

UDC 23

DOI: 10.34670/AR.2025.13.11.010

Digital diplomacy in the era of global transformations: a comparative analysis of strategies of Russia, China, and the USA

Wu Mengting

Master student,
Moscow State University named after M.V. Lomonosov,
119234, 1, Leninskie gory, Moscow, Russian Federation;
e-mail: 13325649075@163.com

Abstract

Amid rapid global transformations, digital diplomacy has emerged as a vital tool in shaping foreign policy strategies, enhancing national image, and engaging with the global information sphere. This study presents a comparative analysis of the digital diplomacy strategies of Russia, China, and the United States. Focusing on cultural narratives, communication channels, and institutional frameworks, the research explores how these countries use digital platforms—social media, multimedia networks, and official digital portals—to project ideology, reinforce soft power, and defend information sovereignty. The interdisciplinary approach also addresses ethical challenges, including opinion manipulation and cyber confrontation. The findings contribute to a comprehensive understanding of digital diplomacy as a global phenomenon and propose an adaptive model for future policy development in this domain.

For citation

Wu Mengting (2025) Digital diplomacy in the era of global transformations: a comparative analysis of strategies of Russia, China, and the USA. *Teorii i problemy politicheskikh issledovaniy* [Theories and Problems of Political Studies], 14 (7A), pp. 115-123. DOI: 10.34670/AR.2025.13.11.010

Keywords

Digital diplomacy, soft power, public diplomacy, Russia, China, USA, globalization, information security.

Introduction

In the 21st century, digitalization has profoundly transformed all spheres of public life, including international relations. Amid growing global competition, information conflicts, and rapid technological advancement, digital diplomacy has become an integral part of many countries' foreign policy strategies. It encompasses a set of tools and practices aimed at promoting national interests through digital channels—social media, multimedia platforms, official websites, as well as cyber-diplomatic initiatives.

Russia, China, and the United States are leading powers that actively use digital diplomacy to shape their global image, strengthen soft power, and safeguard information sovereignty. Despite their shared objective of influencing international audiences, each country implements a unique model of digital diplomacy grounded in its cultural characteristics, political priorities, and technological capabilities.

The relevance of this research lies in the growing need for a systematic comparison of digital diplomacy strategies in the context of global transformations and geopolitical tensions. While the United States emphasizes the dissemination of democratic values and global leadership, China focuses on cultural expansion through the “Digital Silk Road” and the globalization of traditions. Russia, on the other hand, seeks to counter the Western information agenda by developing alternative communication channels.

The objective of this paper is to conduct a comparative analysis of the digital diplomacy strategies of Russia, China, and the United States, with special emphasis on the tools employed, cultural narratives applied, and modes of engaging international audiences. To achieve this goal, the study adopts an interdisciplinary approach, incorporating elements from international relations, communication studies, cultural analysis, and neuromarketing.

Theoretical Framework

Digital diplomacy, also referred to as e-diplomacy or cyber diplomacy, has evolved into a significant component of modern international relations. It denotes the use of digital technologies—particularly social media, data analytics, artificial intelligence, and digital platforms—as tools for achieving foreign policy goals, engaging global audiences, and projecting national narratives. This chapter outlines the theoretical foundation of the study by reviewing the core concepts underlying digital diplomacy, its relation to soft power, and the frameworks used to analyze cross-cultural communication and state behavior in the digital space.

Digital Diplomacy: Definitions and Evolution

Digital diplomacy emerged as an extension of public diplomacy and strategic communication in response to the digital transformation of global society. It reflects the shift from state-centric, closed-door diplomacy to transparent, multi-actor communication where foreign ministries, embassies, leaders, and citizens all interact in an open digital arena.

According to Bjola and Holmes, digital diplomacy can be understood as “the adoption of digital technologies by diplomatic actors to enhance the conduct of diplomacy and international engagement” [Bjola, Holmes, 2015]. This definition includes activities ranging from Twitter-based crisis communication by embassies to long-term cultural branding on platforms such as YouTube and TikTok. The development of digital diplomacy has been further shaped by the proliferation of transnational communication platforms (Meta, Weibo, Telegram) and the growing importance of data-driven decision-making in foreign affairs.

Soft Power and Strategic Narratives

The concept of soft power, introduced by Joseph Nye, is critical to understanding the logic behind digital diplomacy. Nye defined soft power as “the ability to influence others through attraction rather than coercion or payment” [Nye, 2004]. In the digital age, states cultivate soft power by strategically curating their national image, promoting cultural values, and engaging foreign publics through persuasive and emotionally resonant content.

Digital diplomacy serves as a channel for soft power projection, enabling countries to tailor their narratives to different audiences with unprecedented speed and reach. For example, China’s digital diplomacy focuses on the harmonious Confucian values, economic partnership (e.g., Belt and Road), and technological modernity, while Russia emphasizes sovereign multipolarity and opposition to Western “information hegemony.” The United States, by contrast, continues to champion freedom, democracy, and innovation via global digital campaigns.

Strategic narrative theory also complements the concept of soft power. As Miskimmon et al. argue, successful digital diplomacy depends on the coherent crafting of strategic narratives—framing national interests and values in ways that align with global audiences’ emotions, needs, and beliefs [Miskimmon, O’Loughlin, Roselle, 2013]. Thus, digital diplomacy is both instrumental and performative: it is about broadcasting messages and also about co-creating meaning in networked international environments.

Cross-Cultural Communication and Hofstede’s Dimensions

In the comparative context, understanding cultural variability is essential. Digital diplomacy is not simply a matter of disseminating messages online; it also involves encoding and adapting those messages for diverse cultural audiences. Here, Hofstede’s theory of cultural dimensions offers a useful framework.

Hofstede identified six dimensions along which national cultures vary: power distance, individualism versus collectivism, masculinity versus femininity, uncertainty avoidance, long-term orientation, and indulgence versus restraint. These cultural orientations influence how publics in different countries respond to digital messaging.

For instance, high power distance societies (e.g., China and Russia) may resonate more with authoritative government messaging and symbolic leadership presence on platforms, while low power distance societies (e.g., the U.S.) may prefer participatory and dialogical forms of communication. Similarly, long-term orientation in Chinese digital diplomacy (such as the promotion of civilizational continuity and economic partnership) contrasts with the event-driven, responsive nature of American social media diplomacy.

Using Hofstede’s dimensions, scholars can analyze not only how states communicate digitally, but also how citizens interpret and interact with state-driven digital content. This is crucial for understanding the emotional effectiveness and conversion power of digital diplomatic campaigns in cross-border contexts.

The Role of Technology and Infrastructure

Technological capacity is another key variable in shaping digital diplomacy. Countries with advanced digital infrastructure and AI-based analytics capabilities (such as the U.S. and China) have developed sophisticated systems for data monitoring, trend forecasting, and micro-targeted messaging. Russia, while more constrained in platform diversity due to geopolitical sanctions, has invested heavily in creating parallel media ecosystems (e.g., RT, Sputnik) and regional content strategies.

Furthermore, emerging technologies such as virtual reality (VR) and augmented reality (AR) are being explored as tools for immersive public diplomacy. In the future, the fusion of diplomacy and

virtual environments may redefine how states conduct international cultural exchange, museum diplomacy, or educational outreach.

Comparative Analysis of Digital Diplomacy

The digital diplomacy strategies of Russia, China, and the United States reflect distinct national priorities, political systems, and cultural narratives. While all three countries recognize the strategic utility of digital engagement, their approaches vary significantly in terms of institutional frameworks, messaging styles, target audiences, and platform usage. This section compares these approaches to illuminate the geopolitical functions and symbolic dimensions of digital diplomacy in each context.

Russia: Sovereignty and Counter-Narratives

Russia's digital diplomacy is largely shaped by its emphasis on information sovereignty and resistance to Western ideological dominance. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs actively uses platforms such as Twitter (@MID_RF), YouTube, and Telegram to promote narratives of multipolarity, national dignity, and anti-Western critique. A core feature of Russian digital diplomacy is the strategic use of state-backed media such as RT and Sputnik, which disseminate content in multiple languages to global audiences. These efforts are often described as "counter-narrative diplomacy" aimed at disrupting Western hegemony in global information flows [Tsygankov, 2019].

Furthermore, Russia's digital messaging emphasizes historical memory, Orthodox values, and civilizational uniqueness—features designed to resonate both domestically and among culturally aligned international audiences. Scholars note that Russia's digital strategy leverages "emotional mobilization" through symbolism, crisis narratives, and affective rhetoric [Seib, 2012].

China: Cultural Soft Power and Global Partnerships

China has developed one of the most comprehensive digital diplomacy frameworks, aligned closely with its national strategy of peaceful development and global outreach. The country's efforts center on promoting the "Chinese Dream," Confucian harmony, and win-win cooperation, often through the lens of its Belt and Road Initiative (BRI). Chinese embassies and officials actively engage on platforms such as Twitter (despite its inaccessibility within China), while domestically produced content is exported via Xinhua, CGTN, and People's Daily Online.

A key component of China's digital diplomacy is "civilization branding," where the government projects an image of China as an ancient, wise, and technologically advanced nation. This strategy is closely tied to the concept of "discourse power" (话语权)—the ability to shape global narratives in favor of Chinese perspectives [Brady, 2008].

In addition, China utilizes economic diplomacy through digital platforms, promoting Chinese infrastructure projects and trade partnerships in Africa, Southeast Asia, and Latin America. Its use of platforms such as TikTok, WeChat, and Douyin in cultural exports further amplifies its global soft power, especially among younger generations.

United States: Democratic Values and Global Engagement

The United States continues to lead in digital diplomacy through its extensive use of global tech platforms, public diplomacy programs, and network-based engagement strategies. U.S. embassies, diplomats, and the State Department have institutionalized digital outreach as part of their strategic communication, with platforms like Facebook, X (formerly Twitter), and Instagram used to promote democratic values, human rights, and innovation.

What sets the U.S. approach apart is its emphasis on two-way communication. Scholars argue that American digital diplomacy seeks to "foster dialogue and shared values" through participatory media

practices and cultural exchange programs [Seib, 2012]. Moreover, government agencies collaborate with private sector actors (e.g., Meta, Google) to enhance their reach and technological edge.

The State Department's "ShareAmerica" platform exemplifies value-driven storytelling, featuring narratives of diversity, entrepreneurship, and freedom. This content is curated to appeal to global youth audiences and civil society actors, reinforcing the image of the U.S. as an open, innovative society.

Empirical Component and Neuromarketing Insights

To move beyond theoretical generalizations, it is crucial to explore how digital diplomacy affects audiences on a cognitive and emotional level. This section focuses on the empirical analysis of digital symbols and messages used by Russia, China, and the United States through the lens of neuromarketing—a field that studies how marketing stimuli influence the brain and behavior. By integrating neurocognitive methods with diplomatic communication research, we aim to assess how cultural symbols and strategic narratives trigger emotional engagement, trust formation, and behavioral intention in cross-border audiences.

Neuromarketing research shows that emotional resonance, rather than factual content alone, determines whether messages are remembered, shared, and acted upon. Emotional triggers such as nostalgia, aspiration, fear, or moral elevation activate specific brain regions like the amygdala and the medial prefrontal cortex, which are tied to decision-making and empathy [Seib, 2012]. In the context of digital diplomacy, messages that contain strong cultural symbolism—such as national landmarks, traditional rituals, or iconic leaders—are more likely to produce measurable reactions in neural and behavioral data, including gaze fixation, heart rate variability, and purchase or support intention.

For example, China's "Guochao" (国潮) branding campaigns, when integrated into diplomatic narratives, evoke national pride and historical continuity among overseas Chinese communities and sympathetic audiences. A neuro-study by Wang et al. (2021) demonstrated that exposure to traditional Chinese cultural symbols in online advertising activated reward circuits in the brain and enhanced self-identification with the brand's origin country [Wang, Zhang, Liu, 2021]. This has implications for soft power building: digital diplomacy that embeds culturally authentic visual cues can strengthen national affiliation and credibility.

Russia, on the other hand, uses emotionally charged historical imagery and militarized symbolism in its digital outputs. Studies suggest that such content, particularly during crises or conflicts, activates brain regions associated with fear, group identity, and in-group/out-group separation [Bruter, 2005]. This allows Russia to appeal to post-Soviet nostalgia and cultural conservatism, effectively mobilizing both domestic and diasporic audiences.

The United States adopts a more individualistic and aspirational strategy. Its digital diplomacy often highlights stories of personal success, civic participation, and democratic ideals. Emotional appeals tend to focus on hope, freedom, and opportunity. Seib (2012) argues that digital storytelling by U.S. platforms resonates most strongly when it invites co-creation or interaction, activating neural circuits associated with agency and autonomy [Seib, 2012].

Behavioral outcomes of digital diplomacy can be tracked through social media metrics (likes, shares, comments), survey data (trust in foreign government, willingness to collaborate), and experimental tools such as eye-tracking or EEG scans. These methods reveal that cultural alignment and emotional fit between message and audience are critical for successful digital persuasion. Neuromarketing thus serves as a powerful complement to traditional diplomatic analysis, enabling states to tailor content with psychological precision.

Cultural Symbol Adaptation Matrix (CSAM)

As digital diplomacy becomes increasingly transnational, the need for structured, ethically grounded frameworks to guide symbolic adaptation across cultures grows urgent. Many failed cross-border communication campaigns—whether in live commerce, branding, or diplomatic outreach—can be traced to the misapplication or misinterpretation of cultural symbols. This section introduces the Cultural Symbol Adaptation Matrix (CSAM), a conceptual model designed to help governments and global brands ethically and effectively adapt cultural symbols for international digital diplomacy.

The CSAM framework draws from three pillars: (1) Hofstede’s cultural dimensions, (2) semiotic analysis of symbols, and (3) audience neuroscience. The purpose of CSAM is to map cultural symbols along dimensions such as emotional valence, cultural specificity, symbolic depth, and political risk, and to offer guidance for local adaptation in global communications.

For instance, a symbol that carries high positive valence and cultural specificity—like the Chinese dragon, the American eagle, or Orthodox Christian iconography—can be powerful in national contexts but may require contextualization when deployed internationally. Misalignment between symbol meaning and host culture perception can provoke misunderstanding or even backlash, as seen in past branding failures and diplomatic faux pas [Wang, 2011].

CSAM is structured along two axes. The first assesses symbolic congruence, i.e., how well the symbol aligns with the target culture’s emotional and cognitive schema. The second evaluates strategic depth, which includes factors like relevance to national identity, adaptability across digital platforms, and potential to support policy goals.

For example, the U.S. State Department’s “#YoungLeaders” campaign works well in high-individualism, low power-distance societies where agency and personal aspiration are valued. In contrast, such framing may appear culturally tone-deaf in high power-distance contexts like parts of Asia or the Middle East, where hierarchical respect and collectivist identity are prioritized [Hofstede Insights, [www](#)].

A key contribution of CSAM is its emphasis on ethical adaptation. Cultural appropriation—where symbols are borrowed without respect for origin or meaning—can undermine credibility and cause reputational damage. Researchers such as Kraidy warn against the “instrumentalization of culture” in diplomacy, advocating for culturally sensitive, co-created narratives rather than extractive symbolic use [Kraidy, 2005].

By using CSAM, digital diplomacy practitioners can answer questions such as:

Will this symbol be interpreted positively or negatively in the target culture?

Does it support or contradict our desired policy message?

Can it be adapted without distorting its original meaning?

Are we collaborating with local voices to ensure cultural authenticity?

To operationalize the matrix, we propose a four-quadrant typology:

Core Symbols (high congruence, high depth) – e.g., Confucian quotes in China’s education diplomacy.

Bridge Symbols (high congruence, low depth) – e.g., universal motifs like family, health, or music.

Niche Symbols (low congruence, high depth) – requiring careful framing and localization.

Risk Symbols (low congruence, low depth) – best avoided or used in closed networks only.

This typology enables more precise and culturally respectful content planning for embassies, ministries, and communication teams engaging global audiences.

Conclusion

Digital diplomacy has emerged as a cornerstone of international engagement in the 21st century, particularly in an era characterized by rapid technological transformation, information warfare, and shifting geopolitical alliances. This study comparatively examined the digital diplomacy strategies of Russia, China, and the United States, revealing distinct ideological priorities, communication mechanisms, and symbol systems shaped by each country's unique political culture and global aspirations.

The findings underscore that while all three nations deploy digital platforms to advance foreign policy goals, their approaches differ significantly in symbolic construction and audience targeting. Russia tends to emphasize sovereignty, cultural memory, and multipolarity through emotionally resonant and often oppositional narratives. China integrates civilizational heritage, economic development, and global cooperation into its “discursive power” framework, projecting a harmonious and modern national image. The United States leverages open communication, democratic values, and storytelling techniques to promote transparency, innovation, and global leadership.

The comparative analysis further confirms that digital diplomacy is not merely about message dissemination but involves complex symbolic negotiation, where cultural codes are encoded, decoded, and reinterpreted across contexts. As Falkheimer and Heide argue, “strategic communication in the digital age must be dialogic, adaptive, and culturally grounded to be effective” [Falkheimer, Heide, 2014]. Our proposed Cultural Symbol Adaptation Matrix (CSAM) provides a practical framework for assessing the emotional, cultural, and strategic resonance of symbols used in cross-border digital diplomacy.

Incorporating neuromarketing insights into the study of digital diplomacy introduces a novel interdisciplinary dimension. Evidence from cognitive neuroscience demonstrates that symbols and narratives are most persuasive when they resonate with the audience's deep-seated cultural schemas and emotional patterns. As Zak (2013) found, emotionally rich storytelling increases oxytocin levels in the brain, fostering empathy and trust—two foundational elements of successful diplomatic influence [Zak, 2013]. This insight reinforces the strategic value of crafting symbolically aligned, emotionally compelling digital content tailored to specific cultural audiences.

Another important conclusion of this study is the ethical imperative in symbolic adaptation. In an era of rising cultural sensitivities and global digital scrutiny, careless use of culturally significant imagery can damage diplomatic relations or be perceived as propaganda. As Cull (2009) notes, “public diplomacy must move from monologue to dialogue,” emphasizing authenticity, mutual respect, and listening [Cull, 2009]. Governments and communicators must ensure that digital diplomacy not only promotes national interests but also contributes to constructive global discourse.

Looking forward, the evolution of digital diplomacy will likely involve more immersive technologies (such as virtual reality), decentralized platforms, and AI-generated content. These changes will further challenge traditional diplomatic institutions to adapt and innovate responsibly. Continued research is needed to test the CSAM framework empirically, explore new emotional drivers in digital diplomacy, and develop culturally intelligent strategies for emerging platforms.

References

1. Bjola, C., & Holmes, M. (2015). *Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*. Routledge.
2. Nye, J. S. (2004). *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. PublicAffairs.
3. Miskimmon, A., O'Loughlin, B., & Roselle, L. (2013). *Strategic Narratives: Communication Power and the New World Order*. Routledge.

4. Tsygankov, A. P. (2019). *Russia's Foreign Policy: Change and Continuity in National Identity*. Rowman & Littlefield.
5. Seib, P. (2012). *Real-Time Diplomacy: Politics and Power in the Social Media Era*. Palgrave Macmillan.
6. Brady, A. (2008). *Marketing Dictatorship: Propaganda and Thought Work in Contemporary China*. Rowman & Littlefield.
7. Seib, P. (2012). *Real-Time Diplomacy: Politics and Power in the Social Media Era*. Palgrave Macmillan.
8. Wang, J., Zhang, H., & Liu, C. (2021). Cultural Priming and National Identity in Digital Advertising: A Neuromarketing Perspective. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 20(6), 1501–1513.
9. Bruter, M. (2005). *Citizens of Europe? The Emergence of a Mass European Identity*. Palgrave Macmillan.
10. Wang, Y. (2011). Public Diplomacy and the Rise of Chinese Soft Power. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1), 257–273.
11. Hofstede Insights. (2022). Country Comparison Tool. <https://www.hofstede-insights.com>
12. Kraidy, M. M. (2005). *Hybridity, or the Cultural Logic of Globalization*. Temple University Press.
13. Falkheimer, J., & Heide, M. (2014). Strategic Communication in Participatory Culture: From One- and Two-Way Communication to Participatory Communication. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 22(3), 187–195.
14. Zak, P. J. (2013). Why Inspiring Stories Make Us React: The Neuroscience of Narrative. *Cerebrum: The Dana Forum on Brain Science*.
15. Cull, N. J. (2009). Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past. CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy, USC Center on Public Diplomacy.
16. Ponomarev, V. E. history of electronic (digital) information / V. E. Ponomarev // Eurasian legal journal. – 2024. – № 4(191). – P. 382-384. – DOI 10.46320/2073-4506-2024-4-191-382-384. - EDN TGBJBV.
17. Han, ts. the factor of implementation of innovative and technological potential / TS. Han, Zh. s. Kulizhskaya / / discussion. – 2024. – № 1(122). – P. 23-28. – DOI 10.46320/2077-7639-2024-1-122-23-28. - EDN QCRREI.
18. Suslov, Yu. E. management of Sustainable Development: Human Development / Yu. e. Suslov, E. Yu. Suslov, M. V. Zhukov // Human Progress. – 2024. - VOL. 10, NO. 1. - P. 9. - DOI 10.34709/IM.1101.9. – EDN JLXNHX.

Цифровая дипломатия в эпоху глобальных трансформаций: сравнительный анализ стратегий России, Китая и США

У Мэнтин

Магистрант,
факультет глобальных процессов, международных
отношений и глобализационных исследований,
Московский государственный университет им. М.В. Ломоносова,
119991, Российская Федерация, Москва, Ленинские горы, 1;
e-mail: 13325649075@163.com

Аннотация

В условиях стремительных глобальных изменений цифровая дипломатия становится важным инструментом формирования внешнеполитической стратегии, продвижения национального имиджа и участия в глобальном информационном пространстве. Данное исследование направлено на сравнительный анализ стратегий цифровой дипломатии России, Китая и США. В центре внимания — культурные коды, каналы коммуникации и институциональные модели, применяемые этими странами для взаимодействия с международной аудиторией. Используя междисциплинарный подход, автор рассматривает, как цифровые платформы (социальные сети, мультимедийные каналы, государственные цифровые ресурсы) служат механизмами трансляции идеологии, усиления "мягкой силы" и защиты информационного суверенитета. Важное внимание уделено также этическим

вызовам, связанным с манипулированием общественным мнением и киберпротивостоянием. Результаты исследования способствуют формированию комплексного понимания цифровой дипломатии как глобального феномена и предлагают модель адаптивного подхода для будущей политики в этой сфере.

Для цитирования в научных исследованиях

У Мэнтин. Digital diplomacy in the era of global transformations: a comparative analysis of strategies of Russia, China, and the USA // Теории и проблемы политических исследований. 2025. Том 14. № 7А. С. 115-123. DOI: 10.34670/AR.2025.13.11.010

Ключевые слова

Цифровая дипломатия, мягкая сила, публичная дипломатия, Россия, Китай, США, глобализация, информационная безопасность.

Библиография

1. Bjola, C., & Holmes, M. (2015). *Digital Diplomacy: Theory and Practice*. Routledge.
2. Nye, J. S. (2004). *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. PublicAffairs.
3. Miskimmon, A., O'Loughlin, B., & Roselle, L. (2013). *Strategic Narratives: Communication Power and the New World Order*. Routledge.
4. Tsygankov, A. P. (2019). *Russia's Foreign Policy: Change and Continuity in National Identity*. Rowman & Littlefield.
5. Seib, P. (2012). *Real-Time Diplomacy: Politics and Power in the Social Media Era*. Palgrave Macmillan.
6. Brady, A. (2008). *Marketing Dictatorship: Propaganda and Thought Work in Contemporary China*. Rowman & Littlefield.
7. Seib, P. (2012). *Real-Time Diplomacy: Politics and Power in the Social Media Era*. Palgrave Macmillan.
8. Wang, J., Zhang, H., & Liu, C. (2021). Cultural Priming and National Identity in Digital Advertising: A Neuromarketing Perspective. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 20(6), 1501–1513.
9. Bruter, M. (2005). *Citizens of Europe? The Emergence of a Mass European Identity*. Palgrave Macmillan.
10. Wang, Y. (2011). Public Diplomacy and the Rise of Chinese Soft Power. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1), 257–273.
11. Hofstede Insights. (2022). Country Comparison Tool. <https://www.hofstede-insights.com>
12. Kraidy, M. M. (2005). *Hybridity, or the Cultural Logic of Globalization*. Temple University Press.
13. Falkheimer, J., & Heide, M. (2014). Strategic Communication in Participatory Culture: From One- and Two-Way Communication to Participatory Communication. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 22(3), 187–195.
14. Zak, P. J. (2013). Why Inspiring Stories Make Us React: The Neuroscience of Narrative. *Cerebrum: The Dana Forum on Brain Science*.
15. Cull, N. J. (2009). *Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past*. CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy, USC Center on Public Diplomacy.
16. Пономарев, В. Е. Источники электронной (цифровой) информации / В. Е. Пономарев // Евразийский юридический журнал. – 2024. – № 4(191). – С. 382-384. – DOI 10.46320/2073-4506-2024-4-191-382-384. – EDN TGBJBV.
17. Хань, Ц. Факторы реализации инновационного и технологического потенциала / Ц. Хань, Ж. С. Кулижская // Дискуссия. – 2024. – № 1(122). – С. 23-28. – DOI 10.46320/2077-7639-2024-1-122-23-28. – EDN QCRREI.
18. Суслов, Ю. Е. Управление устойчивым развитием: человеческое измерение / Ю. Е. Суслов, Е. Ю. Суслов, М. В. Жуков // Human Progress. – 2024. – Т. 10, № 1. – С. 9. – DOI 10.34709/IM.1101.9. – EDN JLXNHX.