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Summary

Soft power is a concept coined by Joseph Nye, referring to a country’s ability to co-opt rather than coerce other countries to achieve its policy aim. Culture, domestic political values and foreign policy are considered as a country’s soft power resources, while military and economic strength are considered as its hard power resources.

As China’s hard power grows rapidly, its soft power attracts attentions and becomes a topic worthy of deeper exploration. While there has been a lot of descriptive evidence of the growth and potential of China’s soft power, how China’s soft power resources influence and contribute to a desirable outcome remains unclear. Do China’s soft power resources improve its national image? Is China’s image only determined by its hard power resources, or by its soft power resources, or both? What are the factors that influence China’s image? This thesis tries to answer these questions by examining the relationship between China’s soft power resources and China’s national image, controlling the impact of China’s hard power resources.

After reviewing the literature, I operationalize China’s soft power resources as three categories: its culture, political values and foreign policy, and operationalize China’s hard power resources as military and economic strength. Foreign country’s impression of China is operationalized as China’s national image. The quantitative approach transfers the power resources and China’s image into measurable independent variables and dependent variables, by constructing a numerical indicator for each
variable using data from various sources, such as global public opinion polls, Chinese official statistics and yearbooks, well-known international organizations and databases, etc. With the independent and dependent variables, I build three regression models to test the relationship between China’s soft power resources and its national image. The regression result and the comparison of these three models indicate that China’s national image is influenced by both its hard power and soft power resources. China’s soft power resources do work to affect its image, although to a lesser degree compared to its hard power resources. Not all of the power resources could transfer to the expected outcome. “Tradition”, “Cultural products”, “Tourism”, “Military expenditure (relative)”, “% military expenditure in GDP” and “% trade with China in total trade” improve China’s image, while “Confucianism”, “Democracy”, “Highest MID”, “Dispute times”, “GDP (relative)”, “China’s import from the country”, “China’s export to the country” and “Export competition” impair China’s image. The findings suggest that proper handling of the historical factors, a reform towards a more democratic political system, promotion of its cultural products export and inbound tourism, more active participation in the international organizations, effective aid programs that benefit the people and subtle policy to deal with the impact of material power should be on the agenda for China’s image building.
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Chapter 1 Introduction

1-1 Background

Soft power is a concept coined by Joseph Nye, referring to a country’s ability to co-opt rather than coerce others to achieve its goal. Culture, domestic values, and foreign policy come under soft power, while economic and military strength come under hard power. Nye raised this concept in order to rebut the argument that “America is falling”, believing that US soft power prevailed, and it was this soft power that maintained US hegemony in the world.

China is viewed as a rising power in the world. It has obtained a high speed of economic growth and expanded its military expenditure. While China’s hard power grows, its soft power also attracts people’s attention. Chinese movies hit the international box offices with great success. The Chinese language is becoming increasingly popular abroad, with a growing number of Confucius Institutes established in 50 countries and regions. More and more foreign students and tourists choose China as their destination. Chinese cuisine, traditional medicine, martial art and even traditional clothes are today’s fashion. In 2008 the Olympic Games are going to be held in Beijing, China.

China’s soft power is a hot topic in academic and non-academic circles. Responses to this “China heat” vary. Some argue that China’s rising soft power would be just
another “China threat” in the aspect of culture. 1 Some consider soft power as a tool to supplement China’s rise, or to soften its aggressive image in terms of economic and military growth. 2 Although the Chinese government has just started to use the term “soft power” in recent times 3, the idea of cultural power is not new. In fact, the discourse of “peaceful rise” or “peaceful development”, “building a harmonious society and a peaceful world” seems to emphasize the “soft” side of the development rather than merely economic growth. Soft power topping could be used to manage China’s peaceful rise. 4 Media reports also favor this phrase with a high frequency of usage, to some extent reflecting people’s interests. These discussions point to an interesting phenomenon, but also confuse us by different definitions and assessment of China’s soft power.

1-2 Research Question

Power can be analyzed in two aspects: its resources and its outcome. Do China’s soft power resources result in a desirable outcome? Do China’s soft power resources improve its national image? Does China’s “Charm Offensive” work? While hard power is more obvious and easier to measure, soft power seems ambiguous, and

---


3 In the address of the opening ceremony of a gathering of Chinese art and literature organizations by Hu Jintao in Nov.10 2006, the term “soft power” appears in the official setting for the first time. http://culture.people.com.cn/GB/22219/5026372.html (Accessed 2007-9-1). It also appears in Hu Jintao’s report at the 17th Party Congress.

depends very much on the context. Both the power holder and power receiver matter, and this complicates the method to assess soft power. However, it is worth trying to build indexes to measure the resources and outcomes of China’s soft power. Based on the previous research, this thesis aims to find out whether China’s soft power resources have a unique impact on China’s national image by controlling or “separating” the impact of its hard power resources. Furthermore, it tries to identify the factors that significantly influence China’s national image, in order to assess and compare their impacts, and provide some implications on China’s image building.

1-3 Methodology

This thesis applies both qualitative and quantitative approaches. The qualitative approach presents a description of China’s soft power, such as the “Charm Offensive” policy, soft power resources and constraints, the implications of the findings, etc. The quantitative approach is applied in two parts: the measurement of the variables and the design of regression models.

To measure China’s soft power resources, I first specify and conceptualize each resource based on the literature review. Next I operationalize each resource by constructing a numerical index that serves as an indicator for each resource. The outcome of China’s soft power is operationalized as China’s national image. Data used in each index come from global public opinion polls, Chinese official statistics and yearbooks, well-know international organizations, such as the United Nations
(UN), International Monetary Fund (IMF), etc.; well-acknowledged databases, such as the Polity IV project, the World Factbook from the United States Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), military expenditure database from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), Militarized Dispute Data from Correlates of War (COW), etc.; relevant books and papers that help to quantify the variables.

After operationalizing the resources into measurable variables, I build several ordinary least squares (OLS) regression models to test the relationship between China’s soft power resources and its national image. By analyzing results from the regression models, we could find out whether China’s soft power resources have a unique impact on China’s national image, for the impact of China’s hard power resources is controlled or “separated”. Furthermore, we can examine and compare the impact of each resource by looking at the value and significance level of each independent variable in different models, in order to find out the factors that significantly influence China’s national image.

1-4 Significance of the Topic

1-4-1 Theoretical and Empirical Contribution

This thesis aims to contribute to a better understanding of China’s soft power, focusing on how China’s soft power resources influence China’s national image. In a broader sense, it adds some value to the discussion of power, a lasting but somewhat nebulous concept in IR theory, as this thesis analyzes power from two dimensions: its
resources and its outcome. Using China’s soft power as a case, it tries to find out the relationship between the resources and the outcome: whether resources can achieve the outcome, and how resources actually work to achieve the outcome.

More specifically, this thesis studies China’s soft power that attracts attention from both the academic scholar and policy maker. Contending interpretations on China’s soft power influence develop from different definitions of China’s soft power, and draw different conclusions. This thesis tries to aggregate these different views of China’s soft power resources from the literature and operationalizes them into measurable independent variables. By regression analysis, it is expected to provide statistical evidence to assess these contending discussions on China’s soft power. Furthermore, based on the findings, this thesis discusses some policy implications that may be of value to policy makers, such as those dealing with public diplomacy. In the course of China’s peaceful development, a positive image around the world could minimize the fear and hostility from other countries, and thus create an international environment congenial to China’s development. This thesis may shed light on China’s image building as it tries to examine the factors that influence China’s national image.

1-4-2 Methodological Contribution

This thesis measures China’s soft power resource in a quantitative way. It is the first attempt to use regression models to assess the relationship between China’s soft power resource and its national image. The regression analysis can separate the
influence of China’s soft power resource and the influence of hard power resources, thus it is able to indicate whether China’s soft power resources do have a unique contribution to shape China’s national image, or whether China’s national image is shaped by its hard power alone. From a methodological perspective, this thesis serves as a supplement to the studies of China’s soft power in which the qualitative approach dominated the literature, and might inspire future research that applies a similar quantitative approach.

1-5 Limitations of This Thesis

1-5-1 Content Validity of the Measurement

Compared to hard power which is more obvious and easier to measure, soft power seems ambiguous, and depends very much on the context. Both the power holder and power receiver matter, and this complicates the method to assess soft power. As a new attempt, this thesis tries to build an index or a numerical indicator for each soft power resource in order to quantify and measure this resource. However, not all the soft power resources are operationalized and included as independent variables in this thesis. The criteria of choosing the soft power resources as independent variables lie in:

(1) Whether this resource is commonly acknowledged in the current literature.

(2) Whether this resource is quantifiable, given the available data.

Some soft power resources, or potential factors that could have an impact on China’s
image, are not included in this thesis as they fail to satisfy these two criteria mentioned above. For example, China’s development model, represented as “Beijing Consensus”⁵ is not included as it is not yet possible to judge whether a country follows China’s example. China’s media are expected to be a significant factor that could shape China’s image abroad. One possible measurement is to look at the audience rating or viewership data for CCTV, China’s official TV broadcast in each country. Unfortunately I could not obtain the data. Future studies could include more relevant independent variables to address the issue of content validity of the measurement, with a better design of the measurement and greater availability of the data.

1-5-2 The Causal Relationship: One Way or Two Way?

This thesis examines how the China’s soft power resources influence its national image, and does not take into account the reverse impact, i.e. how its image influences its soft power resources. For example, one hypothesis states that the attraction of China’s education, measured by the number of foreign students studying in China from a surveyed country could improve China’s image. More students coming to China from a given country results in a better image of China in this country. However, it is possible that a better image of China leads to an increase of foreign students coming to China from this country. China’s image becomes a cause that influences its soft power resources. In reality both scenarios may be true, and the causal relationship is

two-way rather than one-way. This thesis only explores the one-way causal relationship, i.e. how China’s soft power resources influence its national image. The data for China’s soft power resources as the independent variables precede the data for China’s image as the dependent variable. How China’s image influences its soft power resources or hard power resources is beyond the scope of this thesis, and could be a future topic for interested researchers.

1-5-3 The Spill-over Effect

This thesis argues that China’s soft power resources on a country (country A) will influence China’s image in this country (country A). However, it may be possible that China’s soft power resources on country A will influence China’s image in country B. For example, China’s foreign aid programme, one resource of China’s soft power may improve China’s image in both the aid receiving country and other countries that do not receive China’s aid. Chinese aid to Indonesia may improve China’s image in Korea, although Korea does not receive China’s aid. This “spill-over” effect complicates the measurement and seems difficult to deal with as we want to account for the different manifestations of China’s soft power in different countries, rather than assess China’s soft power in the world as a whole. Ignoring this spill-over effect induces some limitations but makes the quantitative measurement possible.

---

6 Except the pooled dataset. In Chapter 3 there are detail discussions on the causality issue.
1-6 Organization of the Chapters

Chapter 1 raises the research question, and discusses the methodology, expected contribution and limitations of this thesis.

Chapter 2 discusses the concept of power and reviews the literature on soft power theory by tracing its origin as a concept and its development in the Chinese discourse. Then it reviews the studies of China’s soft power, focusing on its soft power resources. After identifying the values and limitations of the current literature, I propose a quantitative approach this thesis applies, which may serve as a supplement to the qualitative literature on this topic.

Chapter 3 deals with the first part of quantification: the measurement of the variables. It operationalizes each resource into a measurable independent variable, by constructing a numerical indicator for each resource, and operationalizes the outcome of soft power into China’s national image. Thus it transfers the power resources and outcome into measurable independent variables and dependent variables.

Chapter 4 deals with the second part of the quantification: building and comparing the regression models. By analyzing results from the regression models, we could find out whether China’s soft power resources have a unique impact on China’s national image, by controlling or “separating” the impact of China’s hard power resources. Next, I examine each independent variable in order to find out the significant factors that
influence China’s national image.

Chapter 5 is the conclusion of the thesis. It summarizes the findings of the previous chapters, and offers some policy implications for China’s image building.
Chapter 2  Literature Review

This chapter reviews the literature on soft power theory and China’s soft power. First it reviews the concept of power, and traces the origin of “soft power” coined by Joseph Nye, followed by some critics and its development in the Chinese discourse. Next it reviews the studies of China’s soft power, a topic which attracts attention from both academic researchers and policy makers, focusing on the resources and the constraints of China’s soft power. By identifying the values and limitations of the current literature, I propose a quantitative approach that this thesis applies, which may serve as a supplement to the mainly qualitative literature on this topic. With the statistical technique, the quantitative approach could contribute to a better understanding of how China’s soft power resources influence its national image.

2-1 The Concept of Power

Before we examine soft power, we first look at the concept of power. According to Dahl, “A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do.”\(^7\) Bacharach and Baratz suggest a second face of power which is exercised covertly. “Power is also exercised when A devotes his energies to creating or reinforcing social and political values and institutional practice that limit the scope of the political process to public consideration of only those issues which are comparatively innocuous to A. To the extent that A succeeds in doing this, B is

prevented, for all practical purposes, from bringing to the fore any issues that might in
their resolution be seriously detrimental to A’s set of preferences.”

Luke proposed a three dimensional view of power. “A exercises power over B when A affects B in a
manner contrary to B’s interests.” A latent conflict of interest was highlighted as a
critique to the first and second dimension of power. In the power relationship, the less
powerful are not aware of their “real interests” because of their “false consciousness”.
“A may exercise power over B by getting him to do what he does not want to do, but
he also exercises power over him by influencing, shaping or determining his very
wants. Indeed, is it not the supreme exercise of power to get another or others to have
the desires you want them to have – that is, to secure their compliance by controlling
their thoughts and desires?”

Power is also an important concept in the studies of international relations. “Despite
the long tradition of power analysis in the international politics, scholarly agreement
on the nature of power and its role in international relations is lacking.” The first
approach, i.e. “the elements of national power” or “power-as-resources” approach
depicts power as a possession or property of states. “The power of individual states
was conceived to be susceptible of measurement by certain well-defined factors”,
such as population, territory, wealth, armies and navies. It was challenged by the

---

“relational power” approach, which developed the idea of power as a type of causation. “This causal notion conceives of power as a relationship in which the behavior of actor A at least partially caused a change in the behavior of actor B…Power is an actual or potential relationship between two or more actors, rather than a property of any one of them.”

In fact, the traditional idea of power does have both material and non-material aspects. Michael Mann identified four sources of social power: ideology power, economic power, military power and political power. Dennis H. Wrong identified four distinct forms of power: force, manipulation, persuasion, and authority. Reinhold Niebuhr explained that political power “is a compound of which physical force, whether economic or military, is only one ingredient”. Many American scholars and politicians “do not fully appreciate that a proper regard for moral aspirations is a source of power”. In war, states rely on force, but in peace, they rely on “prestige”, i.e. not on “power” itself but on their carefully constructed “reputation for power”. Nicolas Spykman who specialized in geo-politics listed several elements of power: military forces, size of the territory, nature of the frontiers, size of the population, absence or presence of raw materials, economic and technological development, financial strength, ethnic homogeneity, effective social integration, political stability and national spirit. Raymond Aron proposed three fundamental elements of power: “first

13 Ibid., 178.
17 Nicholas J. Spykman, America’s Strategy in World Politics: The United States and the Balance of Power. (New
of all the space occupied by the political units; second the available materials and the
techniques by which they can be transformed into weapons, the number of men and
the art of transforming them into soldiers (or, again, the quantity and quality of
implements and combatants); and last the collective capacity for action, which
includes the organization of the army, the discipline of the combatants, the quality of
the civil and military command, in war and in peace, and the solidarity of the citizens
during the conflict in the face of good or bad luck. . . . Milieu, resources, collective
action, such are, from every evidence, whatever the century and whatever the forms
of competition among political units, the determinants of power.” 18 Cline has evolved
a formula for describing the elements of international power: \( P_p = (C+E+M)\times(S+W) \), whereas \( P_p \) = Perceived power, \( C \) = Critical mass = population +
territory, \( E \) = economic capability, \( M \) = military capability, \( S \) = strategic purpose, \( W \)= will to pursue national strategy.19

Although many realist assumptions emphasize the primacy of material capabilities
and define power in terms of its access to exogenously varying material resources,20
attention to the non-material or intangible dimensions of power could be found in the
realist literature. E. H. Carr considered military power, economic power and “mass
opinion” as indivisible in the essence of power.21 Hans Morgenthau defined power as

---

18 Raymond Aron, Peace and War: A Theory of International Relations. Translated from the French by Richard
19 Ray S. Cline, World Power Assessment: A Calculus of Strategic Drift, (Washington: Center for Strategic and
International Studies, Georgetown University, 1975), 11.
20 Sow Keat Tok, “Soft Power: A Re-Examination on the Quest for Legitimacy in a Globalised World”, (M.A.
“man’s control over the minds and actions of other men”, which derived from three sources: “the expectation of benefits, the fear of disadvantages, the respect or love for men or institutions”, via “orders, threats, the authority or charisma of a man or of an office, or a combination of any of these.”

He provided nine elements of national power: geography, natural resources, industrial capacity, military preparedness, population, national character, national morale, the quality of diplomacy, the quality of government, with the latter four items as non-material or intangible dimensions of power.

Combining the “power-as-resources” approach and the “power-as-relation” approach in IR studies of power, I define power as the ability to tap the resources in order to cultivate the expected relations. Thus China’s soft power is defined as China’s ability to tap its non-material resources in order to cultivate a friendly relationship with other countries indicated by a positive Chinese image among the foreign public.

2-2 Soft Power by Nye

Although the traditional idea of power includes both material and non-material factors in international politics, Joseph Nye first coined the term “soft power” in his book Bound to lead, and developed it in his subsequent series of articles, essays as well as the other two important books on this concept: The Paradox of American Power:

---

23 Ibid., 117-154.
Why the World’s Only Superpower Can’t Go it Alone,26 and Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics27. As Nye defined it, soft power is “getting others to want the outcomes that you want—co-opts people rather than coerces them”.28 A country’s soft power rests on three resources: “its culture (in places where it is attractive to others), its political values (when it lives up to them at home and abroad), and its foreign policies (when they are seen as legitimate and having moral authority).”29 On the other hand, hard power “can rest on inducements (“carrots”) or threats (“sticks”), and often refers to military and economic might.30 Nye used a power spectrum to illustrate the relationship between hard power and soft power, and used a form to compare them in terms of “behaviors”, “primary currencies” and “government policies”.

**Table 2-1 Nye’s Spectrum on Power**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spectrum of Behaviors</th>
<th>Hard</th>
<th>Soft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Command</td>
<td>coercion</td>
<td>inducement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>force</td>
<td>payments</td>
<td>institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sanctions</td>
<td>bribes</td>
<td>culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

28 Ibid., 5.
29 Ibid., 11.
30 Ibid., 5.
Table 2-2 Three Types of Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>Primary Currencies</th>
<th>Government Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military Power</td>
<td>coercion</td>
<td>threats</td>
<td>coercive diplomacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deterrence</td>
<td>force</td>
<td>war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Power</td>
<td>inducement</td>
<td>payments</td>
<td>aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coercion</td>
<td>sanctions</td>
<td>bribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Power</td>
<td>attraction</td>
<td>values</td>
<td>public diplomacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agenda setting</td>
<td>culture</td>
<td>bilateral and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>policies</td>
<td>multilateral diplomacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As discussed above, the traditional idea of power does have both material and non-material aspects, although not termed as hard power and soft power. Classical realist theory on power covered both tangible and intangible levels. Neo-realists, however, seem to put too much emphasis on material power, especially military power. Nye’s soft power, which “reflects a continuation of the traditional concept of power”, attempts to draw attention to the neglected aspect. Furthermore, Nye argued that power had changed its nature in the information age, resulting in increasing political and social costs of using military force, thus the role of soft power deserved more attention.

Critiques of Nye’s conceptualization focus on the applicability of the US model. First, “Nye’s anatomy of soft power is based on US national strategic resources and strategic intention, leaving a vague boundary for this concept.” His analytical method aimed at empirical analysis rather than building an elegant theory. Second, Nye failed to clarify the relation between hard power and soft power, and how to assess and measure the strength of soft power. Third, Nye paid too much emphasis on the power holder and too little emphasis on the power receiver. Creditability and legitimacy in the view of the power receiver should have been the core of soft power owned by the power holder. “While having legitimacy may entice others to follow suit, or allow one agent to shape the agenda, having the capacity to attract or the capacity to control the agenda may not necessarily confer legitimacy.” The US may be bound to lead due to its super power status, but the other countries may not be bound to follow. In other words, the outcome of soft power, which should have been examined in a more detailed way, is different from the resource of soft power. Possessing the resources of power does not equal to achieving the outcome, for the resources will not necessarily lead to the desirable outcome. Further more, Nye proposed a concept rather than a theory, because there is no causal relationship discussed, and how the resources are related to the outcome is not clear.

---

2-3 Soft Power in the Chinese Discourse

As early as 1993, Chinese scholars began to investigate the power of culture and soft power. With IR studies developing in China, research on soft power advances towards a comprehensive level. Usually they are combined with other relevant topics, such as “Beijing Consensus”, “peaceful rise” or “peaceful development”, public diplomacy, etc. within the context of China’s reality. The current literature on China’s soft power written in Chinese falls into the following categories.

- Introduction of soft power.

Some textbooks of IR theory cover this new theory. Besides book reviews of Nye’s *Bound to lead* and *Soft power*, journal articles present the background of this concept, Nye’s ideas of hard power and soft power, soft power’s components,

---


characteristics, and the importance in empirical studies. Soft power serves as a non-military means to improve the image of a country. Ideology as a resource of soft power can influence foreign policy. To the US, soft power is a means to maintain hegemony in the world. In 2002, a conference discussing the role and influence of soft power in US foreign policy was held in Beijing.

The resources of China’s soft power

It is believed that China possesses many resources of soft power, such as “traditional culture, network of overseas Chinese, geographic strategic environment”; “Maoism, China’s experience, the mode of gradual reform”; “respect of China’s achievement”; “the vitality of the socialist system with Chinese characteristics, the inspiring and attraction of Chinese culture and the international influence of the independence and self-reliant peace diplomacy”; political ideology; etc.

References:
53 Zhan and Li Zhang, Haijun, "China's Soft Strength's Three Factors in the International Politics," *The Journal of..."
The current status of China’s soft power

Although China’s soft power is increasing, it lags behind its increase of hard power. There are big deficits in the trade of cultural products.55

The role and the importance of China’s soft power

Soft power is important to China because it is a capital to be competitive.56 It can “improve China’s image”;57 facilitate “peaceful rise”;58 help to maximize China’s national interests59 and build a well-off society.60

How to increase China’s soft power

China can increase its soft power by developing its cultural industry; exporting China’s cultural products;61 showcasing China’s unique culture, deepening economic
and political reforms, tapping human resources;\(^{62}\) using second-track diplomacy (non-official, non-profit and issue-specific);\(^{63}\) sticking to an independent and self-reliant peaceful foreign policy, increasing foreign aid, valuing talents and information technology;\(^{64}\) strengthening relations with international celebrities; and making use of NGOs and MNCs that function as a public relations company for China.\(^{65}\)

It is agreed that soft power is very important to a country. China possesses quite a few resources of soft power. Although it is increasing recently, China’s soft power is still lagging behind its hard power and other countries’ soft power. China should attach strategic importance to the construction of soft power.

**2-4 China’s Soft Power**

The previous section reviewed the origin of soft power as a concept and its discourse in China. This section focuses on China’s soft power, aiming to find out what China’s soft power refers to in the current literature.

By studying the papers published by Chinese academic journals, Wang finds that soft

---


\(^{63}\) Ren and Teng, "Research on the Strategy of Promoting Soft Strength by Use of the Second Track." (任吉刚, 滕培圣: “利用第二轨道提升软实力策略研究”。)

\(^{64}\) Li, "Image of Nation: Using the Non-Military Means to Maintain the External Influence." (李晓明: “国家形象与软权力——论运用非军事手段维持增进国家的对外影响力”。)

\(^{65}\) Ren and Teng, "Research on the Strategy of Promoting Soft Strength by Use of the Second Track." (任吉刚, 滕培圣: “利用第二轨道提升软实力策略研究”。)
power in the Chinese discourse can apply not only to nations, but also regions, organizations and even individuals. Regarding the resources of soft power, Chinese scholars seem to agree on the three resources identified by Nye, but the emphasis is different. Table 2-3 summarizes Wang’s findings.

### Table 2-3  A Comparison of Nye and Chinese Scholars on Soft Power Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nye</th>
<th>Chinese Scholars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td>America</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culture</td>
<td>contemporary American pop culture</td>
<td>traditional Chinese culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domestic institutions and values</td>
<td>political values, such as democracy and human rights</td>
<td>the attraction of Chinese economic development model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political recommendations</td>
<td>improving America’s substance and style of foreign policy, especially the virtue of multilateralism</td>
<td>emphasizing the domestic foundation of soft power, such as national coherence and government legitimacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Studies on China’s soft power offer detailed descriptions of its soft power resources, such as traditional and popular culture, Chinese language, education, tourism, cuisine, economic development model, domestic policies under the new leadership, national coherence, peaceful foreign policy, participation in international organizations, public
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diplomacy and foreign aid.\(^{67}\)

After identifying culture, ideas, developmental model, international institution and international image as the core elements for China’s soft power, Men provides assessment for each component using historical and cross-national comparative approaches.\(^{68}\) In his recent book *Charm Offensive: How China's Soft Power Is Transforming the World* published in 2007, Kurlantzick provides detailed observations on China’s soft power manifestation, especially in Southeast Asia, based on his field work in these countries. His observations mostly comply with the resources discussed above, except that business, conventionally considered to be a resource of hard power, is categorized as a tool of soft power.\(^{69}\) Zhang agrees on adding “strong economy” to the resource of China’s soft power. Furthermore, he includes “Chinese diasporas in the region and their economic influence” and “benefits of sub-culture linkage” as the other resource of China’s soft power.\(^{70}\)

The constraint, or the resource that is lacking or insufficient in some sense, include: imbalance in soft-power resources, problems of legitimacy and incoherence in China’s


\(^{70}\) Zhang, "Tapping Soft Power: Managing China's 'Peaceful Rise' and the Implications for the World."
foreign policy; political system of authoritarian nature, failure of the international Communist movement, the Taiwan issue, historical burden of exporting Communism, conflict of interest with neighboring countries, and fear from western countries of a rising China. 

2-5 Limitations of the Current Literature

There are two points that we should pay attention to. First, most of the discussions focus mainly on China’s soft power in the world as a whole. They do not account for the different manifestation of China’s soft power in different countries. Not until recently do the studies on China’s soft power describe different scenarios in different countries, such as Huang and Ding (2006), Zhang (2007), and Kurlantzick (2007). Second, most of the studies on China’s soft power apply a qualitative approach that presents some evidence of China’s rising soft power, or tells how China’s soft power may be hindered by certain factors. The relationship between China’s soft power resources and its outcome deserves further exploration. How effectively are these soft power resources being deployed? Do these resources significantly contribute to the desired outcome? Are some of them more important than others? Can China’s soft power resources work to shape China’s national image, or is China’s national image purely determined by its hard power resources? A qualitative description or approach seems insufficient to answer these questions.

71 Gill and Huang, "Sources and Limits of Chinese 'Soft Power'", 26-30.
73 Although some figures and statistics are presented as evidence or index of China's soft power growth/resource, the relationship between resource and outcome is explored mainly in a qualitative way.
Although research on China’s soft power is mainly qualitative, there is some quantitative research on soft power of countries in general. It tries to quantify soft power by creating indexes for each resource, using data such as the export of cultural products, the number of foreign students, etc. Perceptions from cross-national public opinion data are used to quantify the result or the outcome of soft power. This thesis applies a similar quantitative approach, with additional variables that I consider important for China’s soft power resources.

As stated above, the current literature mainly presents a general picture or provides detailed stories on China’s soft power but does not focus on the relationship between the resources and outcome of China’s soft power. It is not clear whether China’s soft power resources could result in a desirable outcome, as the qualitative and descriptive approach that the literature applies are inadequate to specify this relationship. To explore this unclear but interesting and important relationship between the resources and the outcome, this thesis applies a quantitative approach, building models that regress the outcome on the resources. Thus it could assess the effectiveness of China’s soft power by examining the relationship between China’s soft power resources and its outcome.

Furthermore, a multiple regression in the quantitative approach has the value of

separating the impact of hard power resources and soft power resources. Can China’s soft power resources improve China’s national image? Does China have a better image only because of its hard power? What are the factors that influence China’s image in a significant way? The qualitative approach seems unable to answer these questions as it is difficult to distinguish the impact of soft power resources from the impact of hard power resources on the outcome. By adding the hard power variables as control variables, the regression models could tell the unique influence of China’s soft power resources on its outcome operationalized as China’s national image.

Although the current studies do not specify the relationship between China’s soft power resources and its outcome, they provide detailed descriptions on China’s soft power resources that help the conceptualization and operationalization. Based on these descriptions, this thesis quantifies China’s soft power resource by building some indexes for each resource.

To sum up, the current literature on China’s soft power presents detailed descriptions on the resources and constraints of China’s soft power, but does not clearly explore how these resources and constraints influence China’s image, and could not distinguish the influence of soft power from the influence of hard power. This thesis thus applies a quantitative approach to access the relationship between China’s soft power resources and its national image. A regression model controlling the impact of hard power aims to find out whether China’s soft power resources have a unique
impact on China’s national image, and tries to explore the factors that significantly influence or shape China’s image.
Chapter 3 Modeling China’s Soft Power:  
The Operationalization and Measurement  
of Its Resources and Outcome

The previous chapter reviewed the soft power theory and China’s soft power in terms of its resources and constraints. Most of the literature applies a qualitative or descriptive approach that presents some evidence of China’s rising soft power, or discusses the factors that influence China’s soft power. However, such qualitative studies could not assess the relationship between China’s soft power resources and its outcome. Neither can they distinguish the impact of soft power resources from the impact of hard power resources. A quantitative approach that uses regression analysis could examine the relationship between China’s soft power resource and its outcome. Furthermore, by controlling hard power resources, it could assess the unique impact of China’s soft power resources on its national image.

This chapter first introduces the background of China’s soft power projection. Next, it operationalizes China’s soft power and hard power resources by constructing several indexes for measurement. It operationalizes the outcome of China’s soft power as China’ national image. Thus China’s soft power resources and its outcome are operationalized into measurable independent variables and dependent variables, with China’s hard power resource operationalized as control variables. The conceptualization and operationalization of China’s soft power pave the way for
3-1 Background

The Chinese government stresses the peaceful nature of its foreign policy.75 “Peaceful rise”, or “peaceful development”, advocated by the Chinese government in recent years, on the one hand reflects the anxiety or fear among the international community due to China’s rapid economic growth. On the other hand, this policy (including the nuanced change of terminology from “rise” to a less aggressive “development”) indicates China’s awareness of such anxiety or fear, which may turn into something adverse to its development if not handled properly. To build a positive image among the foreign audience is a major aim set by the Chinese government.

A country’s national image could be measured by the popularity of this country among foreign citizens. Global public opinion polls, such as the Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA), and Pew Global Attitudes Project (PEW), conduct surveys in a number of countries in the world in various years. Their questionnaires include a rating for a specific country in terms of a respondent’s attitude towards this country. Although ephemeral and subject to contingency as acknowledged by Nye,76 these data are a direct indicator of a country’s popularity among foreign audience. As the unit of analysis is not in an individual level, the data are calculated by treating one surveyed country as one observation. The outcome of

76 Nye, Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics, 18.
China’s soft power is measured by how positive a surveyed country’s attitude towards China is.

A positive image not only comes from a country’s soft power, but also from its hard power. Both China’s soft power and hard power may have an impact on China’s national image. To examine such an impact, we should assess the resources of China’s soft power and hard power. The next section discusses various dimensions of China’s soft power and hard power resources, and builds some indexes for measurement, in order to operationalize these resources into measurable independent variables.

3-2 China’s Soft Power Resources

Soft power comes from culture, domestic political value and foreign policy. As reviewed in Chapter 2, China’s soft power resources could also be categorized into these three aspects.

3-2-1 Culture

The first category of China’s soft power resources is culture. The Chinese empires created a great historic civilization and had a great influence on neighboring countries, the tribute system being a good manifestation. Traditional Chinese philosophy, meditation, literature and art works interest foreigners a lot. While it is difficult to measure the impact of Ancient China’s cultural dominance, the tribute system serves
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77 Ibid., 1.
as a proxy to its historical cultural influence over the world. A country which used to be in the tribute system is more influenced by traditional Chinese culture. Whether this influence could turn into credit to a positive image of China would be tested in the model in the next chapter. The first independent variable “Tradition” is a dummy variable. The country scores 1 if it was in the Chinese tribute system in history, or had ever paid tribute to the Chinese empires, and scores 0 if it was not. I refer to Li’s 2004 book, *History of Tribute System: A Study of Ancient China’s Foreign Relations*, to determine which countries participated in the Chinese tribute system. As these countries are referred to by archaic names, I refer to *Chinese Historical Gazetteer* and *Chinese Encyclopedia: Chinese History* to “translate” the archaic country names into modern ones. The ancient countries do not perfectly match the modern countries and some archaic names could not find the corresponding modern names, but generally the list accords with our common knowledge. Countries that were in the Chinese tribute system include: Korea, Japan, Vietnam, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, Kyrgyzstan, Cambodian, Burma, Laos, Brunei, Mongolia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Russia, Turkey, Afghanistan, India, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Kenya, Iran, Iraq, Oman, Maldives, Yemen, Somalia, Saudi Arabia, Italy and Syria.

---


81 Persia was a tribute-sending state to the Chinese Empire during Tang Dynasty. See Dexing Li, Gongwang Liu and Yuxing Wang, *Brief Discussion on Several Approaches of Intercommunication in Medicine between China and Arabia*, *Journal of Tianjin University of Traditional Chinese Medicine*, no. 3 (2004): 119; (李德杏, 刘公望, 王玉兴: “浅析中国与阿拉伯医药交流的实现途径”, 《天津中医学院学报》2004年第3期。)

82 The Curia Romana, or the “Sunset State” in China’s historical records, paid tribute to the Chinese Empire during the Ming Dynasty. See Dake Liao, *A Study of the “Sunset State”*, *Journal of Xiamen University (Arts &
Another variable, “Confucianism”, measures the influence of Confucianism, the once dominant traditional Chinese philosophy. East Asian countries share similar cultural and historical backgrounds where Confucianism is one of the components. “In East Asian countries, Confucian cultural systems have been deconstructed to different extent due to the changes of social economic basis and political system. However, as a cultural tradition, Confucian culture has not totally disappeared. Some elements have been activated, resulting from the impact of foreign culture, and played a role in the process of East Asian countries’ modernization.”

Since Confucianism originated in China, and is believed to play a positive role in East Asian countries’ modernization, my hypothesis is that Confucianism is a positive soft power resource: a country influenced more by Confucianism should have a more favorable opinion of China. “Confucianism” is an ordinal variable: 2 for the countries within the “Confucian cultural circle” which had been influenced deeply by Confucianism; 1 for the countries within the “Confucian cultural circle” but had been influenced by Confucianism less than those scoring 2; 0 for those countries outside the “Confucian cultural circle”. The criterion for the coding is based on Confucianism and Modern Society edited by He and Li. The countries scoring 2 include: Vietnam, Japan, South Korea, North Korea, and Singapore. The countries scoring 1 include: Laos, Cambodia, Burma, and Thailand.
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83 Confucianism and Modern Society, ed. Chengxuan He and Suping Li (Shenyang: Shenyang Press, 2001), 3.
84 Ibid.
Besides traditional culture, Chinese popular culture is another resource of soft power.

To measure the impact of Chinese popular culture, I use Chinese cultural products (calculated in million US dollars) exporting to a country, such as books, newspapers, music, film, and works of art as indicators. These data are available at the United Nation Commodity Trade Statistics Database. These cultural products include:

Printed material--HS49
Name: Printed books, newspapers, pictures and other products of the printing
Description: Printed books, newspapers, pictures and other products of the printing industry; manuscripts, typescripts and plans

Books--HS4901
Name: Printed books, brochures, leaflets and similar printed matter
Description: Printed books, brochures, leaflets and similar printed matter, whether or not in single sheets.

Newspapers--HS4902
Name: Newspapers, journals and periodicals
Description: Newspapers, journals and periodicals, whether or not illustrated or containing advertising material.

Films--HS3706
Name: Cinematographic film, exposed and developed
Description: Cinematographic film, exposed and developed, whether or not incorporating sound track or consisting only of sound track.

Music--HS8524
Name: Sound recordings other than photographic equipment
Description: Records, tapes and other recorded media for sound or other similarly recorded phenomena, including matrices and masters for the production of records, but excluding products of Chapter 37.

Art works--HS97
Name: Works of art, collectors’ pieces and antiques
Description: Works of art, collectors’ pieces and antiques

For each surveyed country, I calculate the total value of these six cultural products
that China exported in the surveyed year in million US dollars. This variable “Cultural products” measures the impact of China’s popular culture on the surveyed countries. A country should have more positive attitudes towards China if China exported more cultural products to it.

The Chinese language has become increasingly popular in foreign countries. In order to meet the increasing demand for learning the Chinese language, the Chinese government set up Confucius Institutes, to “promote friendly relationship with other countries”, “enhance the understanding of the Chinese language and culture” and “provide good learning conditions for the Chinese learners among the world”. By the end of 2006, more than 120 Confucius Institutes had been established in 50 countries and regions. To measure the popularity of Chinese language in a country, I count the number of Confucius Institutes in each country in the surveyed year, with the information from the Office of Chinese Language Council International. Although the Confucius Institute is not the only channel for foreigners to learn Chinese, these numbers reflect the degree of demand from Chinese language learners in a country. It is reasonable to conclude that the more Confucius Institutes a country has, the greater the number of Chinese learners in this country, thus the greater impact of Chinese language will have on this country. Such impact is expected to be positive: the more Confucius Institutes a country has, the more people in that country will have

positive attitudes towards China.

Education could be a resource of soft power in that students studying abroad not only receive knowledge of their field, but also learn about the culture, values, the way of thinking, norms, etc. of the country they stay in. Such influence may establish an impression of the host country or shape the image of the host country. The increasing number of foreign students coming to China seems to demonstrate China’s increasing attractiveness. To measure the education factor, the variable “Education” counts the number of foreign students studying in China in the surveyed year for each country, with the statistics provided by Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs.\footnote{China's Foreign Affairs, ed. People's Republic of China Department of Policy Planning Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Beijing: World Knowledge Press, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006).} The larger the number of students from a country studying in China, the greater the impact of Chinese education will have on this country, and more positive opinions of China are expected in this country.

Tourism is another resource of soft power. Tourists choose a destination of cultural attractiveness. The growing number of foreign tourists coming to China shows the increasing attractiveness of Chinese culture. To measure the impact of tourism as an indicator of soft power resource, the variable “Tourism” counts the number of tourists to China for each country in the surveyed year, using the data from the Chinese National Bureau of Statistics.\footnote{Yearbook of China's Foreign Economic Relations and Trade, ed. the editorial board of the Yearbook of China's foreign economic relations and trade (Beijing: China Foreign Economic Relations and Trade Publishing House, 2002,2003). China Trade and External Economic Statistical Yearbook, ed. National Bureau of Statistics} Larger numbers of tourists from a country to China
indicate a greater impact of Chinese tourism on this country. Like the impact of education, I expect the impact of tourism to be positive: more inbound tourists will generate more positive attitudes towards China in the surveyed country.

3-2-2 Political Value

The second category of soft power resource is China’s domestic political value. Domestic values and policy not only relate to the welfare of Chinese people and the legitimacy of the Chinese government, but also have an impact on China’s image or reputation abroad. Good governance, universal values and a legitimate regime create a positive impression on foreign audience, while corruption, narrow and parochial values, and brutal policies undermine China’s attractiveness abroad.

The impact of China’s domestic political value is difficult to measure. Content analysis of the reports on China’s domestic policy by looking at a country’s mainstream media could be one approach, which may be conducted in future research. In this thesis, the variable “Democracy” that examines a country’s degree of democracy by Democracy Score in Polity IV project is used to measure the impact of China’s domestic political value. It is a dummy variable to indicate whether a country is democratic or not. A democratic country, defined as one with Democracy Score 5 or above, is coded 1, and a non-democratic country, defined as one with

---

Democracy Score below 5, is coded 0. As China is not a democracy in this setting, a country scoring 1 means it has a different political ideology from China. This variable aims to test whether a country’s political values or ideology, i.e. being a democracy or not, or having the same political ideology as China or not, will have an impact on this country’s attitude towards China. Scholars studying China’s soft power agree that China’s political system constrains its soft power development as democracy is considered as a universal value. Therefore, I hypothesize that a democratic country would have a more negative attitude towards China than a non-democratic country.

3-2-3 Foreign Policy

The third category of China’s soft power resource is foreign policy. A country’s foreign policy which is “seen as legitimate and having moral authority” could be one resource of that country’s soft power. Chinese foreign policy has shifted from being ideological and confrontational to pragmatic and peaceful. It has shown greater flexibility on territorial disputes with neighboring countries, increased membership in international institutions and organizations, made increasing efforts to conform more to international norms on sensitive issues, become more active in international agenda setting, and has been aggressive in pursuing public diplomacy.

I use two variables, i.e. “IO participation” and “Foreign aid” to assess China’s “new

---

91 Gill and Huang, "Sources and Limits of Chinese 'Soft Power'"; Zhang, "Tapping Soft Power: Managing China's 'Peaceful Rise' and the Implications for the World."
93 Huang and Ding, "Dragon's Underbelly: An Analysis of China's Soft Power."
diplomacy”. Participation in international organizations (“IO participation”) counts the number of international organizations that both China and a country take part in. It reflects the degree of common interest in international affairs, agenda setting, and multilateral foreign policy. Therefore, it is expected that the greater the number is, the more positive a country’s attitude will be towards China. The World Factbook from the US Central Intelligent Agency (CIA) provides information of what international organizations that each country takes part in for each year.94 This information is used for coding the variable “IO participation”.

As there are no official statistics on the amount of China’s aid to a country, I cannot use the specific figure to code the variable “Foreign aid”. Instead I use a dummy variable that codes 1 if a country received aid from China in the surveyed year, and 0 if otherwise. I rely on the reports on “China’s Aid to Foreign Countries” and the lists of China’s aid programmes from China Commerce Yearbook95 for the coding. In other words, a country is coded 1 for variable “Foreign aid” if it is mentioned in the report or the list as the recipient of China’s aid programmes. Naturally, I also apply the definition of China’s foreign aid in these reports and lists, including: aiding plant projects and unit equipment, aiding technical cooperative projects, financing concessional loan projects, sending young volunteers overseas, delivering emergency assistance to relieve several international humanitarian disasters.

3-3 China’s Hard Power Resources

A country’s hard power refers to its military and economic strength. As power is not decided by the power holder, but by both the power holder and power receiver, it is more appropriate to consider power in relative rather than absolute terms. China’s military expenditure and economic growth mean different things to strong and weak countries, thus China’s hard power should have different impacts and implications for different countries. To measure China’s hard power resources, I use the relative value, i.e. the difference between China and a surveyed country in terms of the strength of hard power resources.

3-3-1 Military Power

Four indicators are used to measure China’s military power, namely “Military expenditure (relative)”, “% military in GDP”, “Highest MID” and “Dispute times”.

“Military expenditure (relative)” equals to the surveyed country’s annual military spending in relative term comparing to China. (i.e. China’s military expenditure minus that country’s military expenditure) A greater value indicates that China has stronger military power over that country in terms of military spending. “% military in GDP” calculates the country’s military expenditure as the percentage of its GDP. The figures in these two variables come from Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) military expenditure database. “Highest MID” (Militarized Interstate Disputes) measures the highest hostility level in disputes. It ranges from 1 to 5: “1-No
militarized action; 2-Threat to use force; 3-Display of force; 4-Use of force; 5-War”.

“Dispute times” counts the numbers of disputes between China and a country during 1816 and 2001. “Highest MID” measures the intensity of the disputes, while “Dispute times” measures the frequency of the disputes. Militarized Dispute Data from Correlates of War (COW)96 are used to code these two variables.

“Military expenditure (relative)” and “% military in GDP” reflect the current military power relation between China and a surveyed country, while “Highest MID” and “Dispute times” assess the historical impact of China’s military power on that country.

3-3-2 Economic Power

China’s economic power can be measured by its relative economic performance and trade relations with the surveyed country. “GDP (relative)” equals China’s GDP minus the surveyed country’s GDP97. A greater value indicates that China has stronger economic power over that country in terms of GDP. “China’s import from the country” and “China’s export to the country” calculate the amount of bilateral trade between the country and China in million US dollars. “% of trade with China in total trade” calculates the percentage of trade with China as the country’s total foreign trade.98 “China’s import>China’s export” is a dummy variable scoring 1 if China’s import is greater than its export to the country, and 0 if China’s export is greater than

97 GDP measured as PPP yields similar result.
98 Calculated in terms of FOB and CIF.
its import from that country. For the variable of each economic resources discussed above, the calculation of the value is based on the source data from International Financial Statistics, International Monetary Fund (IMF).99

Besides the trade partnership, the export competition between China and the surveyed country could have some impact on China’s image, as the surveyed country may complain about its waning export advantage due to China’s fast growing and aggressive exportation. Variable “Export competition” calculate the “coefficient of specialization” (CS) which compares the exporting structure of China with a surveyed country, assuming that the trade competition is more likely if the exporting structure between these two countries is quite similar. The greater the value of CS for a surveyed country, the greater export competition between China and this country.100

The formula to calculate CS is:

\[
CS = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n} |a^n_i - a^n_j |
\]

Where \(a^n_i\) and \(a^n_j\) equals the share of good “n” (classified in SITC code) in total exports of country “i” (the surveyed country) and country “j” (China) in the period “t” (the year of 2004, 2005, 2006). I calculate the value of CS using the data from United Nation Commodity Trade Statistics Database.101
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3-4 China’s National Image as the Outcome of Its Soft Power

As discussed above, the outcome of China’s soft power would be operationalized as China’s national image, measured by its popularity rating in global surveys. After constructing the indexes for the measurement of independent variables, i.e. soft power resources variables, and the measurement of control variables, i.e. hard power resources variables, this section selects the data for the measurement of the dependent variables from various global surveys and public opinion polls.

Currently five global surveys provide data of the public opinion poll that involved in the impression of China. Table 3-1 summarizes the features of each survey.

Among these surveys, Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) and Pew Global Attitudes Project (PEW) are chosen to operationalize the dependent variable. PIPA surveys covered more than 26 countries and provide 79 observations, some of which are surveyed more than once. PEW surveys covered more than 46 countries, and provide 82 observations\(^{102}\). Both meet the requirement of statistical analysis in terms of sufficient observations\(^{103}\). Further more, they covered more countries than the other surveys. The Transatlantic Trends and AsiaBarometer (AB) mainly survey the European countries and Asian countries respectively, thus they are focusing on regional rather than global attitudes towards China. Asian Barometer (ABS) and East Asia Barometer did not provide sufficient observations for a statistical analysis.

\(^{102}\) 76 observations in 2005-2007.
\(^{103}\) The common requirement for a regression analysis is that there should be at least 30 observations.
| Survey                          | Measurement | Questions asked                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Surveyed time | Number of Surveyed Countries (not including China) | Surveyed countries                                                                 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|               |                                                                                                           |                                                                               |
| Transatlantic Trends\(^{104}\) | Scores indicating the warmth (average in that country) towards China                                                                                                                                  | Q12 Next I’d like you to rate your feelings towards some countries, institutions and people, with 100 meaning a very warm, favourable feeling, 0 meaning a very cold, unfavourable feeling, and 50 meaning not particularly warm or cold. You can use any number from 0 to 100. If you have no opinion or have never heard of that country or institution, please say so.[0-100] | 2003 (Jun.2003) | 8 countries                                                                                               | E7 (United Kingdom, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, Poland and Portugal)+US |
|                                |             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |               |                                                                                                           |                                                                               |
|                                |             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 2004 (Jun.2004) | 11 countries                                                                                                | E10 (United Kingdom, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey)+US |
|                                |             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 2005 (May-Jun. 2005) | 11 countries                                                                                                | E10 (United Kingdom, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey)+US |
|                                |             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 2006 (Jun. 2006) | 13 countries                                                                                                | E12 (United Kingdom, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey, Bulgaria, Romania)+US |
|                                |             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 2007 (Jun.2007) | 13 countries                                                                                                | E12 (United Kingdom, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey, Bulgaria, Romania)+US |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Questions asked</th>
<th>Surveyed time</th>
<th>Number of Surveyed Countries (not including China)</th>
<th>Surveyed countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIPA</td>
<td>% of mainly positive/ negative</td>
<td>Please tell me if you think each of the following are having a mainly positive or mainly negative influence in the world . . . China [Mainly positive/ Mainly negative/ Depends/ Neither, no difference/ DK/NA]</td>
<td>2004 (Nov.2004-Jan. 2005)</td>
<td>21 countries</td>
<td>Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, France, Germany, Great Britain, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Mexico, Russia, Philippines, Poland, South Africa, South Korea, Turkey, United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005 (Oct.-Dec. 2005)</td>
<td>32 countries</td>
<td>Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Democratic republic of Congo, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Great Britain, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Kenya, Mexico, Nigeria, Philippines, Poland, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Turkey, United States, Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2006 (Nov.2006-Jan.207)</td>
<td>26 countries</td>
<td>Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Egypt, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Italy, Kenya, Lebanon, Mexico, Nigeria, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Russia, South Korea, Turkey, UAE, United States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-1 Global Public Opinion Surveys of the Impression of China (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Questions asked</th>
<th>Surveyed time</th>
<th>Number of Surveyed Countries (not including China)</th>
<th>Surveyed countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pew Global Attitudes Project (PEW)106</td>
<td>% of very favorable/somewhat favorable/somewhat unfavorable/very unfavorable</td>
<td>Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of China</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>6 countries</td>
<td>Russia, Indonesia, Japan, Philippines, South Korea, Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005 (Apr.-Jun. 2005)</td>
<td>16 countries</td>
<td>United States, Canada, Great Britain, France, Germany, Spain, Netherlands, Russia, Poland, Turkey, Pakistan, India, Lebanon, Jordan, Morocco, Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2006 (Mar.-May 2006)</td>
<td>14 countries</td>
<td>United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Spain, Russia, Egypt, Turkey, Indonesia, India, Pakistan, Jordan, Nigeria, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007 (Apr.-May)</td>
<td>46 countries</td>
<td>Argentina, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Brazil, Britain, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Palestinian ter., Peru, Poland, Russia, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Tanzania, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United States, Venezuela</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Questions asked</th>
<th>Surveyed time</th>
<th>Number of Surveyed Countries (not including China)</th>
<th>Surveyed countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AsiaBarometer (AB)(^{107})</td>
<td>% of Good influence/ Rather good influence/ Neither good nor bad influence/ Rather bad influence/ Bad influence</td>
<td>Do you think the following countries have a good influence or a bad influence on your country? (China) [Good influence/ Rather good influence/ Neither good nor bad influence/ Rather bad influence/ Bad influence/ Don't know]</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>8 countries</td>
<td>Japan, South Korea, Malaysia, Thailand, Vietnam, India, Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>10 countries</td>
<td>Cambodia, Indonesia, Japan, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, Malaysia, Singapore, Korea, Laos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2006(^{108})</td>
<td>4 countries</td>
<td>Japan, Korea, Singapore, Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia Barometer [part of the Asian Barometer (ABS)](^{109})</td>
<td>Scores indicating the warmth (average in that country) towards China</td>
<td>Using a similar scale, please let us know about your impressions of the following countries. Give it a grade from 1 to 10, being 1 very bad and 10 very good. (China)</td>
<td>2006(^{110})</td>
<td>5 countries</td>
<td>Mongolia, Philippines, Thailand, Indonesia, Singapore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{108}\) I am indebted to Dr. Wang Zhengxu who is a team member of East Asia Barometer in Singapore and provided the data.  
\(^{110}\) I am indebted to Dr. Wang Zhengxu who is a team member of East Asia Barometer in Singapore and provided the data.
Given greater data availability, future studies may compare China’s popularity in European countries and Asian countries.

The question in the PIPA survey that we are interested in is: “Please tell me if you think each of the following are having a mainly positive or mainly negative influence in the world . . . China.” Response fell in five categories: mainly positive, mainly negative, depends, neither/no difference, don’t know/NA. I use the percentage of respondents answering “mainly positive” as my first dependent variable “positive”, and the percentage of respondents answering “mainly negative” as the second dependent variable “negative”. I also calculate the percentage of “net positive” which equals to the value of “positive” minus the value of “negative”.

For the PEW survey, the question is “Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of China”. Similarly, I calculate the percentage of respondents answering “very favorable” and “somewhat favorable” as the value for the first dependent variable “positive”, and the percentage of respondents answering “very unfavorable” and “somewhat unfavorable” as the value for the second dependent variable “negative”. The third variable “net positive” equals to the value of “positive” minus the value of “negative”.

For these two datasets, a higher value for the first dependent variable “positive” and the third dependent variable “net positive” indicates a good national image of China in
the surveyed country, while a higher value for the second dependent variable “negative” indicates a bad image.

As Nye admitted, survey results are ephemeral and easily subject to contingency.\textsuperscript{111} To address this problem, I pool all the surveys and construct an index for the percentage of positive survey results from the repeated measurements as a remedy. Some countries were surveyed more than once\textsuperscript{112}. By examining all survey results for various years by different surveys, for each country I count the number of the positive results, defined as a survey in which the positive attitudes outnumbered the negative attitudes towards China. Then I calculate the percentage of these positive results in all the survey results a country had. For example, Canada has been surveyed 5 times, and in 4 surveys there were more positive views than negative views towards China. Thus, Canada scores 0.8 (4 divided by 5) in the index for percentage of positive survey results. The countries being surveyed only once would score either 1 or 0. Thus this index varies from 0 to 1 and could be regarded as a continuous dependent variable which is required for OLS regression.

To sum up, three datasets are used to analysis the relationship between China’s soft power and hard power resources and its national image: PIPA, PEW and the pooled dataset. Using the first two datasets could address the causality issue better because the independent variables precede the dependent variables. PIPA surveys were

\textsuperscript{111} Nye, \textit{Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics}, 18.
\textsuperscript{112} In total there are 68 countries being surveyed, and 41 countries were survey more than once.
conducted at the end of 2004, 2005 and 2006. Therefore, I use the data in 2004, 2005 and 2006 for the independent variables. PEW surveys were conducted in the middle of 2005, 2006 and 2007. By the same token, I use the data in 2004, 2005 and 2006 instead of 2005, 2006 and 2007 for the independent variables. The pooled dataset has more observations than the other two datasets, and therefore allows more variances for the independent variables. Furthermore, it has more stable dependent variables for its repeated measurement. However, the time order may be a concern because all the dependent variables and the independent variables are measured in average term during 2001 to 2006. Thus it could not guarantee a precondition for causality. That is to say, the result for PIPA and PEW datasets could be interpreted as a causal relation, while for the pooled dataset the result should be regarded as a correlation rather than causality.

3-5 Data Transformation

Before running the OLS regression, I observe the distribution of the data to see whether they need to be transformed. First I create a scatter matrix for the dependent variables and each independent variable in three datasets to check the linearity of the distribution. Some independent variables do not present a linear pattern and are highly skewed to the left. After taking the natural logarithm of these variables, the scatter plots show a linear pattern. “Cultural products”, “Education”, “Tourism”, “China’s import from the country”, “China’s export to the country” are transformed to the value of its natural logarithm. “Military expenditure (relative)” and “GDP (relative)” are
transformed to the difference of China’s figure in natural logarithm and the surveyed country’s figure in natural logarithm, i.e. ln(China’s value)-ln(the country’s value).
Chapter 4   Findings from the Regression Models: 
Results and Discussion

The previous chapter operationalizes China’s power resources and the outcome into measurable independent variables and dependent variables, and transforms the data so that the assumptions for using OLS regression are not violated. This chapter builds several models to examine the relationship between China’s soft power and hard power resources and China’s national image. First I construct a “soft power model” that uses independent variables of soft power resources to predict the dependent variables. Next I construct a “hard power model” that uses independent variables of hard power resources to predict the dependent variables. After running these two sets of models, I include both soft power and hard power independent variables as a full model. Thus I compare these three sets of models in terms of model fits and the changes in each coefficient.

4-1 Soft Power Model

The soft power model aims to assess the relationship between China’s soft power resources and its national image. From the regression results\(^{113}\), seven variables out of nine indicate a significant impact (i.e. significant coefficient) at least in one dataset, and four coefficients are both significant and in the same direction with the hypothesis.

\(^{113}\) See Table 4-1 Soft Power Model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th></th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th></th>
<th>Net positive</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEW</td>
<td>PIPA</td>
<td>PEW</td>
<td>PIPA</td>
<td>PEW</td>
<td>PIPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>37.17</td>
<td>61.30+</td>
<td>55.95</td>
<td>24.52</td>
<td>-18.79</td>
<td>36.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28.10)</td>
<td>(27.82)</td>
<td>(33.55)</td>
<td>(19.05)</td>
<td>(58.45)</td>
<td>(41.78)</td>
<td>(0.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>-10.21**</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>14.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5.10)</td>
<td>(27.82)</td>
<td>(6.09)</td>
<td>(3.06)</td>
<td>(10.61)</td>
<td>(6.71)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confucianism</td>
<td>-13.69**</td>
<td>-3.19</td>
<td>18.02**</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
<td>-31.72**</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4.29)</td>
<td>(27.82)</td>
<td>(5.12)</td>
<td>(3.58)</td>
<td>(8.91)</td>
<td>(7.84)</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural products</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.92)</td>
<td>(27.82)</td>
<td>(2.29)</td>
<td>(1.09)</td>
<td>(3.99)</td>
<td>(2.38)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confucius Institute</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>4.82+</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
<td>-5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.80)</td>
<td>(27.82)</td>
<td>(0.96)</td>
<td>(2.51)</td>
<td>(1.67)</td>
<td>(5.51)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>-3.99</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.57)</td>
<td>(27.82)</td>
<td>(3.06)</td>
<td>(1.93)</td>
<td>(5.34)</td>
<td>(4.24)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>5.80+</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>-3.93</td>
<td>5.14*</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>-3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.40)</td>
<td>(27.82)</td>
<td>(4.06)</td>
<td>(2.15)</td>
<td>(7.07)</td>
<td>(4.72)</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>-24.90***</td>
<td>-9.74</td>
<td>21.76**</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>-46.66***</td>
<td>-14.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5.87)</td>
<td>(27.82)</td>
<td>(7.01)</td>
<td>(5.18)</td>
<td>(12.21)</td>
<td>(11.35)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO participation</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.97*</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td>(27.82)</td>
<td>(0.82)</td>
<td>(0.54)</td>
<td>(1.42)</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign aid</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>-9.87**</td>
<td>-5.99</td>
<td>11.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4.77)</td>
<td>(27.82)</td>
<td>(5.69)</td>
<td>(3.59)</td>
<td>(9.92)</td>
<td>(7.87)</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4.53***</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>3.05**</td>
<td>8.33***</td>
<td>3.95**</td>
<td>3.86**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Entries are unstandardized coefficients from OLS regression (standard errors in parentheses). ***p < 0.001; **p < 0.01; *p < 0.05; +p < 0.1 (two-tailed test).

“Tradition”, “Democracy” and “Foreign aid” show strong impacts on China’s image in that they yield significant coefficients in more than one dataset with an identical sign to the hypothesis. A country that had paid tribute to ancient Chinese empires seems to agree that China has a mainly positive influence in the world. People in democratic countries tend to have unfavorable opinions of non-democratic China. China’s foreign aid programmes help to alleviate its negative image of having a mainly negative influence in the world and increase the chance of an overall positive image in a surveyed country.
“IO participation” has a weak impact on China’s image, as we observe only one significant coefficient in the PIPA dataset. Like “Foreign aid”, it alleviates China’s negative image of having a negative influence in the world.

“Confucianism” and “Confucius Institute” have strong impacts on China’s image. However, their impacts are opposite to the hypothesis: they impair rather than improve China’s national image. People tend to have unfavorable opinions of China if their country had been influenced by the traditional Chinese Confucian philosophy in history. The higher the demand for Chinese language study reflected in a larger number of Confucius Institutes, the worse China’s perceived influence in the world by that surveyed country.

Tourism has a mixed impact on China’s image. On the one hand, it generates a more favorable opinion of China. On the other hand, the countries from which more tourists visited China consider China’s influence in the world as mainly negative.

Chinese cultural exports and education seem to have little impact on China’s image in the results, as there is no significant coefficient even in one dataset.

4-2 Hard Power Model
The hard power model examines the relation between China’s hard power resources and its national image. Among all the ten variables, nine variables have at least one significant coefficient in three datasets.\textsuperscript{114}

Table 4-2 Hard Power Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive PEW</th>
<th>Positive PIPA***</th>
<th>Negative PEW</th>
<th>Negative PIPA</th>
<th>Net positive PEW</th>
<th>Net positive PIPA</th>
<th>pooled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>73.50+</td>
<td>154.20***</td>
<td>-22.39</td>
<td>-14.02</td>
<td>95.89</td>
<td>168.22**</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(37.27)</td>
<td>(38.68)</td>
<td>(34.68)</td>
<td>(27.09)</td>
<td>(67.36)</td>
<td>(55.21)</td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest MID</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.87+</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td>(1.04)</td>
<td>(1.06)</td>
<td>(0.73)</td>
<td>(2.07)</td>
<td>(1.48)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute times</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.35*</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-3.60E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(4.78E-03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military expenditure (relative)</td>
<td>-11.65</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>19.00*</td>
<td>-10.29*</td>
<td>-30.65+</td>
<td>17.63+</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.51)</td>
<td>(6.64)</td>
<td>(7.92)</td>
<td>(4.65)</td>
<td>(15.39)</td>
<td>(9.48)</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% military in GDP</td>
<td>-4.43</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>6.99*</td>
<td>-4.44*</td>
<td>-11.41+</td>
<td>7.96+</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.53)</td>
<td>(3.01)</td>
<td>(3.28)</td>
<td>(2.11)</td>
<td>(6.38)</td>
<td>(4.30)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP (relative)</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>-16.54*</td>
<td>-16.52+</td>
<td>11.09+</td>
<td>28.59</td>
<td>27.63*</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.65)</td>
<td>(8.14)</td>
<td>(8.98)</td>
<td>(5.70)</td>
<td>(17.44)</td>
<td>(11.62)</td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China’s import from the country</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>-4.55+</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>-3.20</td>
<td>-6.64*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.19)</td>
<td>(2.29)</td>
<td>(2.04)</td>
<td>(1.60)</td>
<td>(3.97)</td>
<td>(3.27)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China’s export to the country</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>-7.00+</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>-10.46+</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.89)</td>
<td>(4.01)</td>
<td>(3.62)</td>
<td>(2.81)</td>
<td>(7.03)</td>
<td>(5.73)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of trade with China in total trade</td>
<td>23.88</td>
<td>151.16*</td>
<td>-2.89</td>
<td>-73.21+</td>
<td>26.77</td>
<td>224.37**</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(59.36)</td>
<td>(57.60)</td>
<td>(55.23)</td>
<td>(40.34)</td>
<td>(107.27)</td>
<td>(82.23)</td>
<td>(1.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China’s import &gt; China’s export</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>-3.76</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.39)</td>
<td>(5.75)</td>
<td>(5.94)</td>
<td>(4.03)</td>
<td>(11.54)</td>
<td>(8.20)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export competition</td>
<td>-35.37**</td>
<td>-32.60**</td>
<td>37.30***</td>
<td>15.29*</td>
<td>-72.67***</td>
<td>-47.90**</td>
<td>-0.99***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11.39)</td>
<td>(10.36)</td>
<td>(10.60)</td>
<td>(7.26)</td>
<td>(20.58)</td>
<td>(14.79)</td>
<td>(0.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.63**</td>
<td>4.52***</td>
<td>3.21**</td>
<td>14.35***</td>
<td>3.22**</td>
<td>10.11***</td>
<td>6.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Entries are unstandardized coefficients from OLS regression (standard errors in parentheses).

***p< 0.001; **p< 0.01; *p< 0.05; +p< 0.1 (two-tailed test).

For military power resources, “Dispute times” has a weak negative impact on China’s

\textsuperscript{114} See Table 4-2 Hard Power Model.
The more disputes a country had with China in history, the less people in that country consider China’s influence as positive in the world. The other three variables, i.e. “Highest MID”, “Military expenditure (relative)” and “% military expenditure in GDP” have mixed effects on China’s image: they could improve and impair China’s image, as the sign of the significant coefficients do not show a pattern that consistently supports or rejects the hypothesis. A higher level of militarized dispute with China invites a greater impression of China’s negative influence as well as China’s positive influence in the world. In a country with weak military power, in terms of military spending compared to China, more people have unfavorable opinions of China, and less people have favorable opinion of China. One the other hand, more people consider China’s influence in the world as positive and fewer people consider China’s influence as negative. A country whose military expenditure takes up a larger proportion of its GDP has more unfavorable opinion and less favorable opinion of China. Meanwhile, in such a country more people think that China has a mainly positive influence in the world, and fewer people consider China’s influence in the world as negative.

For economic resources variables, four out of six show a consistent pattern among three datasets. China’s trade with a country, both import and export, has a negative impact on China’s image, as the greater import or export value, the worse China’s image became, as less people in that country consider China’s influence in the world to be positive. However, if we calculate the trade relation in terms of the percentage of
bilateral trade with China in the country’s total foreign trade, this trade impact becomes positive. A country tends to think of China’s influence in the world as mainly positive if China is its important trade partner, i.e. its trade with China takes up a high percentage of its total foreign trade. “Export competition” has the strongest impact on China’s image as all of its coefficients reach high significance level in three datasets. The consistent direction of the sign supports the hypothesis that countries with similar export structure with China, hence a high export competition with China, would consider China’s influence as mainly negative, and tend to have an unfavorable opinion of China. “GDP (relative)”, like “Military expenditure (relative)”, has a mixed effect on China’s image. Rich countries consider China’s influence as positive, while more people in these rich countries have unfavorable opinion of China. A country’s surplus or deficit in its bilateral trade with China, or trade balance, measured by “China’s import>China’s export”, has little impact on China’s image, as none of the coefficients is significant in three datasets.

4-3 The Full Model

The previous sections create two models: a soft power model and a hard power model that include only soft power resources and hard power resources in each model. Thus in the soft power model, the impact of hard power resources are ignored. As soft power resources and hard power resources exist together, they are expected to have impacts on China’s national image simultaneously. The third model (i.e. the third model) includes both soft power and hard power variables as independent variables.
This section first re-assesses each independent variable in the full model to see their unique contribution in predicting the dependent variables. Next, it compares three models in terms of the change in model fit, as well as the changes in value and sign for each coefficient.

Similar to the first two models, I use Pew, PIPA and the pooled datasets to run the regressions. Before comparing the three models, we should look at the regression results of the full models including both soft power and hard power variables.115

4-3-1 Soft Power Variables in the Full Model

For soft power resources, five out of nine variables yield significant coefficients at least in one model, and among them four variables support the hypothesis with expected signs.

The variable “Tradition” shows a relatively weak impact on China’s image as it has only one significant coefficient in three datasets. A country that had ever paid tribute to the ancient Chinese empires is less likely to consider China’s influence in the world as negative. China’s cultural exports have a positive influence on China’s image. The more cultural products that China exported to a country, the fewer respondents in that country would consider China’s global influence to be negative.

115 See Table 4-3 Full Model Including Soft Power and Hard Power Variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Net positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEW</td>
<td>PIPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>71.59</td>
<td>168.04**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(75.17)</td>
<td>(59.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.36)</td>
<td>(4.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confucianism</td>
<td>-12.69+</td>
<td>-13.94*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.93)</td>
<td>(6.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural products</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.68)</td>
<td>(2.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confucius Institute</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.76)</td>
<td>(3.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-3.75</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.20)</td>
<td>(2.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>14.94**</td>
<td>9.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.17)</td>
<td>(3.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>-28.34*</td>
<td>-9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10.69)</td>
<td>(8.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO participation</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.92)</td>
<td>(0.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign aid</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>-6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.15)</td>
<td>(5.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest MID</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.65)</td>
<td>(1.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute times</td>
<td>-0.85*</td>
<td>-0.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td>(0.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military expenditure (relative)</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
<td>14.50+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.15)</td>
<td>(8.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% military in GDP</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>6.98+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.80)</td>
<td>(3.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP (relative)</td>
<td>-11.11</td>
<td>-33.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15.75)</td>
<td>(10.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China’s import from the country</td>
<td>-2.56</td>
<td>-6.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.70)</td>
<td>(2.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China’s export to the country</td>
<td>-11.80+</td>
<td>-24.62***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.00)</td>
<td>(6.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of trade with China in total trade</td>
<td>127.01</td>
<td>342.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(137.38)</td>
<td>(99.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China’s import &gt; China’s export</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.11)</td>
<td>(6.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export competition</td>
<td>-14.31</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20.45)</td>
<td>(16.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.98**</td>
<td>3.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Entries are unstandardized coefficients from OLS regression (standard errors in parentheses).

***p < 0.001; **p < 0.01; *p < 0.05; +p < 0.1 (two-tailed test).
“Tourism” and “Democracy” have relatively strong impacts on China’s image, for both of them yield at least three significant coefficients with consistent sign to the hypothesis. In a country where there are more tourists visiting China, more people rate China’s global influence as positive. Tourism also helps to increase the percentage of favorable opinion and reduce the percentage of unfavorable opinion of China. In contrast, “Democracy” seems to be a constraint on China’s soft power. A democratic country tends to have unfavorable opinion of China while non-democratic countries have better attitudes towards China. The results also suggest that similar political value generates good impressions while different political value generates bad impressions among countries.

“Confucianism” has a strong impact on China’s image as it yields 5 significant coefficients in the models. However, the signs are consistently in the opposite direction to the hypothesis. The countries in the “Confucian cultural circle” seem to have worse impressions of China: there are less favorable opinion and more unfavorable opinion, as well as a smaller percentage of people consider China’s influence to be positive.

“Confucius Institute”, “Education”, “IO participation” and “Foreign aid” do not have any significant coefficient for all models. Their impacts are yet to be observed.
4-3-2 Hard Power Variables in the Full Models

For hard power resources, nine out of ten variables yield significant coefficients at least in one model, and among them three variables, namely “Highest MID”, “Dispute times” and “Export competition” have coefficients of the same sign as the hypothesis.

In the military aspect, “Highest MID” shows a minor impact on China’s image. More respondents think China has a negative influence in the world in a surveyed country if the militarized disputes level between this country and China is high. “Dispute times” shows a similar pattern and a much greater impact as it has significant coefficients among three datasets. A country tends to have more favorable opinion of China and consider China’s global influence as positive if it had fewer disputes with China in history. The sign of the coefficients for “Military expenditure (relative)” indicates that a country with a relatively weak military power in terms of low military spending rates China’s influence to be positive. Meanwhile, “% military expenditure in GDP” seems to indicate that a country with higher percentage of military spending in its GDP considers China’s influence in the world more positive.

In the economic aspect, the hypothesis or the expected sign of the coefficients are not as clear as the military and soft power variables. There are contending interpretations and debates on the impact of China’s economic strength and bilateral trade, whether it is a threat or an opportunity to other countries, thus China’s economic performance might improve or impair China’s national image. “Export competition” may be the
only variable that reaches a consensus: a country should have a negative view of China if the export competition between them is high. The results support this hypothesis with weak evidence, given only one significant coefficient in the pooled dataset.

China’s economic power over the country, measured by the difference between China’s GDP and the surveyed country’s GDP, shows a negative impact on China’s image in PIPA datasets. A richer country (i.e. China’s economic power is weaker compared to that country) seems to think positively of China’s influence in the world.

China’s imports from a country have a negative impact on China’s image. The more China imports from a country, the less people from that country consider China’s global influence as positive. Similarly, China’s exports to a country impair China’s image but to a greater extent. The more China exports to a country, the less people in that country have favorable opinion and rate positive influence for China. Interestingly, if we calculate the weight of the bilateral trade with China in the country’s total foreign trade, the trade relation becomes a positive factor for China’s image: a country views China’s influence in the world more positive if its trade with China takes up a higher percentage in its foreign trade. Surplus or deficit in the bilateral trade, measured by “China’s import>China’s export”, has little impact on China’s image, as none of its coefficient is significant. Export competition shows a weak negative impact as there is only one significant coefficient in the pooled dataset.
The chance is lower for a country to have warm feeling towards China if its export structure is similar to China’s.

4-4 Comparing the Models

The soft power model tells the impact of each soft power resource, without controlling the hard power variables. The full model tells the impact of each individual soft power resource after controlling the hard power variables, but it does not tell the collective impact of all the soft power resources. Do the soft power variables as a whole have an impact on the dependent variables? Do China’s soft power resources have a distinct contribution or a unique influence to China’s national image? To answer these questions, we need to detect the joint effect of China’s soft power variables, thus we compare the hard power model and the full model, by conducting an analysis of variance (ANOVA) test, to see how different the results are for a model without soft power variables (i.e. the hard power model) and a model with soft power variables (i.e. the full model). If these two models are significantly different, we can conclude that adding the soft power variables does strengthen the model fit and its predictive power. Therefore, China’s soft power resources as a whole do have some impact on China’s image. If these two models are indistinguishable statistically, it suggests that China’s soft power resources have little impact on China’s image, and China’s hard power resources are sufficient to explain the variances in China’s image in different countries. In other words, China’s national image is purely influenced by its hard power resources rather than its soft power resources.
Table 4-4 shows the comparison of the hard power model and the full model. The R square change, the F change and its significance level indicate that these two models are different in most of the comparison. For the PEW dataset, more than 33% of the variances in the dependent variables are due to the variances in the soft power variables, as shown in the R square change. The significance level of F change reaches at least 0.05. In the PIPA dataset, soft power variables have less unique impacts, with an average R square change of 0.13, and two out of three significant F change. In the pooled dataset, soft power variables have little impact on explaining the variances of the dependent variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEW</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>3.644</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIPA</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>2.121</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEW</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>2.958</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIPA</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>1.484</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEW</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIPA</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>1.847</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pooled</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the results we can see that the hard power model and the full model are different in most comparisons. The soft power variables as a whole have an impact on the dependent variables. China’s soft power resources have a distinct contribution to China’s national image. To be more specific, soft power resources show a greater impact in the PEW survey than the PIPA survey. Comparing the somewhat different
questions asked in these two surveys\textsuperscript{116}, we can conclude that soft power resources have a great impact on people’s opinion of China, be it “favorable or unfavorable” (as the PEW survey asked) and some impact on China’s influence in the world, be it “mainly positive or mainly negative” (as the PIPA survey asked).

\textbf{4-5 Comparing the Coefficients of the Soft Power Variables}

The previous section assesses the joint effect of China’s soft power resources on China’s national image, and concludes that the effect does exist. This section explores further to see the impact of each individual soft power resource on China’s image by comparing the coefficients in different models\textsuperscript{117}. Our purpose is to find out the change of the coefficients for each soft power variable after controlling the effect of hard power variables, so we compare the soft power model (i.e. the model with soft power variables only) and the full model (i.e. the model with both soft power and hard power variables). Specifically, for each independent variable, we compare the coefficients by examining the change of the sign, the significance level, and the absolute value of the standardized coefficient. A change of the sign for a coefficient tells that the variable plays a different role in influencing China’s image. It may shift from being a positive factor (i.e. improve China’s image) to a negative factor (i.e. impair China’s image) or vice versa. The significance level and the absolute value of the standardized coefficient indicate the predictive power for the variables. A high

\textsuperscript{116} PEW survey asks “Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of China”. PIPA survey asks “Please tell me if you think each of the following… (China) are having a mainly positive or mainly negative influence in the world”.  
\textsuperscript{117} See Table 4-5 Comparing the Standardized Coefficients of the Soft Power Variables in the Soft Power Model and the Full Model.
significance level and large absolute value of the standardized coefficient signify a powerful predictor and thus an important factor to shape China’s national image. To sum up, for each coefficient, the change of the sign indicates a change of the nature for this independent variable, while the change of the significance level and the absolute value indicate a change of the degree of its impact that this independent variable has on the dependent variables.

Table 4-5 Comparing the Standardized Coefficients of the Soft Power Variables in the Soft Power Model and the Full Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive PEW</th>
<th>Positive PIPA</th>
<th>Negative PEW</th>
<th>Negative PIPA</th>
<th>Net positive PEW</th>
<th>Net positive PIPA</th>
<th>pooled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft power model</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.36**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confucianism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft power model</td>
<td>-0.51**</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.59**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>-0.47+</td>
<td>-0.47*</td>
<td>0.69*</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.61*</td>
<td>-0.35+</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft power model</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.47*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.46+</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confucius Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft power model</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.21+</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft power model</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft power model</td>
<td>0.72*</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.73*</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>1.85**</td>
<td>1.34**</td>
<td>-1.69*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>1.83**</td>
<td>0.78*</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft power model</td>
<td>-0.77***</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.72***</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>-0.88*</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.77*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.85*</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft power model</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.35+</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft power model</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.30**</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<0.001; **p<0.01; *p<0.05; +p<0.1 (two-tailed test).

“Tradition” retains a positive effect on China’s image, but this effect loses some weight after adding the hard power variables: the significance level for the
coefficients drops and the absolute value of the standardized coefficient becomes smaller, meaning that its relative importance as a predictor decreases.

“Confucianism” retains a negative effect on China’s image. Although the significance levels for the coefficients decrease, the number of significant coefficients increases. Its relative importance as a predictor also increases for most of the significant standardized coefficients raise their absolute value.

“Cultural products” is the only variable that becomes significant in the full model from being non-significant in the soft power model. The increase in its absolute value of standardized coefficients indicates that it gains some weight in predicting the dependent variables after including the hard power independent variables.

In contrast, “Confucius Institute”, “IO participation” and “Foreign aid” become non-significant factors after hard power variables are controlled. They seem to have little impact on China’s image with other variables being equal.

“Tourism” has a mixed effect on China’s image in the soft power model for it generates more favorable opinion on the one hand, and invites perception of China’s negative global influence on the other hand. After adding the hard power variables, “Tourism” becomes a purely positive factor of China’s image. It helps to enhance the favorable opinion of China, and enhance the perception that China’s influence in the
world is positive.

“Democracy” loses some degree of significance for the coefficients. However, its relative importance as a predictor increases, witnessed by the rise of the absolute value of the standardized coefficients. It remains a strong factor that impairs China’s image by inciting unfavorable opinions of China.

“Education”, measured by the number of foreign students studying in China, remains a non-significant factor in all models. It seems to have little impact on China’s national image.

4-6 Comparing the Coefficients of the Hard Power Variables

The previous section discusses how the impact of soft power variables changes after adding the hard power variables. Using a similar comparative approach, this section aims to find out the changes of the coefficients for the hard power variables. However, our purpose is different: we are interested in the joint effect of the soft power variable on each hard power variable, rather than the changes of the hard power variables per se.

Table 4-6 compares the standardized coefficients for each hard power variable in the hard power model and the full model. The sign for all significant coefficients remains the same, meaning that soft power variables do not change the nature of each hard
power variable: there is no shift from being a positive factor to being a negative factor for China’s image. However, we find some variables lose their mixed effect. The once complex effect that both improves and impairs China’s image becomes simple: it either improves or impairs China’s image.

Table 4-6 Comparing the Standardized Coefficients of the Hard Power Variables in the Hard Power Model and the Full Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Net positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEW</td>
<td>PIPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest MID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard power model</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.31+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard power model</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>-0.99*</td>
<td>-0.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military expenditure (relative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard power model</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>2.02+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% military in GDP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard power model</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.71+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP (relative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard power model</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>-1.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>-4.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China’s import from the country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard power model</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.68+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.97+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China’s export to the country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard power model</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.74+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>-1.32+</td>
<td>-2.85***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of trade with China in total trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard power model</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China’s import &gt; China’s export</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard power model</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export competition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard power model</td>
<td>-0.53***</td>
<td>-0.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full model</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < 0.001; **p < 0.01; *p < 0.05; +p < 0.1 (two-tailed test).

The most dramatic change in significance level goes to “Dispute times” and “Export competition”. “Dispute times” gains more significant coefficients after including the soft power variables. In contrast, “Export competition” loses almost all significant coefficients. Controlling the soft power variables, “Dispute times” has a greater
negative impact on China’s national image, while “Export competition”, a seemingly strong factor that impairs China’s image, becomes much less influential or even negligible.

After controlling the soft power variables, the mixed effect of “Highest MID”, “Military expenditure (relative)” “% military in GDP” and “GDP (relative)” becomes simplex. “Highest MID” shows a negative impact on China’s image. “Military expenditure (relative)” shapes the perception of China’s influence in the world: a country with low military spending rates China’s influence to be positive. It does not affect people’s favorable or unfavorable opinion of China any more. Similarly, “% military in GDP” becomes irrelevant to people’s favorable or unfavorable opinion of China after controlling the soft power variables. It only affects people’s perception of China’s global influence: a country with higher percentage of military spending in its GDP considers China’s influence in the world more positive. China’s economic power over the country, measured by “GDP (relative)”, used to be a negative factor for China’s global influence and a positive factor for China’s favorability among the respondents in the hard power model. After adding the soft power variables, it only affects China’s global influence: a poor country (i.e. China’s economic power is strong compared to that country) seems to consider China’s influence in the world as mainly negative.

The effect of China’s trade relations with the surveyed country remains unchanged in
nature. China’s imports and exports still have negative impacts on China’s image, while a high percentage of trade with China in the country’s total trade improves China’s image as more respondents in that country agree that China has a mainly positive influence in the world. The trade balance, i.e. whether China imports more from or exports more to the country, remains irrelevant to China’s image, as there are no significant coefficient for “China’s import>China’s export” in all models.
Chapter 5  Conclusion

The previous chapters operationalize China’s soft power in terms of its resources and its outcome, and build several models to test the relationship between them. Do China’s soft power resources contribute to a positive image? Do China’s soft power resources play a more important role in shaping its image than China’s hard power resources do? What are the factors that influence China’s national image? This chapter aims to answer these questions by analyzing the research findings from theoretical and empirical perspectives, and discuss the implications for China’s national image building.

5-1 Theoretical Findings

5-1-1 The Relation between Resources and Outcome Should Not be Taken for Granted

We start to analyze power from its two components: its resource and its outcome. The regression result supports the argument that resources may or may not be transferred to a desirable outcome. It depends on how resources are tapped. Resource itself does not have any value orientation: it can be good or bad, depending on how the power holder uses it, and depending on how the power receiver interprets the intention and outcome of the usage of the power.

As Nye points out, “the effectiveness of any power resource depends on the
context.¹¹⁸ “Having power resources does not guarantee that you will always get the outcome you want.”¹¹⁹ “Power resources cannot be judged without knowing the context.”¹²⁰ Our findings further support this point. On the one hand, soft power resources do not necessarily contribute to a desirable outcome or improve China’s national image. Education that attracts foreign students to study in a country is considered to be one resource of this country’s soft power. However, our findings indicate that for China this resource fails to result in a desirable outcome: education did not improve China’s national image. Confucianism, one of the core values of Chinese culture, which Chinese people are proud of and willing to promote to other countries, is not necessarily accepted by other countries. The regression result suggests that Confucianism actually impairs China’s national image. On the other hand, some hard power resources do not lead to the expected negative outcome or impair China’s image. A trade deficit with China is often believed to be a negative factor for China’s image. A country that imports more from China than it exports to China is expected to have a less favorable impression of China. However, the regression result shows that the trade balance has little impact on China’s image.

5-1-2 Definition Revisited

Nye defined soft power as the ability to co-opt rather than coerce other countries to achieve its policy aim. To be qualified as “soft power”, the power resource should be non-material and the power outcome should be desirable. In that sense, China’s soft

¹¹⁸ Nye, Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics, 12.
¹¹⁹ Ibid., 3.
¹²⁰ Ibid., 4.
power should only include the power of tourism, tradition and cultural products. We could presume that each country’s soft power differs from one another. Strictly speaking, we could not talk about a country’s soft power without knowing whether the resource of this soft power could contribute to a desirable outcome. Thus it will be better and safer to talk about “soft power resources” that may or may not lead to a desirable outcome, rather than talk about “soft power” which needs more examination.

5-2 Empirical Findings

5-2-1 The Role of Soft Power Resources and Hard Power Resources in China’s Image Building

5-2-1-1 Both Hard Power and Soft Power Resources Matter

We do not observe that soft power variables or hard power variables dominate or prevail over the other. China’s national image is influenced by its hard power and soft power resources. Two ANOVA tests assess the joint effect of soft power variables and the joint effect of hard power variables by comparing different models. The result shown in Table 4-4 and Table 5-1 confirms that soft power resources and hard power resources do have their unique impacts on China’s image. By observing the value of R square change and F change, we may further conclude that soft power resources have a greater impact on China’s favorability among the respondents (shown in the PEW dataset), while hard power resources have a greater impact on China’s perceived influence in the world (shown in the PIPA dataset).
As China’s integration into the international community deepens, people in other countries have more access to know the real China, and they form their perception on a more comprehensive basis. Thus both material and non-material forms of power work to shape people’s attitudes towards China.

5-2-1-2 Soft Power Resources Do Have a Unique Contribution to Influence China’s National Image

First of all, by comparing the models with and without soft power variables, we conclude that soft power resources as a whole do have some joint effect on people’s opinion of China and their perception of China’s influence in the world.

Furthermore, by controlling hard power variables, some soft power variables still have significant impacts on China’s image individually. A multiple regression has the value of indicating the unique contribution of each variable in explaining the variation of the dependent variables, holding other variables constant. As shown in the full model, after controlling China’s hard power variables, China’s soft power variables still have some significant coefficients. The variation of soft power resources in different countries does have a unique contribution to explain the variation of China’s image.

5-2-1-3 Hard Power Resources Seem More Important in Affecting China’s National Image

Although both soft power and hard power variables have significant impacts on the dependent variables, their impacts differ in the degree of explaining the variation of
the dependent variables. Hard power variables seem more powerful in predicting the
dependent variables than soft power variables. First, the joint effect of hard power
variables is stronger than the joint effect of soft power variables. Two ANOVA tests
show that hard power variables render a higher level of significance for the F change
and greater R square change than soft power variables do\textsuperscript{121}. Second, comparing the
nested model and the full model, more hard power variables remain significant than
soft power variables. The soft power variables “Confucius Institute”, “IO
participation”, and “Foreign aid” lose their significance in three datasets after
controlling the hard power variables, while no hard power variables become
non-significant in all datasets after controlling the soft power variables. To conclude,
hard power resources seem more influential on China’s national image than soft
power resources, both in terms of the joint effect and the effect of each individual
resource.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5-1 ANOVA Test for the Joint Effect of the Hard Power Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Comparing soft power model and the full model)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td>PEW 0.214</td>
<td>2.114</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PIPA 0.483</td>
<td>4.412</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td>PEW 0.259</td>
<td>2.082</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PIPA 0.213</td>
<td>3.696</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net positive</td>
<td>PEW 0.240</td>
<td>2.281</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PIPA 0.373</td>
<td>5.233</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pooled 0.347</td>
<td>3.196</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{121} See Table 4-4 ANOVA Test for the Joint Effect of the Soft Power Variables and Table 5-1 ANOVA Test for the
Joint Effect of the Hard Power Variables.
5-2-2 Factors that Influence China’s Image

5-2-2-1 Soft Power Factors

From the full model we can see that some soft power resources improve China’s image, such as “Tourism”, “Tradition” and “Cultural products” while others impair China’s image, such as “Confucianism” and “Democracy”. Among all the soft power resources, “Tradition”, “Confucianism”, “Tourism” and “Democracy” have greater impacts than others on China’s image as they remain significant after controlling the hard power variables. (i.e. they are significant in both soft power model and the full model.) To be more specific, “Democracy” affects people’s opinion of China, while “Tradition” and “Cultural products” affect people’s perception of China’s influence in the world. “Confucianism” and “Tourism” affect both China’s favorability (i.e. people’s favorable and unfavorable opinion of China) and its perceived influence in the world.

5-2-2-2 Hard Power Factors

Besides soft power resources, we find some hard power resources that shape China’s image as well. From the full model we can see that “Military expenditure (relative)”, “% military expenditure in GDP” and “% trade with China in total trade” improve China’s image, while “Highest MID”, “Dispute times”, “GDP (relative)”, “China’s import from the country” “China’s export to the country” and “Export competition” impair China’s image. To be more specific, “Highest MID”, “Military expenditure (relative)”, “% military expenditure in GDP”, “GDP (relative)”, “China’s import from
the country” and “% trade with China in total trade” affect people’s perception of China’s influence in the world. “Dispute times” and “China’s export to the country” affect both China’s favorability (i.e. people’s favorable and unfavorable opinion of China) and its perceived influence in the world.

5-2-2-3 Historical Factors

Historical factors, or long term factors, play an important role in shaping China’s image. Among the nineteen independent variables, five independent variables, namely “Tradition”, “Confucianism”, “Democracy”, “Highest MID” and “Dispute times” are historical or long term factors. All of these factors have significant coefficients in both the nested models and the full models. China’s historical relationship with other countries greatly influences people’s impressions of modern China. An ANOVA test for the joint effect of these historical or long term factors shows significant F change with an average R square change of 23% in the PEW dataset. For the PIPA and the pooled dataset, only some of the F changes are significant. It means that these historical or long term factors have a stronger joint effect on China’s favorability measured by people’s favorable and unfavorable opinion of China, and a weak effect on China’s perceived global influence. Unfortunately, besides “Tradition”, these historical or long term factors are negative factors that impair China’s image.

Table 5-2 ANOVA Test for the Joint Effect of the Long Term Factors

122 See Table 4-5 Comparing the Standardized Coefficients of the Soft Power Variables in the Soft Power Model and the Full Model and Table 4-6 Comparing the Standardized Coefficients of the Hard Power Variables in the Hard Power Model and the Full Model.
123 See Table 5-2 ANOVA Test for the Joint Effect of the Long Term Factors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEW</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>4.451</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIPA</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>3.536</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEW</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>3.778</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIPA</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>1.665</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEW</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>4.567</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIPA</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>2.122</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pooled</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>1.511</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5-3 Implications for China’s Image Building

5-3-1 Historical Factors: Cannot Change?

As discussed above, historical or long term factors play a significant role in influencing China’s national image. Historical factors, such as “Tradition”, “Confucianism”, “Highest MID level” and “Dispute times” cannot be changed. However, the degree of their impacts can be changed if handled properly. How the Chinese government transfers the historical glory into credit, and minimizes the destructive impact of the historical shadow is a challenge for China’s image improvement.

China’s political system or political culture is acknowledged as a constraint for China’s soft power projection.124 “The authoritarian nature of the Chinese government, corruption, loose rule of law, and closed operation of the government are in deep conflict with the world’s dominant trend of democratization and proliferation of

---

124 Most of the studies on China’s soft power acknowledge this point. For example, Zhang, "Tapping Soft Power: Managing China's 'Peaceful Rise' and the Implications for the World."; Gill and Huang, "Sources and Limits of Chinese 'Soft Power'."; Huang and Ding, "Dragon's Underbelly: An Analysis of China's Soft Power."
liberal values.”125 Our findings further support this point: the variable “Democracy”, a long term and significant factor, impairs China’s image. Further reform towards a more democratic political system could improve China’s favorability among foreign countries.

5-3-2 Cultural Products and Tourism: although Nascent but Already Work

China’s export of cultural products helps to shape people’s view of China’s influence in the world. According to a report on international flows of selected cultural goods and services from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), “China started to be an important player in trade flows from the early 1990s. Since the mid-1990s, the Chinese trade balance has become positive. It is also the case for core cultural goods; China is a net exporter with US$ 5.8 billion in exports but only US$1.2 billion in imports.”126 In 2002, China ranked No. 4 in total core cultural goods export in the world. In terms of export value, it ranked No. 1 in audiovisual media, No. 2 in visual arts, No. 7 in books, No. 7 in other printed matter, and No. 14 in recorded media.127

Tourism wins credit for China’s image building. According to Country Brand Index 2005 that studies the global tourism industry, China ranks No. 1 for “most improved country brands” and “rising star country brand”. It is in the top ten of the best country

125 Ibid. 122.
127 Ibid. See Annex I, Table V “Top 20 importers and exporters for the main core cultural goods categories”.
brands for “art and culture”, “history”, “convention” and “business”.128

5-3-3 Language and Education: No Impact Yet

Chinese language and education attractiveness are growing in recent years, as the numbers of foreign students and Chinese language learners increase rapidly. However, the regression result does not show any positive impact of these two soft power resources on China’s image. One possibility is that this impact takes time to be seen. We could only see the expected positive impact in the long run. Another possibility may be due to the relative low quality of education that doesn’t satisfy the foreign students or meet their expectations. It may be equally true that foreign students come to China just for economic concerns. The fact that they are attracted by the potential economic benefit may not result in an improved opinion of China.

5-3-4 International Organization Participation: from Passive to Active

Our finding suggests that international organization participation does not improve China’s national image. Although China participates in quite a few international organizations129, it does not play an active and constructive role in most of the organizations. China’s involvement in agenda setting, providing public goods and other initiatives is quite limited. This passive participation does not improve China’s national image. China should make use of international organization as a multilateral

platform to be a “responsible power”. Otherwise international organization participation could not help to improve China’s image.

5-3-5 Foreign Aid: Who Benefits?

Foreign aid has little contribution to a positive image for China. “China has developed a substantial aid program. From almost nothing in the mid-1990s, Chinese aid now can compete with American aid programs in parts of Southeast Asia, Latin America, and Africa.”\textsuperscript{130} China’s aid has not only grown but also become more sophisticated.\textsuperscript{131} However, our regression result indicates that foreign aid has little contribution to improving China’s image. One possible reason is that China promises much more than it can deliver. “Still a developing country, China could overplay its hand, making promises to other nations that it cannot fulfill.” “Indeed, after Chinese leaders make promises of new aid during visits overseas, Beijing sometimes fails to follow through with the cash.”\textsuperscript{132} “China’s promises of aid and investment could take years to materialize, yet Beijing has created heightened expectations about its potential as a donor and investor in many countries.”\textsuperscript{133} Not fulfilling the aid promise will destroy China’s credibility, thus impairing China’s image greatly.

Another reason lies in the recipient countries. The aid may not benefit the people if the recipient country has a corrupt government. What’s worse, “China’s aid policies

\textsuperscript{130} Kurlantzick, Charm Offensive: How China's Soft Power Is Transforming the World, 97.
\textsuperscript{131} Ibid., 101.
\textsuperscript{132} Ibid., 98-99.
\textsuperscript{133} Ibid., 230.
could undermine efforts by Western governments and international financial institutions to demand better governance and environmental regulation from aid recipients.”\textsuperscript{134} Take Angola for example. “International corruption watchdogs warn that the Chinese assistance, given with no conditions, will allow the Angolan government to revert to its old habits, skimming the petroleum cream for itself. Already Angola has backed off its EITI commitment and postponed a mission by the World Bank designed to teach the country about transparency.”\textsuperscript{135} Foreign aid could improve China’s image only if the aid benefits the people rather than sustains the corrupt government.

5-3-6 Hard Power Resources: Angel or Devil?

The hard power variables show a more complex pattern. Measured by different criteria, China’s hard power plays different roles. We cannot conclude that in general China’s hard power resources improve or impair China’s national image. In the aspect of military power, a country with low military spending rates China’s influence to be positive. On the other hand, a country which spends more of its GDP in military expenditure regards China’s influence to be positive. In the trade aspect, China’s influence is viewed more positively by the country that imports less from or exports less to China. Bilateral trade, in terms of dollar value, seems to impair China’s image. However, if China is an important trade partner to a country as indicated by a high percentage of the bilateral trade with China in that country’s total trade, this trade

\textsuperscript{134} Ibid., 171.
\textsuperscript{135} Ibid., 174.
impact is a positive factor and improves China’s image. Other trade impacts, commonly believed to be positive or negative, such as having a trade surplus or deficit with China, and how fierce the export competition is with China\textsuperscript{136}, actually show little or no impact on China’s image. To improve China’s national image, conventional wisdom on the role of material power may not hold. Subtle military and economic policies from further studies are needed.

To sum up, China’s national image is influenced by both its hard power resources and soft power resources. China’s soft power resources do work to affect its image, although to a lesser degree compared to its hard power. “Tradition”, “Cultural products”, “Tourism”, “Military expenditure (relative)”, “% military expenditure in GDP” and “% trade with China in total trade” improve China’s image while “Confucianism”, “Democracy”, “Highest MID”, “Dispute times”, “GDP (relative)”, “China’s import from the country”, “China’s export to the country” and “Export competition” impair China’s image. The findings suggest that proper handling of the historical factors, a reform towards a more democratic political system, promotion of its cultural products export and inbound tourism, more active participation in the international organizations, effective aid programs that benefit the people and subtle policy to deal with the impact of material power should be on the agenda for China’s image building.
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### Appendix 1 Independent variable description

#### Soft Power Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>scores 1 if the country was in Chinese tribute system in history, or had ever pay tribute the Chinese empires, and scores 0 if it was not.</td>
<td>Li, Yunquan. <em>History of Tribute System: A Study of Ancient China’s Foreign Relations</em>. Beijing: Xinhua Press, 2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confucianism</td>
<td>2 for the countries within the “Confucian cultural circle” which had been influenced deeply by Confucianism; 1 for the countries within the “Confucian cultural circle” but had been influenced by Confucianism less than those scoring 2; 0 for those countries outside the “Confucian cultural circle”</td>
<td><em>Confucianism and Modern Society</em>. Edited by Chengxuan He and Suping Li. Shenyang: Shenyang Press, 2001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural products</td>
<td>China’s cultural products export to the country, in million US dollars, in natural logarithm term. Includes: books, newspaper/journal, music, works of art/antiques</td>
<td>United Nation Commodity Trade Statistics Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confucius Institute</td>
<td>Number of Confucius Institute in the country</td>
<td>Confucius Institute Division, The Office of Chinese Language Council International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Number of foreign student from a country to study in China, in natural logarithm term</td>
<td><em>China’s Foreign Affairs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Number of tourist from a country, in natural logarithm term</td>
<td><em>Yearbook of Chinese foreign economic statistics</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>1 if the country’s democracy score is greater than 5, 0 otherwise</td>
<td>Polity IV Country Report. 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO participation</td>
<td>the number of international organizations that both China and a country take part in</td>
<td>CIA: The World Factbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign aid</td>
<td>1 if China gave foreign aid to the country, 0 otherwise</td>
<td>China Commerce Yearbook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Hard Power Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military expenditure (relative)</td>
<td>China’s military expenditure minus that country’s military expenditure, in million US dollars, in natural logarithm term, i.e. ( \ln(\text{China’s military expenditure}) - \ln(\text{the country’s military expenditure}) )</td>
<td>SIPRI military expenditure database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% military in GDP</td>
<td>the percentage of military expenditure in GDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest MID</td>
<td>the highest hostility level in dispute (5 being the highest)</td>
<td>COW. Militarized Interstate Disputes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute times</td>
<td>the times of disputes between China and a country during 1816 and 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP (relative)</td>
<td>China’s GDP minus the country’s GDP, in million US dollars, in natural logarithm term, i.e. ( \ln(\text{China’s GDP}) - \ln(\text{the country’s GDP}) )</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund (IMF), International Financial Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China’s import from the country</td>
<td>China’s import from the country, in million US dollars, in natural logarithm term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China’s export to the country</td>
<td>China’s export to the country to the country, in million US dollars, in natural logarithm term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of trade with China in total trade</td>
<td>the percentage of trade with China as the country’s total foreign trade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China’s import&gt;China’s export</td>
<td>1 if China’s import is greater than its export to the country, and 0 if China’s export is greater than its import from that country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export competition</td>
<td>coefficient of specialization: the greater the value is, the greater export competition between China and the country</td>
<td>Calculated by the author, data from United Nation Commodity Trade Statistics Database</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2 Dependent variable description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive (PIPA)</td>
<td>% of “mainly positive”</td>
<td>Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA): “Please tell me if you think each of the following are having a mainly positive or mainly negative influence in the world . . . China [Mainly positive/Mainly negative/Depends/Neither, no difference/DK/NA].” 79 observations in 2004, 2005 and 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (PIPA)</td>
<td>% of “mainly negative”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net positive (PIPA)</td>
<td>% of “mainly positive” minus % of “mainly negative”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive (PEW)</td>
<td>% of “very favorable/somewhat favorable”</td>
<td>Pew Global Attitudes Project (PEW): “Please tell me if you have a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion of China.” 76 observations in 2005, 2006 and 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative (PEW)</td>
<td>% of “somewhat unfavorable/very unfavorable”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net positive (PEW)</td>
<td>% of “very favorable/somewhat favorable” minus % of “somewhat unfavorable/very unfavorable”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net positive (pooled)</td>
<td>% of positive survey results in all the surveys a country had.</td>
<td>Calculated by the author. The surveys include: Transatlantic Trends, PIPA, Pew, AsiaBarometer, East Asia Barometer. 68 countries being surveyed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>