

Roman S. Czarny
Jan Kochanowski University
in Kielce, Poland

IMAGE AND STEREOTYPE IN PROMOTING A COUNTRY ABROAD

“Conventional wisdom has always held that the government with the largest military prevails, but in an information age it may be the state (or non-state) with the best story that wins.”¹

Joseph S. Nye

National identity provides the foundation for foreign policy of promoting a country abroad, hence understanding the concept and the necessity of marketing a nation seem to, firstly, equip the promoted country with a clear and recognizable image, and, secondly, constitute an indispensable condition for the future success of such actions. Promoting a positive image of a country should be considered of strategic importance, enjoy a continually updated plan of action (depending on the arising needs), be verifiable and constantly coordinated by responsible domestic entities, possess a transparent structure and system of decision-making, and above all - be provided with sufficient human and financial resources allowing for realization of the intended goals.

The aim of this article is to present the relationship between the stereotype and the image of the country, this existing and that desired, as well as the difficulties in changing/improving the image as shown by the case of Poland after 1991.

Poland experienced in the last decade of the 20th century an extremely important and commonly known political and economic transformation, which has brought about new challenges, as always accompanied by new opportunities. These changes created the need of working out a general concept of the country's progress, in order to eliminate differences in comparison with the so-called developed states, as well as allow for the increase of Poland's competitiveness, i.e. making the country more attractive in the international arena.

Although the image of a country should at least in theory directly call on national identity and reflect it as close as possible, thus shaping the said image in accordance

¹ Joseph S. Nye is a Harvard professor well-known for his explorations of “soft power,” “hard power” and “smart power” which so often appear in public diplomacy. The fundamentals of his ideas were published in the book *Soft Power: The Means to Succeed in World Politics*, New York 2004.

with the intended and desired image of a given state, the international perception in its great majority seems rather to follow the principle of stereotyping. The stereotype generally tends to have a pejorative connotation, so perhaps the term “collective group belief” or a “collective mental image” should be used. A collective picture of some sort always exists, and it seems to follow the phenomenon of weather: it is always out there, but it can be good or bad, more or less conducive, or more or less favorable, depending on who is entrusted with assessing it. However, calling upon these two notions, namely “national identity” and “stereotype” in the sense of a collective picture requires some elaboration on the definitions.

National identity is localizing an individual, and at the same time, an individual projection of such a localization within the symbolic structures through which others, by utilizing those structures, actually identify the individual in a concrete way, in accordance with this individual’s expectations.² So it is a basic and fundamental core, which projects, or rather illustrates, various dimensions of social life, including culture, politics, and economy. It provides a platform for an individual to identify with a given society, as well as constitutes a criterion of the division into the categories of “domestic” and “foreign.” Hence national identity is a complex construct composed of actual nationality, the sense of national bond, the language, religion, and culture. All these aspects are strictly interwoven within individual identity. Identity is built through the process, which constantly occurs within the sphere of social practice, and the course of its creation occurs simultaneously on both individual and collective levels. However, collective identity is not simply a sum of individual identities, as the former notion constitutes a complete and coherent whole characterized by specific features for a given collective entity. Thus identities created by the interaction of the whole organism, individual awareness and social structures impact that very social structure maintaining it, modifying and even creating it anew. Societies have their own history, which creates and shapes specific identities, and that history is also a product of people of a specific identity.³ National identity is of key importance in formulating the policy of the international promotion of a given state. Assuming that identity is what differentiates a country, it should formulate the core of the message to be transmitted abroad.

National identity determinants directly influence the image of a country. Tradition and national heritage, symbols and myths, constitute the foundation of a promotional message and one of the basic spheres of the promotion targeting foreign countries. National symbolism establishes the frame for the visual identification, which is of utmost importance in promoting a country abroad. The success of promoting a country abroad, or the lack of it, is simply verified by international perception, which is composed mostly of stereotypes, or a collective image, rather than objective factors. As

² A. Szulżycka, *Kilka uwag o tożsamości narodowej w perspektywie etnometodologicznej*, [in:] *Kultura narodowa i polityka*, ed. J. Kurczewska, Warszawa 2000, p. 103.

³ P.L. Berger, T. Luckmann, *Spoleczne tworzenie rzeczywistości*, Warszawa 1983, p. 263.

claims Jian Wang, "A nation's image is an indicator of the strength of a country's symbolic power, which reflects and affects the nation's standing in the global arena."⁴

The American writer and political commentator, Walter Lippmann, famous among others for coining the term "Cold War," defined a stereotype in its modern usage and understanding. He called it a subjective mental picture.⁵ In other words, it is a picture not based on facts but a much simplified representation of reality, which is acquired and accepted individually. Hence stereotype is a distorted picture or image in a person's mind, not based on personal experience, but derived culturally. As it is acquired through culture, its formation must be driven by social, political, and economic motivations. In addition to that, since stereotypes are passed from one generation to the next, they can become quite pervasive and resistant to change. As objectivity and/or cognitive methods do not seem to apply here at all, there is no need, necessity or even possibility of solid analyses.

As a "collective mental picture," stereotype is shared by the majority of society or the whole nation and internalized in the process of socialization. As said before, and which is of utmost importance for this article, the stereotype's inherent feature is its persistence and longevity, as it is passed from generation to generation, constantly revived and reinterpreted.⁶

The permanence of stereotypes is as true, as it might be annoying to some, especially in the case of negative images. The persistence results from a simple fact that stereotypes usually do not depend at all on individual life experiences, but the existing mental image is rather shaped by historical factors, which pertained to a completely different group of people, i.e. those long time before us, and impacted them throughout a significant period. Stereotype, for better or worse, with the emphasis on the latter, is an unbearably durable indicator of the ways of thinking and perceiving, and the introduction of any change takes long many years, i.e. more generations of people who will create a new or a different image. Changing political and economic environments may lead after some time to reinterpretation of the stereotype,⁷ but it is usually restricted only to emphasizing the previously less accented elements.

Naturally, there exists also an auto-stereotype, which invariably is much more positive and usually, though regrettably, much different from the international perception. It is also subjective, by virtue of being a stereotype, and strangely full of excuses, most of the time known only to the creators of that auto-stereotype, not understood or simply not known to foreigners, assuming they are at interested in it at all or care about it.

⁴ J. Wang, *The United States' Standing in China*, [in:] *US Foreign Policy and Global Standing in the 21st Century: Realities and Perception*, eds. E. Inbar, J. Rynhold, Routledge 2016, p. 93.

⁵ See: Z. Benedyktowicz, *Portrety obcego: od stereotypu do symbolu*, Kraków 2000.

⁶ Compare Ch. Stangor, M. Schaller, *Stereotypy jako reprezentacje indywidualne i zbiorowe*, [in:] *Stereotypy i uprzedzenia*, eds. C.N. Macrae, Ch. Stangor, M. Hewstone, Gdańsk 1999.

⁷ See: J. Berting, Ch. Villain-Gandossi, *The Role and Significance of Nation Stereotypes in International Relations*, [in:] *Stereotypes and Nations*, ed. T. Walas, Cracow 1995.

The history of a given nation is by rule not known to other nations, especially distant ones, and counting on the will of a foreign nation to study and psychoanalyze the attitudes of another nation is a far cry, which will be hardly realized, or even heard.⁸

It is obvious that a stereotype can be positive or negative. Throughout history there has been no record so far of any entity fighting or trying to change a positive image, so, naturally, the biggest challenge of the broadly understood promotion of a country is to debunk negative national stereotypes or at least, should they exist, to minimize their negative impact or consequences. A pejorative impact of the existing national negative stereotype can be overcome, but it is a long-term process, without any guarantees of a successful outcome and – which is of crucial importance – requiring tremendous effort and exorbitant financial investment. Nevertheless, it is achievable through intercultural education⁹ and foreign cultural and economic policy, which composes today a sphere of activity called public diplomacy.

Public diplomacy is to be oriented towards a given public and presupposes cooperation, mutual understanding, tolerance, open communication channels and building mutual trust. Public diplomacy also strongly advocates, if not simply demands abandonment of all the restrictions posed or created by nationalism. In other words, it requires a global approach and actions which honor the traditions and customs of the receiving country.

Once again, should public diplomacy be entrusted to the state, another problem arises. Every administration craves success, possibly instantaneous. However, in the case of public diplomacy, it is very difficult to measure whether a given program or action was actually successful. Again, it is problematic to distinguish hard facts from opinions, and even if the government or the ministry of foreign affairs pronounces a given measure undertaken by the state a huge success, it is always advisable to examine the facts with caution. It so happens that consecutive administrations, especially those hailing from opposing parties, have basically one approach towards the issue of public diplomacy: everything that had been done by their predecessors was bad and needs to be changed immediately, and now everything will be done the right way. Fortunately or regrettably, depending on the political direction in which one leans, according to the specialists, it does not work that way. The image cannot be created, changed or improved within the relatively short time a given party is in the office, but should the promotional message work, it must be, once again, clear, consistent, long-term and coherent.

Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs has the following motto on its main website: *To serve Poland – to build Europe – to understand the world*, and the order of listed priorities is by no means accidental. In the document *Zagraniczna polityka kulturalna*

⁸ A certain American law firm upon the necessity of confirming a reception of a message via computer, elected to send the following communiqué: “This is to confirm that your message has been received, which does not entail that it has been read or understood.”

⁹ Compare: J. Nikitorowicz, *Edukacja międzykulturowa: w kręgu potrzeb, oczekiwań i stereotypów*, Białystok 1995.

Polski i jej priorytety na lata 2001–2003 [Foreign Cultural Policy of Poland and Its Priorities for the Years 2001–2003], among the direct goals of foreign cultural policy, the following was listed: creating a picture of contemporary Polish culture, reacting to the expectations and needs of the recipients, generating their interest and making Polish cultural heritage, as well as participation in the cultural life of the Third Polish Republic available. The indirect goal of the policy is to objectify the image of Poland abroad among larger social groups, particularly in the societies of the countries of vital interest for Polish foreign policy.”¹⁰

According to the message posted on the official site, “The multilateral public diplomacy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland comprises a broad spectrum of information and communication activities, aimed at shaping the positive image of Poland among foreigners, promoting improved and objective knowledge and understanding of Poland and its history, as well as the contribution of Poland and Polish citizens in European and global development, strengthening Poland’s prestige as a global actor, and stimulating contacts and cooperation among Polish and international partners. Another important objective of public diplomacy is to strengthen the image of Poland as an important EU Member State, an advocate of the EU policy towards East European countries, a firm NATO ally, a country boasting immense civilizational achievements, and whose citizens cherish and share the spirit of freedom, a country increasingly committed to providing development aid and supporting the Polish diaspora, a country characterized by security and offering stable perspectives for further development guaranteed by its membership in the European Union and NATO, and – last but not least – a worthy political, economic, scientific, social and cultural partner.”¹¹

Poland has created an interesting construct within the ministry of foreign affairs, namely a Department of Public and Cultural Diplomacy. In the literature devoted to the subject, there has been a raging debate whether cultural diplomacy or policy is, should be, and actually currently constitutes a part of public diplomacy. Is cultural diplomacy just a subset of public diplomacy or should it stand alone? The answer depends on the author of a given argument. If the general assumption is that the role of promotion is to create a favorable image of a country in the international arena executed by state institutions, it would practically be synonymous with nation branding, i.e. creating a combination of the country’s reputation and the deliberate managing of its image. A given image of a place, one more time, can be a combination of “all emotional and aesthetic qualities, such as experience, beliefs, ideas, recollections, and im-

¹⁰ *Zagraniczna polityka kulturalna Polski i jej priorytety na lata 2001–2003*, Ministerstwo Spraw Zagranicznych, Ministerstwo Kultury i Dziedzictwa Narodowego, Warszawa 21 sierpnia 2001, p. 4; see also M. Mickiewicz, *Polska dyplomacja kulturalna*, [in:] *Dyplomacja publiczna*, ed. B. Ociepka, Wrocław 2008, pp. 115–147, after A. Ziętek, *Dyplomacja publiczna Polski*, “Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska,” Sectio K, *Politologia* 2010, vol. XVII.

¹¹ *About Public Diplomacy*, http://www.msz.gov.pl/en/foreign_policy/public_diplomacy/about_public_diplomacy/about_public_diplomacy [February 12, 2016].

pressions that a person has of a place.”¹² This definition also stresses that the way, in which an individual forms an image is based on his/her personal frame of reference. Nevertheless, “The Department of Public and Cultural Diplomacy creates a positive image of Poland that is favourable to Poland’s foreign policy by stimulating public opinion and promoting Polish culture, science, education and tourism. The Department defines the directions of public and cultural diplomacy, oversees the efforts undertaken in that respect by Polish diplomatic missions abroad, negotiates cultural cooperation agreements in the field of education, science and information, as well as youth exchanges, cooperates with foreign and domestic institutions and foreign media.”¹³

In view of the previously mentioned difficulties and general trouble connected with stereotypes, in order to be successful, such an activity first of all requires a long-term strategy. It cannot be oriented to bring immediate results and, furthermore, it calls for substantial resources, both human and financial, and – above all – it must be consistent, because it is a process, which must not be subjected to temporary political affiliations or changing administrations.

However, no matter whether the intention is to change or create a favorable image, it is first necessary to establish the existing or prevailing one in order to diagnose the situation. Historically speaking, many Polish politicians seemed to be aware that the image of Poland abroad is far from satisfactory. For example, the Minister of Foreign Affairs at the time, Radosław Sikorski, during his expose in the Sejm (Polish Parliament) on May 7, 2008 said as follows: “Our image in the world is still, regrettably, burdened with negative stereotypes.”¹⁴ MP of that time, later President of Poland, Bronisław Komorowski, said a year earlier that “Poland has a disastrous image in the world.”¹⁵ These two statements prove beyond reasonable doubt that some people realized the necessity of establishing policies and taking necessary steps to improve the image of Poland abroad. However, few things appear to be as persistent and as difficult to change as stereotypes. “Existing prejudices, mistaken imaginations, and stereotypes have been creating a deformed image of Poland outside of it for many years now. It is very difficult to answer the question about what the image of Poland nowadays is. It must be noticed that there is no regular government monitoring system for the image of Poland.”¹⁶

It seems that branding the nation is a necessary part of modern statecraft. A nation’s brand image is its most valuable asset: it is national identity made robust, tangible,

¹² J. Bednarz, *The Impact of the Image of Poland on the International Competitiveness of Polish Enterprises*, “International Business and Global Economy” 2014, no. 33, p. 472.

¹³ *Department of Public and Cultural Diplomacy*, http://msz.gov.pl/en/ministry/organisation/organisational_units/_department_of_public_and_cultural_diplomacy [January 27, 2016].

¹⁴ *Sprawozdanie stenograficzne z 15 posiedzenia Sejmu*, May 7, 2008, <http://orka2.sejm.gov.pl/StenoInter6.nsf/main?OpenForm&Seq=1#top> [22 January, 2016].

¹⁵ *Sprawozdanie stenograficzne z 41 posiedzenia Sejmu*, May 11, 2007, <http://orka2.sejm.gov.pl/StenoInter6.nsf/main?OpenForm&Seq=1#top> [22 January, 2016].

¹⁶ J. Bednarz, *The Impact*, p. 475.

communicable, and – at its best – made useful. Simon Anholt¹⁷ developed the concept of the Nation Brands Index in 2005, and the first Index was published in April 2005. He is recognized as one of the world’s leading authorities on the branding of countries, regions and cities. Nation brand is an important concept in today’s world. As a consequence of globalization, all countries must compete with each other for the attention, respect and trust of investors, tourists, consumers, donors, immigrants, the media, and the governments of other nations. Hence a powerful and positive nation brand provides a crucial competitive advantage. It is essential for countries to understand how they are seen by the international public; how their achievements and failures, assets and liabilities, as well as people and products are reflected in their brand image. The nation brand is the sum of people’s perceptions of a country across six areas of national competence. Together, these areas make up the Nation Brand Hexagon:

Graph 1. The Nation Brand Hexagon



The Nation Brand Hexagon. Copyright © 2002 Simon Anholt

As for Europe, both the domestic (Polish) and foreign image perception surveys of Poland conducted in the 1990s clearly indicated, to put it diplomatically, a somewhat blurred or simply non-existent image of Poland. If the image of Poland called attention, it did so for all the wrong reasons: the lack of clarity and definition. There existed few clearly defined associations with Poland as a country which showed little understanding of the process of Poland’s transformation, as well as a prevailing common perception of

¹⁷ Simon Anholt advises a number of national governments and UN agencies on brand strategy, public diplomacy, cultural relations, investment and export promotion, tourism and economic development. He is the editor of the quarterly journal, “Place Branding and Public Diplomacy,” and the author of *Brand New Justice*, *Brand America* and several other books.

the region as a whole, i.e. the states of the Eastern Block, without making any differentiation between separate countries.¹⁸ Among neighbouring countries of the West, Poland, burdened with negative stereotypes of the previous era, was perceived as a backward country, extremely traditional and very ineffective in terms of economy. Equally common and strong is the stereotypical perception of Poland as a country allowing for too great an influence of the Catholic Church, both in the social and political sphere. That feature was considered a proof of an alleged ultraconservatism of Poland.¹⁹ In comparison with other European countries, Poland's ranking is rather low. The Country Brand Index of 2010 lists Poland in the 82nd place out of 110 ranked countries. Among EU members, only Estonia and Romania ranked lower at that time.²⁰

According to the research conducted within the frame of the European Institute of Place Marketing and Branding "Best Place" in January 2012 by Magdalena Florek and Marta Jankowska, titled *Eye on Poland. Promocja i wizerunek Polski w oczach międzynarodowych ekspertów marketingu miejsc*,²¹ 14 out of 19²² international experts took part in the survey on Poland. The aim was to assess the current assessment of the image of Poland at that time and its promotional attempts from the perspective of territorial marketing. Among those interviewed, 64% have visited Poland.

It should be mentioned that the survey was conducted after a series of promotional events organized by Poland,²³ hence the supposition that perhaps before the image might have looked slightly worse. Diplomatically speaking, in the eyes of experts on recognizability and effective promotion, Poland's scores were rather mediocre. Al-

¹⁸ Compare: L. Kolarska-Bobińska, *Obraz Polski i Polaków w Europie*, Warszawa 2003, and EC Directorate General for Research, *Representations of Europe and the Nation in Current and Prospective Member-States: Media, Elites and Civil Society*, eds. B. Strath, A. Triandafyllidou, European Commission 2003, <http://www.eui.eu/RSCAS/Research/EURONAT/Projectsdetail.htm> [November 17, 2013].

¹⁹ Compare *ibidem*.

²⁰ M. Ryniejska-Kieldanowicz, *Instruments of Public Diplomacy in the Promotion of Poland*, [in:] *Competing Identities: The State of Play of PR in the 2010s*, eds. F. Lalueza, D. McKie, and J. Xifra, International PR 2011 Conference Barcelona, June 28-29, 2011, p. 59, http://www.uoc.edu/symposia/meetingcom2011/docs/draft_proceedings.pdf [November 10, 2013].

²¹ M. Florek, M. Jankowska, *Eye on Poland. Promocja i wizerunek Polski w oczach międzynarodowych ekspertów marketingu miejsc*, Warszawa 2012, <http://bestplaceinstytut.org/www/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/Eye-on-Poland-raport-w-pol.-wersji.pdf> [January 10, 2014].

²² In alphabetical order, the experts (their number in brackets) hailed from the following countries: Finland, France, Germany (2), Great Britain (4), Greece, New Zealand (2), Portugal, Slovakia, Spain (2), Sweden (2), and the United States (2).

²³ For example, the promotional campaign before Poland's accession to the European Union in various countries, The Year of Chopin (2011), "Make History – Visit Poland" (Polska Organizacja Turystyczna, 2008), "Move Your Imagination" (POT, 2011), a multimedia project by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs during Poland's Presidency of the EU named "Do you know Polska?", big events and conferences of international scope and range (e.g. European Cup in Football), Marka Polskiej Gospodarki [A Brand of Polish Economy], Polska Power, and others.

though the experts noted that it undoubtedly is an important and interesting country (which could and probably should be attributed to their political correctness), but at the same time made some observation that were not necessarily nice.

The majority of associations with Poland given by the respondents included: John Paul II, Eastern Europe, end of communism, family, shopping, football (soccer) and cold. When asked about the immediate association that comes to mind first, John Paul II definitely ranked top, but also, there were others, like Catholicism, conservatism, bureaucracy and family. The group of historical associations listed the end of communism and the strikes of 1980, but the respondents also mentioned the death camp in Auschwitz as an element associated with Poland. “Best Place” experts also mentioned several positive characteristics of the Polish people: hardworking, disciplined, educated, well-organized, resourceful, friendly and of an entrepreneurial spirit. Although Poland is perceived as a source of cheap labour, the residents are nice and intelligent, so it indeed may be a good place for headhunters. Hence the assessment that Poland may become a good place for investment based on human capital, if not for bureaucracy, which constitutes a barrier for investments in Poland. As mentioned before, one of the associations was also shopping, undoubtedly brought up by experts from the neighbouring countries and cross border relations, because it is difficult to attribute this association to the expert from, for example, New Zealand. It seems that people tend to like good, natural Polish food and alcohols, although the latter category remains somewhat embarrassing for Poles themselves for completely inexplicable reasons. As for geographical location, Poland is mostly perceived as a cold country of Eastern Europe with beautiful views and only two cities, Warsaw and Cracow.²⁴

However, the most important outcome of the survey, in the author’s reckoning, is the “Best Place” experts’ opinion on what needs to be done to improve the image of our country. Not surprisingly at all, their recommendations almost fully match these of the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and those listed in the report of the Polish Supreme Chamber of Control:

- create a clear message and vision,
- define what differentiates Poland, particularly from the rest of Europe,
- be consistent and visible in your actions,
- make people the best ambassadors of the Brand Polska,
- use Polish people in all promotional campaigns,
- create a brand for the new society and not the old, conservative one,
- have articles published in American papers and magazines, appear on American TV,
- maximize activities through your embassies,
- do not focus your promotional message on inexpensive tourism,
- identify and create one body coordinating the promotional message.²⁵

²⁴ See: M. Florek, M. Jankowska, *Eye*, pp. 1-22.

²⁵ *Ibidem*.

It seems that the diagnosis is quite clear and all the interested parties agree. The only remaining bit is how to do it. Especially important seems to be the necessity of including not only government organization in the process of promoting Poland, which is understood and possibly attempted. Assuming that promoting Poland abroad is the task entrusted to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Poland, as said by the minister of the time, “It is essential to maintain an ongoing dialogue with society, take into account various opinions, trends and moods, listen to independent thinkers and draw inspiration from unorthodox methods, which may often lead to a review of established strategies. Co-operation with organisations outside the government – cultural institutions, NGOs, think-tanks or business circles – can be a highly effective tool for developing Poland’s image worldwide.”²⁶

Another call is establishing a body which would coordinate and oversee the process of promoting Poland. Theoretically it is already in place. “The Council for the Promotion of Poland”, an interministerial body appointed by the Prime Minister and chaired by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, serves to ensure synergy in public-funded efforts to establish and strengthen the Polish brand abroad. The Council determines the relevant priority joint measures, their directions and formats.”²⁷ The “interministerial body” in question, however, as the very name suggests, is composed of the administration officials. Should the ruling party lose the parliamentary elections, this “interministerial body” becomes completely different, acquires new members and hardly guarantees any continuation of the previous line and/or consistency.

It appears that Poland did not manage to take advantage of the potential born from the process of political and economic transformation in terms of revitalizing or acquiring a new image. The country is still perceived as a former communist state, which it was, and still belongs to the so-called Eastern Block and Eastern Europe. Especially the first half of the 1990s made its mark as a particularly dormant period in the nation branding. Obviously, one can reasonably argue that in those years Poland had much more important problems to solve, and working on the image was not exactly a priority then, saving aside the matter of financing and know-how. Nevertheless, it remains an undisputed fact that we lost a chance to promote our country at the time of the greatest interest in Poland of the international community.

As said before, it seems that the image of Poland is far from the desired one. As it was shown, the diagnosis is quite clear, and all the interested parties agree that it could use a substantial improvement. Once again, the only remaining bit is how to do it. One way of tackling the problem is applying a foreign policy, including public diplomacy, the methods and instruments used in public relations and in economic promotion. Economic diplomacy involves diplomatic instruments of realizing foreign economic policy, and though the method is diplomatic (political), the goals are economic.²⁸ Perceiv-

²⁶ *Public Diplomacy 2011*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland, p. 6.

²⁷ *Public Diplomacy 2012*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland, p. 6.

²⁸ H. Dumala, *Dyplomacja ekonomiczna RP – założenia i realizacja*, [in:] *Nowe oblicza dyplomacji*, ed. B. Surmacz, Lublin 2013, p. 253.

ing countries as companies competing in the international arena made Germany integrate the actions of traditional cultural diplomacy and economic promotion to serve "Company Germany." Hence a new foreign policy promoting a positive image of a country, conditioned by the globalization, is essentially done for economic reasons. Images of individual countries can compete in international markets, just like companies do. "It's the economy, stupid" is the phrase which James Carville had coined as a campaign strategist of Bill Clinton's successful 1992 presidential campaign against the sitting President George H. W. Bush. Polish Prime Minister reiterated the sentiment in 2008, saying that the economy is absolutely they key, so that every Pole can feel the improvement in the state of his/her pocket.²⁹

Since such solutions and approaches have been tested and have been working effectively in the major countries in the world, perhaps Poland does not necessarily need to reinvent the wheel, but simply draw from the experience and follow the good practices of other countries.

Summary

IMAGE AND STEREOTYPE IN PROMOTING A COUNTRY ABROAD

National identity provides the foundation for foreign policy of promoting a country abroad, hence understanding the concept and the necessity of marketing a nation seem to, firstly, equip the promoted country with a clear and recognizable image, and, secondly, constitute an indispensable condition for the future success of such actions. Promoting a positive image of the country should be considered of strategic importance, enjoy a continually updated plan of action (depending on the arising needs), be verifiable and constantly coordinated by responsible domestic entities, possess a transparent structure and system of decision-making, and above all - be provided with sufficient human and financial resources allowing for realization of the intended goals.

The image cannot be created, changed or improved within the relatively short time a given party is in the office, but should the promotional message work, it must be, once again, clear, consistent, long-term and coherent.

A stereotype can be positive or negative. Throughout history there has been no record so far of any entity fighting or trying to change a positive image, so, naturally, the biggest challenge of the broadly understood promotion of a country is to debunk negative national stereotypes or at least, should they exist, to minimize their negative impact or consequences. The negative impact of the existing unfavourable national stereotype can be overcome, but it is a long-term process without any guarantees of a successful outcome and – which is of crucial importance – requiring tremendous effort

²⁹ Prime Minister Donald Tusk in a TV interview in 2008, PAP, Premier: powtarzam "gospodarka głupcze," "Wprost," February 24, 2008, <http://www.wprost.pl/ar/124351/Premier-powtarzam-gospodarka-glupcze/> [January 2, 2014].

and exorbitant financial investment. Nevertheless, it is achievable through intercultural education and foreign cultural and economic policy which compose today a sphere of activity called public diplomacy.

Key words: image, stereotype, national identity, promotion, national brand

Содержание

ИЗОБРАЖЕНИЕ И СТЕРЕОТИП В ПРОДВИЖЕНИИ ГОСУДАРСТВА ЗАГРАНИЦЕЙ

Национальная идентичность является основой для продвижения внешней политики, и поэтому понимание концепции и необходимости национального маркетинга: во-первых, дает стране четкий имидж, необходим для его признания; во-вторых, является необходимым условием для успеха международного продвижения его интересов. Продвижение имиджа страны должно быть рассмотрено в стратегическом плане, неуклонно иметь актуальный план действий, должно быть проверяемым, безусловно координироваться всеми национальными органами отвечающими за него, иметь прозрачную структуру ответственности и систему управления, и, прежде всего обеспеченную адекватную кадровую и финансовую поддержку для ее осуществления.

Изображение не может быть создано, изменено или улучшено в течение относительно короткого периода времени, в котором данная политическая партия находится у власти. Чтобы преуспеть, имиджевой посыл должен быть открытым, согласованным, последовательным и долгосрочным.

Стереотипы могут быть положительными или отрицательными. До сих пор, история еще не знает ни одного случая попытки менять стереотип положительный, следовательно, самой большой проблемой для продвижения страны является оспорение отрицательного национального стереотипа или, по крайней мере, минимизирование его влияния или последствий. Отрицательное влияние существующего негативного стереотипа можно преодолеть, но это долгосрочный процесс без каких-либо гарантий окончательного успеха и, который, самое главное, требует чрезвычайных усилий и огромных финансовых затрат. Тем не менее, это осуществимо путем межкультурного образования и внешней культурной и экономической политики, которая сегодня известна под названием «публичная дипломатия».

Ключевые слова: имидж, стереотип, национальная идентичность, продвижение, национальный бренд.

Streszczenie

WIZERUNEK I STEREOTYP W PROMOCJI ZAGRANICZNEJ KRAJU

Tożsamość narodowa stanowi podstawę polityki promocji zagranicznej, a więc zrozumienie koncepcji i konieczności narodowego marketingu, po pierwsze, nadaje krajowi wyrazisty wizerunek, konieczny do rozpoznawalności tegoż, a po drugie, jest warunkiem sukcesu promocji zagranicznej. Promowanie wizerunku kraju winno być postrzegane w kategoriach strategicznych, mieć stale aktualizowany plan działania, winno być weryfikowalne, zdecydowanie koordynowane przez wszystkie służby krajowe za nią odpowiedzialne, posiadać transparentną strukturę odpowiedzialności i systemu kierowania, a przede wszystkim zapewnione należyte środki osobowe i finansowe pozwalające na jej realizację.

Wizerunku nie da się stworzyć, zmienić czy polepszyć w relatywnie krótkim czasie, w jakim dana partia polityczna sprawuje władzę. Jeśli przekaz promocyjny ma odnieść sukces, musi być transparentny, spójny, konsekwentny i długoterminowy.

Stereotypy mogą być pozytywne lub negatywne. Jak dotąd w historia nie zapisała jeszcze żadnego przypadku, by ktokolwiek zwalczał czy starał się zmienić stereotyp pozytywny, stąd też, naturalnie, największe wyzwanie dla szeroko pojętej promocji kraju jest obalanie negatywnego stereotypu narodowego bądź przynajmniej minimalizowanie jego pejoratywnego wpływu czy konsekwencji. Pejoratywny wpływ istniejącego negatywnego stereotypu można przezwyciężyć, ale to proces długoterminowy, bez żadnych gwarancji ostatecznego sukcesu i co najważniejsze – wymagający niezwykłego wysiłku i ogromnych nakładów finansowych. Niemniej jest to osiągalne poprzez kształcenie międzykulturowe oraz zagraniczną politykę kulturalną i ekonomiczną, które dzisiaj tworzą dziedzinę działalności zwaną dyplomacją publiczną.

Słowa kluczowe: wizerunek, stereotyp, tożsamość narodowa, promocja, marka narodowa

Bibliography

About Public Diplomacy, http://www.msz.gov.pl/en/foreign_policy/public_diplomacy/about_public_diplomacy/about_public_diplomacy [February 12, 2016].

Bednarz Joanna, *The Impact of the Image of Poland on the International Competitiveness of Polish Enterprises*, „International Business and Global Economy” 2014, no. 33, pp. 470-481.

Benedyktowicz Zbigniew, *Portrety obcego: od stereotypu do symbolu*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2000.

Berger Peter L., Luckmann Thomas, *Spoleczne tworzenie rzeczywistości*, Warszawa: PIW, 1983.

- Berting Jan, Villain-Gandossi Christiane, *The Role and Significance of Nation Stereotypes in International Relations*, [in:] *Stereotypes and Nations*, ed. T. Walas, Cracow: International Cultural Centre, 1995, pp. 13-27.
- Department of Public and Cultural Diplomacy, http://msz.gov.pl/en/ministry/organisation/organisational_units/_department_of_public_and_cultural_diplomacy [January 27, 2016].
- Dumała Hanna, *Dyplomacja ekonomiczna RP – założenia i realizacja*, [in:] *Nowe oblicza dyplomacji*, ed. B. Surmacz, Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS, 2013, pp. 253-275.
- EC Directorate General for Research, *Representations of Europe and the Nation in Current and Prospective Member-States: Media, Elites and Civil Society*, eds. Bo Strath, Anna Triandafyllidou, European Commission 2003, <http://www.eui.eu/RSCAS/Research/EURONAT/Projectsdetail.htm> [November 17, 2013].
- Florek Magdalena, Jankowska Marta, *Eye on Poland. Promocja i wizerunek Polski w oczach międzynarodowych ekspertów marketingu miejsc*, Fundacja Best Place – Europejski Instytut Marketingu Miejsc, Warszawa 2012, <http://bestplaceinstytut.org/www/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/Eye-on-Poland-raport-w-pol.-wersji.pdf> [January 10, 2014].
- Jarón Józef, *Charakter narodowy jako problem naukowy*, [in:] *Charakter narodowy i religia*, ed. K. Wiliński, Lublin: Wyd. UMCS, 1997, pp. 13-27.
- Kolarska-Bobińska Lena, *Obraz Polski i Polaków w Europie*, Warszawa: ISP, 2003.
- Nikitorowicz Jerzy, *Edukacja międzykulturowa: w kręgu potrzeb, oczekiwań i stereotypów*, Białystok: Wyd. Uniwersyteckie „Trans Humana”, 1995.
- Public Diplomacy 2011*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland.
- Public Diplomacy 2012*. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland.
- Ryniejska-Kiełdanowicz Marta, *Instruments of Public Diplomacy in the Promotion of Poland*, [in:] *Competing Identities: The State of Play of PR in the 2010s*, eds. F. Lalueza, D. McKie, and J. Xifra International PR 2011 Conference Barcelona, June 28-29, 2011, http://www.uoc.edu/symposia/meetingcom2011/docs/draft_proceedings.pdf [November 10, 2013].
- Sprawozdanie stenograficzne z 15 posiedzenia Sejmu*, May 7, 2008, <http://orka2.sejm.gov.pl/StenoInter6.nsf/main?OpenForm&Seq=1#top> [22 January, 2016].
- Sprawozdanie stenograficzne z 41 posiedzenia Sejmu*, May 11, 2007, <http://orka2.sejm.gov.pl/StenoInter6.nsf/main?OpenForm&Seq=1#top> [22 January, 2016].
- Stangor Charles, Schaller Mark, *Stereotypy jako reprezentacje indywidualne i zbiorowe*, [in:] *Stereotypy i uprzedzenia*, eds. C.N. Macrae, Ch. Stangor, M. Hewstone, Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wyd. Psychologiczne, 1999, pp. 13-36.
- Szulżycka Alina, *Kilka uwag o tożsamości narodowej w perspektywie etnometodologicznej*, [in:] *Kultura narodowa i polityka*, ed. J. Kurczewska, Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa, 2000, pp. 101-115.

Premier: powtarzam „gospodarka głupcze”, “Wprost”, February 24, 2008, <http://www.wprost.pl/ar/124351/Premier-powtarzam-gospodarka-glupcze/> [January 02, 2014].

Zagraniczna polityka kulturalna Polski i jej priorytety na lata 2001–2003, Ministerstwo Spraw Zagranicznych, Ministerstwo Kultury i Dziedzictwa Narodowego, Warszawa, 21 sierpnia 2001.

Wang Jian, *The United States’ Standing in China*, [in:] *US Foreign Policy and Global Standing in the 21st Century: Realities and Perception*, eds. E. Inbar, J. Rynhold, Routledge 2016, pp. 91-117.

The date of submitting the paper to the Editorial Staff: February 6, 2016.
The date of initial acceptance of the paper by Editorial Staff: February 20, 2016.