That is the same as for products or services as well as for nations. If a customer finds quality and reliability of a product to be false, the brand would be discredited. In the case of a nation, it can have serious consequences (Healey, 2008: 6).

According to Anholt, brand is "a product, service or organization considered in combination with its name, its identity and its reputation". It consists of four aspects: brand *identity* (core concept of the product), brand *image* (the perception of the brand by consumers), brand *purpose* (the internal aspects of a brand like shared values or common purpose) and brand *equity* (assets measured in dollar). Branding is then the process of designing, planning and communication the name and the identity, in order to

build or manage the reputation.” (Anholt, 2007: 4). For Wally Olins brand is “an optimal non-verbal communication tool, speaking clearly to the like-minded people all over the world. Branding enables us to define ourselves in terms of shorthand which is immediately comprehensible to the world around us” (Olins, 2003: 15, *my translation*). Dutch expert Peter van Ham defines brand “as a customer’s idea about a product, the “brand state” comprises the outside world’s ideas about a particular country” (Ham, 2001: 2-3).

There are many definitions of nation branding. Simon Anholt defines it as “the act of creating favourable images of countries through marketing communications.” He says that only “a consistent, coordinated, and unbroken stream of useful, noticeable, world-class, and above all relevant ideas, products, and policies can, gradually, enhance the reputation of the country that produces them” (Anholt, 2011: 1, 7).

Anholt also highlights that the fact that we use marketing techniques on states does not mean, that we could work with a country like with a product. Therefore, he calls now the whole idea of nation brand management “Competitive Identity”, because it has more to do with a national identity and the politics and economics of competitiveness than with branding as it is usually understood. He coined this new approach in order to avoid critics saying that the term “nation branding” is not correct, because activities for nation brand formations go beyond the marketing practice for everyday products. We could not consider a nation as a product or service. Every nation has own natural brand image without even trying. Nations gain their brand images on the ground of public opinion. But with a product or service, it is possible to create a brand from its origin. That is not possible in the case of a nation. Nation branding involves also activation of Diaspora networks, coordination of diverse government agencies and debate on national identity. Therefore, the Anholt’s approach of competitive identity is more apt. It is a combination of brand management with public diplomacy and trade, investment, tourism an export promotion. Competitive identity is a new model that aims at growth of national competitiveness in a global world (Brown, 2007: 251, Anholt, 2007: 1-3).

In Keith Dinnie’s opinion (which is very similar to Anholt’s approach of competitive identity), nation branding is a multi-dimensional concept including not only familiar branding themes like brand identity, brand image, brand positioning, brand

equity etc., but also national identity, sustainable development and political awareness (Dinnie, 2007: 5). Similar definition was developed also by Eugene Jaffe and Israel Nebenzahl. They say that the aim of nation branding “is to create a clear, simple, differentiating idea built around emotional qualities which can be symbolized both verbally and visually and understood by diverse audiences in a variety of situations” (Jaffe, Nebenzahl, 2006: 14). Eliška Tomalová offers also her own definition. According to her: “nation branding is a concept associated with PR which tries to form or modify brand state that will identify a particular state at the international level. For receivers of this message, it will be easier to recognize this particular state because of its specific attributes” (Tomalová, 2008: 20, *my translation*). Ying Fan from the Brunel University adopted for his work this definition: “nation branding concerns applying branding and marketing communications techniques to promote a nation’s image”. Sometimes, he uses the term “country branding” which is a synonym for nation branding. He also points out that there are two forms of nation branding. The first version uses the nation’s image in order to promote sales and exports. The second version of nation branding is de facto place marketing; the aim is to promote a country (or just a city in this country) as a destination for tourism or investments (Fan, 2006: 3-4).

Melissa Aronczyk from the New York University gives us another look at nation branding. According to her, unlike corporate branding which primarily aims to promote consumption of goods and services, nation branding is a total sum of a day to day standard of living in a particular state. Whereas corporate branding is a one-way process of communication, nation branding process is reciprocal – it relies on public perception. A state can present itself to the world in a certain way, but its projected qualities are dependent on its true qualities. This creates a cyclical and co-dependent effect. Therefore nation branding can be interpreted as practical application of the imagined national identity (Aronczyk, 2008: 43).

There are many reasons why states use nation branding as a soft power building tool. Wally Olins and Melissa Aronczyk say that the most important aim of nation branding is formation of a national identity (Olins, 2003). Simon Anholt writes about increasing of state’s competitiveness (Anholt, 2007). According to Peter van Ham: “strong brands are important in attracting foreign direct investment, recruiting the best

and the brightest, and wielding political influence” (Ham, 2001: 3). For Gyorgy Szondi, nation branding is a significant support of economic and political interests of the state at home as well as abroad (Szondi, 2008) and for Hlynur Gudjonsson it is crucial improvement of state’s reputation (Gudjonsson, 2005).

In the literature we can come across other terms regarding nation branding. For example, German expert on Global Governance and Foreign Policy Analysis Rainer Hülse uses the term “foreign image policy” which “is effort of states to influence how they are seen by foreign publics and it also reflects state’s self-understanding.” He understands foreign image policy as a broader term of foreign culture policy extended by two parallel goals: security and economics, and two parallel instruments: classical culture diplomacy and PR and marketing, including nation branding (Hülse, 2009: 293-299). In literature we can also find the term “international public relations of nation states” or “global public relations”. According to Michael Kunczik: “international public relations for the nation-state comprise persuasive communicative acts of a government, directed at a foreign audience. The main aim is to establish (or maintain an already existing) positive image of one’s own nation, that is, to appear trustworthy to other actors in the world system” (Kunczik, 1997: 13, 74, Albritton, Manheim, 1984: 641-642). International public relations as well as nation branding represent a part of state’s public diplomacy. PR consultants are hired to participate on public diplomacy campaigns on behalf of governments to promote country’s economic and political interests abroad including often also nation branding (Szondi, 2009: 297-298).

There are many definitions of nation branding. For the purpose of my thesis, I will use the term “nation branding” defined by Simon Anholt and Keith Dinnie. That means as a multidimensional concept including brand management, national identity, public diplomacy and trade, tourism, export and investment promotion. After a short introduction of nation branding, I would like to introduce other concepts from the field of international relations and put them in the context of nation branding.

Firstly, I would like to clear a distinction between soft power and nation branding. Soft power is the ability to attract. Attraction gives us soft power which helps us to obtain preferred outcomes. In order to become attractive, it is important to have a good image, positive reputation and a credible brand. There is a clear connection between soft power and presentation of the state’s positive image abroad. Joseph Nye

says that it is crucial to promote a state abroad and to form a public opinion. Soft power could be destroyed when a state has negative reputation abroad (Nye, 2004: 6).

Soft power and nation branding have a lot of common attributes. They both try to gain influence in the world through attraction. Soft power is an ability to get what you want through attraction; nation branding is an ability to get people to believe in the qualities of a country – it is an instrument for soft power building. Positive reputation of a country is a necessary condition for wielding soft power. The problem is that the sources of soft power are dispersed and governments do not have them under control. Good nation branding strategy could become a strategic instrument for gaining control over them. Soft power does not have to be a by-product of social and economic development but a main product of nation branding strategy. According to Nye, the main sources of soft power are culture, political values and foreign policy. All these elements are also elements of a nation brand. According to Anholt, a nation brand is a modern example of soft power, because a good brand could capture attention with regard to the country's achievements and help to gain trust concerning its qualities (Anholt, 2003: 13).

The aim of nation branding is to create a credible brand for a state. By creating a brand, soft power resources are mobilised and used in practice. When we achieve a better brand, we also achieve a better image and reputation in the view of foreign audience which leads to more attraction and to gaining more soft power.

Secondly, there is a country of origin effect. It is an effect that a product or service's origin has on consumer's attitudes and behaviour towards that product or service. The aim is to reach a positive association between a product and a country of origin. For instance French perfumes, German cars, Japanese technology, Colombian coffee or Scotch Whisky represent some of the best known product categories with good name known in the whole world (Dinnie, 2007: 84).

Country of origin effect, known as "made in" or "made by", is only one part of country's brand image. It affects mainly decisions of consumers. For example, they want to buy a product as fast as possible (because they do not want to spend much time thinking what they want to buy and because they are also short of patience), therefore they prefer to be informed about them shortly and clearly. The country of origin of a

certain product, similarly like a brand name, could help them to make a decision about buying a product very quickly. For instance, if somebody wants to buy a high quality car, he decides to buy Jaguar rather than Toyota because it has been produced in Great Britain and because consumers believe that British cars offer greater value than Japanese (Anholt, 2007: 9-10).

A country's good name not only helps to sell its products, but it also affects a lot of decisions: a) decisions of companies – where they build their factories, set up their overseas operations, market their products etc., then b) decisions of sport and entertainment bodies – for example which country should host their next event etc. c) governments - where to spend their foreign aid budgets, who should they pick as an ally in the times of an international conflict (Anholt, 2007: 9-10).

But it could also negatively affect exportation. For example, in Germany, in the past, South African products were boycotted because of apartheid. The image of a company may also create or strengthen existing negative images of a nation, for example, the German steel company Krupp which obtained the label “a merchant of death and a warmonger” (Kunczik, 1997: 68).

The first nation that regulated the close connections between the image of a nation and its economy by law were Britons. Paragraph 16 of the Act to consolidate and amend the Law Relating to Fraudulent Marks on Merchandise (1887) prescribed that all foreign products had to be marked with a name of a country of origin, otherwise they are prohibited to be imported into the United Kingdom. The aim was to protect British products against foreign goods. For instance, German products had to be labelled “Made in Germany”. In the long run, paradoxically, “Made in Germany” became synonymous with an excellent quality all over the world. Some experts even claim that Germany's identity was coined by a kind of fixation on economic success (Kunczik, 1997: 68-69).

Public diplomacy is another soft power's key instrument. In comparison to soft power it is a tangible and content concept that states use in different ways. It is nearly as old as diplomacy itself. Even in ancient Greece and Rome, representatives did not ignore a public opinion of foreign lands and put efforts into managing reputation of their land. Czech scientist and expert on public diplomacy Jana Peterková defines public diplomacy as “a process of communication with foreign public which is exercised with

different tools". This process aims at obtaining positive perceptions of a country, its national institutions, culture, foreign policy etc. in minds of foreign public and state elites. Positive perceptions of a country play a crucial role by advancing its interests in the areas of foreign direct investments, trade policy or tourism. Public diplomacy is not coercive and is based on soft power (Peterková, 2006: 87, *my translation*).

What is the difference between traditional and public diplomacy? Jan Melissen sees this distinction as follows: "Whereas traditional diplomacy is about relationships between the representatives of states and other international actors, public diplomacy targets the general public in foreign societies and more specific non-official groups, organizations and individuals" (Melissen, 2005a: 5).

After the Cold War public diplomacy became an important element of diplomacy. Since then we have been using the term "new public diplomacy". Melissen defines it as "a large extent, public diplomacy that requires different skills, techniques, and attitudes than those found in traditional diplomacy" (Melissen, 2005a: 11). Jana Peterková sees new diplomacy as "an activity focused on creation and influencing positive perceptions of a state, its values and activities which the state presents to foreign public. Honest communication with the foreign public is an appropriate tool that the government and private entities use" (Peterková, 2006: 87, *my translation*).

To put it in context with nation branding whereas theory and practice of public diplomacy is considered to be an American matter, nation branding has its roots in Europe. Two British "gurus" of nation branding, Simon Anholt and Wally Olins, strongly advocate this concept and largely contribute to its evolution and practice. The difference between public diplomacy and nation branding was also a point of interest of Gyorgy Szondi. He sees the first distinction in goals. Whereas public diplomacy promotes mainly political interests, nation branding focuses mostly on economic interests. Public diplomacy is concentrated on identity and it is driven by international relations and culture; nation branding is more focused on an image and it is driven by marketing and consumerism. Public diplomacy is targeted at public /stakeholders that are active, nation branding on mass /consumers that are passive. Public diplomacy aims at foreign public, nation branding at both foreign and domestic audience. In the case of public diplomacy, government is an initiator as well as a message sender. Regarding nation branding, government could be the initiator, but rarely the sender. Whereas the

public diplomacy is ongoing and continuous process, nation branding is made mostly ad hoc and is campaign-driven. An interesting trend is that while in public diplomacy the role of the government has been declining, and clearing the way for more credible actors such as NGOs and other non-state actors, nation-branding makers are calling for more government involvement in order to achieve more coordination and a more coherent approach (Szondi, 2008: 17-18).

Public diplomacy and nation branding are overlapping fields which explain why foreign ministers are often interested in nation branding. But according to Melissen, practice of nation branding involves a much greater and coordinated effort than public diplomacy. Whereas public diplomacy is limited to diplomats, nation branding requires mobilization of the entire nation forces that can participate on promotion of its national image abroad. Both concepts are complementary – they both aim at foreign public and pursue positive perception of a state abroad, nevertheless, public diplomacy is first of all about promoting and maintaining smooth international relationships – it strengthens relationships with non-official target groups abroad. Nation branding uses more marketing tools and it is a more holistic concept (Melissen, 2005b: 22-24).

One of the components of public diplomacy is cultural diplomacy. Every state exercises different diplomatic practice, but with the same aim to positively influence a foreign audience. Cultural diplomacy focuses on cultural production and heritage, lifestyle, media and language. It addresses the foreign audience by cultural events, study, scientific, artistic and other exchange programs, or by language education. Some countries have their own cultural centres, for instance Goethe Institut (Germany), British Council (United Kingdom), Alliance Française (France) or Instituto Cervantes (Spain). Territorial associations are also important since they promote state's culture abroad. Cultural diplomacy and nation branding have the same target group and it addresses the whole society (Tomalová, 2008: 25-28).

Cultural diplomacy is closer to public diplomacy than nation branding but it is more independent on the state diplomatic apparatus than public diplomacy. It represents a non-governmental part of public diplomacy and directs its attention on the long-run projects rather than on ad hoc actions or casual campaigns (Melissen, 2005b: 25-26).

There is no clear definition of a relation between culture diplomacy and nation branding. Culture diplomats find nation branding activities to be just a marketing procedure aiming at a positive image of a particular state which is treated as a product. Hlynur Gudjonsson distinguishes three main groups depending on how they look at nation branding. There are Absolutists, Moderates and Royalists. The Absolutists claim that nations can be branded as products or companies while using marketing techniques. The Moderates say that nations cannot be branded, but they can use the tools of branding in order to increase the value of the nation's image, and the Royalists also consider a nation rather as an entity than a product, but they refuse to use nation branding tools to alter the image of a nation because of their holistic nature. They say that the nation is beyond and above regular human interventions. Changes or reforms of the nation are based on higher philosophical grounds. It cannot be treated as a commercial or a consumer product. It is even above an individual and it is important to understand the context in which the nation is placed (Gudjonsson, 2005: 283-284).

When the government decides to adopt a nation branding strategy, cultural diplomats could use it too. Similarly, cultural diplomacy could help to nation branding, because it creates a positive outlook abroad. So they both could be mutually beneficial, but still - whereas cultural diplomacy is a long-run process within which a deep relationship between two states is created, nation branding made by experts from the private sector, represents a short-run campaign which could hardly influence perception of a certain state which is constituted for generations (Tomalová, 2007: 24).

In the context of nation branding, we can come across the term propaganda which should be also clarified. According to Zaharna, "political propaganda represents the most extreme form of control over information design and dissemination in an attempt to cross over from public advocacy to coercion" (Zaharna, 2009: 89). Propaganda aims also at influencing foreign audience and perception of a state abroad like nation branding. It also tries to persuade people to think in a particular way, and does not allow a dialog that is based on a liberal notion of communication. It is a unilateral process of communication, there is just one possible version and a recipient does not have the possibility of interpretation. Historically, this concept has had bad reputation (relating to Nazi or communist propaganda) (Melissen, 2005b: 22, Tomalová, 2007: 20).

In this chapter, I introduced the concept of nation branding, its definitions and its related disciplines. It is quite hard to theoretically anchor this under-researched approach in the field of international relations. It is an instrument of country's soft power building used in public and cultural diplomacy. However, its scope is broader and more oriented on economic interests of the country. Simon Anholt offers the best explanation in his theory of competitive identity, which I am going to introduce in the next chapter.

### **1.3.1. External Competitive Identity Building**

Nowadays, our marketplace is so overcrowded that most of the people or organisations do not have the time to study what other places are really like. We simplify the modern world with a few simple clichés which help us to make an opinion about the places and locate them in the complexity of the world. Therefore, when somebody says Paris, most of the people imagine the Eiffel tower or a good fashion style. We are not aware of it or at least we do not want to admit it to ourselves. Therefore, recently, more and more states have been using nation branding and have been trying to influence its image. By doing that, the states pursue three main objectives: to attract tourists, talented and educated people and investments, to boost export, and increase their political influence. There are many benefits of nation branding. An effective image campaign can stabilize currency, restore credibility, increase international political influence, and stimulate international partnerships. It could also positively affect domestic population, boost national consciousness and pride. Nation branding could restore bad reputation by both the rich and the poor, or by war damaged countries (Anholt, 2007: 1-3).

Countries communicate with each other through six different channels which form intentionally or unintentionally their reputation. Anholt calls it "Nation Brand Hexagon" or newly "Hexagon of Competitive Identity" (Anholt, 2007: 25).

Firstly, it is *tourism*. It brings the biggest contribution to state's reputation. It is not just promotion of a country abroad as a perfect holiday destination, but it includes also behaviour of the tourists themselves when they are making holiday abroad – they participate on the state's reputation too (Anholt, 2007: 2, 25).

For both developed and developing countries, tourism is an important export product that provides income and employment. It is also one of the world's largest

industries. For example, in 2009, worldwide tourism receipts amounted to 611 billion Euros (UNWTO, 2010: 3). People want to travel, meet friends, business partners, make new acquaintances and get to know different countries therefore there is a big competition between countries. In order to attract tourists, they advertise things that make them different and more attractive. Therefore, many previously isolated countries such as China or Vietnam have opened themselves for global tourists (Walvis, 2001: 1).

It is the only corner of the hexagon that has permission to brand the country directly which made it very powerful. The public usually does not pay much attention to the direct communication from the national governments. Therefore, communication from the tourist boards is seen as a legitimate representation of the country to the global audience. Tourist board is the main body for communication in this dimension that promotes the country to holidaymakers and business travellers. Tourist boards give people new information about the country as well as new images. They tell them what the place looks like, what sort of people live there, what the climate, the food, the culture and the history are like over there (Anholt, 2007: 88-90).

Even though the destination is too expensive, the tourist marketing can be a valuable way to broadcast the country's image. For example, New Zealand and Australia, do not persuade large numbers of people to visit them. They rather make people interested in their cultural production. They make something like a "vicarious visit" for them and attempt to awake their interest. If a certain country impresses foreign people, then they can incline to buy products from this country, or they look up more information about it or tell their friends about it who may consider making a holiday there one day. This "mental postcard" of a country can attract not only tourists, but also investors. Moreover, visiting a country tends to improve people's attitude towards the whole nation and eliminate the stereotypes (Anholt, 2007: 88-90).

Secondly, it is *export*. Brands are a dominant channel of communication for the national identity. Products are far more effective for the national image than promotional campaigns, because they rather make than cost money. Moreover, people welcome products that they can take home and avoid advertisements which they usually throw away. Nevertheless, it can function only under the condition that there is a connection between a successful product and a country of origin. Therefore, it is important to persuade the owners of successful commercial brands to include their

country of origin in their marketing or packaging. People are curious and they want to know where the products come from. That is the same situation when we meet somebody for the first time. It is in the human nature to ask him where he comes from, says Anholt. Country of origin is hard equity which in many cases does not need to be created because it already exists in the consumer's mind and has a definite shape and form (Anholt, 2007: 91-92).

Anholt says that there were some attempts of companies to present themselves as a global brand without stating a specific country of origin. However, it did not work. For example, British Airways wanted to become a global travel brand and instead of the Union flag it put the flags of many different nations on its planes in 1997. According to Anholt, British Airways overlooked the crucial point that a brand coming from nowhere does not mean global. It can be sold everywhere like Coca-Cola or McDonald's, but it comes from somewhere concrete. Consumers are increasingly asking where the brands come from and they are expecting a concrete answer. In 2001, British Airways painted the Union Jack back on the planes (Anholt, 2007: 93)

Nowadays, most of the products bearing the most valued brand names are actually manufactured in developing countries that are known for using cheap labour and inferior materials. It is then hard to sell these products for a high price. The biggest global brands have already started the process of breaking down these prejudices by acknowledging where their products were created and labelling them with little stickers such as "Made in China", "Made in Vietnam" or "Made in Thailand". Over decades, consumers have gotten familiar with it and accepted the fact that many products they buy are manufactured (to the high standards required by American and European brand-owners) in poorer countries. Simultaneously, the American and European brand owners did their supplier nations a better favour and made them visible in the world (Anholt, 2007: 94-95).

It is clear that a country with strong, positive and universally-recognised associations of trust, quality and integrity has a major advantage in the eyes of the exporters facing global competition.

Thirdly, *policy* plays an important role. The main ambassador is the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that communicates with the foreign public. It explains and presents

them the policies of its country in the best possible light (Anholt, 2007: 2). The governments decide if the country's foreign policy affects external populations directly or if domestic issues will be reported in the international media. It is important that the information coming from a country is consistent, non-controversial and follows the common goal no matter how often the crucial politicians change owing to the elections. The government has to also communicate its attitude to the up-to-date and global topics like democracy, justice, poverty, environment etc. Not only the government, but also the activities and behaviour of leading politicians influence the image of a country (Anholt, 2007: 25).

When states are engaged in unpopular foreign policy issues as for example wars or oil drilling in a beautiful nature, it can contaminate other hexagon corners that are innocent, as for example culture, export or tourism. Usually, in such situations, governments tend to create a picture of domestic solidarity and support for foreign policy. According to Anholt, they should do exactly the opposite and allow and encourage dissenting voices coming out from its own citizens. Because the critics aiming at foreign policy put an emphasis on cultural values and the core of a nation brand stays protected against the damaging effect of the government's unpopular foreign policy actions. Citizens would loudly speak and highlight other aspects of a national life and defend its reputation. Therefore, it might be productive for governments to invest in tourism promotion, cultural relations and export promotion in such times rather than to try to persuade people that they have good reasons for these actions. The aim is to show that there is a difference between the activities of the government and the nation and that foreign public can be against the government, but it would be unfair to be also against the culture, products or people. For example, philanthropy in the international scope can be a good instrument for governments to directly and unofficially communicate with foreign public and show some moral principles (Simon Anholt's Blogspot, 2007).

Fourthly, it is a *culture*. That means cultural exchange, activities and exports - mainly world sports competitions, movies or famous interprets. Culture plays an essential role in the process of enriching a country's reputation; however, governments find it often problematic. They acknowledge that it is necessary to promote the country's culture, but they do not want to invest in it, because culture is perceived as a

“non-profit” activity. Culture is “not for sale” so there is no need to create commercial messages and attract consumers. Moreover, culture, like geography, is a truly unique feature of a particular country. Therefore, representation of a country’s culture provides the country’s image with that all-important quality of dignity. For example, Japanese art, poetry, cuisine and philosophy work as important counterbalance to the commercial image of Japan (productivity, miniaturization, technology). It reduces the image of a highly efficient and productive nation (Anholt, 2007: 97-98).

The challenge for all the countries is to find ways of continually presenting and re-presenting their past cultural achievements to younger audience and plural modern society. It is a mistake to ignore the multiracial reality of the country’s population. For example, France tells its old “brand story” of becoming a white Christian European power. But many French people are neither white nor Christian and they cannot identify themselves with this story. That is one part of explanation for France’s current racial tensions. Changing population is a big challenge and governments have to reflect on it by interpreting their history (Anholt, 2007: 99).

Culture is mainly interconnected with tourism. It can awake people’s interest in a country. A rich cultural life makes a place worth visiting during the whole year. There are also world famous events like the Olympic Games, championships, beauty competitions, specialized fairs and other occasions states can use for country’s promotion (Anholt, 2007: 101-102).

Fifthly, it is a dimension of *investment and immigration*. The investment promotion agency created by the government promotes a country to business audience as a good business location in order to attract foreign investments. Talents, students, experts and skilled labor are the second target group. In order to attract them, states promote its good standard of living, equality of opportunities etc. (Anholt, 2007: 2, 25).

This dimension is mostly connected with tourism and policy. Effective tourism promotion can affect a major investment decision or decisions of skilled people about living in another country. It is not easy for people to think about things in an entirely abstract way. They usually assign their thoughts to visual images. These visual images can pop into the heads of investors deciding in which country they want to make an investment or skilled experts considering living and working in another country.

Positive “mental postcards” should be created and promoted by the tourist boards. Also governmental actions can influence these decisions by ensuring good business environment without an excessive bureaucratic burden, infrastructure, good social and health system etc. (Anholt, 2007: 89-90).

Finally, the nation brand is communicated via *people* of the country itself – politicians, journalists, sportsmen, movie stars etc. and also via the population in general – how they behave when they visit a foreign country and how they treat visitors (Anholt, 2007: 25). Anholt says that in traditional diplomacy, the communication is based on government-to-government (G2G) element, public diplomacy on government to public (G2P) element and that effective nation branding also includes public-to-public (P2P) element. Some countries such as the USA or Italy achieve the P2P spirit quite naturally, but for other countries such as Germany, it can be a main problem. If a country wants to attract foreign people, it needs to teach its own people to love themselves first. Because when people love their own nation and own country, they also promote it and that is according to Anholt the most powerful piece of marketing (Anholt, 2007: 105-106).

**Table 2: Hexagon of Competitive Identity (Anholt, 2007: 26)**



The corners of hexagon are interconnected. Communication via one of them can influence the outcomes of another one. For example, successful touristic campaign can increase export or attract more investors. In the same way, bad political reputation can repel investors or tourists. Therefore it is crucial to harmonize all communication channels by a common nation branding strategy and thus achieve consistence. It can save money and avoid contradictories.

However, there is also so-called *belligerent branding*. That means that somebody else manages the national image for you. The United States are a world leader in branding other countries. Firstly, they do it partly through economic influence of its three biggest credit rating agencies (Moody's, Standard & Poor's and Fitch). These companies grade the solvency of a country, which is used by investors in all over the world with the intent to decide which countries are safe to invest in and which are not. Secondly, the USA brands other countries by declaring them as its partner or enemy. The USA mark them with terms like "rogue states", "failed states" or even "axis of evil". These markings are utilized by the media world-wide and have more likely impact than any commercial slogan (Anholt, 2007: 41-42).

### **1.3.2. Internal Competitive Identity Building**

In the previous pages I outlined six dimensions of competitive identity through which a state influences its perception abroad. Now, I would like to concentrate on the steps of competitive identity building in homeland.

As I have already mentioned, the ideal situation is, when the image branding program is initiated and managed by the national governments. They are the representatives of the whole nation and it is the best way to do it consistently. Nation reputation cannot be created from anything. It has to be based on reality and be goal-directed, recognizable, elaborated and attractive. The most successful national images are not made-up, but they are based a current state of their image. In this sense, they are natural and they develop independently. But if states want to realize their potential, they need leadership. Competitive identity building is more complicated than brand building of a product and it has to be more coordinated, but the principle is the same. The aim is to create a clear, simple and unique message which is based on emotional qualities and which we can visualize and verbally articulate. The message has to be understandable and adaptable for various audience (Olins, 2009: 159).

Generally speaking, there are three distinct steps involved in the preparation of a coordinated nation image building strategy: a) evaluation – awareness of the country's identity and image, b) identification and planning - defining a new image, c) implementation and communication – by what means can a new message be effectively communicated to the public (Anholt, 2007).

The first step on the path towards building a new image is awareness of own identity and image. The government has to have a realistic and clear overview of the whole situation in the country. Firstly, it has to find out how the domestic audience really sees the country today and it has to understand why they do not take an active interest in the country. That means, they need to conduct an opinion poll. Secondly, it has to be found out what the current perceptions of the nation by foreign audience are. There are many barometers of “global” perceptions, as for example Anholt’s Nation Brands Index (GFK ©2013), FutureBrand Country Index (FutureBrand, ©2013), IfG Monocle Soft Power Index (McClory, 2010), and others. All these projects do not have global coverage, they use different methodology and different samples of countries; however, they can give us an approximation of nation’s image in the world. Thirdly, it is important to come up with a vision of how people should see the country and to map out a strategy – to work out an effective and accountable process for getting a new image (Anholt, 2007: 30, Aronczyk, 2008: 50).

One of the common reasons for developing competitive identity is simply to prevent the image of the county from becoming outdated and to keep up with fast-changing reality. If people have not heard anything interesting coming out of the country for a long time (longer than one living generation), it means that the place has no identity beyond its immediate neighbourhood. Moreover, when a country has an interest in participating in the global community, it cannot ignore the impact of its national reputation (Anholt, 2007: 63, Aronczyk, 2008: 51).

Therefore the government should think about why the image of the place needs to be changed (on the ground of the analytical study’s results). There are 4 possibilities: either a) the place is unknown to its target market and needs to be introduced or b) the place is known, but to wrong audience and it needs to target more accurately on the right countries or c) the place is known, but for the wrong reasons and needs to be corrected. In this case, associations that are connected with this place need to be expanded, enhanced, revitalized or improved. If there are negative associations about the place and there are false or unfounded, they should be suppressed or better ignored, but if the negative perceptions are true, they have to be either contextualized, so that the audience understands them better, or de-emphasized so that they are sidelined in the audience’s mind (Anholt, 2007: 68).

In this phase of nation image building it is also important to stay objective. The reputation of countries is not invented by public opinion – it could happen that the country has done unpopular things, or failed to do things that created reputation. This kind of objectivity is important because it is essential to know whether the poor reputation is genuinely unfair or whether it is a result of a gap between reality and perception – the problem could lie in communication, and it is right the communication that can fix it. But it could happen that the poor reputation is deserved. In this case, new policies and new behaviour are the only solution to this problem (Anholt, 2007: 64).

In order to develop a strategic plan, government should establish a steering committee as the first step of the second phase. Members should be representatives from government, industry, arts, education, sport and media. Private sector and civil society involvement is important, because there are more flexible than the government, owing to election periods. The steering committee should be properly financed and get proper competences. It also has to appoint consultants which will lead the committee. The steering committee should also address opinion leaders and invite them to consultations and together set national strengths and weaknesses and compare them with results of internal and external research studies and examine various options of the main ideas. For this purpose, SWOT analysis should be created. It helps the committee to identify key strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities of the image. On an example below, we can see how the SWOT analysis for Nevis business image looks like (Aronczyk, 2008: 52, Olins, 2009: 160, Wilkin-Armbrister, 2007: 97).

**Table 3: SWOT Analysis for Nevis (Wilkin- Armbrister, 2007: 98)**

<p><b>Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent financial laws</li> <li>• Quality financial products</li> <li>• Offers customers quality services</li> <li>• Located in a time friendly zone</li> <li>• Politically stable government</li> <li>• Economically stable</li> </ul>	<p><b>Weaknesses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geographical location</li> <li>• Size of the island</li> <li>• Lack of internationally reputable institutions</li> <li>• Lack of strong and active marketing campaign for Nevis</li> </ul>
<p><b>Opportunities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nevis has the potential to create a strong brand</li> <li>• Will benefit from being a first mover within the Caribbean as a brandy nation</li> <li>• Utilise SMEs to partnerships to internationalise and strengthen the brand</li> </ul>	<p><b>Threats</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retaliation from more established jurisdictions</li> <li>• Scrutiny by international governments and organizations once it is branded</li> <li>• Pressures from the OECD and FATF</li> </ul>

There should be created a “core idea” or “brand essence” on which the nation image and the whole program will be based. Devising the core idea is the most complicated step of any branding process. Its effectiveness is determined by its ability to negotiate these four spheres: standardization, difference, rationality and emotionality. It is important that the core idea roots and remain rooted in the relational context of functional similarity (standardization). It must also distinguish its object from its counterparts (difference), elicit an emotional attachment (require loyalty from its users) and it has to be justifiable on a rational level. The brand essence idea has to be represented via colours, symbols and typography. The steering committee should engage a skilful designer who would be able to create an adequate national symbol. At the same time, a brand handbook should be created which would illustrate and demonstrate national attitudes, character and style. It will serve as a model for different companies which would like to present themselves under the image program. All the messages specified for different sectors, foreign investments, export and tourism should be coordinated and modified in order to target every audience and they should be in accordance with the core idea (Olins, 2009: 160-161, Aronczyk, 2008: 53).

Simon Anholt considers the way all of the country’s companies, organisations, people etc. communicate important. They all have to speak with one voice and tell the same powerful, believable and interesting narrative about the country. Then the country starts to achieve control over its international image (Anholt, 2007: 31).

The image building strategy should be a) *creative* (surprising, arresting, memorable), b) *ownable* (uniquely an unarguably about the place and not anywhere else), c) *sharp* (highly focused, not generic, telling a very specific and definite story about the place), d) *motivating* (clearly points people towards new and different behaviour within the government, the private sector and civil society that will lead to a changed image), e) *relevant* (a meaningful promise to the consumer) and f) *elemental* (simple, usable, practical and robust enough to be meaningful for everybody in every situation over a very long period, and implementable) (Anholt, 2007: 76-78).

According to Anholt, it is politically impossible to impose a common nation brand strategy from 2 reasons: a) lack of patience, because politicians are elected for a limited period and b) political difficulty of imposing shared purpose on the stakeholders of national reputation, because they are usually commercial and political competitors.

Due to these reasons, successful competitive identity can be achieved through soft power. That means it has to be attractive, which is an enormous demand on the creative abilities of the steering committee devising the strategy. The common strategy has to be attractive for everybody even for stakeholders so that they voluntarily agree to support the national competitive identity strategy (Anholt, 2007: 83).

Phase three is the most important part of the project, therefore, when a country starts to communicate the competitive identity strategy to its population and to the stakeholders; it has to spend a lot of energy, vigour, imagination and commitment. The most common problem is that most of the states just give away many documents, flyers and brand books. These materials could be a valuable back up, but in order to achieve the right effect, face-to-face contact is necessary. Consumers and media are not interested in states talking about why they think they should be more famous, but they are usually interested in real events that are relevant and that are a part of a bigger compelling story (Anholt, 2007: 85).

Getting everybody to respect and spread the core idea, and do it well, is just one part of the project. The second part is launching a nation image building program. The program should be launched gradually and unnoticeably, without huge sensation. It should be oriented on all occasions, not just on fairs, advertisement, business issues or issues of embassy, but people are also influenced by food, movies, art, sport or more visible and directed forms of promotion. Therefore mainly film festivals or football matches are as important as a business delegation. The mother of success is a well-done strategy and program included in all official as well as unofficial occasions (Anholt, 2007: 22, Olins, 2009: 162).

In order to achieve success, the image building program has to be not just based on reality, but it also has to have a long term vision (15-20 years timeline). For example, to invest into hosting of a major international sports event without a proper long-term plan for capitalizing from its impact on the country's image is, according to Anholt, a sign of incompetent governance (Anholt, 2007: 31).

The government has to realize that competitive identity building is not an advertising, design or public relations exercise, it just borrows their techniques for promoting the things that the country makes or does –its tourist attractions, companies,

products, services, music, sport, people etc. The most important is that there is the same message which all these actors of nation image building send out about the place they belong to (Anholt, 2007: 34-38).

In the end, responsibility for the success of the nation image lies with individuals: the nation's citizens, members of the diaspora or even non-citizens. Their key function is to "live the brand" – to perform attitudes and behaviours that are compatible with the nation strategy. The mediators of the message are effectively the citizens themselves (Aronczyk, 2008: 54).

### **1.3.3. Role of Government in Nation Branding**

Nation branding is initiated and managed by national governments. The private sector can also participate on the whole process, but the governments are the representatives of the nations as a whole and they have the most complete overview of the situation in a country. Therefore nation branding should be conducted by them. In most of the states, there are many other bodies, agencies, ministries, interest groups, non-governmental organisations or business organisations which promote somehow their state abroad. The problem is that they send different and sometimes even contradictory messages. It results in an inconsistent image of a country abroad with the same or even worse reputation. Therefore, engagement of the governments in a role of the coordinators is crucial. Responsible governments should discover what the world's perception of their state is, develop a strategy and manage it. They should also create and fund organisations that will focus on nation branding and pursue relevant activities in key locations around the world (Anholt, 2007: 2-3, Cromwell, Kyriacou, 2006).

The role of the government is also crucial for another reason. For example, in general, to attract investors, a state must be governed by the rule of law, it must protect private property, have modern infrastructure etc. States should create proper conditions that will back up the nation branding campaigns (Cromwell, Kyriacou, 2006).

### 1.3.4. Nation Brands Measurement

In 2005, Simon Anholt developed a system of brand's valuation<sup>4</sup> – the first analytical ranking of the world's nation brands – the Nation Brands Index (NBI). Since spring 2008, in cooperation with GfK Roper company, the Anholt-GfK Roper Nation Brands Index has been measuring the image of 50 nations. Each year, about 20 000 consumers are polled on their perceptions regarding six areas of national assets (corners of the hexagon introduced above), characteristics and competences. Interviews are conducted among citizens aged over 18 from 30 surveyed countries<sup>5</sup> around the world. In each surveyed country, about 1 000 online interviews are held. That means, each of the 50 nations<sup>6</sup> is evaluated by up to 10 000 people in this global study. It is a barometer of global opinion which measures the power and appeal of a nation's brand image. (Anholt, 2005: 263, The Anholt-GfK Roper Nation Brands Index Report for Holland, 2009: 6).

In the table below, we can see the overall results from 2008 to 2013. In 2008, Germany was viewed as the best overall "brand" receiving the highest ranking of the 50 countries measured, followed by France and the United Kingdom. In following years, the United States of America took the first place followed by Germany, France or the United Kingdom.

**Table 4: Overall Results of the Anholt-GfK Nation Brands Index<sup>7</sup>**

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
1.	Germany	United States	United States	United States	United States	United States
2.	France	France	Germany	Germany	Germany	Germany
3.	United Kingdom	Germany	France	United Kingdom	United Kingdom	United Kingdom

<sup>4</sup> Nowadays there are many of such projects, however, I will mainly work with this one, because it is the oldest and most popular one regularly used by governments, which also works with a large amount of data and it is focused on the all brand's elements.

<sup>5</sup> USA, Canada, United Kingdom, Germany, France, Italy, Sweden, Russia, Poland, Turkey, Japan, China, India, South Korea, Australia, Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Egypt, South Africa (The Anholt-GfK Roper Nation Brands Index Report for Holland, 2009: 6)

<sup>6</sup> USA, Canada, United Kingdom, Germany, France, Italy, Spain, Ireland, Scotland, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Iceland, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, Finland, Austria, Russia, Poland, Czech Republic, Estonia, Lithuania, Hungary, Turkey, Romania, Japan, South Korea, China, India, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Taiwan, Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Chile, Ecuador, Peru, Cuba, Colombia, United Arab Emirates, Iran, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Angola, Kenya, Nigeria (The Anholt-GfK Roper Nation Brands Index Report for Holland, 2009: 7)

<sup>7</sup> The table was made by author from GfK's press releases available online: <http://www.gfk.com/us/news-and-events/press-room/press-releases/Pages/default.aspx>

However, there are some problems regarding this kind of measurement. Firstly, the emotional perception of a certain country sometimes prevails over the reality. Secondly, the research deals only with 20 states although it calls itself “a barometer of global opinion”. Thirdly, opinions of people are inconstant (The Anholt-Gfk Roper Nation Brands Index Report for Holland, 2009: 4).

In spite of all these deficiencies, this ranking has a real effect. Governments follow regularly the results of the measurement and draw consequences from it. Bad position or decline could lead to launching of a nation brand campaign or a new nation brand strategy as it happened in Iceland. Iceland’s reputation fell as a result of the government’s decision to again allow whale-hunting at the end of 2006. Negative reactions came immediately. For instance, as a reaction on this decision, the American chain store the “Whole Food Market” stopped to sell Iceland’s products in their stores. The Iceland’s export declined and the reputation of the country was destroyed. Therefore, the Iceland’s government launched a nation brand campaign in order to improve the reputation of the country (mainly in the USA) (Pálsdóttir 2007: 183).

### **1.3.5. Criticism of Nation Branding**

Nation branding has many opponents who argue that state cannot be branded as a product and that marketing techniques could not be used on states. According to them, to handle a state as some sort of product is inconvenient and inappropriate. They also consider marketing’s terms as unsuitable, because they associate manipulation, fraud and superficiality (Olins, 2002: 6-7).

Similarly, Simon Anholt writes in his book “Competitive Identity: the New Brand Management for Nation, Cities and Regions” that there is a huge scepticism about brands. Branding is a topic which appears in media every day. That leads to the fact that consumers make their own idea about what branding means. Most of them liken branding to advertising, graphic design, promotion or even propaganda. There is also the problem that emotional perception of a country sometimes prevails over the reality. Psychologists name it “cognitive dissonance - unconscious reaction of mind to contradiction between attitudes and the real state of things” (Anholt, 2007: 4).

That is also reason why Simon Anholt rather works with the term competitive identity. He admits that it all is more about national identity, politics and competitive

economics than about brand promotion as we know from the marketing theory (Anholt, 2007: 4).

In first part of my thesis, I defined the theoretical background of nation branding. Based on my research, nation branding is not a theory, but rather an instrument of the government for national soft power building. Soft power is becoming more and more significant in the contemporary global information age. However, as I found, it is not easy for governments to wield soft power. In comparison to hard power, soft power is intangible, unpredictable, indirect, and has delayed effect. Its sources are outside the control of the governments and their effects are dependent on whether the target group accepts it or not. The measurement of soft power is also problematical. Unlike hard power, soft power does not have any commodity that could be measured. Therefore, it is usually evaluated by opinion polls. However, this technique is imperfect. It depends on formulation of the questions which can be misleading. Moreover, people change their opinion very often. There is also broad criticism of soft power. Many scholars do not consider soft power to be power as it is not coercive and fully under control of the governments. Other experts say that the effects of soft power cannot be proved and that there is an ontological problem with the objective validity of soft power resources.

It is not easy to find a place for nation branding in the field of international relations. It is quite a new approach which is still ignored by many scholars. On the one hand it is an instrument for soft power building that overlaps with public and cultural diplomacy; on the other hand it extends into many other disciplines like marketing or public relations. The best explanation for nation branding was introduced by Simon Anholt. In my thesis, I will work with his explanation of nation branding that he calls competitive identity. These terms, I will use interchangeably.

Generally, we can notice new trends in the field of international relations: a) instrumentalization of foreign policy (nation branding as an instrument for soft power building), b) departure from the state-centred approach in the international relations – involvement of private sector and non-state actors that are becoming more and more important, c) tendency to consider international relations to be market relations – every state tries to promote its brand on the international market and the recipients (foreign

audience) are perceived to be clients, d) there is also rising significance of public opinion in the field of international relations (Tomalová, 2007: 13)

Nation branding is a holistic concept which is used by states in order to become more competitive and attractive in the global world. Nowadays, in contemporary global information age, there is too many information from too many sources which results in formation of simple clichés and prejudices. Therefore, states started to use nation branding in order to change these stereotypes and influence their perception by target audience. The aim is to give a state emotional dimension which people can identify with, to create an identity of a country that will be competitive at the international level. With such an identity, a country can catch attention of target groups and attract them. When a state manages to increase its attraction, it also increases its soft power which brings a lot of advantages today.

States promote themselves by foreign public via six different channels of communication that also represent the elements of the nation brand. Either the country manages its internal and external promotion through these nation brand dimensions separately or adopts a common strategy. I showed how such a strategy should look like according to the experts. To brand a nation is more complicated than to brand a product, but the principles are the same. The most complicated step is to devise the brand essence. It is not easy to encapsulate the nation identity in one short idea which is acceptable and reasonable for all. The second most complicated part of the project is to persuade all the people to follow the nation branding strategy. To give them a brand handbook and other back up materials is not sufficient. They must be really convinced about the nation image and motivated to become active in supporting the image building, because they all are the most crucial mediators of the core message.

It is problematical to measure the effects of nation branding which is also surveyed via opinion polls. The opinions of people change and their perceptions of countries do not correspond with reality. There is also huge scepticism about brands and branding because these marketing terms are often associated with manipulation and fraud. Most of the critics also argue that it is not possible to handle a state as a product.

## **2. The Brand Germany – Analysis of German Competitive Identity**

Current Federal Republic of Germany is a relatively young and diverse country. After the reunification, a renewed state emerged burdened by the historical events of the Second World War and scaring neighbour countries with the possibility of its re-strengthening. However, after twenty years, the hated, feared and downtrodden nation has become a reliable and crucial partner and a European leader. Today, the Federal Republic of Germany is a synonym for a politically and economically strong state that has significant influence in the international relations. It is an attractive state with one of the strongest and most valuable competitive identity in the world (see Table 3). It was a long and difficult path for Germans to recover their image and reputation. How did they manage to do it and which problems do they still have to cope with is shown in this part of my thesis.

In the previous pages, I introduced the theoretical framework which I will use for the analysis of the German case in this part of the thesis. Nation branding seems to be a suitable instrument for soft power building of Germany. Although it has its own limits, its application can be useful for image recovery, rising of confidence, increase of attraction and gaining more soft power. On the case of Germany I will show how effective strategic nation brand building can help to re-brand the country in desired way. Firstly, I introduce a brief history of German image management and show how nation branding has become a part of German foreign policy. Germany communicates with foreign public in two ways: on the one hand via nation branding campaigns, on the other hand via six dimensions of nation brand hexagon, I will analyse both of these ways. I will concentrate on the two nation branding campaigns that have been most discussed and their results. After that I apply the Anholt's theory of competitive identity and analyse each dimension of the German hexagon of competitive identity and subsequently the German competitive identity as a whole. My aim is to confirm the hypothesis that since the reunification, Germany has increased its soft power by using nation branding. The growth of German attractiveness in the world has resulted in breaking down the prejudices, supporting economic growth and increasing of political influence.

## **2.1. History of German Nation Image Building**

Strategic nation image building is generally an issue of the last 15 – 20 years due to information and technological development, but the label “Made in Germany” has marked the German products for already more than 100 years. It all started in 1876 during the world exhibition in Philadelphia where the Germans presented their products which were found of the inferior quality. As a result of this negative evaluation, they increased the quality of their products and sold them at low prices. Ten years later, Great Britain was oversupplied with these products which resulted in trade crisis because English products were suppressed by the high amount of products coming from Germany. In order to get away from the crisis, the British established a law according to which all German products had to be marked with the label “Made in Germany” and were not allowed to enter the British market. In the long run, paradoxically, all over the world “Made in Germany” has become synonymous for excellent quality and reliability and Germany has profited from this good reputation until today (Block, Bulka, Priemer, Wendt, 2012).

However, nowadays the quality is no guarantee of success, because there are other high-quality products coming from the whole world. Therefore in the shops people buy what they identify with. Whether they prefer Nike to Adidas is not a question of quality but of the company’s image – its brand. States face a similar situation. They resemble each other a lot therefore the emotional factor becomes more important. Investors go to the country they best identify with. Hence states need to create feelings and become brands (Hülse, 2007: 6).

Germany has a long tradition of managing its international image. However, until the mid 1990s, it cared about its image for security reasons and used the traditional instruments of foreign cultural policy. Owing to huge and loud Nazi campaign during the world war two, German international image was always managed quietly and patiently. Changes have come after the reunification and with the era of globalization.

### **2.1.1. Globalisation (1990 – 1997)**

German unification was a real challenge to the country's image managers. There was a fear of re-strengthened Germany, therefore foreign cultural policy instruments were used for trust-building – for example – new Goethe-Institutes were established in Central and Eastern Europe. Until 1996 Germany used the classical foreign cultural policy tools for its nation image building mainly for political or security goals (Hülse, 2009: 297-298).

A turning point came in 1996 at the conference on “Culture, Commerce and Foreign Policy”. The then foreign minister Klaus Kinkel introduced a new goal of the German international presentation. He argued that it is no more possible to keep culture and commerce separate. He suggested including commerce into foreign culture policy. According to him, the time came to present Germany as the “Unternehmen Deutschland” (corporation Germany). Germany should be presented as an economic power and should not concentrate on its history<sup>8</sup> (Kinkel, 1996: 33, Schulte, 2000: 64).

Thus Kinkel broke a taboo by calling culture part of the country's “trademark” and by admitting that for him foreign cultural relations is about “advertising Germany”. Never before had marketing and PR vocabulary been used in the foreign cultural policy (Hülse, 2007: 14-15). It was the first step made for competitive identity building of Germany. The purpose was clear, it was necessary to employ new instruments in order to become more competitive in the global world.

Although the Kinkel's new approach was widely criticised (Schulte, 2000: 131), the new government of social democrats and greens, that came into power in 1998, continued to promote the new image management which aimed at making Germany more competitive and attractive at the global level (Hülse, 2007: 15).

### **2.1.2. The first attempts (1998 – 2000)**

Already in 1998, German public television ZDF asked the branding firm of Wolff Olins<sup>9</sup> to develop a nation brand strategy for Germany. Firstly, Wolff Olins conducted an

---

<sup>8</sup> He meant the culture approach from 70s which was trying to restore an image of Germany as the Land of Poets and Thinkers (Land der Dichter und Denker) (Schulte, 2002: 45).

<sup>9</sup> The nation branding guru who also participated on the United Kingdom's „Cool Britannia“ campaign – one of the first and most successful nation branding campaigns that was launched in 1997 under the Blair-Government (Hülse, 2007: 7).

analytical study (internet public opinion research) in order to get to know the German image in the world. He found out that Germany is perceived as a nation of “mechanical perception” with lacks creativity. Although the foreign audience complimented its economic and technical successes, Germans were considered cold, unemotional, strict, negative, and even hostile nation without national pride (Hülse, 2007: 24, Chernatony, 2007: 24, Koenig, 1999).

Secondly, he came up with a few particular suggestions about how Germany needs to be seen in the world and outlined a strategy. According to him, Germany should assume a global role which is positive and persuasive. The country should create an image that shows it as a source of energy and productivity without weakening its commercial and technical prowess. Olins’ non-German co-workers were surprised at how many different nation groups live together peacefully in one country, so they decided to name the core idea “Unity and Diversity”. They also created a draft of “warmer image” and even a new flag. They suggested that Germany should be shown as an integral part of the European Union. For this purpose, they even proposed to replace black colour on the German flag with European blue. The internet and e-mail suffix for Germany “DE” was chosen as the main symbol. This stands also for “Deutschland Europa” – and could also be a symbol of German Europeaness. “DE” was also supposed to replace the German eagle which is associated with aggression. The clichés regarding the Germans were supposed to have been written on the posters, those were for instance: “How can be the Germans conservative when they organise Love Parade?” or “How can trust the Germans in authority when they demolished the Berlin Wall?” Such slogans should have been accompanied by the promoters of the campaign like Joschka Fischer, Claudia Schiffer or Boris Becker. Posters were thought to be a round shape as a symbol of openness and flexibility. The whole campaign was called “DEbate: Germany as a Global Brand” and was presented to a wider audience in a ZDF-broadcast and as an exhibition in Berlin in 1999 (Hülse, 2007: 24, Jeff, Nebenzahl, 2006: 151-153, Chernatony, 2007: 24, Koenig, 1999).

Thirdly, Olins suggested six steps of implementing the German image campaign: 1) set up a national brand steering committee under the leadership of the Chancellor or President of the Republic, 2) create a research and development team responsible for reporting to the steering committee, 3) begin a process of national consultation

involving representatives of all the lands as well as national figures in industry, commerce, media, culture and the arts, 4) commission extensive research into perceptions of Germany overseas, benchmarking these studies against data on perception of other nations, 5) carry out a thorough review of how and where the national brand could appropriately be utilized, 6) draw up and submit for Bundestag approval a programme of implementation for the brand options adopted by the national steering committee (Jeff, Nebenzahl, 2006: 152, Chernatony, 2007: 24).

Nevertheless, the government, which did not assign the campaign, anyway, did not like it and refused these suggestions. Although the campaign was not adopted, it generated much public interest and debate within Germany. The Germans found out how they are perceived abroad and it forced them to think about their image (Hülse, 2007: 24).

Another opportunity for Germans to present the nation image came in 2000, when the country hosted the world exhibition Expo. This huge international fair, which takes place every 5 years, is considered a great tool to present oneself. As the first Expo was organized in 1851, this event boasts with great tradition. Especially in the recent decades, the countries have taken up this mega-event as a platform for defining and delivering their “nation brands,” in hopes of capturing the attention of the international audience. Every time, there is a topic that the countries have to address, and the whole exhibition usually lasts six months (Sun, Wang, 2012: 5, Xu, 2011: 5).

Germany hosted this event in Hannover - “Expo 2000 Hannover”. On this occasion, the chancellor Gerhard Schröder and his government made every effort to improve the German reputation and free its image of the Nazi past. The plan was to link a “new national self-consciousness with a success of the World Exhibition”. However, the Expo 2000 Hannover reached poor attendance that was below all expectations (18 million people visited the exhibition, while 40 million were expected (Stern.de, 2010)). The German and international media criticised the whole event and called the Expo 2000 Hannover a failure. According to them, it damaged the nation’s image in the world (*for example*: The Guardian, 2000). The German dissatisfaction with the exhibition overshadowed its positive features and the opinions of visitors and participants that were not negative. The expert on brand management Tjaco Walvis said that the German government failed in handling the media relations (Walvis, 2001: 2).

Even though the first nation branding campaign was not put into practice and the Expo 2000 Hannover got some bad reactions, the government spoke more about the fact that Germany needs to become more attractive in the global world and for this purpose new instruments were employed. For example, in the government's official report on foreign cultural policy in 2000 can be read that "foreign cultural relations need to be adapted to the changing social and political context", which includes "handling the challenges that result from economic and social globalisation" (IFA, 2000: 4, *my translation*) or that one of the goals of Foreign Ministry was defined as the "intensification of advertisement for German science institutes and universities (university marketing), because "in the age of globalisation the international competitiveness of the Germany can be secured only by proving Germany's leading position in a research- and teaching field abroad" (IFA, 2000a: 13-14, *my translation*). We can see that more and more callings for increased German competitiveness had emerged. PR and marketing vocabulary, which can be found in the official foreign policy documents is also worth noticing.

### **2.1.3. After the 9/11 (2001 – 2005)**

Terrorist attacks on New York in September 2001 reminded the world that positive image is important, mainly for security reasons. Germany considered this new situation and reacted by using classical instrument of foreign cultural policy – cultural dialogue – and in order to improve its image in the Islamic world, launched the Islam cultural dialogue. The cultural dialogue consists of various projects of values and opinion exchange. The goal is to lead a dialog which eliminates clichés and makes different points of view clear (Auswärtiges Amt, ©1995-2013).

That is rather interesting, as the United States and other western countries used the "new" foreign policy instruments for nation image building and advertised themselves in the Middle East. The US, for instance, showed a film about that how well the Muslims are treated in the US. Germany, on the other hand preferred the traditional instruments of cultural diplomacy. It did not give up the PR instruments completely, but they were used only for managing its economic image (Hülse, 2007: 17).

These changes in German foreign cultural policy made in order to make Germany more competitive, affected also the Federal Press Office (Bundespresseamt).

According to the government report from 2002, it should now contribute to “advertising the Germany in a situation of global competition and (...) to the marketing of our products” (cited according to Hülse, 2007: 20). Image management was mostly carried out by the Foreign Office, respectively its foreign cultural policy department, however, the Federal Press Office was in charge of foreign PR. Therefore, in order to present Germany more effectively, the foreign PR was transferred from the Federal Press Office to the Foreign Office (Singer, 2003: 32).

In the same time, Germany also took steps in order to improve its self-presentation in the media. It developed and re-launched its website and created a new central internet-portal Deutschland.de. The country also set-up the English-language website “Young Germany” (Young Germany, ©2013) which serves as an information resource for young foreign people who consider studying or working in Germany. The Foreign Ministry even publishes a handbook about Germany “Tatsachen über Deutschland” (Tatsachen über Deutschland, ©2013) on Germany in 19 languages and a journal named “Deutschland-Magazin” in 8 languages (Deutschland.de, ©2013). The German government also offers a one-week visitor-programme for foreign persons and students who have the opportunity to get to know Germany. Every year, about 1000 experts from the fields of journalism, culture, policy, economy and society visit Germany in this way. The program was originally offered by Federal Press Office. In 2003 it was re-launched under the Foreign Office (Auswärtiges Amt, ©1995-2013).

In 2002, Wally Olins emerged again with the management consultancy “Accenture”, PR-firm “ECC Kohtes Klewes” and also with the Goethe-Institutes as cooperating partners. They prepared a 50-page “Brand Manifesto for Germany.” According to this document, “Made in Germany” used to be a very strong brand, but is now obsolete. The Manifesto brings again the slogan “DEbate: Germany as a Global Brand” and restores the idea of Germany being a key player in the global world. However, German government refused it again. Germany got its brand three years later with the first nation branding campaign “Land of Ideas”. Wolff Olins did not participate in this project (Hülse, 2007: 24-25).

Besides the Islam cultural dialogue, Germany launched its presentation in Japan in 2005 (from April 2005 to March 2006). At first sight it looked like classical practice of foreign cultural policy. Germany organized a year of cultural events in Japan, the

“Deutschland in Japan.” However, this project became supposedly the most comprehensive presentation of Germany abroad ever. The German Foreign Office, Goethe Institute and also private companies participated in the organization. It presented the modern image of Germany via 1500 projects, mainly among young people. The main goal was to demonstrate “Germany’s international competitiveness as far as life-style, fashion, consumer goods and high tech is concerned.” The project was supposed to show that Germany is “an attractive place for study and research” (IFA, 2006: 6, *my translation*). This project is different because it does not focus just on culture, but it presents modern and many-sided picture of Germany in the fields of policy, culture, economy, science and education (16. Bericht der Bundesregierung zu Auswärtigen Kultur- und Bildungspolitik 2011/2012, 2012: 5).

It became clear from the governments’ reports that the country is going to manage its image by new instruments that private companies originally use: marketing and PR-tools. Nation branding started to penetrate the German foreign policy.

#### **2.1.4. Brand Germany (since 2005)**

Since the beginning of the new century, Germany started to use nation branding and launched its first nation branding campaigns.

Mostly, national branding programmes are aimed at foreigners in order to improve country’s reputation in the eyes of the rest of the world. Nevertheless, it is equally important to create programmes that also aim at citizens, because in the long-term a nation is perceived also through its individuals (Anholt, 2007: 25).

In Germany, two such campaigns were organised. The first one named “Perspective Germany” was launched in 2001. The initiator was not the German government, but it was a coordinated campaign organised by McKinsey & Company, the German television ZDF and web portals Stern.de and Web.de. It aimed at German citizens in order to gain their opinion on governmental reform and societal issues. The second campaign aiming mainly at citizens was “You are Germany” which I will analyse later. The first governmental nation branding campaign was launched in 2005 (Walsh, Wiedmann, 2008: 156).

The table below shows a comprehensive list of Germany's major nation branding campaigns, particular nation branding programmes held in Germany, their initiators and partners as well as their main focus and components. In the next part of this chapter I will concentrate on two most discussed campaigns: "You are Germany" and "Land of Ideas" including a project "A time to make friends" that promoted FIFA World Cup 2006 held in Germany.

**Table 5: A list of Germany's major nation branding campaigns<sup>10</sup>**

**Campaign Title: Perspective Deutschland (Perspective Germany)**

<b>Initiator and Partners</b>	<b>Main Focus</b>	<b>Core components of concept</b>
McKinsey & Company Stern ZDF Web.de	Aimed at German citizens in order to cause a societal change through public information and discussion, especially aiming at a change of mood, and activating new initiatives.  No specific target groups, but only implemented in Germany  Period: 2001-2006	a) incorporating huge online surveys each year since 2001 identifying and analyzing public opinions about relevant societal issues  b) developing reform proposals  c) publications, events.etc.

**Campaign Title: Partner für Innovation (Partner for Innovation)**

<b>Initiator and Partners</b>	<b>Main Focus</b>	<b>Core components of concept</b>
Initiator: former Chancellor Gerhard Schröder.  Supported by the Federal Ministry of Economics and Labor, and over 200 companies, unions and other institutions.	The goal of the campaign was to establish a well-functioning cooperation between all relevant institutions in business, politics and science to initiate innovation processes, and especially to help together as soon as possible from ideas to market maturity.  Target groups: experts and decision makers in all kind of institutions, and young people as well as small and medium sized companies that might have potential for future success.  Period: from 2004	a) building networks of people and institutions to support all kind of innovative initiatives, especially new business ventures by consulting and venture capital  b) some advertising and PR campaigns  c) mainly events, presentations, lectures, publication of books  d) internet portal to organize information and exchange

<sup>10</sup> Compiled by author from these sources: (Walsh, Wiedmann 2007: 156-157), (Handelsblatt, 2004), (Stern, 2004), (Das Gastgeberkonzept der Bundesregierung zur Fußball Weltmeisterschaft, 2006: 2)

**Campaign Title: Du bist Deutschland (You Are Germany)**

<b>Initiator and Partners</b>	<b>Main Focus</b>	<b>Core components of concept</b>
<p>Initiator: Bertelsmann, A.G.</p> <p>Supported by German celebrities, media companies, joined by numerous business and non-business institutions</p>	<p>Launched in order to change a mood, increase national pride and joy, and activate all citizens and institutional representatives to take responsibility for Germany's future and to get active, creative and innovative.</p> <p>Target groups: all citizens, all national media, important advertising and PR agencies, enterprises, no-business organizations and initiatives.</p> <p>Period of main activities: 2005 and 2006. Currently operating on a much smaller scale, with a different objective (in 2007 relaunched to address the problems of Germany's aging population and encourage reproduction )</p>	<p>a) advertising and PR campaigns spread over wide range of media</p> <p>b) presentations, events, articles</p> <p>c) internet platform providing information</p>

**Campaign Title: Deutschland – Land der Ideen (Germany – Land of Ideas)**

<b>Initiator and Partners</b>	<b>Main Focus</b>	<b>Core components of concept</b>
<p>Initiator: German Government (Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology).</p> <p>President Horst Köhler became a patron.</p> <p>Represented by the German Industry Association (BDI), implemented by FC Deutschland.</p> <p>Partnered with several German corporations and educational institutions eg.</p>	<p>The main goal was to strengthen and maintain Germany's reputation as "land of ideas" both within Germany and abroad, especially focusing on: nation of science and culture – the land of poets and thinkers, innovative products "made in Germany".</p> <p>Target groups: all citizens within Germany and abroad, but especially concentrated on decision-makers in all kinds of business and non-business institutions to achieve their support and willingness to invest in Germany.</p> <p>Period: from 2005</p>	<p>a) advertising and PR campaigns spread over a wide range of media</p> <p>b) presentations, events, lectures, publication of books</p> <p>c) building a network of people and institutions to support all kinds of innovative initiatives, especially new business ventures</p> <p>d) internet portal to organize information and exchange</p>

Deutsche Bank, DAAD (German academic exchange service), Germany Trade & Invest		
--	--	--

**Campaign Title: Die Welt zu Gast bei Freunden (A Time to Make Friends) as a part of the campaign “Land of Ideas”**

<b>Initiator and Partners</b>	<b>Main Focus</b>	<b>Core components of concept</b>
Initiator: Federal Government via FIFA World Cup Organizing Committee led by Franz Beckenbauer	The aim of this campaign was to portray Germany in a friendly manner to the rest of the world, while also highlighting successful hosting one of the world’s largest international events.	The campaign was the official slogan of the 2006 FIFA World Cup, hosted in Germany from 9 <sup>th</sup> June to 9 <sup>th</sup> July 2006.
Partnered with Andre Heller (slogan designer) and PR firm Whitestone Agency	Targeted both internally and externally.  Period: 2006	
Supported by business and no-business organizations		
All event preparation and budgeting was approved by the German Government		

“You are Germany” was social media marketing campaign launched under the initiative “Partner for Innovation” in 2005. The initiator was Gunther Thilen - chief executive officer of the Bertelsmann AG company. The first part of the campaign ran from 26<sup>th</sup> September 2005 to 31<sup>st</sup> January 2006. At the beginning of the campaign, almost all TV channels in the country broadcasted a two-minute TV spot which ran the slogan “Du bist Deutschland.”<sup>11</sup> There were also additional advertisements in the print media, flyers, outdoor and online advertisements of amounting to 30 million Euros. All of the supporting companies gave their income up. The background music composed by

<sup>11</sup> Du Bist Deutschland Original Video: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NbA11O3EqK4>, 7.11.2013

Alan Silvestri, was originally used in the film *Forrest Gump*. The logo of the campaign can be seen below in Table 6 (Cultural Diplomacy Outlook Report, 2011: 3).

**Table 6: Logo of the campaign Du bist Deutschland** (Du bist Deutschland, ©2005-2007)



Above all, the slogan was really unfortunately chosen. The German newspaper “Die Zeit” found out that the same slogan was used in the Nazi time. The journalists found a photo in the city archive of Ludwigshafen (see Table 7 below), which was taken in 1933 or in 1934 and which aroused a quite bit of criticism for its resemblance with the nationalist initiatives of the Third Reich (Erenz, 2005).

**Table 7: Photo from the city archive of Ludwigshafen** (Erenz, 2005)



The main goal of the campaign was to increase confidence, positive nationalist sentiment and people’s own initiative within Germany. However, because of the criticism, the campaign was relaunched in 2007 and was more concentrated on children and child friendliness in the German society because of the steadily falling birth rate and also because just 35 % of Germans found their country as children friendly (in France, it was 80 %). More than 200 initiatives worth 35 million Euros were organised. The initiator was Bertelsmann AG again, supported by media companies. A two-minute TV spot was again created showing the situation of children from the parents’ perspective accompanied by slogans such as: “You are no luxury, you are priceless – you are Germany”. The spot run on 12 TV channels, appeared in 44 magazines and 18 daily

newspapers. “We are aiming at the emotions,” commented the campaign its boss Oliver Voss from advertising agency Jung von Matt (Süddeutsche, 2010).

Although it was not a governmental campaign, it gained much public interest and debates within the Germany. German government saw the effects the campaign had and gained an overview of the situation in the country. The chancellor Angela Merkel commented it: “The campaign “Du bist Deutschland” approached and touched millions of people.” The second part of the campaign received a positive reaction. According to GfK - Opinion survey, 53 % of citizens older than 14 years got aware of the campaign (about 10 millions of Germans). Furthermore, 88 % of campaign-knowers thought that the topic of the campaign was significant and 71 % of the respondents found the campaign positive (Bertelsmann, 2008).

It was necessary to boost the national pride in Germans. Since world war two, they have been very careful when it comes to showing national symbols or their nationality. Nevertheless, one campaign could not fix the historical trauma. It needs much more time and patience to get some substantial results. Nevertheless, it was a significant improvement and the first good step on the long path to more confident and patriotic nation.

In 2006, Germany was going to host the football World cup. On this occasion, the German government in cooperation with the German Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology, the Federation of German Industries (BDI) and representatives from the private sector decided for a joint image campaign in order to make Germany more attractive in the world. The main aim of the campaign was to communicate “an image of Germany as an innovative, cosmopolitan and enthusiastic country”. The “Germany – Land of Ideas” initiative “works with different partners to carry out projects and hold competitions to focus attention on the country, its people and their ideas”. The campaign was launched under the slogan “Germany – Land of Ideas” in October 2005 (Deutschland Land der Ideen, ©2013).

The slogan was inspired by the former president’s Köhler inauguration speech in May 2004: “Germany – a land of ideas: I see this as being curiosity and experimentation. As courage, creativity and a desire for the new without excluding the old, in all areas of life”. The symbols of the brand are dahlias which are used in

numerous projects and which we can see under the slogan in Table 8. Alexander von Humboldt brought dahlia seeds from Central America to Berlin in 19<sup>th</sup> century. They bloom only in those three colours which are also the national colours in Germany – in black, red and gold (Deutschland Land der Ideen, ©2013). Firstly, Horst Köhler became the patron of the campaign and afterwards he handed it over to his adherent Christian Wulff in 2010. The initiative has been aiming again mainly at people and trying to motivate them. It seeks “to use its projects and competitions to encourage people to make their ideas and innovations public and visible, thereby creating a social climate characterised by imaginative flair and a wealth of ideas. Each person is needed and can contribute towards the success” (Deutschland Land der Ideen, ©2013a). Its core idea “individuality in diversity” was inspired by Wally Olins.<sup>12</sup>

**Table 8: Logo for the “Germany – Land of Ideas” campaign** (Deutschland Land der Ideen, ©2013)



The most popular project of this campaign was the 2006 FIFA World Cup hosting promoted by the campaign “A Time to Make Friends”. In July 2000, Germany was chosen the hosting nation of the International Federation of Association Football (FIFA) World Cup in 2006. This was seen as an opportunity to introduce a new image to the world. “We want to take advantage of the unique opportunity presented by FIFA World Cup 2006 to show our country in its best light,” said the then Federal Minister of the Interior Otto Shily while presenting the initiative “Germany – Land of Ideas in Berlin on 14 June 2005 (Deutschland, 2005).

Besides “A Time to Make Friends” there were two more initiatives accompanying the World Cup: “Nation Service and Friendship Campaign” and “Art and Culture Program.” All these campaigns were organized in order to portray Germany as a friendly and modern nation to the guests of the world football tournament. For example,

---

<sup>12</sup> Very similar idea „unity and diversity“ suggested the team of Wally Olins already in 1999 (Hülse, 2007: 24).

one of the most visible projects “Walk of Ideas” organized by FC Deutschland GmbH, was an exhibition presenting a set of six sculptures in central Berlin. It was designed by Scholz & Friends and symbolized six different dimensions of German contributions to modern society (Deutschland Land der Ideen, ©2013b).

**Table 9: “Walk of Idea´s” Sculptures** (Deutschland Land der Ideen, ©2013b)

<p><b>Der Fußballschuh</b></p>  <p>Der flexible Schraubstollenschuh revolutionierte den Fußball. &gt; mehr</p>	<p><b>Meilensteine der Medizin</b></p>  <p>Deutsche Forscher begründeten den Ruf als „Apotheke der Welt“. &gt; mehr</p>	<p><b>Das Automobil</b></p>  <p>In Deutschland beginnt das Automobil seine Erfolgsgeschichte. &gt; mehr</p>
<p><b>Der moderne Buchdruck</b></p>  <p>Von Deutschland aus ging der Schriftsatz in Serie. &gt; mehr</p>	<p><b>Meisterwerke der Musik</b></p>  <p>Der Musikgeschichte wird ein Denkmal gesetzt. &gt; mehr</p>	<p><b>Die Relativitätstheorie</b></p>  <p>Mit seinen Ideen revolutionierte Albert Einstein die Physik. &gt; mehr</p>

Another project, held under the “Art and Culture Program”, was a model of giant football ball “Football Globe Germany” which appealed football fans in Tokyo, Paris, Milan and Curych on his world tour as an international ambassador of the World Cup before the tournament (Focus, 2006). In order to bring the World Cup’s official motto “A time to Make Friends” to life, the Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development and the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Woman and Youth organized a project under the “Nation Service and Friendship Campaign” - “World Cup Schools – Fair Play for Fair Life” which involved 205 German schools acting each as an ambassador of one FIFA nation up to the World Cup summer. Thousands of pupils were learning intensively about the country their school was representing and about what fair play means. There was also an environmental initiative

“Green Goal,” educational campaign “No Smoking, please” about the incompatibility of sport and smoking and many other projects (Deutschland, 2005a).

The program “Invest in Germany – Land of Ideas” was in charge of promoting Germany as a business location during the World Cup, its advertising campaign with German model Claudia Schiffer attracted much interest. Posters of her wrapped in German flag and slogans like “Invest in Germany, Boys!”, “Come on over to my place,” or “Follow your instincts, Invest in Germany” were hanged out at the underground stations in New York, Tokyo and London (Deutschland Land der Ideen, ©2013c). The posters became so popular that even the Parisian museum of advertising history Musée de la Publicité exhibited one of them (Hülse, 2007: 23). On the occasion of the official opening of the Allianz Arena in Munich, “Invest in Germany” in co-operation with “Invest in Bavaria” hosted a special type of event in order to promote Germany as a perfect location for foreign investors (Deutschland, 2005b).

**Table 10: Poster of Claudia Schiffer promoting initiative “Invest in Germany – Land of Ideas”** (Süddeutsche, 2010a)



Five millions of football fans visited Germany during the tournament which yields according to Pressportal.co.za a potential brand audience of 750 million people. Except of attracting investors, boosting tourism and export, one of the goals of the football campaign was to shake off the old image of Germany as a conservative, cold and boring, and to prove to the world that Germans can be great hosts, friendly and nice, too. Prior to the tournament, German media wrote about the fear of possible neo-Nazi demonstrations and xenophobia. Instead of that, Germany reached zero incidents during the event (Elbert, 2006).

The image building campaign that accompanied the World cup received a lot of positive reactions and tangible results. According to the survey of the German National

Tourist Board, foreign tourism bookings increased by 31 %. Furthermore 88 % visitors to Germany would recommend the country as a travel destination and 95 % found the majority of Germans to be friendly. Flowingly, 87, 1 % of respondents thought that the World Cup was a good advertisement for the country and 79 % believed that the German's attitude to their country has improved. Germany improved its image significantly in Italy and Brazil, and more unexpectedly, in France and the Netherlands. Worldwide, 2006 FIFA World Cup and destination Germany was communicated to 75 million internet users, in 25 million print products, on 5 000 fact-finding tours and at around 1 000 trade fairs. Moreover, the campaign increased German export by 1,07 billion Euros (from 2006 to 2008). The German government estimates the overall added value to the economy by the World Cup-induced activities to be around three billion Euros, spread over a period of at least three years (GNTB, 2006: 2-8).

Awaking of German patriotism is seen as the biggest success of the campaign. In the Nation Brands Index survey of 2005, almost all country panels rank their own people as the best in the world with only three exceptions. Germans were one of them. They rank themselves fourth after the Canadians, the Swedes and the Australians (Anholt 2007: 58). German president Johannes Rau diagnosed that in his speech as a "collective depression" (Der Bundespräsident, 2004). The FIFA World Cup brought back the German patriotism. In the next surveys, Germans always ranked themselves on the first place. In 2006, the dimension people became even the second most successful dimension of the German hexagon (Anholt, 2009).

The tournament rebranded Germany and shifted the world's view of the nation from serious and humorless to fun-loving and friendly. The German philosopher Gunter Gebauer said that the World Cup gave Germans a glimpse of who they want to, and could, be. The German Foreign Secretary, Fran-Walter Steinmeier said, that although "other nations had expected perfect organization from the Germans, the degree of enthusiasm, openness and tolerance during the four-week-long football spectacle was a surprise". The British Prime Minister Tony Blair declared: "The old clichés have been replaced by a new, positive and fairer image of Germany." British newspaper "The Times" wrote: "Never mind the final, Germans are the real World Cup winners." The German Chancellor Angela Merkel told RTL television that "Germany's image abroad

has definitely changed incredibly. I liked this inner, happy self-confidence a lot. We're a great country, we can do it, and we're admired by others" (Crossland, 2006).

Sport events are great opportunities how to brand a nation. Germany took advantage of such a popular sport event and made Germany a strong and respected brand. However, there have been other successful projects like a guide to "The 365 landmarks in the land of ideas" – competition aiming at talented Germans who want to promote German's landmarks or programmes directed at foreign students and scientists considering working or studying in Germany "Research in Germany – Land of Ideas" and "Study in Germany – Land of Ideas". There is also the image film "Welcome to Germany – Land of Ideas", coproduced with the foreign ministry and starring Heidi Klum (Deutschland Land der Ideen, ©2013d) and another projects like: the European Union's 50th anniversary celebrations, the "Germany and China – Moving Together" or "Year of Germany in India" – numerous events held from 2011 to 2012 in India on the occasion of the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the diplomatic relations establishment between both states and other interesting initiatives (Deutschland Land der Ideen, ©2013e).

The initiators of the campaign declared "Deutschland – Land der Ideen" the most successful image campaign in the history of Germany and decided to continue at least until 2010. The campaign is ongoing until nowadays (Deutschland, 2006a). This campaign differs from most of the other campaigns that have been launched in Germany due to the fact that a) it aims as at the domestic as well as at foreign public, b) it was formed, monitored and executed solely by the German government and the Federation of German Industries (BDI) and c) it became an integral part of the Germany Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology. Originally, it was supposed to be only a temporary initiative, but having been so popular and successful, the campaign became permanent.

## **2.2. *Hexagon of German Competitive Identity***

In this chapter I will analyze how Germany builds and promotes its image via the six dimensions of its competitive identity in the last years. Germany does not have a national nation branding strategy, but it is building its image separately in the areas of policy, culture, people, investment, brands and tourism which together create the hexagon of competitive identity. I will analyze each of these areas. I will show how the

image of Germany in each section looks like which body is responsible for an image promotion and what are its tasks and instruments. I will also give some examples of such promotion. In the end of each section I will show its position in Anholt's Nation Brands Index from 2009. Although I evaluated through my research this kind of nation brand measurement as insufficient (see chapter *Nation Brands Measurement*), I will apply it because it is the most comprehensive source of information that is available today and also because it is used by many governments and the international media. It can also provide us with determinative information and identify sections in which Germany is weaker or stronger than other countries. Although we cannot consider the results of the surveys accurate, it can give us an approximate image of Germany in the world.

### **2.2.1. Tourism**

The first dimension is tourism. Germany as a travel destination is promoted by the German National Tourism Board (GNTB) on behalf of the German federal government. "It communicates the diverse appeal of the country to a worldwide market, thereby promoting a strong and attractive brand – Destination Germany" can be read on the GNTB's websites. The GNTB uses the following marketing instruments: image building and the development of products and strategies, as well as sales, advertising, market research and PR activities. It develops strategies and concepts that are based on specific themes, events and attractions in order to a) increase the volume of tourist traffic, b) boost foreign currency receipts, c) strengthen Germany's profile as a business location and d) position Germany as a advertise and attractive travel destination. The GNTB cooperates closely with the whole German travel industry - its partners from commerce and trade associations (altogether 79) which also significantly participate in the German image building (GNTB, ©2013).

That are companies (Deutsche Bahn, Lufthansa, Goethe Institute, Grand City Hotels etc.), regional marketing organizations (Bayern Tourismus marketing, HA Hessen Agendutr-Toursimus und Kongressmarketing etc.), associations (German Cyclist's Federation, German Hotel and Restaurant Association etc.), marketing corporations (Magic Cities Germany, German UNESCO World Heritage Sites Association, etc.) and sponsors (Association of Tourist Guides in Germany, German Society of Tourism Research etc.). The GNTB's main task is to coordinate the

promotion of Germany with their activities (GNTB, ©2013a). It is a huge network that operates in the whole world and attracts not only holiday tourists, but also business travellers and visitors who visit their friends and families. Last but not least, tourists who have already visited Germany and were given some impression of the country promote Germany as a travel destination abroad.

There are six regional management offices that coordinate the international activities of the GNTB. Thirty foreign representative offices are assigned to them (11 are GNTB's own offices, 19 are marketing and sales GNTB's partner agencies). Their activities focus on business development in the travel industry and direct targeting of the end consumers and the media. In Turkey and South Korea, the GNTB cooperates with four PR agencies which engage in press and PR work to promote destination Germany. In 2012 the GNTB opened a new regional office in Belgrade. It is responsible for promotion Germany as a travel destination in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Montenegro, Romania and Serbia (2012 Annual Report, 2012: 16).

The GNTB brand strategy includes: a) authoritative market research and market analysis, b) intensive press and PR activities abroad, c) administrating of [www.germany.travel](http://www.germany.travel) website in 29 languages with links to partner organisations, d) social media activities targeted at B2B and B2C markets, e) advertising in international media to secure partners for tourism service providers, f) providing advice to service providers and tourism organisations on market-specific product development and business development, g) continuous development and production of new theme related advertising material such as sales brochures, image brochures, product flyers and catalogues, h) media cooperation, i) support and marketing of packages for specific target groups and regions (2012 Annual Report, 2012: 17).

The German National Tourist Board uses numerous channels to target people abroad. It promotes Germany at selected international tourism trade fairs, regional exhibitions (trade and public), at workshops and roadshows. It organises the GTM Germany Travel Mart, the biggest sales event for Germany's inbound tourism industry. It recruits international tour operators to act as sales partners. It runs fact-finding tours of Germany for international travel professionals and media representatives and it offers the Sales Guide Germany at [www.germany.travel](http://www.germany.travel) as a central sales tool for the travel industry (2012 Annual Report, 2012: 17).

The GNTB presents Germany as an open and miscellaneous place which can be attractive for everybody. On its websites, it has offers for young people, seniors, families, barrier-free travellers, honeymooners and also for gays and lesbians. It provides potential tourists with information about German culture, cities, events, national and nature parks, walking, cycling, palaces, castles, gardens, scenic routes, Germany's islands etc. as well as with all practical travel information (GNTB, ©2013b). Since 1992, the number of overnight stays by foreign guests has grown by 80 % to reach its current level of nearly 69 million a year. It has been beneficial to the country as it has increased revenues and created new jobs (2012 Annual Report, 2012: 23).

One of the biggest campaigns that promoted the German image as a tourist destination was the campaign "A Time to Make Friends" that accompanied the football cup in 2006 and about which I wrote above. The campaign was evaluated by the GNTB as successful. According to the GNTB's survey, 88 % World cup visitors to Germany would recommend the country as a travel destination (GNTB, 2006: 6).

Every year there are many different promotion campaigns and events organised by the GNTB. Every year there is a theme which the GNTB addresses. For example in 2011, the GNTB focused on health and wellness-related travel. It concentrated on people who simply wanted to take a restful and relaxed holiday and consequently it promoted mainly the wellness, spa and beauty hotels. It also focused on medical travel with marketing activities that highlighted the services of hospitals and medical specialists. In 2012, the marketing activities were concentrated on business travel (2012 Annual Report, 2012: 50-52) and in 2013 it was social media campaign oriented on young Facebook and Twitter users. Berlin, Cologne, Hamburg and Munich participated in an interactive checkpoint system where visitors with Facebook accounts can wear special bracelets that trace and track them on their travels as well as post photos so friends can get an immediate take on the destinations (Lisella, 2012).

Despite all efforts and activities of the GNTB and its partners, the tourist dimension is the weakest one of the German hexagon. In the GfK's survey, respondents were asked the following three questions in the dimension of tourism which address the following concepts: a) would you like to visit the country if money were no object, b) the country is rich in natural beauty, c) the country is rich in historic building and monuments (GfK, 2009: 33). Here are the results:

**Table 11: Tourism Index (GFK, 2009: 34)**

2009 rank order	2008 rank order	Nation	2009 NBI™ score	2009 rank order	2008 rank order	Nation	2009 NBI™ score
1	1	Italy	75.64	26	27	Finland	62.75
2	2	France	74.45	27	28	Belgium	62.49
3	3	Spain	72.14	28	31	Turkey	61.80
4	6	United States	71.57	29	29	Peru	61.05
5	4	United Kingdom	71.24	30	30	Singapore	60.52
6	5	Australia	69.99	31	37	Malaysia	59.50
7	7	Canada	69.70	32	33	Hungary	59.41
8	8	Japan	69.56	33	38	South Africa	59.36
9	10	Germany	69.28	34	35	Czech Republic	59.04
10	10	Egypt	69.19	35	36	Poland	58.91
11	8	Switzerland	69.14	36	34	Chile	58.45
12	13	Brazil	67.56	37	39	Indonesia	58.23
13	12	Scotland	67.26	38	40	Cuba	57.18
14	14	Sweden	66.84	39	41	Taiwan	56.99
15	15	Austria	66.58	40	42	Romania	56.61
16	16	New Zealand	66.48	41	43	South Korea	55.93
17	18	Holland	66.46	42	44	Ecuador	55.54
18	19	Ireland	65.41	43	n/a	Colombia	54.58
19	21	China	65.27	44	47	United Arab Emirates	54.03
20	17	Mexico	65.13	45	n/a	Kenya	53.91
21	22	Russia	64.61	46	46	Estonia	53.67
22	24	India	64.25	47	45	Lithuania	53.59
23	25	Thailand	63.29	48	48	Saudi Arabia	52.52
24	23	Denmark	63.26	49	n/a	Angola	48.27
25	26	Argentina	62.82	50	50	Iran	45.48

Tourism scores range from 1-100

\*In 2008, Norway was 20<sup>th</sup>, Iceland 32<sup>nd</sup>, and Nigeria 49<sup>th</sup>. These countries are not included in 2009

Germany was in 2009 the ninth most popular tourist destination among 50 countries, which is a better than previous year. The leader in tourism is Italy followed by France and Spain. The United States jumped from the sixth place to the fourth.

**Table 12: Tourism Question Rankings (Ranking range from 1-50) (GFK, 2009: 36)**

Concept	Holland	Sweden	Germany	France	United Kingdom
Strongly like to visit is money was no object	13	11	11	4	8
This country is rich in natural beauty	22	11	28	8	24
This country is rich in historic buildings and monuments	19	21	9	3	4
This country has a vibrant city life and urban attractions	11	13	7	2	4

Germany would rank the 11<sup>th</sup> place in the world which the respondents would have visited if they had had enough money. The country was not found to be rich in natural beauty but rather in historic building and monuments. The respondents think that France and United Kingdom have more vibrant city life and urban attractions.

**Table 13: Tourism World Associations (GFK, 2009: 36)**

Adjectives that describe the experience of visiting each country	Holland %	Sweden %	Germany %	France %	United Kingdom %
Romantic	17	16	12	47	16
Depressing	*	*	4	*	4
Exciting	24	22	25	31	28
Boring	5	6	8	4	6
Fascinating	27	26	28	37	30
Risky	4	3	4	3	5
Educational	22	23	35	31	35
Stressful	*	3	5	4	6
Spiritual	5	5	5	8	6
Relaxing	20	21	12	20	14

\*2% or less

Germany was found to be educational, fascinating and exciting. The respondents think that Germany is not so romantic, but also not depressing, boring, risky, stressful and spiritual.

**Table 13: How people in 20 different countries saw Germany as a holiday location in 2008 and 2009 (ranking range 1-50)<sup>13</sup>**

How highly do people in...	Rank a holiday in Germany 2008	Rank a holiday in 2009
Argentina	7	7
Australia	11	11
Brazil	8	7
Canada	10	11
China	12	6
Egypt	9	10
France	13	15
Germany	1	1

<sup>13</sup> Generated from the data on this website: <http://www.simonanholt.com/Research/research-introduction.aspx>, 14.11.2013

India	9	7
Italy	11	11
Japan	5	8
Mexico	6	8
Poland	32	22
Russia	7	7
South Africa	8	10
South Korea	6	8
Sweden	20	18
Turkey	22	17
United Kingdom	16	17
United States	5	9

The Chinese, the Russians and the South Koreans wanted to visit Germany in 2008 and 2009 most. It was the least favourable holiday destination for the Turks, the Poles and the Swedes.

In 2012, according to the GNTB, the most visitors came from the Netherlands (10, 9 million overnight stays), followed by Switzerland (5, 2 million overnight stays), the United States (4, 9 million overnight stays) and United Kingdom (4, 5 million overnight stays). According to the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), in 2012, Germany was the second most popular destination for the Europeans for the third year running, behind Spain and ahead of France. There was also a growth in business trips to Germany by Europeans – 6,2 million business trips in 2012 which is growth by 16, 7 % compared to 2011. (2012 Annual Report, 2012: 23-27).

**Table 14: Tourism Index 2008 - 2013<sup>14</sup>**

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
Tourism	10	9	9	8	9	8

Tourism is the weakest part of the German hexagon although the country has much to recommend to one. It has low criminality (Numbeo, © 2009-2013), rich cultural heritage (GNTB, ©2013c) and also beautiful nature. The GNTB and its partners are trying to improve the tourist image of the country, but it needs time and patience in order to reach more significant improvement. According to last GfK's survey, Germany held the eighth place in 2013, which is an improvement comparing to 2012 (GCB, 2013).

### **2.2.2. Brands**

German exporters participate in the German image building by promoting their products and services abroad. What is important here is the fact, that their country of origin is explicit. That means, if nobody knows where a product comes from, then it cannot affect people's feelings about the country. When the origin is strongly branded, it can speak just as loudly as tourism campaigns, says Anholt (Anholt, 2007: 25). However, it is also important to promote other products and services coming from Germany in order to introduce them to the foreign audience, link them to the country and in the long-run period get the positive connection to the country of origin.

Besides companies, the government foreign trade and inward investment agency Germany Trade & Invest (GTAI) promotes the country to foreign companies as a business and technology location and supports the German companies that are active abroad with global market information and with expert advice (GTAI, ©2013). Besides GTAI, there is also the German Chambers of Commerce (Deutsche Auslandshandelskammern) that promote German business in other countries and officially represent the interest of Germany's industry and commerce with respect to political and administration authorities in their host countries. The Chambers unite about 50 000 member companies and support their market interests in the host country.

---

<sup>14</sup> Processed by the author of this thesis from the annual reports of German National Tourist Board, available online: <http://www.germany.travel/de/parallel-navigation/ueber->

They also promote Germany as a business location for interested companies in the host country (AHK ©2013).

It is quite hard for exporters of “non-typical” products to gain acceptance on foreign markets because they are not typical for the country. German fashion brands, such as Hugo Boss or Jil Sander have always downplayed their national origins because fashion products do not respond to the consumer perception of a rational and technical Germany that are usually associated with brands such as Mercedes, BMW, Porsche, Bosch or AEG (Anholt, 2007: 91).

According to the study of the German consulting company Globeone, the most popular German brands are 1. BMW, 2. Mercedes-Benz, 3. Adidas, 4. Volkswagen, 5. Audi, 6. Nivea, 7. Puma, 8. Siemens, 9. Bosch and 10. Porsche. Particularly favourite are German brands in growing economies like Brazil, Russia, India and China (BRIC). Local consumers buy German goods more than products coming from Japan, the US, France or Italy. Particularly the Russians give weight to the label “made in Germany”. The best-selling German brands there are: 1. Adidas, 2. Nivea, 3. Puma, 4. Siemens, 5. Bosch, 6. Bayer, 7. Volkswagen, 8. Braun, 9. Metro Cash & Carry and 10. Hugo Boss (Bialek et al., 2011).

The label „Made in Germany“ has a long history which I have already mentioned above. However, never has the German country of origin effect been as powerful as today. The following example illustrates it perfectly: The Russians are the biggest fans of Germany (which is also proved by the GfK’s survey that will be demonstrated later). German goods are so favored in Russia that even the British concern Dylon International developed a detergent named “Frau Schmidt” for the Russian market. There was nothing pointing to the German quality or country of origin, but just the German name evoked the desired associations. Similarly, the Russian restaurants promote themselves with German names like “Schwarzwald”, “Hände hoch!” or “Sehr gut” in order to gain new customers. German car producer Maybach even makes more cars for the Russian market than for the German. Finally, in India, “made in Germany” became a part of the election campaigning. A local Indian politician put the slogan “I bring the German technology to India” on his election poster (Bialek et al., 2011).

Besides “Made in Germany” there is another initiative “Handmade in Germany” launched in 2010 which benefits from the excellent reputation of German products abroad. It groups German manufactories, which enjoy a high reputation and a wide market success within Germany and abroad. “The German Manufactory Initiative wants to bundle mutual interests, emphasize the significance of manufactories as important employers and highlight their positive contribution the image that Germany enjoys on an international level” (Deutsche Manufakturen, ©2013).

Germany is the world’s number one destination for trade fairs where the companies promote their products to the domestic and foreign visitors. It hosts some 150 international exhibitions and trade fairs every year that attract around 170 000 exhibitors and about ten million visitors. Three of the five largest exhibition centres in the world are in Hannover, Frankfurt and Cologne. Two thirds of the global trade fairs are held in Germany, including the ITB travel fair in Berlin, Frankfurt International Motor Show and the CeBIT computer fair in Hannover (2012 Annual Report, 2012: 52).

In Germany, there is no institution that would decide which producer can use the label “made in Germany”. The marking is absolutely free and available for everyone and no company carries responsibility for it (Wied, 2006). The German companies and their quality products themselves have been creating the good reputation of “made in Germany”.

Germany has an excellent “country of origin” reputation. It is the most powerful corner of German hexagon, which the GfK’s study also confirms. In the GfK’s survey, respondents were asked the following three questions within the dimension of brands which address the following concepts: a) the country’s contribution to innovation in science and technology, b) the effect of a product or service’s “country of origin” on people’s attitude towards purchasing it c) the degree to which the country is a creative place with cutting-edge ideas and new ways of thinking (GfK, 2009: 37). Here are the results:

**Table 15: Brands Index (GFK, 2009: 16)**

2009 rank order	2008 rank order	Nation	2009 NBI <sup>SM</sup> score	2009 rank order	2008 rank order	Nation	2009 NBI <sup>SM</sup> score
1	1	Japan	76.15	26	27	Brazil	51.37
2	2	United States	75.16	27	29	Poland	48.52
3	3	Germany	71.73	28	30	Czech Republic	47.92
4	4	United Kingdom	67.13	29	33	United Arab Emirates	47.80
5	5	France	66.69	30	32	Hungary	47.79
6	7	Switzerland	65.25	31	31	Argentina	47.57
7	6	Canada	64.91	32	33	Malaysia	47.09
8	9	Italy	62.78	33	35	Mexico	46.54
9	8	Sweden	62.58	33	38	Turkey	46.54
10	10	Australia	60.97	35	37	South Africa	46.26
11	11	Holland	58.47	36	36	Thailand	46.19
12	12	Spain	57.88	37	39	Egypt	45.45
13	17	Russia	57.23	38	41	Saudi Arabia	44.96
14	15	Finland	56.97	39	41	Indonesia	44.51
15	14	Denmark	56.55	40	40	Chile	43.81
16	16	Austria	56.42	41	44	Romania	43.48
17	21	China	55.67	42	45	Estonia	42.49
18	19	Belgium	55.63	43	43	Lithuania	42.36
19	18	South Korea	55.13	44	46	Cuba	42.26
20	20	New Zealand	54.50	45	47	Peru	41.52
21	22	Scotland	54.02	46	48	Ecuador	40.58
22	24	Ireland	53.23	47	n/a	Colombia	40.24
23	23	Singapore	52.96	48	n/a	Kenya	37.79
24	25	Taiwan	52.87	49	49	Iran	37.20
25	26	India	52.13	50	n/a	Angola	36.47

Exports scores range from 1-100

\*In 2008, Norway was 13<sup>th</sup>, Iceland 28<sup>th</sup>, and Nigeria 50<sup>th</sup>. These countries are not included in 2009

This table proves that the German products have very good reputation in the world. They are the third most popular brands after the Japanese and the American ones.

**Table 16: Brands Question Rankings (Ranking range from 1-50) (GFK, 2009: 18)**

Concept	Holland	Sweden	Germany	France	United Kingdom
Contributes to science and technology	14	10	3	6	4
Feel good about buying products from country	11	9	1	5	6
Creative place with cutting-edge ideas and new ways of thinking	11	8	3	4	5

Germany scores in this section as the majority of respondents feel good when they are buying German products. They also think that Germany is the third most creative place with cutting-edge ideas and new ways of thinking and that it contributes to science and technology. Germany is presenting itself as a perfect location for study and research in its nation branding activities.

**Table 17: Brands World Associations (GFK, 2009: 19)**

Products and services associated with these countries	Holland %	Sweden %	Germany %	France %	United Kingdom %
High technology	17	30	54	30	39
Banking	16	22	31	21	43
Automotive	7	25	66	39	34
Advertising	12	12	19	24	28
Crafts	15	13	14	17	13
Agriculture	29	11	16	21	15
Fashion	9	11	14	62	33
Food	19	13	21	41	19
Oil	*	3	3	3	8
Film and television	6	8	18	30	34

\*2% or less

Germany is associated mostly with automotive, high technology and banking, less with agriculture, fashion, film and television. France is most associated with food and fashion and United Kingdom also with high technology, banking, automotive, advertising and film and television.

**Table 18: How people in 20 different countries saw the German products in 2008 and 2009 (ranking range 1-50)<sup>15</sup>**

How highly do people in...	Rank German products in 2008	Rank German products in 2009
Argentina	2	2
Australia	4	4
Brazil	4	5
Canada	4	5
China	2	2
Egypt	2	2
France	2	3
Germany	1	1
India	5	5
Italy	5	4
Japan	3	3
Mexico	2	3
Poland	3	3
Russia	2	2
South Africa	3	3
South Korea	4	4

<sup>15</sup> Generated from the data on this website: <http://www.simonanholt.com/Research/research-introduction.aspx>, 14.11.2013

Sweden	4	4
Turkey	2	4
United Kingdom	4	4
United States	3	5

The German products are especially favoured by the Russians, the Chinese, the Argentineans and the Egyptians. There is no state that ranked Germany lower than the fifth.

**Table 19: Brand Index 2008 - 2012<sup>16</sup>**

Dimension	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Brands	3	3	3	3	3

In 2009, German was the second biggest exporter of goods worldwide after China. The most important trading partners are France, the Netherlands, the USA and United Kingdom. Nevertheless, the importance of trade relations with growing Asian markets is gradually increasing. In 2009, 14 % of German exports went to this region where China is the most important partner (Hintereder, Orth, 2010). Since 2008, Germany has held the third place in overall rankings.

### 2.2.3. Policy

The domestic and foreign policy decisions that get reported in the international media are the main focus in this dimension. The main body is the German Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs (FMFA). German foreign policy is divided into three pillars: policy, economy and culture. In the policy part, the main task is to present German policies to foreign public in the best light. The official website of the Ministry states that “The Federal Foreign Office represents Germany’s interests to the world and promotes international exchange.” The Foreign Ministry resides in Berlin and has 229 missions abroad. They maintain Germany’s relations with other countries as well as with the international and supra-national organizations (Auswärtiges Amt, ©1995-2013a). Simon Anholt writes that sometimes the Foreign Ministry attempts to manage the national reputation as a whole (Anholt, 2007: 2) which is also the case of Germany. According to the official websites “the Federal Foreign Office promotes intensive interaction and

<sup>16</sup> Processed by the author of this thesis from the annual reports of German National Tourist Board, available online: <http://www.germany.travel/de/parallel-navigation/ueber-uns/marktforschung/marktforschung.html>

exchange with the world in the fields of business, culture, science and technology, environment, development issues and many more areas” (Auswärtiges Amt, ©1995-2013a).

The Foreign Office defines globalization as “the most important tasks of diplomacy”. In order to cope with globalization and global competition, the FMFA works closely with partners from civil society, including business associations, unions and humanitarian and human rights organizations. With the assistance of its embassies and consulates-general, “it influences the public abroad in order to convey a positive, up-to-date image of Germany” (Auswärtiges Amt, ©1995-2013a). That proves that image building became a part of German foreign policy.

The FMFA has two policy sections. The first one concentrates on presenting the German foreign policy to the members of the European Union, to other European states, to the North America and to the central Asia. The second one aims at growing economies like China, India, Brazil and the South Africa. German embassies and consulate-generals in these regions explain German foreign policy regarding the particular region or state and make it consistent and coherent. They also present the German identity and make its society and culture visible in these states. Furthermore, they support German companies and their activities there (Auswärtiges Amt, ©1995-2013b).

Besides that, Germany has a special interest in maintaining good relations with its neighbours France and Poland, its transatlantic partners Canada and the United States and with Russia. The FMFA employs coordinators and commissioners who are focus on deepening Germany’s inter-societal relations with these states. Their tasks are to help move with the particular states closer together and to advance joint projects. Their interest is also in mutual exchanging of young people and scholars as well as in city twinnings (Auswärtiges Amt, ©1995-2013c).

German representatives use different instruments in order to promote German policy. They use not only classical instruments of public diplomacy like international broadcasting, exchange programs, information services and the country’s position, interests and goals explaining (Peterková, 2008: 15), but they also use modern communication instruments. They communicate directly with local and international

media, administrate their websites, publish newsletter, magazines, guides and other publicity materials, newly communicate also via Facebook and Twitter, organise press conferences, various projects and programs (exhibitions, conferences etc.) and other activities in order to get in touch with public of the host country. Besides meeting the state's representatives, the ambassadors also cooperate with the local politicians, participate on scientific conferences, visit schools, discuss with students at universities etc.<sup>17</sup>

Besides the official website of the Foreign Office, the Foreign Office informs about German policy (and also culture and economy) via a website Deutschland.de (Deutschland, ©2013), a handbook on Germany (Tatsachen über Deutschland, ©2013). which is available in 19 languages and a journal named "Deutschland-Magazin" available in 8 languages (Deutschland, ©2013).

Activities and behaviour of the Chancellor and the Federal President also influence the nation's image. The position of the Chancellor Angela Merkel is very strong both at home and abroad. In September 2013 she won a third term as a chancellor. Only Konrad Adenauer and Helmut Kohl have previously achieved that. In the recent years, mainly the global economic and financial crisis has strengthened her position and improved her public image. She promised her citizens that Germany would emerge stronger from the crisis. According to the statistics, these promises are going to be fulfilled (the German GDP and export are growing and the unemployment is on the minimal level) (Hadrava, 2013, Scholz 2013). With respect to the opinion polls made before the last election, 67 % of voters would have voted for her in the case of direct election (Hadrava, 2013).

She has become the symbolic figure of the euro rescue politics. In order to fight against the crisis, Merkel wants other countries to adopt Germany's stability and efficiency standards and in that way to make Europe as a whole more competitive. That way, Merkel figures Germany as a major power in Europe. German political scientist Dirk Kurbjuweit commented: "It has been a long time since a German politician dared to have so much national ambition. And this attitude is well received by the general public. For many Germans, Merkel is the defender of their homeland against the

---

<sup>17</sup> to be found at: [www.auswaertiges-amt.de](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de)

world.” However, he also highlights that there is no particular enthusiasm for her. Her policy does not simply bother the majority of German citizens (Kubjuweit, 2013).

She gained a nickname “Mutti” (Mummy) because of her policy style which the chancellor candidate of the opposing Social Democratic Party (SPD) Peter Steinbrück compared to the period of “Biedermeier<sup>18</sup>”. Kurbjuweit explains it as follows: “Merkel avoids open confrontation whenever she can. She shies away from making clear statements, polarization and big social ideas that could spark disagreement. Merkel is working to build a “tower” for everyone - a sheltered place of calm, a homey home - and Germans as a whole don't seem opposed to the idea” (Kubjuweit, 2013). There is also her recognisable hand gesture well-known in the world as “Merkel Rhombus or Diamond.” It is so popular that the CDU placed a huge billboard of this gesture in the centre of Berlin. It should depict “the calm and power of a chancellor”. The poster attracted attention of the world media (The New York Times, Aljazeera, The Guardian and many others reported on the poster) (Connolly, 2013).

**Table 20: Election Campaign Poster of CDU featuring the hands of German chancellor Angela Merkel (Kelley, 2013)**



Since 2010, 12 governments have fallen in the euro-zone composed of 17 countries. The political fallings have hit not only the economically weakened countries such as Greece, Ireland or Spain, but also affected more stable countries such as Finland, Slovakia or the Netherlands. Germany was the exception in this pattern, it has

---

<sup>18</sup> The Biedermeier period refers to an era in Central Europe between 1815, the year of the Congress of Vienna and 1848, the year of the European revolutions. Press censorship, in particular, was meant to prevent the spread of liberal and nationalist views. A portion of the disappointed middle class withdrew from public to private life, which had a detrimental effect on public discourse. Today, the word

even grown economically, which has strengthened its position and the position of the chancellor. However, the chancellor is not popular with the south European countries that were hit by the crisis the most. When she visited Greece, protesters wearing Nazi uniforms marched through the streets of Athens. During her visit to Lisbon, a hundred of protesters demonstrated against her policy with banners “Merkel must go” (Bergfeld, 2013, Traynor, 2013). Nevertheless her strong position at home and the good condition of German economy are making her the Europe’s unassailable leader. The magazine Forbes ranked her the most powerful woman in the world (Howard, 2013).

Angela Merkel is branding Germany very well. At home, she has enjoyed great popularity. As “Mutti” she gives her citizens self-confidence and builds her image on protecting Germany from the world. Abroad, she is perceived as the leader of Europe in the fight against the euro-zone crisis. However, Germany has been avoiding playing a more important role at a global level. According to Volker Perthes from the German Institute for International and Security Policy, Germany is perceived as a European leader because it is economically strong (when much of Europe is weak). It was rather a coincidence than a result of the German foreign policy. Although the German foreign policy has become more assertive in the last years, it still leaves the global leadership to America, Britain and France. For example, in 2011 when the UN Security Council voted on Libya, Germany abstained (joining Russia and China rather than supporting its traditional NATO allies - Britain, France and America) or when France intervened in Mali in order to turn away an Islamic takeover, Germany offered only feeble support with a few transport aircraft. Germany was also restrained by the negotiations whether to intervene in Syria or not. “It is a legacy of Germany’s post-war status, when it had at first no foreign policy independent of the allies, and subsequently defined foreign policy purely in the context of German reunification and the cold war,” explained for the Economist Jan Techau, director of Carnegie Europe, a foreign-policy think-tank in Brussels (Economist, 2013).

There have been many other things influencing German brand in the world in the recent years (for example the last elections, wiretapping of the chancellor, the German European policy etc.). However, it would have required deeper analysis for which I do not have enough space in my thesis. Therefore, I just mentioned a couple of them.

---

"Biedermeier" is mainly associated with the style of furniture typical of the period, as well as being used

Now I would like to show, which position holds Germany in the Anholt-GfK Nation Brands Index from 2009 in the dimension of policy. Respondents were asked five questions which address the following concepts: a) the country is competently and honestly governed, b) the country respects the rights of its citizens and treats them with fairness, c) the country behaves responsibly in the areas of international peace and security, d) the country behaves responsibly to protect the environment, e) the country behaves responsibly to help reduce world poverty (GfK, 2009: 20). Here are the results:

**Table 21: Policy Index** (GfK, 2009: 21)

2009 rank order	2008 rank order	Nation	2009 NBI <sup>SM</sup> score	2009 rank order	2008 rank order	Nation	2009 NBI <sup>SM</sup> score
1	2	Canada	65.71	26	27	Estonia	47.88
2	1	Switzerland	65.40	27	28	Lithuania	47.47
3	3	Sweden	64.24	28	30	Romania	47.42
4	4	Germany	64.05	29	37	Turkey	47.39
5	5	Australia	63.10	30	35	Malaysia	47.26
6	10	France	62.30	31	38	United Arab Emirates	47.08
7	9	United Kingdom	62.25	32	31	Taiwan	47.05
8	7	Holland	61.71	33	31	South Korea	46.91
9	7	Denmark	61.32	34	36	Egypt	46.85
10	11	Finland	60.91	35	33	Chile	46.69
11	12	New Zealand	60.41	36	33	Mexico	46.41
12	13	Austria	60.26	37	39	Peru	45.70
13	15	Belgium	59.76	38	39	Thailand	45.69
14	14	Scotland	59.53	39	43	Russia	45.48
15	16	Spain	59.39	40	45	South Africa	45.00
16	17	Japan	58.92	41	44	Indonesia	44.71
17	18	Italy	58.62	42	46	Saudi Arabia	44.67
18	22	United States	58.16	43	41	India	44.58
19	20	Ireland	57.34	44	42	Ecuador	44.45
20	21	Hungary	52.00	45	n/a	Kenya	41.32
21	23	Poland	51.50	46	n/a	Colombia	40.51
22	25	Czech Republic	51.15	47	47	Cuba	39.80
23	23	Singapore	51.01	48	n/a	Angola	39.75
24	26	Brazil	50.33	49	48	China	38.38
25	28	Argentina	48.31	50	50	Iran	32.50

Governance scores range from 1-100

\*In 2008, Norway was 6<sup>th</sup>, Iceland 19<sup>th</sup>, and Nigeria 49<sup>th</sup>. These countries are not included in 2009

Germany reached the fourth place among 50 states just as in 2008 following Canada on the first place, Switzerland on the second and Sweden on the third.

---

to express a certain quiet, lethargic sort of hominess (Kurbjuweit, 2013).

**Table 22: Policy Question Rankings (Ranking range from 1-50) (GFK, 2009: 24)**

<b>Concept</b>	<b>Holland</b>	<b>Sweden</b>	<b>Germany</b>	<b>France</b>	<b>United Kingdom</b>
Competently and honestly governed	9	4	3	8	6
Respects the rights of citizens and treats them with fairness	8	3	4	7	5
Behaves responsibly in the areas of international peace and security	8	3	4	6	7
Behaves responsibly to protect the environment	6	2	4	10	12
Behaves responsibly to help reduce world poverty	8	3	2	6	3

Germany is found to be the second most responsible state in helping to reduce world poverty and the third most competently and honestly governed state. It ended up fourth in the areas of the rights of citizens, international peace and security and protecting environment. In comparison to other countries mentioned in this chart, Germany reached the second best result right after Sweden.

**Table 23: Policy World Associations (GFK, 2009: 24)**

<b>Adjectives that most accurately describe the government</b>	<b>Holland</b>	<b>Sweden</b>	<b>Germany</b>	<b>France</b>	<b>United Kingdom</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>%</b>
Reliable	24	26	29	25	25
Unpredictable	6	5	8	10	8
Transparent	9	10	7	8	7
Trustworthy	21	21	20	18	20
Dangerous	*	*	3	3	4
Corrupt	*	*	3	4	4
Reassuring	12	12	10	10	10
Unstable	*	*	3	3	4

\*2% or less

Based on the results, 29 % of respondents find German government reliable which is the best score and then 20 % trustworthy. Just 3 % of respondents think that it is dangerous, corrupt and unstable. The results of the Pew Global survey of European countries made in 2012 also support the previous figures. According to this survey, Germany is seen as the least corrupt state in the Europe by other European countries (Economist, 2012).

**Table 24: How people in 20 different countries saw the policy of Germany in 2008 and 2009 (ranking range 1-50)<sup>19</sup>**

How highly do people in...	Rank the policy of Germany in 2008	Rank the policy in Germany in 2009
Argentina	6	7
Australia	11	9
Brazil	4	5
Canada	11	13
China	6	4
Egypt	4	2
France	2	1
Germany	6	4
India	7	6
Italy	3	2
Japan	2	3
Mexico	4	4
Poland	9	7
Russia	3	1
South Africa	5	8
South Korea	5	5
Sweden	7	5
Turkey	6	7
United Kingdom	9	8
United States	14	13

The Russians, the Egyptians, the Frenchmen and the Japanese found the German policy in these years well-done and placed it high in the ranking. On the contrary the Americans, the Canadians, the Australians and the Britons rated German policy worse and placed it on the ninth (Britons) to the fourteenth (Americans) place. The Germans rated their own policy as the fourth (2009) and sixth (2008) best. In the table below, it can be observed that Germany has held quite a stable position on the fourth or the third place since 2008.

**Table 25: Policy Index 2008 - 2012<sup>20</sup>**

Dimension	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Policy	4	4	4	3	3

<sup>19</sup> Generated from the data on this website: <http://www.simonanholt.com/Research/research-introduction.aspx>, 14.11.2013

<sup>20</sup> Processed by the author of this thesis from the annual reports of German National Tourist Board, available online: <http://www.germany.travel/de/parallel-navigation/uebersicht/marktforschung/marktforschung.html>

In the dimension of policy, Germany has a good image. It communicates its image via the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and its embassies which explain the German domestic and foreign policy to the foreign public and promote their homeland. In the recent years, there have been neither any outcomes from German domestic or foreign policy that affected the German brand negatively as well as some contrary information coming from different sources. Germans are satisfied with their “mummy” chancellor that has been protecting them and making them a good name in the world. In Europe, Germany has become more confident due to its economic stability and got an image of the European leader (and also the chancellor), however, it was not the plan. At the global level, Germany is known for its absence and restrained approach. The German Chancellor Angela Merkel represents her nation as a strong leader who has significant support of her citizens. The results of Nation Brands Index also supports my findings, according to which, Germany has a strong position in the dimension of policy. German policy has been perceived better than the policy of United Kingdom, France or the United States which are the biggest rivals in the overall rankings.<sup>21</sup>

#### **2.2.4. Culture**

The department for culture and communication of the German foreign office is the main body in the cultural dimension. It deals with classical cultural diplomacy. The main tasks are: to present Germany as a land of well-known and miscellaneous culture, to present Germany as a land with quality education and science, to spread the German language in Europe and in the world and to support the intercultural dialogue. It fulfills its tasks via these core activities: scientist and university exchange, foreign education (German schools abroad), cultural programs (in the fields of art, music, theater, dance, literature and movie), support of German teaching and intercultural dialogue. These activities are performed by the department for culture and communication of the German foreign office, by the embassies and consular-generals and by these partner institutions: Goethe Institute, German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), Alexander von Humboldt-Foundation, Institute for Foreign Relations, Central Agency for German Schools Abroad, Pedagogic Exchange, German UNESCO commission, German Archeological Institute, Federal Institute for Vocational Training, Max Weber

---

<sup>21</sup> See the table 3, p.35

Foundation, Federal Cultural Foundation and House of World Cultures (Auswärtiges Amt, ©1995-2013d).

Currently, there are three major projects of the foreign office and its partners. Firstly, it is the program “Schools: Partner for Future” (Schule: Partner der Zukunft). Its goal is to widen the global network of some 1500 schools that attach high value on German language in the priority regions of Asia, the Middle East and Central and Eastern Europe (Schulen: Partner der Zukunft, ©2008-2013). Secondly, it is a program that supports teaching of German language in Europe. For example, in 2011, the language campaign “šprechtíme” was launched in the Czech Republic. The campaign has been aiming at young parents who have been choosing the foreign language for their children at school. The campaign includes advertising measures, information service via website and different activities, for example, a stage program organized by Goethe Institute in six cities (Auswärtiges Amt, 2012: 65). And thirdly, it is the “German year (Deutschlandsjahr)” in the Russian Federation (since June 2013) and Brazil (since May 2013). In the past there were similar programs in Japan (2005/2006), in China (2007-2010) and in India (2011/2012). The goal of these projects has been not only to present culture and education in the priority states, but also policy and economy (Auswärtiges Amt, 2012: 6).

Besides the activities of the foreign office and their partners, Germany also presents its culture at various fairs, movie festivals, sport events, beauty competitions etc. There is for example the Berlin International Film Festival (Berlinale) – one of the world’s leading film festivals (Internationale Filmfestspiele Berlin, ©2013), or the international film festival in Munich – “Filmfest München” – the second biggest film festival in Germany (Filmfest München, ©2013). Germany is also well-known for its Frankfurt Book Fair – the world’s largest fair for books (about 7 000 exhibitors and 300 000 visitors from all over the world) (Frankfurter Buchmesse, ©2013). The country has also attended the international fair Expo (Expo 2015. ©2013) and many other events.

Germany presents itself as a land of poets and philosophers. The country is home to great writers and famous composers like Goethe, Günther Grass, Bach or Beethoven that are part of a long and distinguished cultural tradition that is still topical today. The aim is to present Germany from the ancient to the ultra-modern angle. There are around

300 theatres, 130 professional orchestras, 630 art museums and more than 6 000 museums (GNTB, ©2013d).

In the GfK's survey, respondents were asked these three questions in the dimension of culture which address the following concepts: a) the country excels at sports, the country has a rich cultural heritage, c) the country is an interesting and exciting place for contemporary culture such as music, films, art and literature (GfK, 2009: 25). Here are the results:

**Table 26: Culture Index (GfK, 2009: 26)**

2009 rank order	2008 rank order	Nation	2009 NBI <sup>SM</sup> score	2009 rank order	2008 rank order	Nation	2009 NBI <sup>SM</sup> score
1	1	France	70.07	26	28	Turkey	54.45
2	2	Italy	69.88	27	27	Finland	53.95
3	5	United States	69.80	28	31	South Africa	53.69
4	3	United Kingdom	68.04	29	29	Czech Republic	53.66
5	4	Germany	67.63	30	30	Poland	53.46
6	6	Spain	66.02	31	33	South Korea	52.89
7	9	China	65.32	32	32	Hungary	52.82
8	8	Japan	65.11	33	34	Romania	52.34
9	7	Russia	65.04	34	35	Cuba	51.97
10	10	Brazil	62.10	35	36	Peru	51.02
11	11	Australia	60.47	36	37	Thailand	50.95
12	12	Canada	59.90	37	n/a	Kenya	50.05
13	14	<b>Holland</b>	58.90	38	39	Chile	49.93
14	13	Sweden	58.54	39	40	Singapore	48.60
15	18	Egypt	58.01	40	44	Malaysia	48.36
16	15	Austria	57.94	41	42	Indonesia	48.31
17	20	India	57.76	42	43	Taiwan	48.29
18	16	Scotland	57.57	43	41	Lithuania	47.86
19	17	Argentina	57.55	44	45	Estonia	47.54
20	18	Switzerland	56.83	45	46	Ecuador	47.46
21	21	Mexico	56.39	45	n/a	Colombia	47.46
22	22	Ireland	55.97	47	48	Saudi Arabia	46.76
23	24	Denmark	55.14	48	49	United Arab Emirates	46.61
24	26	Belgium	54.74	49	50	Iran	44.05
25	25	New Zealand	54.68	50	n/a	Angola	43.59

Culture scores range from 1-100

\*In 2008, Norway was 23<sup>rd</sup>, Iceland 38<sup>th</sup>, and Nigeria 47<sup>th</sup>. These countries are not included in 2009

Germany held the fourth place in 2008 and the fifth in 2009. France came in first, Italy and the United States followed. The improvement of China is as well worth noticing (9th in 2008 to 7th in 2009). This changes right after it successfully hosted the Olympic Games in 2008. The rankings of Germany remained stable.

**Table 27: Culture Question Rankings (Ranking range from 1-50) (GFK, 2009: 28)**

Concept	Holland	Sweden	Germany	France	United Kingdom
This country excels at sport	14	15	2	7	8
This country has a rich cultural heritage	16	20	9	4	7
Interesting and exciting place for contemporary culture such as music, films, art, and literature	14	12	5	2	4

Germany is known for its good results in sport, especially in football. Football, beer and great cars are the main common associations people in the world have with Germany (Dick, 2013). The German Football Association is also the largest individual body in the German Olympic Sports Federation which unites all German sport clubs (DOSB, ©2013). France was found as the second most interesting and exciting place for contemporary culture.

**Table 28: Culture World Associations (GFK, 2009: 28)**

Cultural activity or product most expected to be produced in this country	Holland %	Sweden %	Germany %	France %	United Kingdom %
Opera	11	12	27	34	28
Pop Videos	12	15	20	22	36
Circus	8	8	14	19	15
Sculpture	18	17	24	37	26
Museums	30	28	43	55	50
Street Carnival	15	9	16	19	15
Films	14	18	30	45	41
Sports	20	20	42	34	39
Modern design	20	25	31	38	32
Music	15	20	30	37	44

\*2% or less

Germany scores in sports too. German museums, of which there are more than six thousands, were ranked high as well (GNTB, ©2013e). It received good scores also in modern design, music, films and operas.

**Table 29: How people in 20 different countries saw the German culture in 2008 and 2009 (ranking range 1-50)<sup>22</sup>**

How highly do people in...	Rank the culture of Germany in 2008	Rank the culture of Germany in 2009
Argentina	4	3
Australia	6	7
Brazil	6	5
Canada	6	8
China	6	5
Egypt	5	5
France	3	5
Germany	1	1
India	7	7
Italy	6	6
Japan	6	6
Mexico	5	5
Poland	6	4
Russia	3	2
South Africa	5	7
South Korea	6	6
Sweden	7	7
Turkey	6	7
United Kingdom	6	8
United States	4	4

This chart shows unbelievably stable results across the states. The only exceptions are the Germans themselves and the Russians. Germany got the worst score from the Indians.

**Table 30: Culture Index 2008 - 2012<sup>23</sup>**

Dimension	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Culture	4	5	4	5	5	5

The dimension of culture is a very stable part of German Hexagon (see the chart above). The main body responsible for German presentation via culture is the department for culture and communication of the German Foreign Office, its embassies and partners. There are thousands of programs, projects and initiatives. As there is not

<sup>22</sup> Generated from the data on this website: <http://www.simonanholt.com/Research/research-introduction.aspx>, 14.11.2013

<sup>23</sup> Processed by the author of this thesis from the annual reports of German National Tourist Board, available online: <http://www.germany.travel/de/parallel-navigation/ueber-uns/marktforschung/marktforschung.html>

enough space in my thesis for all of them, I have just mentioned a couple of them. Besides them, the German nation brand influences also the sport events, fairs, movie festivals and others.

### **2.2.5. Investment & Immigration**

This dimension includes the way the country entices foreign investors and companies and recruits foreign talents and students. The main body is the government foreign trade and inward investment agency Germany Trade & Invest (GTAI) that promotes the country to foreign companies and investors as a business and technology location. It supports companies based in Germany, companies looking to enter Germany and German companies seeking to expand their business abroad with global market information and with expert advice (GTAI, ©2013).

The predecessor of GTAI was established in 1951 as Federal Information Office for Foreign Trade. Originally, foreign trade promotion was lobbying for German commercial interest abroad. Now, as Germany finds itself confronted with global competition, it re-defines its trade promotion defining it as “the practice of promoting, advertising and improving the image of Germany as a business location” with the goal of attracting foreign direct investment. In 1998, it was institutionalized at the federal level. Germany Trade & Invest has offered the highest levels of German foreign trade expertise under one roof since 2009 (GTAI, ©2013). GTAI cooperates with all relevant actors in the German economy including all federal ministries, the Worldwide Network of German Chambers of Commerce, Chambers of Industry and Commerce, Chamber of Crafts and many others (GTAI, ©2013).

There have been many initiatives organized by this agency. Under the nation branding campaign “Land of Ideas” there are the programs “Made in Germany – Ludwig Erhard Preis” which awards the best German managers who contribute the most to the excellent reputation of “made in Germany” and the project “Invest in Germany – Land of Ideas” under which “Germany Book” was published. It outlines the advantages of investing in Germany. Then there is an initiative “Innovation Powerhouse,” the open platform for addressing innovation and problem-solving processes in business and industry, as well as scientific, social and political issues. Various businesses, organizations and establishments use external knowledge and expertise in order to solve

their own specific issues. The best idea providers can in turn benefit from their ideas being implemented through awards and recognition of their services from the community (Deutschland Land der Ideen, ©2013f).

There is also another initiative - “Health – Made in Germany”, project of the Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology which supports the German health care industry. The aim is to advance Germany’s position among leading export countries (GTAI, ©2013). In 2010, GTAI launched the international marketing campaign with the slogan “Germany. Smart-up your business” in order to promote Germany as an innovation and high-technology location (Auswärtiges Amt, ©1995-2013e). All these programs, projects and initiatives are aiming at both domestic and foreign audience and thus participate on nation brand building and promote the good reputation of Germany.

The second part of this dimension concentrates on foreign talents, students and workers considering living, studying or working abroad. Under the campaign “Land of Ideas”, there are two projects “Study in Germany – Land of Ideas” and “Research in Germany – Land of Ideas.” Under the program “Research in Germany” the internet portal was established which informs foreign scientists, opinion leaders from the fields of politics and economy as well as journalists about the German research landscape (Deutschland Land der Ideen, ©2013g). “Study in Germany” is the project of the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) that on behalf of the Federal Ministry of Education and Research encourages young people to study in Germany. Apart from worldwide posters and advertisements, the campaign also uses video commercials and an online portal in order to create a visible reference to Germany (Study in Germany – Land of Ideas, ©2013).

The German foreign office also organizes many exchange programs for foreign students and scientists because according to the foreign office “exchange programs lead to the collective solutions of the global challenges like climate change, energy safety and terrorism” (Auswärtiges Amt, ©1995-2013f). In 2011, Germany became the third most popular destination for foreign students according to the survey of the OECD. There were 4, 3 million students studying abroad, 16, 5 % of them were studying in the United States, 13 % in United Kingdom and 6, 3 % in Germany. However, since 2000 the number of students studying in Germany (and also in the US, United Kingdom or

France) has been decreasing while in other countries like Russia, Brazil, Saudi Arabia or South Korea has been improving (Kercher, 2013).

The German government passed new immigration rules in 2013 that have made it easier for skilled workers from the outside of the European Union to take a job in the country. The government adopted measures to cut bureaucracy and encourage companies to recognize qualifications from abroad. The aim is to attract foreign workers for target industries such as engineering, train driving and plumbing which are understaffed. Germany also adopted a “blue card” system that has made it easier to hire foreign academics and helped the foreign nurses to work there. In spite of the euro zone debt crises, Germany’s employment rate is at its highest since the reunification in 1990, the problem is ageing population and relatively low immigration (Brown, Hansen, 2013).

In the section of investment and immigration, Germany has launched many projects in order to attract foreign investors, companies, students and skilled labor. The way the foreigners see Germany as a business and immigrant location is shown below.

In the GfK’s survey, respondents were asked the following five questions in the dimension of investment which address the following concepts: a) willingness to live and work for a substantial period in the country, b) quality of life, c) good place to study for educational qualifications, d) the country has businesses I would like to invest in, e) equal opportunity (GfK, 2009: 37). Here are the results:

**Table 31: Investment Index (GFK 2009: 38)**

2009 rank order	2008 rank order	Nation	2009 NBI <sup>SM</sup> score	2009 rank order	2008 rank order	Nation	2009 NBI <sup>SM</sup> score
1	1	Canada	67.41	26	28	Argentina	48.17
2	2	United States	67.36	27	29	United Arab Emirates	47.58
3	4	Switzerland	66.14	28	30	South Korea	46.55
4	2	United Kingdom	65.93	29	32	Taiwan	46.18
5	6	France	65.75	30	31	Mexico	45.79
6	5	Germany	65.59	31	35	Malaysia	45.43
7	7	Australia	63.85	32	36	Turkey	45.20
8	8	Sweden	63.65	33	33	China	44.94
9	9	Italy	62.72	34	44	Romania	44.51
10	10	Japan	61.79	35	43	Egypt	44.46
11	11	Holland	60.82	36	41	South Africa	44.41
12	12	Spain	60.57	37	41	Saudi Arabia	44.24
13	15	Austria	59.52	38	39	Thailand	44.22
14	13	Denmark	59.09	39	39	Chile	44.11
15	15	New Zealand	58.99	40	38	Estonia	44.09
16	18	Finland	58.23	41	36	Lithuania	43.89
17	17	Scotland	58.10	42	34	India	43.79
18	19	Belgium	57.66	43	45	Indonesia	42.45
19	20	Ireland	56.07	44	45	Peru	42.37
20	22	Singapore	50.36	45	47	Ecuador	41.15
21	23	Brazil	50.09	46	48	Cuba	40.57
22	26	Poland	49.00	47	n/a	Colombia	39.20
23	24	Hungary	48.91	48	n/a	Kenya	37.68
24	25	Russia	48.75	49	n/a	Angola	36.25
25	27	Czech Republic	48.48	50	50	Iran	32.46

Immigration/Investment scores range from 1-100

\*In 2008, Norway was 14<sup>th</sup>, Iceland 21<sup>st</sup>, and Nigeria 49<sup>th</sup>. These countries are not included in 2009

Germany is the fifth most popular country for investors and immigrants. The most popular is Canada followed by the United States, Switzerland, United Kingdom and France. Germany is known for its quite complicated bureaucracy and although it is now trying to make it easier as I showed above, the critics say it is not enough (Brown, Hansen, 2013).

**Table 32: Investment Question Rankings (Ranking range from 1-50) (GFK, 2009: 40)**

Concept	Holland	Sweden	Germany	France	United Kingdom
Willing to live and work for a substantial period in this country	12	9	10	4	7
High quality of life	11	6	5	3	7
Good place to study for educational qualifications	13	8	3	4	2
Has businesses I'd like to invest in	11	10	3	7	6
Cares about equality in society	8	2	4	7	4

**Table 33: Investment World Associations (GFK, 2009: 41)**

Adjective that describes each country's current economic and business conditions	Holland %	Sweden %	Germany %	France %	United Kingdom %
Backward	*	*	*	*	3
Developing	10	9	8	7	7
Forward-Thinking	16	19	20	18	17
Ambitious	9	9	11	10	9
Modern	27	28	28	29	26
Declining	3	3	5	6	8
Isolated	*	*	*	*	*
Stagnant	6	5	6	7	8

\*2% or less

Table 27 and 28 show the adjectives that were most commonly selected to describe each country's current economic and business conditions. Germany is most associated with being modern, open, ambitious and technologically developed. It is found to be a good place for studying and investing. However, people would rather live and work for a substantial period in France and United Kingdom than in Germany.

**Table 34: How people in 20 different countries saw the immigrating to Germany in 2008 and 2009 (ranking range 1-50)<sup>24</sup>**

How highly do people in...	Rank immigrating to Germany in 2008	Rank the immigrating to Germany in 2009
Argentina	4	1
Australia	7	7
Brazil	5	7
Canada	6	9
China	7	2
Egypt	1	5
France	4	4
Germany	1	1
India	8	7
Italy	7	7
Japan	4	5
Mexico	4	7
Poland	7	5
Russia	3	1
South Africa	4	7

<sup>24</sup> Generated from the data on this website: <http://www.simonanholt.com/Research/research-introduction.aspx>, 14.11.2013

South Korea	5	6
Sweden	8	7
Turkey	7	6
United Kingdom	8	11
United States	8	8

Germany is a favourite business and studying location for the Russians, the Argentineans, the Chinese and the Egyptians. In 2011, China became the largest investor in Germany and overtook the United States for the first time. Switzerland and France took the third and fourth place. The foreign investment projects in Germany mainly focus on the mechanical engineering and automotive sectors (Xinhua, 2012). Since 1999 Germany has also been the largest European investor in China, about 2 500 German companies invest there (Hintereeder, Orth, 2010).

**Table 35: Investment Index 2008 - 2012<sup>25</sup>**

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>
Investment	5	6	4	4	3	3

Germany has a very good reputation in the dimension of investment, since 2008 it has moved upwards in the rankings. Last year, it was found to be the third best country for the investments and immigration. Also Ernst & Young's "European Attractiveness Survey 2012" confirms Germany's reputation as one of the most attractive business locations in the world. International decision makers ranked Germany first within the EU and sixth worldwide. American business executives highlighted in the survey of AmCham Business Barometer 2012 these factors as the top location advantages that distinguish Germany from its competitors: stability, reliability, security, skilled workers, qualified employees, education, market size, market relevance, infrastructure, logistics, innovation and research intensity. According to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), Germany is one of the world's leading countries for foreign direct investments (FDI) with more than 513 billion Euros in inward FDI in 2011 which represents a growth of 13 % comparing to 2008. Germany's attractiveness as an international business location proves also more than 55 000 foreign companies already operating in the country (GTAI, 2013: 2).

<sup>25</sup> Processed by the author of this thesis from the annual reports of German National Tourist Board, available online: <http://www.germany.travel/de/parallel-navigation/ueber-uns/marktforschung/marktforschung.html>

### 2.2.6. People

In this dimension all the citizens promote their country abroad - the popular persons (the high-profile leaders and media, sport stars, models, etc.) as well as the population in general. On the one hand the way they behave when they are abroad and on the other hand the way they treat visitors to their country (Anholt, 2007: 25).

There are many stereotypes regarding Germans in the world. People consider Germans to be cold, arrogant, hostile, boring and humorless, but also efficient, punctual, organized and reliable. Germans are highly regarded, but as potential employees or managers rather than as friends or hosts. This has been also supported by the results of the Pew Research Center's survey (Pollard, 2013) and the survey from GfK (GfK, 2009: 24).

Simon Anholt sees the root of this problem in a lack of German national pride. "The Germans are not quite sure how to love themselves and it is a fundamental tenet of human psychology that it is hard to love somebody who does not quite know how to love himself" (Anholt, 2007: 71). Sixty eight years after the end of the world war two some Germans are still against any expression of national pride. They find uneasy to show the German flag or scream "Deutschland, Deutschland" during the football match (Grieshaber, 2010).

Germany is aware of that and therefore it has started to teach the nation how to love itself. The campaign "You are Germany" was held in order to induce positive nationalist sentiment within Germany. Unfortunately it was criticized for being too reminiscent of the Nazi propaganda. However, the next try was successful. The hosting of the FIFA World Cup in 2006 surprisingly boosted German nationalism. Moreover it also changed the perception of the Germans in the world. According to the survey made by the German National Tourist Board in 2007, 95 % of respondents found Germans to be friendly and 79 % of them believe that the German's attitude to their country has improved (GNTB, 2006: 6).

This dimension of the hexagon is very hard to coordinate, because every citizen herself/himself is responsible for propagation of the country's good image. Personalities also promote the nation like for example models Claudia Schiffer and Heidi Klum or sportsmen Michael Schumacher, Franz Anton Beckenbauer and Boris Franz Becker.

In the GfK's survey, respondents were asked the following three questions in the dimension of people which address the following concepts: a) If I visited the country, the people would make me feel welcome, b) I would like to have a person from the country as a close friend, c) a well-qualified person from the country would be a valuable employee (GfK, 2009: 29). Here are the results:

**Table 36: People Index (GfK, 2009: 30)**

2009 rank order	2008 rank order	Nation	2009 NBI <sup>SM</sup> score	2009 rank order	2008 rank order	Nation	2009 NBI <sup>SM</sup> score
1	1	Canada	68.26	26	27	Hungary	58.20
2	2	Australia	66.68	27	31	Russia	58.01
3	3	Italy	66.53	28	32	Egypt	57.85
4	5	Switzerland	65.93	29	29	Thailand	57.81
5	13	United States	65.85	30	29	Czech Republic	57.76
6	6	United Kingdom	65.61	31	34	South Africa	56.99
7	4	Sweden	65.54	32	37	Turkey	56.82
8	8	Spain	65.41	33	38	Malaysia	56.81
9	8	Japan	65.23	34	33	Taiwan	56.51
10	7	Germany	65.16	35	41	China	56.16
11	11	France	64.85	36	35	Peru	56.15
12	10	New Zealand	64.32	37	39	South Korea	55.76
13	12	Holland	64.15	38	35	Chile	55.72
14	15	Scotland	63.19	39	41	Romania	55.54
15	18	Austria	62.74	40	41	Indonesia	55.42
16	18	Finland	62.57	41	40	Cuba	55.17
17	20	Brazil	62.54	42	45	Ecuador	54.53
18	17	Ireland	62.50	43	44	Lithuania	54.40
19	16	Denmark	62.05	44	46	Estonia	54.32
20	21	Belgium	61.89	45	n/a	Kenya	53.98
21	23	Argentina	59.36	46	47	United Arab Emirates	53.97
22	24	Mexico	59.00	47	n/a	Colombia	52.73
23	26	India	58.74	48	48	Saudi Arabia	52.04
24	25	Singapore	58.65	49	n/a	Angola	50.92
25	28	Poland	58.23	50	50	Iran	44.90

People scores range from 1-100

It can be seen that Germany took the tenth place in 2009, which is worse than the previous year. The dimension of people is the second weakest corner of the German hexagon. The improvement of the United States is astonishing. It jumped from the thirteenth place to the fifth. As well as in the policy dimension, Canada and Sweden got a high score.

**Table 37: People Question Rankings (Ranking range from 1-50) (GFK, 2009: 32)**

Concept	Holland	Sweden	Germany	France	United Kingdom
People would make you feel welcome	9	7	21	19	13
Like to have a person from this country as a close friend	12	9	10	6	5
Willing to employ a well-qualified person from this country	11	8	1	7	5

**Table 38: People World Associations (GFK, 2009: 32)**

Adjectives that describe the people of each country	Holland %	Sweden %	Germany %	France %	United Kingdom %
Honest	23	28	26	19	23
Hard-Working	27	30	42	22	26
Lazy	3	3	3	9	7
Ignorant	3	3	3	5	5
Unreliable	4	3	5	7	7
Skillful	24	28	38	28	29
Fun	15	11	10	19	15
Tolerant	17	17	12	14	16
Rich	12	16	20	20	23
Aggressive	3	*	11	7	7

\*2% or less

Here the clichés about Germany that are still ongoing in the world are demonstrated. Although the FIFA World Cup in 2006 improved the image of Germans for a while, it would be naïve to think that one event could change stereotypes that have been here for centuries. What is important is the fact that Germans are aware of this problem and they want to do something about it.

**Table 39: How people in 20 different countries saw the Germans in 2008 and 2009 (ranking range 1-50)<sup>26</sup>**

How highly do people in...	Rank the people in Germany in 2008	Rank the people in Germany in 2009
Argentina	6	8
Australia	15	13
Brazil	10	6

<sup>26</sup> Generated from the data on this website: <http://www.simonanholt.com/Research/research-introduction.aspx>, 14.11.2013

Canada	15	19
China	7	1
Egypt	6	12
France	5	9
Germany	1	1
India	10	7
Italy	9	8
Japan	3	7
Mexico	11	11
Poland	29	23
Russia	3	2
South Africa	10	13
South Korea	7	5
Sweden	14	10
Turkey	11	12
United Kingdom	17	18
United States	11	12

The Germans got the best score from the Chinese, the Russians and from themselves. That is a good progress, because in 2005 they ranked themselves fourth after the Canadians, the Swedes and the Australians (Anholt, 2007: 58). In 2006 the dimension of people was even the second most successful dimension of the hexagon (GNTB, 2006a: 22). This could be a result of the nation branding campaigns held in Germany in 2005 (Land of Ideas, You are Germany) and 2006 (Time to make friends) that encouraged their national pride.

**Table 40: People Index 2008 - 2012<sup>27</sup>**

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
People	7	10	6	8	6

We can see that Germany took the tenth place in 2009, which is the worst score in the past years. In the last three years the results have been stable.

The dimension of people is very interesting. Although Germany has been fighting against the clichés, they are still ongoing. These stereotypes are deeply rooted in the world population and it takes many years until it changes. The problem is that the Germans themselves have a lack of national pride and low confidence, which also influences the perception of them in the eyes of foreigners. The nation branding

campaigns and the FIFA World Cup in 2006 had quite a big impact on the self-perception of the Germans and also on the perception of foreigners, however, that was just a short-term effect. It would be naïve to think that one campaign can heal the historical trauma.

### 2.3. Final Evaluation

Based on my analysis and the results of GfK's survey, I found out that Germany has a generally positive but somehow unbalanced image. In chart below can be seen that while the German policy is much admired, its investment potential well recognized and its brands associated with high quality, the reputation in the areas of people, culture and tourism is not so successful. Germany is perceived as an efficient factory that produces high quality products by using high technology. It is viewed to be a good business location, but Germans as people are considered to be arrogant and humourless and Germany is not so popular tourist destination either.

**Table 41: German Hexagon of Competitive Identity (Ranks 1-50)<sup>28</sup>**

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
<b>Tourism</b>	10	9	9	8	9	8
<b>Exports</b>	3	3	3	3	3	not available
<b>People</b>	7	10	6	8	6	not available
<b>Governance</b>	4	4	4	3	3	not available
<b>Culture</b>	4	5	4	5	5	5
<b>Investment/ Immigration</b>	5	6	4	4	3	3
<b>Overall Ranking</b>	1	3	2	2	2	2

However, in overall rankings, Germany is perceived as a strong nation brand. Simon Anholt suggests that the brand Germany is worth almost 4, 6 billion dollars, only surpassed by Japan (6, 2 billion) and the US (17, 9 billion) (Anholt, 2007: 46).

<sup>27</sup> Processed by the author of this thesis from the annual reports of German National Tourist Board, available online: <http://www.germany.travel/de/parallel-navigation/ueber-uns/marktforschung/marktforschung.html>

<sup>28</sup> Processed by the author of this thesis from the annual reports of German National Tourist Board, available online: <http://www.germany.travel/de/parallel-navigation/ueber-uns/marktforschung/marktforschung.html>, 23.11.2013

Germany started to strategically brand its nation at the beginning of 21<sup>st</sup> century. After the “Land of Idea’s” campaign and FIFA World Cup had started, Germany became one of the strongest climbers between 2005 and 2006 in the Nation Brands Index. It moved from the 6<sup>th</sup> place at the end of 2005 to 2<sup>nd</sup> place at the end of 2006. In 2007 and 2008 Germany even reached the first place. There is no way how to prove that the campaigns lead to the better image, but there are some indicators that show the improvement.

Besides Anholt’s and GfK’s project, there are other surveys with the focus on the country’s image. For example, Germany is viewed as the most positive nation since 2008 according to the annual Country Ratings Poll made for the BBC by GlobeScan and PIPA. More than 26 000 people are surveyed in this international poll since 2008. They are asked to rate 16 countries and the EU on whether their influence in the world was “mainly positive” or “mainly negative”. Germany has won the first place with one exception in 2012. In chart below can be seen the results. The United Kingdom jumped by 2 places in the last survey probably owing to the summer Olympic Games that were held in London in 2012 (BBC, 2013).

**Table 42: BBC World Service Country Ratings Poll<sup>29</sup>**

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
1	Germany (56 %)	Germany (61 %)	Germany (59 %)	Germany (62 %)	Japan (58 %)	Germany (59 %)
2	Japan (55 %)	Canada (59 %)	Canada (51 %)	UK (58 %)	Germany (56 %)	Canada (56 %)
3	EU (52 %)	UK (58 %)	EU (53 %)	Japan (57 %)	Canada (53 %)	UK (55 %)

The BBC’s analyst Stephan Evans said that the results may be an outcome of German diligent diplomacy. Government ministers frequently tour countries with markets for German goods. “Political clout isn't the driving force - it's trade,” claimed Evans. Although a couple years ago, the chancellor Merkel was pictured in a Nazi uniform in protests from Athens to Madrid, now it turns out that many admire the country. In the last survey, 68 % of Spanish respondents said they felt Germany has “a

<sup>29</sup> Compiled by the author from the BBC’s press releases available online:  
[http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/articles/views\\_on\\_countriesregions\\_bt/index.php?nid=&id=&lb=btvoc&cat=1&page=1](http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/articles/views_on_countriesregions_bt/index.php?nid=&id=&lb=btvoc&cat=1&page=1), 23.11.2013

mainly positive influence in the world". In Britain, it was 78 % and in France even 81 %. Only Greece with 52 % gave a negative rating (BBC, 2013).

The McClory's IfG-Monocle Soft Power Index is another project which is more complex. It combines statistical data (foreign aid, number of cultural missions, media presence) with subjective metrics (the perceived effectiveness of a country's head of government on the global stage, perceived strength of commercial brands etc.) of 26 countries and compares them according to the quality of their standard of government, diplomatic infrastructure, cultural output, capacity for education and appeal to business. In the last survey, Germany took the third place (2012)<sup>30</sup> (McClory, 2012: 11).

There is also rival country brand index conducted by a global brand consultancy FutureBrand. This company makes annual survey that ranks global perceptions of the world's nations. It surveys around 3 500 people from 18 countries.<sup>31</sup> This project uses another methodology and work with another sample of countries. However, this project (as well as the IfG-Monocle Index) also confirms the results of the GfK's analysis: Germany is perceived as a strong and reliable business partner with the advanced technology, good investment climate, skilled workforce, job opportunities and good quality of life. It is also seen as a politically stable and independent country with great education system. However, its culture is not found to be attractive and people do not find Germany as an attractive holiday destination.<sup>32</sup>

We cannot find the survey's results from the GfK, FutureBrand or McClory's Soft Power Index to be an objective country brand (soft power) measurements that give as an accurate results, but they serve us as a useful source for analyzing the weaknesses and strengths of the German nation's brand image. Although the methodologies of these three projects are different, they seem to agree on the common weaknesses and strengths which are attempted to be addressed through branding campaigns.

---

<sup>30</sup> In the previous years 2010 and 2011, Germany held the fourth place (McClory, 2010: 5, 2011: 15)

<sup>31</sup> These 18 states: the US, Canada, UK, Germany, Italy, France, Turkey, Russia, Brazil, Argentina, Mexico the UAE, India, South Africa, Japan, China, Hong Kong and Australia

<sup>32</sup> Summary from the FutureBrand's and IfG-Monocle's reports (McClory, 2010, 2011, 2012) available online: <http://www.futurebrand.com/foresight/cbi/cbi-2012>, <http://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/publications/new-persuaders-iii> , 24.11.2013

**Table 43: SWOT Analysis for German Nation Brand**

<p><b>Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• generally perceived as a state with positive influence</li> <li>• positive investment climate</li> <li>• high technological development</li> <li>• high quality of products</li> <li>• skilled workforce</li> <li>• job opportunities</li> <li>• environmental friendliness</li> <li>• political freedom</li> <li>• stable, reliable and competent government that behaves responsibly at the international level</li> <li>• respect to the human rights</li> <li>• high quality of live, safety</li> <li>• high quality of healthcare and educational system</li> <li>• sport successes</li> </ul>	<p><b>Weaknesses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is not perceived as an interesting and exciting place for contemporary culture and as a country that has rich natural beauty</li> <li>• people are found to be boring, humourless, cold, arrogant, hostile and little bit aggressive</li> <li>• Germany is not perceived as a an attractive destination for holiday</li> <li>• lack of national pride</li> <li>• negative history</li> <li>• absence of the common brand building strategy</li> </ul>
<p><b>Opportunities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Germany has the potential to become an attractive tourist destination because of its cultural heritage, natural beauty and safety</li> <li>• Germany is very successful economic and political power with high technology, excellent science and educational system and also sport successes – its citizens have a lot to be proud of</li> <li>• Germany has also a positive history</li> <li>• In reality, Germans are nice, hearty and interesting people</li> </ul>	<p><b>Threats</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• belligerent branding from other states</li> <li>• inattention to the weaknesses</li> </ul>

In the SWOT analysis above, I identified the most significant German strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. The successes of nation branding projects depend most basically on the quality of the product the country is trying to sell. Nation branding cannot be used for masking the weaknesses of the country, but on the contrary, it can make the strengths visible.

The German nation image building is a very complex issue. Germany is a large and diverse country consisting of 16 federal lands which also brand themselves in the world. Moreover all communication channels of the hexagon are interconnected and conjoined with nation branding campaigns.

The biggest strength of the German competitive identity is the fact that there is a real basis on which the country can build its image – even in the weaker parts of hexagon. Not only it really has friendly investment climate, high technological development, high quality of products, skilled workforce, stable and reliable government but there are also real prerequisites to become an attractive tourist destination and a cultural place. The country has cultural heritage and natural beauty and it is also a very safe country as I have already shown above. However, it needs time, patience and continual emphasizing that Germany really is a land of poets and thinkers, with rich cultural heritage, natural beauty and other possibilities for having a pleasant holiday.

Similar problem can be found in the dimension of people. There is a need to make the national pride of Germans constantly stronger. There are many reasons why Germans can be proud of their nation. Germany is the economic and political power as I explained above, it has highly developed technologies and educational system, positive investment climate, high quality products with excellent reputation, there are also sport successes etc. Germany has already taken necessary steps and via its nation branding campaigns succeeded in encouraging the relationship of Germans to their nation, however, two campaigns cannot break the long-lasting national depression. It is necessary to continue boosting the patriotism, because, if they want to attract foreign people, they need to love themselves first. To love own nation and own country is according to Anholt the most powerful piece of marketing (Anholt, 2007: 105-106).

Germany has taken the historical burden of Nazi times. That is an unpleasant historical stigma. Owing to huge and loud Nazi campaign during the World War Two, Germany tends to manage its promotion quietly and patiently and draw attention to its positive historical aspects. Germans invented the printing press or diesel engine, Germany is homeland of Goethe, Beethoven, Günther Grass or Schiller. Germany addresses these issues also via its nation branding campaigns.

Strategic nation brand building is a long-term process. Although Germany had started to use nation branding as a soft power building tool already at the end of 1990s, its first nation branding campaign initiated by government was launched in 2005 - eight years ago. That is a short time to get tangible results. However, Germany is on a good way to become even more attractive also in dimensions of people, culture and tourism.

## Conclusion

The focal point of my thesis was the concept of nation branding and its application in German domestic and foreign policy as a soft power building tool. There were three main reasons why Germany started to strategically manage its image and implemented nation branding. Firstly, after the reunification the “new” Germany had to cope with the damaged image as a result of the historical events of 20<sup>th</sup> century and improve its reputation. Secondly, there was very low confidence and national pride of the German citizens that needed to be boosted. Thirdly, the consequences of globalization, technological progress, information revolution and the increasing media coverage forced Germany to compete with other states for the world’s attention. I chose Germany, particularly because of the huge progress the country has made since its reunification using nation branding.

Firstly, I tried to theoretically embody the concept of nation branding within the field of international relations. It is not easy to find a place for nation branding in international relations. It is an instrument for soft power building that helps a country to become more attractive and persuasive in the world. On one hand it overlaps with public and cultural diplomacy; on the other hand it extends into many other disciplines like marketing or public relations – it is a pluralistic discipline. Simon Anholt offers the best explanation when saying that it is a combination of public diplomacy and brand management with trade, tourist, export, and investment promotion. He calls his approach the theory of competitive identity. Nation brand or competitive identity is then according to him a modern example of soft power (Anholt, 2007: 3).

In general, international relations, as an academic field as well as political practice, are changing. Foreign policy is becoming instrumentalized, private sector and non-state actors play more and more important roles, there is a tendency to consider international relations to be market relations – states try to promote its brand on the international market and its recipients (foreign audience) are perceived to be clients. There is also rising significance of public opinions in the international relations.

I also identified these trends in the German case. Originally, Germany built its image with the assistance of the classical instruments of public and cultural diplomacy

(intercultural dialog, exchange programs, information service etc.), mainly for the security reasons. With globalization, the world started to be perceived as a global market place and the logic of the economy has spread everywhere. States started to be regarded as competition states competing with each other for foreign investments, exports, tourists and skilled labour. Germany as well as other states reacted to these changes by implementing new instruments originally used by companies, involving private sector and pursuing besides security also economic goals.

Nation branding is primarily associated with its international aspect as a part of foreign policy which aims at foreign public. However, I found out through my analysis that nation branding has also a domestic dimension. Germany devised a strategy under which, firstly, nation branding activities were aimed at domestic actors with the objective of boosting German's patriotism and confidence. Secondly, domestic actors have been engaged to build and share common values and image. The country could be promoted to the foreign public only when the domestic actors had been persuaded and attracted by their own country.

The hypothesis of my work were a) *that states want to become more attractive and competitive at the international scene and thus increase their soft power*, b) *that nation branding is a suitable tool for soft power building in contemporary global world* and c) *that application of nation branding helps to break down the prejudices, encourage economic growth and increase political influence*.

The first hypothesis was confirmed. As the evidence for the first one serve: a) official statements and documents of German government saying that Germany needs to become more attractive and competitive at the global scene (see chapter "History of German Image Building", b) institutional changes made in order to promote Germany more effective, c) official goals and activities of the governmental nation branding campaigns and agencies like the German National Tourist Board or the Trade & Investment Agency, d) the re-structuralization of German presentation on the internet and e) the fact that German Brands actively use the country of origin logo "Made in Germany" that is generally perceived as a symbol of excellent quality.

The theory of competitive identity creates the main theoretical background of my analysis. I applied this theory on the German case in order to find out how Germany

manages its image and in order to identify the most significant strengths and weaknesses of the German competitive identity. Through my analysis, I discovered that Germany uses nation branding in two ways. It promotes the country by using nation branding campaigns on one hand and also via the six dimensions of hexagon on the other hand. Both approaches overlap.

In Germany, many nation branding campaigns have been held, in my work, I analysed two most significant of them. Both received positive reactions. Although the first one - “You Are Germany” – was firstly widely criticised for its resemblance with Nazi propaganda and was not a governmental campaign, it achieved much public interest and debates within Germany. German government saw how such campaigns worked and gained an overview of the situation in the country. In the upshot, the campaign was found to be significant and positive in the public opinion poll. The warning about the lack of national pride within the nation is considered the biggest success of this campaign. It brought an impulse to change it.

The second campaign I researched was the campaign “Land of Ideas” (including the campaign “A Time to Make Friends” that accompanied the FIFA World Cup in 2006). Sport events are great opportunities how to brand a nation. Germany took advantage of such a popular sport event and made Germany a strong and respected brand. The campaign received a lot of positive reactions and tangible results. Germany achieved many positive economic outcomes regarding export, investment and tourism. In the opinion polls, foreign visitors found majority of Germans to be friendly and their attitude to their country to be improved. Awakening of German patriotism is seen as the biggest success of the campaign even though it was rather a side-effect than the main goal. The tournament rebranded Germany and shifted the world’s view of the nation from serious and humorless to fun-loving and friendly. The initiators of the campaign declared “Land of Ideas” the most successful image campaign in the history of Germany and decided to continue at least until 2010. The campaign is ongoing until nowadays.

The results of the Anholt-GfK Nation Brands Index also confirm that the campaigns were successful. According to this survey, Germany was the strongest climber in the index between 2005 and 2006 – it moved from the 6<sup>th</sup> place in 2005 to 2<sup>nd</sup>

place in 2006. In 2007 and 2008 it even reached the first place. Since 2010 it still holds the 2<sup>nd</sup> place (see Table 41).

Besides the campaigns, Germany actively promotes its country via the six communication channels that create its competitive identity. In my research I identified the strengths and weaknesses of the German brand. Germany has generally positive but somehow unbalanced image. The most successful is Germany in the parts of brands, investment and policy. In the world, Germany is perceived as an economically and politically strong country, reliable business partner with stable investment climate, high quality products, highly developed technologies, good job opportunities etc. Even foreign companies use the excellent reputation of German products. There is the example of the British company that gave its product a German name in order to link it to the well-known high quality of German products and thus evoke desired associations by potential customers. German government is considered to be stable, reliable and competent with responsible behaviour at the international level. The chancellor Angela Merkel is perceived as a strong leader that has significant support of her citizens. This fact makes her strong also at the international level, where she is considered to be a European leader in the fight against the Euro-zone crisis. Although the German foreign policy has become more assertive in recent years, it still leaves the global leadership to the United States, Britain and France.

Contrarily the tourism, culture and people sectors are the weakest parts of the German competitive identity. Germany is not perceived as an interesting and exciting place for contemporary culture, people are found to be boring, humourless and cold with lack of national pride and Germany is not perceived as an attractive holiday destination either. Although Germany has been fighting against the clichés and lack of national pride they are, according to surveys, still ongoing. The nation branding campaigns have had quite a significant impact on the self-perception of the Germans and also on the perception of foreign people, but it was just a short-time effect. There are still aspects of the German identity that cannot be healed simply through campaigning. It is an issue that needs to be handled patiently and constantly for a long period. What is positive is the fact, that Germany has real prerequisites to become more attractive also in the dimensions of tourism and culture. Germany has rich cultural

heritage and natural beauties, it just has to just direct more nation branding activities at these dimensions.

Not only the Anholt-GfK Nation Brands Index, but also surveys by FutureBrand, IfG-Monocle Soft Power Index and GlobeScan confirm these findings. However, we have to take into consideration, that the methods of nation brands/soft power measurement that these companies use are imperfect. They work mainly with opinion polls, which can be problematic. Firstly, the way the questions are formulated and asked can be misleading and unless the same questions are put forward constantly for some time, they could not represent a continuous picture. Secondly, emotional perception of some country can prevail over the reality. Thirdly, the research has a limited coverage and concerns just a limited number of states. Fourthly, the people's opinions are inconstant. In spite of that, these projects serve us as a useful source for analyzing the weaknesses and strengths of the German nation's brand. Moreover they show us the position of Germany in comparison to other states and give us an approximation of country's soft power. Although their methods of measurement are different, they seem to agree on the common weaknesses and strengths of German brand which are attempted to be addressed through branding campaigns and the country's hexagon.

The second and third hypothesis were also confirmed. It seems to be clear, that Germany improved its image and increased its soft power via its strategic nation image building which proved to be a suitable tool for soft power building in the contemporary global world. The nation branding campaigns as well as constant country's promotion via six parts of hexagon generated positive results which the public opinion surveys confirm. Since the reunification in 1990, Germany has changed its perception in the world and has become more attractive and persuasive in the world.

## Summary

Germany seems to be a very good example of how nation branding can or should be used and thus how it can increase country's soft power. After the reunification in 1990, Germany basically emerged as a new state with damaged reputation, low confidence and a lack of national pride of its citizens. Moreover, it had to react to the consequences of the global world and has been trying to become more attractive and competitive. For this purpose, Germany has implemented nation branding as a soft power building tool and has become, according to public opinion surveys, one of the most admired and persuasive state.

It is not easy to find a place for nation branding in the field of international relations. It is an instrument for soft power building. On one hand it overlaps with public and cultural diplomacy; on the other hand it extends into many other disciplines like marketing or public relations – it is a pluralistic discipline. Simon Anholt offers the best explanation with his theory of competitive identity that created a theoretical framework for the analysis of the German case.

Through the analysis, it has been discovered that Germany has been using nation branding in two ways. It promotes the country by using nation branding campaigns on one hand and via the six dimensions of hexagon on the other hand. Both approaches overlap. Moreover, it has been found out that nation branding has also a domestic dimension. Germany aims its nation branding activities not only at foreign public, but also at its own citizens.

In the analysis, the strengths and weaknesses of the German image have been also identified. Germany has generally positive but somehow unbalanced image. The dimensions of brands, investment and policy are the most successful ones, while in the sections of tourism, culture and people worse results were achieved. On one hand, Germany is perceived as an economically and politically strong country, but on the other hand it is not found to be an attractive tourist or culture destination. However, Germany is generally perceived to be one of the most successful and attractive brands, which has been equally confirmed by the public opinion surveys.

## Bibliography

### ***Monographs and Chapters in Collections:***

ARON, Raymond. *Peace and War. A Theory of International Relations*. New York: Doubleday, 1967. 820 p. ISBN 0765805049

ANHOLT, Simon. *Brand New Justice. The upside of global branding*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2003. 180 p. ISBN 0-7506-56999.

ANHOLT, Simon. *Competitive Identity. The New Brand Management for Nations, Cities and Regions*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. 134 p. ISBN 0-230-500280

BROWN, Stephen. Academic Perspective: True North. In: DINNIE, Keith. *Nation Branding: Concepts, Issues, Practice*. Oxford: Taylor & Francis, 2007. p. 249-251. ISBN 978-0750683494

CARR, Edward Hallett. *The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919 – 1939. An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. London: Macmillan, 1993. 243 p. ISBN 0-333-312287

CHERNATONY, Leslie de. Academic Perspective. Adapting Brand Theory to the Context of Nation Branding. In: DINNIE, Keith. *Nation Branding: Concepts, Issues, Practice*. Oxford: Taylor & Francis, 2007. p. 16-33. ISBN 978-0750683494

DINNIE, Keith. *Nation Branding: Concepts, Issues, Practice*. Oxford: Taylor & Francis, 2007. 264 p. ISBN 978-0750683494

FERGUSON, Niall. *Colossus: The Price of America's Empire*. New York: Penguin Press, 2004. 416 p. ISBN 0143034790

FOUCAULT, Michel. *Power/Knowledge. Selected interviews and other writings 1972 – 1977*. New York: Harvester Press, 1980. 270 p. ISBN 0-85527-557

GIDDENS, Anthony. *Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007. 186 p. ISBN 0-7456-0923-6

GILPIN, Robert. *War and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981. 272 p. ISBN 0-521-27376-5

HEALEY, Matthew. *What is Branding?* Mies: RotoVision, 2008. 256 p. ISBN 978-2-940361-45-8

JEFF, Eugene D., NEBENZAHL, Israel D. *National Image & Competitive Advantage. The Theory and Practice of Place Branding*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press, 2006. 238 p. ISBN 8763001721

KUNCZIK, Michael. *Images of Nations and International Public Relations*. New Jersey: LEA, 1997. 337 p. ISBN 0-8058-1713-1

LOCKE, John: *Two Treatises of Government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. 480 p. ISBN 9780521357302

LUKES, Steven. *Power: A Radical View*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. 192 p. ISBN 0-333-42092-6

MACHIAVELLI, Niccolo. *Vladař*. Praha: Nakladatelství Ivo Železný, 1997. 106 p. ISBN 80-237-3544-6

MATTERN, Janice, Bially. Why „Soft Power“ isn't so Soft. In: BERENSKOETTER, Felix, WILLIAMS M. J., eds. *Power in World Politics*. London: Routledge. 2007. p. 98-119. ISBN 978-0-415-42113-3

MELISSEN, Jan (eds.). *The New Public Diplomacy. Soft Power in International Relations*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005a. 221 p. ISBN 0230535542

MORGENTHAU, Hans. *Politics among Nations. The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1973. 617 p. ISBN 0394-31712-2

NYE, Joseph S. *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*. New York: Basic Books, 1990. 307 p. ISBN 0-465-00177-7

NYE, Joseph S. *Soft Power. The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs, 2004. 191 p. ISBN 13 978-1-58648-306-7

NYE, Joseph S. Notes on a Soft-Power Research Agenda. In: BERENSKOETTER, Felix, WILLIAMS M. J., eds. *Power in World Politics*. London: Routledge, 2007. p. 162-172. ISBN 978-0-415-42113-3

NYE, Joseph S. *The Powers to Lead*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. 226 p. ISBN 978-0-19-533562-0

NYE, Joseph S. *Macht im 21. Jahrhundert. Politische Strategien für ein neues Zeitalter*. München: Siedler Verlag, 2011. 383 p. ISBN 978-3-88680-983-7

OLINS, Wally. *Wally Olins on Brand*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2003. 256 p. ISBN 978-0500511459

OLINS, Wally. *O značkách*. Praha: Argo, 2009. 253 p. ISBN 978-80-257-0158-4

PÁLSDÓTTIR, Inga Hlín. Iceland Naturally – Establishing an Umbrella Brand to Increase Country Image Impact and Coherence. In: DINNIE, Keith. *Nation Branding: Concepts, Issues, Practice*. Oxford: Taylor & Francis, 2007. p. 183-187. ISBN 978-0750683494

Power. In: HAWKER, Sara, SOANES, Catherine, WAITE Maurice (eds.). *The Oxford Dictionary, Thesaurus, and Wordpower Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. 1542 p. ISBN 0-19-860373-8

SCHMIDT, Brian C. Realist Conceptions of Power. In: BERENSKOETTER, Felix, WILLIAMS M. J., eds. *Power in World Politics*. London: Routledge. 2007. p. 43-63. ISBN 978-0-415-42113-3

SCHULTE, Karl Sebastian. *Auswärtige Kulturpolitik im politischen System des Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Berlin: VWF. 2000, ISBN 3-89700-238-8

TOMALOVÁ, Eliška. *Kulturní diplomacie. Francouzská zkušenost*. Praha: ÚMV. 2008, ISBN 978-80-86506-73-9

WILKIN-ARMBRISTER, Elsa. Brand Nevis – The Role of the Financial Service Sector. In: DINNIE, Keith. *Nation Branding: Concepts, Issues, Practice*. Oxford: Taylor & Francis, 2007. p. 97-103. ISBN 978-0750683494

WEBER, Max. *The Methodology of the Social Science*. Piscataway: Transaction Publishers, 2011. 240 p. ISBN 978-1412813198

WALSH, Gianfranco, WIEDMANN, Klaus-Peter. Country Case Insight – Germany. Branding Germany – Managing Internal and External Country Reputation. In: DINNIE, Keith. *Nation Branding: Concepts, Issues, Practice*. Oxford: Taylor & Francis, 2007. p. 154-160. ISBN 978-0750683494

ZAHARNA, R.S. Mapping out a Spectrum of Public Diplomacy Initiatives. In: SNOW, Nancy, TAYLOR, Philip M., eds. *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*, New York: Routledge. 2009. p. 86-100

### **Articles**

ALBRITTON, Robert B., MANHEIM, Jarol B. Changing National Images: International Public Relations and Media Agenda Setting. *The American Political Science Review*, 1984. Vol. 78, No. 3, p. 641-657

ANHOLT, Simon. Beyond the Nation Brand: The Role of Image and Identity in International Relations. *The Journal of Public Diplomacy*. 2011. p. 12, Syracuse University, available online: <http://www.exchangediplomacy.com/wp->

content/uploads/2011/10/1.-Simon-Anholt\_Beyond-the-Nation-Brand-The-Role-of-Image-and-Identity-in-International-Relations.pdf, 12.9.2013

ANHOLT, Simon. The Anholt Nation Brands Index Special report on Europe's international image, Q2 2006, plus an update on the status of Brand Denmark. In: *Place Branding*, 2005. Vol. 2, No. 3, p. 263-270

BERTELSMANN, 2008. „Du bist Deutschland“ zieht positive Bilanz. *Bertelsmann.de* [online]. <https://cms.bertelsmann.de/Presse.html>, 7.11.2013

BACHRACH, Peter, BARATZ, Morton S. Two Faces of Power. *The American Political Science Review*. 1962. Vol. 56, No. 4, p. 947-952, available online: <http://www.columbia.edu/itc/sipa/U6800/readings-sm/bachrach.pdf>, 27.8.2013

CROMWELL, Thomas, KYRIACOU, Savas. NATION BRANDING: The Concept and Benefits of Nation Branding. *Diplomatic Traffic*. 2006. available online: [http://www.diplomatictraffic.com/opinions\\_archives.asp?ID=75](http://www.diplomatictraffic.com/opinions_archives.asp?ID=75), 23.9.2013

CROMWELL, Thomas, KYRIACOU, Savas. Corporate Strategies for a Nation's Success. *Diplomatic Traffic*. 2006. available online: [http://www.diplomatictraffic.com/nation\\_branding.asp?ID=15](http://www.diplomatictraffic.com/nation_branding.asp?ID=15), 23.9.2013

DAHL, Robert. The Concept of Power. *Behavioral Science*. 1957. Vol. 2, No. 3, p. 201-215, available online: [http://welcometorel.files.wordpress.com/2008/08/conceptpower\\_r-dahl.pdf](http://welcometorel.files.wordpress.com/2008/08/conceptpower_r-dahl.pdf), 21.8.2013

FAN, Ying. Soft power: Power of Attraction or Confusion? *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*. 2008. Vol. 4, No. 2, p. 147 – 158.

FAN, Ying. Branding the Nation: What is Being Branded? *Journal of Vacation Marketing*. 2006. Vol. 12, No. 1, p. 5 – 14, available online: <http://www.commlx.com/kaneva/YingFan.pdf>, 20.9.2013

GUDJONSSON, Hlynur. Nation Branding. *Place Branding*, 2005. Vol. 1, No. 3, p. 283 - 298

HAM, Peter van. The Rise of the Brand State. The Postmodern Politics of Image and Reputation. *Foreign Affairs*, 2001. Vol. 80, No. 5, p. 2 - 6

HÜLSSE, Rainer. German Foreign Image Policy. The Logic of Attractiveness. Paper prepared for the 48<sup>th</sup> Annual Convention of the International Studies Association (ISA), Chicago, February 27 – March 3, 2007

HÜLSSE, Rainer. The Catwalk Power: Germany's New Foreign Image Policy, *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 2009. Vol. 12, No. 3, p. 293 - 316

KINKEL, Klaus: „Kultur, Kommerz und Außenpolitik – Ungewohnte Perspektive, neue Kooperationen“, Speech at the event organised by German Publishers and Booksellers Association 15<sup>th</sup> January 1996 in Frankfurt am Main. *Zeitschrift für Kulturaustausch*. 1996. Vol. 1, No. 2

MCCLORY, Jonathan. *The New Persuaders: An international ranking of soft power*. 2010. London: Institute for Government, available online:  
[http://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/The%20new%20persuaders\\_0.pdf](http://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/The%20new%20persuaders_0.pdf), 28.8.2013

MCCLORY, Jonathan. *The New Persuaders: An international ranking of soft power II*. 2011. London: Institute for Government, available online:  
[http://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/The%20New%20PersuadersII\\_0.pdf](http://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/The%20New%20PersuadersII_0.pdf), 28.8.2013

MCCLORY, Jonathan. *The New Persuaders: An international ranking of soft power III*. 2012. London: Institute for Government, available online:  
[http://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/The%20new%20persuaders%20III\\_0.pdf](http://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/The%20new%20persuaders%20III_0.pdf), 28.8.2013

MELLISSEN, Jan. *Wielding Soft Power: The New Public Diplomacy. Clingendae Diplomacy Papers*, No. 2, 2005b. Hague: Netherlands Institute of International Relations, p. 1-31

NYE, Joseph S. Get smart. Combining Hard and Soft Power. *Foreign Affairs*. 2009. Vol. 88, No. 4, p. 160-163

PETERKOVÁ, Jana. Veřejná diplomacie - jen módní pojem nebo skutečná změna? *Mezinárodní vztahy*. 2006. Vol. 41, No. 3, p. 83-99

PETERKOVÁ, Jana. Veřejná diplomacie malých států a realita České republiky. *Mezinárodní vztahy*. 2008. Vol. 43, No. 2, p. 5-24

SZONDI, Gyorgy. *Public Diplomacy and Nation Branding: Conceptual Similarities and Differences* (Discussion Papers in Diplomacy), 2008. Netherlands Institute of International Relations „Clingendael“, available on-line:

[http://www.nbiz.nl/publications/2008/20081022\\_pap\\_in\\_dip\\_nation\\_branding.pdf](http://www.nbiz.nl/publications/2008/20081022_pap_in_dip_nation_branding.pdf), 12.9.2013

TRUNKOS, Judit. What is Soft Power Capability and how Does it Impact Foreign Policy? 2013. University of South Carolina, available online:

<http://www.culturaldiplomacy.org/academy/content/pdf/participant-papers/2013-acdusa/What-Is-Soft-Power-Capability-And-How-Does-It-Impact-Foreign-Policy--Judit-Trunkos.pdf>, 2.9.2013

WALVIS, Tjaco. The Branding of Nations. Excerpted from a forthcoming book on national branding by Stardust New Ventures. 2001. available online:

<http://www.intracen.org/search-results.aspx?searchtext=walvis>, 15.11.2013

XU, Yichao. Expoalum.com – the Entrepreneurial Initiative for Shanghai World Expo 2010 Presenters. 2011. Interactive Qualifying Project Report, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, available online: <http://www.wpi.edu/Pubs/E-project/Available/E-project-011011-145208/unrestricted/EXPOALUM.pdf>, 15.11.2013

WANG, Jian, SUN Shaojing. Experiencing Nation Brands: a Comparative Analysis of Eight National Pavilions at Expo Shanghai 2010. *CPD Perspective on Public Diplomacy*. 2012. Paper 2, available online:  
[http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/publications/perspectives/CPDPerspectives\\_Nation\\_Brands\\_Paper\\_2\\_2012.pdf](http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/publications/perspectives/CPDPerspectives_Nation_Brands_Paper_2_2012.pdf), 15.11.2013

### **Internet Resources**

ANHOLT, Simon. 2007. Protecting National Image against Unpopular Foreign Policy. *Simon Anholt's Blogspot* [online]. <http://simonanholt.blogspot.cz/2007/11/protecting-national-image-against.html>, 26.11.2013

ANHOLT, Simon. 2009. Nation Brands Index. *Simonanholt.com* [online].  
<http://www.simonanholt.com/Research/research-introduction.aspx>, 26.11.2013

AUSWÄRTIGES AMT, ©1995-2013. Das Besucherprogramm. *Auswaertiges-amt.de* [online]. <http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/DE/AAmt/ZuGastimAA/Besucherprogramm-node.html>, 5.11.2013

AUSWÄRTIGES AMT, ©1995-2013a. About us. *Auswaertiges-amt.de* [online].  
[http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/AAmt/AuswDienst/Aufgaben\\_node.html](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/AAmt/AuswDienst/Aufgaben_node.html), 11.11.2013

AUSWÄRTIGES AMT, ©1995-2013b. Abteilung Kultur und Kommunikation. *Auswaertiges-amt.de* [online]. [http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/DE/AAmt/Abteilungen/KulturUndKommunikation\\_node.html](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/DE/AAmt/Abteilungen/KulturUndKommunikation_node.html), 11.11.2013

AUSWÄRTIGES AMT, ©1995-2013c. Coordinators and Commissioners. *Auswaertiges-amt.de* [online]. [http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/AAmt/Koordinatoren/Uebersicht\\_node.html](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/EN/AAmt/Koordinatoren/Uebersicht_node.html), 11.11.2013

AUSWÄRTIGES AMT, ©1995-2013d. Auswärtiges Kultur- und Bildungspolitik (AKBP). *Auswaertiges-amt.de* [online]. <http://www.auswaertiges->

amt.de/DE/Aussenpolitik/KulturDialog/ZieleUndPartner/ZielePartner\_node.html,  
14.11.2013

AUSWÄRTIGES AMT. ©1995-2013e. *Entdeckte-Deutschland* [online].  
[http://www.entdecke-deutschland.diplo.de/\\_\\_Zentrale\\_20Komponenten/Ganze-Seiten/en/Wirtschaft/germany-smart-solutions-en.html?site=367613](http://www.entdecke-deutschland.diplo.de/__Zentrale_20Komponenten/Ganze-Seiten/en/Wirtschaft/germany-smart-solutions-en.html?site=367613), 14.11.2013

AUSWÄRTIGES AMT. ©1995-2013f. Ziele der Außenwissenschaftspolitik.  
*Auswaertiges-amt.de* [online]. [http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/DE/Aussenpolitik/KulturDialog/Initiativen/Aussenwissenschaftsinitiative2009/UebersichtAWP\\_node.html](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/DE/Aussenpolitik/KulturDialog/Initiativen/Aussenwissenschaftsinitiative2009/UebersichtAWP_node.html), 16.11.2013

AUSWÄRIGES AMT, 2012. 16. Bericht der Bundesregierung zur Auswärtigen Kultur- und Bildungspolitik 2011/2012. *Auswaertiges-amt.de* [online].  
[http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/cae/servlet/contentblob/634528/publicationFile/175854/130109\\_16.pdf](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/cae/servlet/contentblob/634528/publicationFile/175854/130109_16.pdf),  
14.11.2013

BBC. 2013. BBC poll: Germany most popular country in the World. *BBC* [online].  
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-22624104>, 23.11.2013

BIALEK, Catrin, BUSCH, Alexander, MAYER-KUCKUK, Finn, WILLERSHAUSEN, Florian. 2011. Markenimage – Deutsch ist geil. *Handelsblatt.com* [online].  
<http://www.handelsblatt.com/unternehmen/it-medien/made-in-germany-markenimage-deutsch-ist-geil/5746232.html,%20date:%2016/04/2012.>, 18.11.2013

BERGFELD, Mark. 2013. The many faces of Frau Merkel. *Aljazeera* [online].  
<http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2013/09/2013918114745951603.html>,  
12.11.2013

BLOCK Christian, BULKA Sara, PREIMER, Petra, WENDT, Nicola. 2012. Image Made in Germany – Does It still Exist? *Labormum* [online].  
<http://labormum.com/2012/05/03/image-made-in-germany-does-it-still-exist/>, 4.11.2013

BROWN, Stephen, HANSEN, Holger. 2013. Germany relaxes immigration rules to attract skilled labour. *Reuters* [online].

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/27/germany-labour-idUSL6N0BR7FX20130227>, 16.11.2013

Chelsom-Pill, Charlotte, Hallam, Mark. 2011. Crime rate drops to rekord low. *Deutsche Welle* [online]. <http://www.dw.de/crime-rate-drops-to-record-low/a-15093336>, 24.11.2013

CONNOLLY, Kate. 2013. „Merkel diamond“ takes centre stage in German election campaign. *The Guardian* [online]. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/german-elections-blog-2013/2013/sep/03/angela-merkel-diamond-german-election-campaign>, 12.11.2013

CROSSLAND, David. 2006. Germany's World Cup Reivention: From Humorless to Carefree in 30 Days. *Spiegel.de* [online]. <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany-s-world-cup-reinvention-from-humorless-to-carefree-in-30-days-a-426063.html>, 12.11.2013

DER BUNDESPRÄSIDENT, 2004. Berliner Rede 2004 von Bundespräsident Johannes Rau. *Bundespraesident.de* [online].

[http://www.bundespraesident.de/SharedDocs/Reden/DE/Johannes-Rau/Reden/2004/05/20040512\\_Rede.html](http://www.bundespraesident.de/SharedDocs/Reden/DE/Johannes-Rau/Reden/2004/05/20040512_Rede.html), 11.11.2013

DEUTSCHE AUSLANDSHANDELSKAMMERN (AHK). ©2013. About AHK. *Ahk.de* [online]. <http://ahk.de/en/about-ahk/ahk-tasks/>, 22.11.2013

DEUTSCHE MANUFAKTUREN. ©2013. Die Initiative. *Handmade In Germany* [online]. <http://www.handmade-in-germany.org/main/die-initiative/>, 22.11.2013

DEUTSCHER OLYMPISCHER SPORTBUND (DOSB). ©2013. *Dosb.de* [online]. <http://www.dosb.de/de/organisation/>, 14.11.2013

DEUTSCHLAND, 2005. New horizons open up for Germany – Land of Ideas.

*Deutschland.de* [online].

<http://wm2006.deutschland.de/EN/Content/WorldCupNews/NewsItems/2005/land-of-ideas-new-horizons-open-up-for-germany.html>, 10.11.2013

DEUTSCHLAND, 2005a. Five „World Cup Schools“ visit the countries they are representing – youth exchange influenced by development policy. *Deutschland.de* [online].

<http://wm2006.deutschland.de/EN/Content/WorldCupNews/NewsItems/2005/five-world-cup-schools-visit-the-countries-they-are-representing.html>, 10.11.2013

DEUTSCHLAND, 2005b. Invest in Germany – event on the occasion of the official opening of the Allianz Arena. *Deutschland.de* [online].

<http://wm2006.deutschland.de/EN/Content/WorldCupNews/NewsItems/2005/invest-in-germany-allianz.html>, 10.11.2013

DEUTSCHLAND, 2006. Das Gastgeberkonzept der Bundesregierung zur Fußball Weltmeisterschaft. *Deutschland.de* [online].

<http://wm2006.deutschland.de/DE/Content/SharedDocs/Publikationen/gastgeberkonzept,property=publicationFile.pdf>, 7.11.2013

DEUTSCHLAND, 2006a. „Deutschland – Land der Ideen“: Erfolgreichste Imagekampagne in der Geschichte Deutschlands soll bis mindestens 2010 fortgesetzt werden. *Deutschland.de* [online].

<http://wm2006.deutschland.de/DE/Content/WMAktuell/Pressemitteilungen/2006/21-09-06-deutschland-ideen-kampagne-soll-weitergefuehrt-werden.html>, 9.11.2013

DEUTSCHLAND, ©2013. *Deutschland.de* [online]. <https://www.deutschland.de/de>, 5.11.2013

DEUTSCHLAND LAND DER IDEEN, ©2013. Our brand. *Land-der-ideen.de* [online].

<http://www.land-der-ideen.de/node/50367>, 8.11.2013

DEUTSCHLAND LAND DER IDEEN, ©2013a. Welcome to Land of Ideas! *Land-der-ideen.de* [online]. <http://www.land-der-ideen.de/node/50367>, 8.11.2013

DEUTSCHLAND LAND DER IDEEN, ©2013b. Walk of Ideas. *Land-der-ideen.de* [online]. <http://www.land-der-ideen.de/projektarchiv/walk-ideas/walk-ideas>, 10.11.2013

DEUTSCHLAND LAND DER IDEEN, ©2013c. “Invest in Germany – Land of Ideas”. *Land-der-ideen.de* [online]. <http://www.land-der-ideen.de/projektarchiv/invest-germany/invest-germany-land-ideas>, 9.11.2013

DEUTSCHLAND LAND DER IDEEN, ©2013d. Film: “Welcome to Germany – The place for your ideas”. *Land-der-ideen.de* [online]. <http://www.land-der-ideen.de/en/film-welcome-germany-place-your-ideas>, 8.11.2013

DEUTSCHLAND LAND DER IDEEN, ©2013e. Projects in Germany. *Land-der-ideen.de* [online]. <http://www.land-der-ideen.de/en/projects-in-germany>, 8.11.2013

DEUTSCHLAND LAND DER IDEEN, ©2013f. The Innovationskraftwerk (innovation powerhouse) – Germany’s first complete Open Innovation Platform. *Land-der-ideen.de* [online]. <http://www.land-der-ideen.de/en/innovationskraftwerk-innovation-powerhouse-germany-s-first-complete-open-innovation-platform>, 15.11.2013

DEUTSCHLAND LAND DER IDEEN, ©2013g. Research in Germany. *Land-der-ideen.de* [online]. <http://www.land-der-ideen.de/en/projects-around-world/research-germany>, 14.11.2013

DICK, Wolfgang. 2013. Despite stereotypes, Germany highly regarded. *Deutsche Welle* [online]. <http://www.dw.de/despite-stereotypes-germany-highly-regarded/a-16694367>, 14.11.2013

DU BIST DEUTSCHLAND, ©2005-2007. *Du-bist-deutschland.de* [online]. <http://www.du-bist-deutschland.de/>, 7.11.2013

ECONOMIST. 2012. Stereotypes of Europe. *Economist* [online].  
<http://www.economist.com/blogs/graphicdetail/2012/05/greeks-say-they-are-hardest-working-european-nation>, 13.11.2013

ECONOMIST. 2013. Germany in the Word: The occasional leader. *Economist* [online]. <http://www.economist.com/news/europe/21580174-do-not-expect-germany-play-bigger-or-more-strategic-role-any-time-soon-occasional-leader>, 12.11.2013

ELBERT, Nikolaus. 2006. How Germany Won The World Cup Of Nation Branding: BrandOvation Featured By The Business Day. *Pressportal.co.za* [online].  
<http://pressportal.co.za/business-and-economy/story/444/how-germany-won-the-world-cup-of-nation-branding-brandovation-featured-by-the-business-day.html>, 10.11.2013

ERENZ, Benedikt. 2005. Kreatives Grenzland. *Zeit.de* [online].  
[http://www.zeit.de/online/2005/48/denn\\_du\\_bist\\_deutschland](http://www.zeit.de/online/2005/48/denn_du_bist_deutschland), 7.11.2013

EXPO 2015. ©2013. *Expo2015.org* [online]. <http://en.expo2015.org/expo-2015>, 14.11.2013

FIFA. ©1994-2013. Germany. *Fifa* [online].  
[http://www.fifa.com/associations/association=ger/ranking/gender=m/index.html?intcmp=fifacom\\_hp\\_module\\_ranking](http://www.fifa.com/associations/association=ger/ranking/gender=m/index.html?intcmp=fifacom_hp_module_ranking), 24.11.2013

FILMFEST MÜNCHEN. ©2013. *Filmfest-muenchen.de* [online]. <http://www.filmfest-muenchen.de/>, 14.11.2013

FRANKFURTER BUCHMESSE. ©2013. *Buchmesse.de* [online].  
<http://www.buchmesse.de/en/company/>, 14.11.2013

FOCUS, 2006. „Football Globe Germany“ soll an WM erinnern. *Focus.de* [online].  
[http://www.focus.de/sport/fussball/fussball-dfb-football-globe-germany-soll-an-wm-erinnern\\_aid\\_291665.html](http://www.focus.de/sport/fussball/fussball-dfb-football-globe-germany-soll-an-wm-erinnern_aid_291665.html), 10.11.2013

FUTUREBRAND ©2013. *Futurebrand.com* [online]. [www.futurebrand.com](http://www.futurebrand.com), 30.10.2013

GERMAN CONVENTION BUREAU (GCB). 2013. Neuste Ergebnisse des Anholt GfK Roper Index. *Gcb.de* [online].

<http://www.gcb.de/article/newsroom/newsblog/neueste-ergebnisse-des-anholt-gfk-roper-index>, 23.11.2013

GERMAN NATIONAL TOURIST BOARD (GNTB). 2006. The 2006 FIFA World Cup and its effect on the image and economy of Germany. *Germany.travel* [online].

[http://www.germany.travel/media/en/pdf/dzt\\_marktforschung/Fazit\\_der\\_FIFA\\_WM\\_2006\\_PDF.pdf](http://www.germany.travel/media/en/pdf/dzt_marktforschung/Fazit_der_FIFA_WM_2006_PDF.pdf), 11.11.2013

GERMAN NATIONAL TOURIST BOARD (GNTB). 2006a. Incoming – Tourismus Deutschland. *Germany.travel* [online].

[http://www.germany.travel/media/de/pdf/dzt\\_marktforschung/Incoming-Tourismus\\_Deutschland\\_Edition\\_2006\\_PDF\\_.pdf](http://www.germany.travel/media/de/pdf/dzt_marktforschung/Incoming-Tourismus_Deutschland_Edition_2006_PDF_.pdf), 20.11.2013

GERMAN NATIONAL TOURIST BOARD (GNTB). 2012. 2012 Annual Report.

*Germany.travel* [online]. <http://viewer.zmags.com/publication/21311126#/21311126/2>, 12.11.2013

GERMAN NATIONAL TOURIST BOARD (GNTB). ©2013. The GNTB.

*Germany.travel* [online]. <http://www.germany.travel/en/germany/about-us/the-gntb/the-gntb.html>, 22.11.2013

GERMAN NATIONAL TOURIST BOARD (GNTB). ©2013a. Cooperation agreements and partners. *Germany.travel* [online].

<http://www.germany.travel/en/germany/about-us/partners/kooperationen-und-partner.html>, 22.11.2013

GERMAN NATIONAL TOURIST BOARD (GNTB). ©2013b. Welcome to destination Germany. *Germany.travel* [online]. <http://www.germany.travel/en/index.html>,

22.11.2013

GERMAN NATIONAL TOURIST BOARD (GNTB). ©2013c. UNESCO World Heritage. *Germany.travel* [online]. <http://www.germany.travel/en/towns-cities-culture/unesco-world-heritage/unesco-world-heritage.html>, 23.11.2013

GERMAN NATIONAL TOURIST BOARD (GNTB). ©2013d. Germany at a glance. *Germany.travel* [online]. <http://www.germany.travel/en/travel-information/germany-at-a-glance/germany-at-a-glance.html>, 14.11.2013

GERMAN NATIONAL TOURIST BOARD (GNTB). ©2013e. Museums. *Germany.travel* [online]. <http://www.germany.travel/en/towns-cities-culture/museums/museums.html>, 14.11.2013

GERMAN NATIONAL TOURIST BOARD (GNTB). ©2013f. National parks & nature parks. *Germany.travel* [online]. <http://www.germany.travel/en/leisure-and-recreation/national-parks-nature-parks/national-parks-nature-parks.html>, 24.11.2013

GERMANY TRADE & INVEST (GTAI). ©2013. About us. *Gtai.de* [online]. <http://www.gtai.de/GTAI/Navigation/EN/Meta/about-us.html>, 15.11.2013

GERMANY TRADE & INVEST (GTAI). 2013. Economis Overview Germany: Market, Productivity, Innovation. *Gtai.de* [online]. [http://www.gtai.de/GTAI/Content/EN/Invest/\\_SharedDocs/Downloads/GTAI/Brochures/Germany/economic-overview-germany-market-productivity-innovation.pdf](http://www.gtai.de/GTAI/Content/EN/Invest/_SharedDocs/Downloads/GTAI/Brochures/Germany/economic-overview-germany-market-productivity-innovation.pdf), 18.11.2013

GfK ©2013. *Gfkamerica.com* [online]. [www.gfkamerica.com](http://www.gfkamerica.com), 30.10.2013

GfK ROPER PUBLIC AFFAIRS & MEDIA (GfK). 2009. The Anholt-GfK Roper Nation Brands Index 2009 Report prepared for Holland. *US Public Diplomacy* [online]. [http://usepublicdiplomacy.org/pdfs/2009\\_Anholt\\_GfK\\_Nation\\_Brands\\_Index.pdf](http://usepublicdiplomacy.org/pdfs/2009_Anholt_GfK_Nation_Brands_Index.pdf), 12.11.2013

GRIESHABER, Kirsten. 2010. Some Germans uneasy showing national pride. *The Washington Times* [online]. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/jul/4/some-germans-uneasy-showing-national-pride/?page=all>, 18.11.2013

HADRAVA, Lukáš. 2013. Fenomén Merkelová: Proč Němci milují svoji kancléřku. *Česká televize* [online]. <http://www.ceskatelevize.cz/ct24/svet/239247-fenomen-merkelova-proc-nemci-miluji-svoji-kanclerku/>, 12.11.2013

HANDELSBLATT, 2004. Schröder setzt auf „Partnerschaft für Innovation“. *Handelsblatt.com* [online]. <http://www.handelsblatt.com/politik/deutschland/gipfeltreffen-schroeder-setzt-auf-partnerschaft-fuer-innovation/2299052.html>, 7.11.2013

HINTEREDER, Peter, ORTH, Martin. 2010. Strong economic hub in the global market. *Tatsachen-ueber-deutschland.de* [online]. <http://www.tatsachen-ueber-deutschland.de/598.0.html>, 18.11.2013

HOWARD, Caroline. 2013. The World's Most Powerful Women 2013. *Forbes* [online]. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/carolinehoward/2013/05/22/the-worlds-most-powerful-women-2013/>, 12.11.2013

INSTITUT FOR CULTURAL DIPLOMACY, 2011. Cultural Diplomacy Outlook Report. *Culturaldiplomacy.org* [online]. [http://www.culturaldiplomacy.org/culturaldiplomacynews/index.php?en\\_cd-outlook-2011\\_content](http://www.culturaldiplomacy.org/culturaldiplomacynews/index.php?en_cd-outlook-2011_content), 8.11.2013

INSTITUT FÜR AUSLANDSBEZIEHUNGEN (IFA), 2000. 5. Bericht der Bundesregierung zur Auswärtigen Kulturpolitik. *Ifa.de* [online]. [http://cms.ifa.de/pdf/aa/akbp\\_bericht2000.pdf](http://cms.ifa.de/pdf/aa/akbp_bericht2000.pdf), 15.11.2013

INSTITUT FÜR AUSLANDSBEZIEHUNGEN (IFA), 2000a. Auswärtige Kulturpolitik – Konzeption 2000. *Ifa.de* [online]. [http://www.ifa.de/fileadmin/pdf/aa/akbp\\_konzeption2000.pdf](http://www.ifa.de/fileadmin/pdf/aa/akbp_konzeption2000.pdf), 16.11.2013

INSTITUT FÜR AUSLANDSBEZIEHUNGEN (IFA), 2006. Bericht zur Auswärtigen Kulturpolitik 2005/2006. *Ifa.de* [online]. [http://www.ifa.de/fileadmin/pdf/aa/akbp\\_bericht2005-06.pdf](http://www.ifa.de/fileadmin/pdf/aa/akbp_bericht2005-06.pdf), 7.11.2013

INTERNATIONALE FILMFESTSPIELE BERLIN. ©2013. *Berlinale.de* [online].  
<http://www.berlinale.de/en/HomePage.html>, 14.11.2013

KELLEY, Michael. 2013. The Internet Is Having A Field Day With This Gigantic Billboard Of Angela Merkel's Hands. *Business Insider* [online].  
<http://www.businessinsider.com/pictures-of-angela-merkels-hands-billboard-2013-9>, 12.11.2013

KERCHER, Jan. 2013. Deutschland jetzt drittbeliebtestes Gastland für ausländische Studierende. *DAAD* [online].  
<https://www.daad.de/portrait/presse/pressemitteilungen/2013/24176.de.html>, 16.11.2013

KOENIG, Aaron. 1999. Blau, Rot, Gold! *Zeit.de* [online].  
[http://www.zeit.de/1999/02/199902.neues\\_deutschlan.xml](http://www.zeit.de/1999/02/199902.neues_deutschlan.xml), 5.11.2013

KUBJUWEIT, Dirk. 2013. „Mommy Merkel“: How the Chancellor Paralyzed German Politics. *Spiegel.de* [online]. <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/how-chancellor-angela-merkel-has-paralyzed-german-politics-a-900330.html>, 12.11.2013

LISELLA, Maria. 2012. Growth markets, campaigns among German Travel Mart topics. *Travel Weekly* [online]. <http://www.travelweekly.com/Europe-Travel/Growth-markets-campaigns-among-German-Travel-Mart-topics/>, 23.11.2013

NUMBEO. © 2009-2013. Crime Index for Country for 2013. *Numbeo* [online].  
[http://www.numbeo.com/crime/rankings\\_by\\_country.jsp](http://www.numbeo.com/crime/rankings_by_country.jsp), 23.11.2013

POLLAND, Jennifer. 2013. The French Are The Most Arrogant People In The European Union. *Business Insider* [online]. <http://www.businessinsider.com/pew-research-center-european-stereotypes-poll-2013-5#ixzz2kY243DXb>, 18.11.2013

SCHOLZ, Kay-Alexander. 2013. Merkel wins a third term as chancellor. *Deutsche Welle* [online]. <http://www.dw.de/merkel-wins-a-third-term-as-chancellor/a-17103347>, 12.11.2013

SCHULEN:PARTNER DER ZUKUNFT. ©2008-2013. Goals. *Pasch-net.de* [online].  
<http://www.pasch-net.de/udi/zie/enindex.htm>, 14.11.2013

STERN, 2004. „Eine Partnerschaft für Innovation gründen.“ *Stern.de* [online].  
<http://www.stern.de/politik/deutschland/innovationsgipfel-eine-partnerschaft-fuer-innovation-gruenden-518920.html>, 7.11.2013

STERN, 2010. Schröder und Wulff erinnern an die Weltausstellung in Hannover. *Stern.de* [online].  
<http://www.stern.de/panorama/expo-2000-schroeder-und-wulff-erinnern-an-die-weltausstellung-in-hannover-1570946.html>, 28.11.2013

STUDY IN GERMANY – LAND OF IDEAS. ©2013. *Study in Germany* [online].  
<https://www.study-in.de/en/>, 16.11.2013

SÜDDEUTSCHE, 2010. Mit Fernsehspots zur Kinderfreundlichkeit. *Sueddeutsche.de* [online].  
<http://www.sueddeutsche.de/panorama/kampagne-du-bist-deutschland-geht-weiter-mit-fernsehspots-zur-kinderfreundlichkeit-1.344802>, 7.11.2013

SÜDDEUTSCHE, 2010a. Patriotisch erotisch. *Sueddeutsche.de* [online].  
<http://www.sueddeutsche.de/wirtschaft/claudia-schiffer-patriotisch-erotisch-1.653610>,  
 9.11.2013

TATSACHEN ÜBER DEUTSCHLAND, ©2013. *Tatsachen-ueber-deutschland.de* [online].  
<http://www.tatsachen-ueber-deutschland.de/de/>, 5.11.2013

THE GUARDIAN, 2000. Is Expo out of steam? *The Guardian* [online].  
<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2000/oct/31/worlddispatch>, 15.11.2013 WORLD

TRAYNOR, Ian. 2013. Angela Merkel's election win is reward for weathering the euro crisis at home. *The Guardian* [online].  
<http://www.theguardian.com/world/german-elections-blog-2013/2013/sep/22/germany-election-merkel-victory>, 12.11.2013

TOURISM ORGANISATION (UNWTO,) UNWTO World Tourism Barometr. *Unwto.org* [online]. 2010. Vol. 8, No. 2, ISSN 1728-9246,

[http://www.unwto.org/facts/eng/pdf/barometer/UNWTO\\_Barom10\\_2\\_en.pdf](http://www.unwto.org/facts/eng/pdf/barometer/UNWTO_Barom10_2_en.pdf),  
2.11.2013

WIED, Arno. 2006. Auszüge aus dem Vortrag: Die Herkunftsbezeichnung „Made in Germany“. *Made in Germany* [online]. [http://www.made-in-germany.biz/fileadmin/user\\_upload/Bilder/Firmensitz/Vortrag\\_Herkunftsbezeichnung\\_Made-in-Germany.pdf](http://www.made-in-germany.biz/fileadmin/user_upload/Bilder/Firmensitz/Vortrag_Herkunftsbezeichnung_Made-in-Germany.pdf), 18.11.2013

XINHUA, 2012. China becomes top foreign investor in Germany. *China Daily* [online]. [http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/bizchina/2012-03/16/content\\_14848648.htm](http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/bizchina/2012-03/16/content_14848648.htm), 16.11.2013

YOUNG GERMANY, ©2013. *Young-germany.de* [online]. <http://www.young-germany.de/>, 6.11.2013

YOUTUBE, 2007. Du Bist Deutschland Original Video. *Youtube.com* [online]. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NbA1lO3EqK4>, 7.11.2013