Analyzing the Effects of International Tourism on Soft Power

By Jiangyun Yang

Capstone Paper for Master of Arts in International Relations
Professor: Dr. Michael Pfau
University of San Diego
23rd May 2019

Contents

Figures

Abstract

Soft power is a state's ability to get others to do what it wants them to do by the force of attraction and persuasion, which is different with hard power, relying on coercion or punishment. One of the key opponents of building soft power is positive communication between people. Therefore, many scholars rightly think cross-border tourism, which carries billions of times of people communication, as a useful approach to build soft power. However, there are very few empirical researches about the effects of international tourism on soft power, which is the focus of this paper. Through panel data regression analysis, the author found out receiving tourists helps build soft power in destination countries, which also could receive strongly negative effects due to the high expenditures of each tourist. However, sending people traveling abroad may produce negative national images of origin countries. This paper suggests that for building soft power by tourism, policymakers should focus on building their countries' charm to attract visitors. Appropriate official sponsors and cooperation in controlling tourists' expenditures are possibly helpful too. But the official involvement can also produce negative effects due to people's natural antipathy towards governments.

Key Words

Soft Power, International Tourism, Inbound Tourists, Outbound Tourists

Introduction

The idea of soft power was promoted in 1990 by Joseph S. Nye Jr, the former dean of Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government. Soft power is a state's ability to get others to do what it wants them to go through the power of attraction and persuasion (Keohane and Nye 1998; Nye 2004), attempting to "structure issues, advance their own understandings" and consciously pursuing to frame "the behavior and preferences of others in order to achieve specific goals, extremely important in a political context to allow others to see the same goal" (Nye, 2008a, 2008b; Hall, 2010)[1]. The foundational basis of the concept of "soft power" is the daily laborious work "on the ground", targeted at developing strong and positive relationships[2]. It is, therefore "an authority or power-to-act used to invoke centuries-old lines of thought and lengthy-standing ways of searching and discovering the world" (Hollinshead, 2011, p. 1115)[3]. Soft power exercises impact indirectly by constructing a certain atmosphere that can lead to changes in the diplomatic decisions, impacted not only by political elites but also by public opinion[4]. It is about economic and especially cultural power, unlike the hard power of military capability, which relies on punishment or coercion[5]. The ultimate goal of soft power is transforming appeal into influence[6].

Soft power is different from hard power, which relies excessively on military or economic policy instruments, often triggering long-term backlashes that harm the interests of a country. Soft power is "a nation's grand strategy charm-offensive policy", a smart tool achieving successful international politics in shaping others' behaviors internally and unconsciously.

There are three primary resources of soft power, drawing from Nye's argument: "a country's culture (in which it becomes attractive to others), its political values (where it lives up to them at domestically and internationally) and its foreign policies (where it is regarded as legitimate and has moral authority)"[7]. All of them promote a positive external image of the state that attracts other nations, and consequently, the influence of such state in the world politics increases (Nye, 2005).

---

[1] Chen, Yuwen. and Duggan, N. Soft power and tourism: a study of Chinese outbound tourism to Africa, Journal of China and International Relations, 4(1), pp. 45-66, 2016.
[2] Kwek, Anna, Ying Wang, and David B. Weaver, Retail Tours in China for Overseas Chinese: Soft Power or Hard Sell? Annals of Tourism Research 44, January 1, 2014.
[3] Kwek, Anna, Ying Wang, and David B. Weaver, Retail Tours in China for Overseas Chinese: Soft Power or Hard Sell? Annals of Tourism Research 44, January 1, 2014.
[4] Servaes, Jan, *Soft power and public diplomacy: The new frontier for public relations and international communication between the US and China,* Public Relations Review, page 643-651, 2012.
[5] Barry Buzan, *Confusing Public Diplomacy and Soft Power*, Asia Dialogue, 10 March 2016.
[6] Bunakov, Oleg, *Tourism as a Method of "Soft Power" in Modern Diplomacy on the Example of the Russian Federation,* 2008.
[7] Nye, Joseph S., *Public Diplomacy and Soft Power,* The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 616, page 94–109, March 2008.

Soft power attributes include but are not limited to media, digital technology, music, food, tourism, education, arts and literature, and the environment[8]. The degree of attraction from these attributes can be divided into short-term and long-term categories. To illustrate that, buying tickets to watch movies is the shortest term, visiting a country and studying abroad is longer, and emigrating is the longest term. The more and deeper the attractive of a country, the more and higher engagement foreigners do.

Among all of these attributes, tourism as a mechanism of building "the soft power" in international politics is the tool through which the state will be capable to tell the story of itself to the world. When publics of the targeted country like your country, it is likely to build positive relationships with and influence government policies of that country. Besides, soft power is built by positive communication, mainly happening during people-to-people interaction. According to the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), there are 1.4 billion cross-border people in 2018[9]. This huge number of people-to-people exchange carried by tourism makes it worthy for soft power study to focus on the effects of tourism. Besides, Nye also uses the shrinking size of tourists between 2000 and 2003, when the dollar was weak, to illustrate that the decreasing soft power of the United States.

1   Literature Review

Tourism study scholars are increasingly agreeing to the opinion that outbound and inbound tourism as people-to-people exchange forums are both tools of soft power (Kwek, Wang & Weaver, 2014; Gou, Li & Wang, 2014; Weaver, 2015; Stumpf & Swanger, 2015)[10][11][12][13]. Some scholars think outbound tourism is more effective than inbound tourism, (Fan, 2010; Tse, 2013; Honggang Xu, Ke Wang & Young Mi Song 2018), and some scholars only focus on inbound tourism. (Anna Kwek, Ying Wang, David B. Weaver, 2013)[14]. Most of these scholars use China as their case for study, some of them also use Russia, Europe Union, and the United States. According to their

---

[8] Admin, *Engaging cities: the growing relevance of soft power to city reputations in Asia pacific,* corporate communication, Forum for Asia, city reputation, Engaging Cities, soft power. December 16, 2014.
[9] Max Roser, *Tourism*, online at OurWorldInData.org, 2019. Retrieved from: https://ourworldindata.org/tourism
[10] Chen, Yuwen. and Duggan, N. Soft power and tourism: a study of Chinese outbound tourism to Africa, Journal of China and International Relations, 4(1), pp. 45-66, 2016.
[11] Fan, S. P. , *The effects of China's tourism diplomacy and a "united front"*,   China: An International Journal, 8(02), page 247–281, 2010.
[12] Tony S.M. Tse, *Chinese Outbound Tourism as a Form of Diplomacy*, Tourism Planning & Development, page 149-158, 2013.
[13] Honggang Xu, Ke Wang, and Young Mi Song, *Chinese outbound tourism and soft power,* Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events, 2018.
[14] Kwek, Anna, Ying Wang, and David B. Weaver, Retail Tours in China for Overseas Chinese: Soft Power or Hard Sell? Annals of Tourism Research 44, January 1, 2014.

standpoints, the effects of tourism on building soft power can be divided into two parts, respectively for receiving and sending sides.

First of all, it becomes the tourist authorities' principal mandate to characterize a pretty attractive image of the nation and its places to the global public. Such well-designed brand of the destination country entails strong glorifying images of itself to counter the negative images (Ooi, 2014, 2016)[15]. And in this way, the state will be capable to tell its own story to the world (Oleg, 2017)[16].

Secondly, based on Nye's theory, both foreign policy and cultural consumption are resources of soft power. Tourism policy can be placed with foreign policy, transmitting political values, cultural values, beliefs, and agendas by impressing audience minds and souls in a particular country or around the world. In this way, it will eventually enhance cultural consumption by other nations (Ooi, 2014, 2016)[17].

Thirdly, by creating synergies and bridging differences, tourism will build trust, openness and mutual understanding between the host and the guest country.[18] To achieve this goal, tourism creates a forum enabling travelers to interact with locals and to engage with, live, experience and imbibe the culture of other society/community. This experience will "leave psychological, emotive, sensitive, intellectual, aesthetic, and spiritual impacts" in tourists[19], helping tourists cultivate greater and deeper understanding, and empathy of the destination country's values, culture, way of life of the population. As Ooi said, "tourism works the best way through all the resources because with it or through it, soft power works internally and unknowingly" (Ooi, 2016) [20].

For the sending side, tourism may attract destination countries to pursuit good political relations with and follow some criteria setting by origin countries[21]. To be specific, tourism brings revenues to the budget, attracts investment inward, and increases employment of the population. All of these benefits will drive destination countries to build benign political relations with main source nations to pave the way for cooperation[22]. (Kim, Guo & Argusa, 2005). For making this argument, many scholars take the example of China's Approved Destination Status (ADS) policy, "an intergovernmental arrangement between the Chinese government and a destination, by

---

[15] Ooi CS, *Soft power, tourism,* Jafari J., Xiao H. (eds) Encyclopedia of Tourism. Springer, Cham, 2015.

[16] Bunakov, Oleg, *Tourism as a Method of "Soft Power" in Modern Diplomacy on the Example of the Russian Federation,* 2008.

[17] Pallavi Sharma, *Beyond the Euro-trip: Tourism As Means To European Union Soft Power*, South Asian University Year of submission: 2014.

[18] Steve Webel, *Understanding China's "Soft Power" and Influence*, Friendsofeurope.org. December 2107. https://www.friendsofeurope.org/sites/default/files/2017-12/Tourism_report_web_rev.pdf

[19] Pallavi Sharma, *Beyond the Euro-trip: Tourism as Means To European Union Soft Power*, South Asian University Year of submission: 2014.

[20] Bunakov, Oleg, *Tourism as a Method of "Soft Power" in Modern Diplomacy on the Example of the Russian Federation,* 2008.

[21] Tony S.M. Tse, *Chinese Outbound Tourism as a Form of Diplomacy*, Tourism Planning & Development, page 149-158, 2013.

[22] Chen, Yuwen. and Duggan, N. Soft power and tourism: a study of Chinese outbound tourism to Africa, Journal of China and International Relations, 4(1), pp. 45-66, 2016.

the permission of which Chinese tourists are allowed to engage in leisure travel to that destination in groups". And most of them think ADS is a very useful tool for the Chinese government to gain diplomatic success by soft power.

Besides political relations, people-to-people communication also promoted by the high economic benefits of tourism. To maximum economic benefits, commercial organizations need to interpret consumer motivation and behavior[23], local travel operators need to learn the language and culture of tourists and to understand their preferences and behaviors (Kings 2014). Part of this knowledge is acquired through people communication[24].

Last but not least, the outsider travelers bring their countries' message and in this way, they change the stereotypical views established against the other countries (Ooi, 2014, 2016).

However, some scholars, such as Honggang Xu, Ke Wang, and Young Mi Song, think the different effects of soft power building are more likely to impacted by the similarity between the host and guest countries. To be specific, countries having stronger economic ties, cultural similarities and shared values are more effective than others in building soft power through outbound tourism[25].

Besides, since soft power relying on tourism is created through policies of the government, which include authorized destination status, tourism culture activities, foreign tourism financial support and tourism cooperation, as well as interactions amongst the tourists and hosts in addition to businesses[26], some scholars, such as Dynon and Ferguson, criticize that "how the attraction of tourism can be translated into the results of foreign policy" is debatable. The expectation that international tourists will perform as "diplomats for their countries is more a beautiful slogan than reality" (Dynon, 2013)[27]. Not only because cultural encounters are not always peaceful[28], but also because discrepancies may exist between the soft power messages sent to the targeted audience and the subjective understanding of the message by the target group. (Ferguson, 2003)[29].

Scholars mentioned above did a masterful job in explaining the effects of tourism on soft power building. However, most of them achieve their argument by case study and there are only a few empirical researches about tourism and soft power. One of the most specific empirical research is Soft Power Today reported by the British Council, the

---

[23] Admin, *Engaging cities: the growing relevance of soft power to city reputations in Asia pacific,* corporate communication, Forum for Asia, city reputation, Engaging Cities, soft power. December 16, 2014.

[24] Chen, Yuwen. and Duggan, N. Soft power and tourism: a study of Chinese outbound tourism to Africa, Journal of China and International Relations, 4(1), pp. 45-66, 2016.

[25] Honggang Xu, Ke Wang, and Young Mi Song, *Chinese outbound tourism and soft power,* Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events, 2018.

[26] Honggang Xu, Ke Wang, and Young Mi Song, *Chinese outbound tourism and soft power,* Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events, 2018.

[27] Chen, Yuwen. and Duggan, N. Soft power and tourism: a study of Chinese outbound tourism to Africa, Journal of China and International Relations, 4(1), pp. 45-66, 2016.

[28] Chen, Yuwen. and Duggan, N.

[29] Chen, Yuwen. and Duggan, N.

University of Edinburgh. In the report, the British Council uses soft power as the independent variable to test its social, cultural, economic and political influence. They measure the binary relations of each pair variables by scatter diagrams and fully illustrate all factors by the statistical models with multiple variable analysis. The three primary resources drawing from Nye's argument was used to represent soft power, which is the effect variable. To be specific, "political values evaluated by concentrations of democracy and restrictions on political freedoms, the attractiveness of economic success observed by income per capita, cultural property gauged by international networks of cultural institutions and countries' cultural rankings, and citizen communications calculated by internet usage level". Additionally, the report uses the four-dimension attractiveness as explanatory variables. They measure social attractiveness by international students, economic attractiveness by foreign direct investment, and political attractiveness by the ideal point in Affinity index, and cultural attractiveness by the number of international tourists. For the part of international tourism, Soft Power Today concludes that countries having economic attractiveness with cultural institutions in origin countries are more likely to gain strong soft power than others. Although international tourism is used in this report, it shows only as an index of cultural attractiveness. The British Council did not measure the effects of tourism on soft power.

Besides Soft Power Today, another famous report is Soft Power 30, which is a soft power ranking produced and published from 2015 by the media company Portland. International tourism is taken as one of the statistical metrics of soft power ranking in Soft Power 30. Both of these two popular reports take the perspective that international tourism helps build soft power with granted. Therefore, this paper is going to explore the effects of international tourism on building soft power. That is to say, international tourism will be used as the explanatory variable rather than the effect variable.

2 Hypotheses

Drawing from Ooi, Oleg and some other scholars' points of view, inbound tourists are good for destination countries building soft power. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that receiving tourism has positive effects on destination countries. Here is the first hypothesis:

H1. People visiting a country are likely to increases their soft power.

Comparatively, following the logic of scholars, such as Kings Kim, Guo & Argusa, outbound tourists are their origin countries' "grassroots ambassadors" telling stories to the word and building positive national images. Thus, this paper expects that sending tourists outbound has positive effects on origin countries' soft power. Here is the second hypothesis:

H2: Sending people traveling abroad are likely to increase origin countries' soft power.

Last but not least, since the number of money tourists spent in destination countries is one of the representations for their wiliness to consume the culture, international tourism expenditures are reasonably taken as an index for attraction. This paper expects that the more money tourists spent in a country, the more soft power it has. Therefore, the following is the third hypothesis:

H3. The more money people spend in a country, the more soft power it gains.

3   Research Design

Independent Variables

Based on theoretical reasons and data availability, this research paper uses the World Bank tourism database, which collected data from the World Tourism Organization, Yearbook of Tourism Statistics and Compendium of Tourism Statistics and data files.

3.1.1 The number of international inbound tourists

International inbound tourists (overnight visitors) are the volume of people traveling to a country besides that in which they have their normal daily residence, but outside their regular environment, for a duration not exceeding 12 months and whose primary purpose in visiting is other than an activity paid from within the country visited. Sources and methods of collecting arrivals vary across countries. In some cases, the resources are border statistics (police, immigration, and the like) and border surveys supplement dataset. Data from tourism accommodation establishments are in other cases. In other cases, data are from tourism accommodation institutions. The number of arrivals for some countries is limited to air arrivals and for others to arrivals in hotels. Some countries also include arrivals of foreign nationals while others do not. The inbound tourists' data refers to the number of arrivals, not to the number of people traveling. Thus, an individual who during a given time frame makes multiple trips to a country is calculated as a new arrival each time.

In this paper, the number of international inbound tourists will be used to measure the effects of international tourism on destination countries.

3.1.2 The number of international outbound tourists

International outbound tourists are the number of departures that individuals make from their country of regular residence to any other state for any intention other than a paid

activity in the country visited. Similar to the data of inbound tourists, the data on outbound tourists refers to the number of departures, not to the number of people traveling. Thus, a person who makes several trips from a country during a given period is counted each time as a new departure.

In this paper, the number of international outbound tourists will be used to measure the effects of international tourism on origin countries.

3.1.3 International tourism, expenditures (current US$)

International tourism expenditures are expenditures of international outbound tourists in other countries, including payments for international transportation to foreign operators. These expenses may include those of residents traveling abroad as visitors on the same day, except in situations where such expenses are sufficiently important to justify separate classification. They do not include expenses for passenger transport items for some countries. Data are in current U.S. dollars.

This paper is going to use international tourism expenditures to measure the effects of tourists spending money on destination countries.

Dependent Variables

Usually, public polling, which represents general social opinions is a good measurement to estimate the level of a country's attractiveness. However, being attractive is only the "vehicle" of building soft power, not the "destination". As mentioned above, the ultimate goal is to influence targeted countries' foreign policy, shaping their political preferences and getting them to think in the way you want them to. One of the political preference representations is the United Nations General Assembly voting results. Therefore, this paper is going to use the Affinity index of nations, which estimates national foreign policy preferences based on United Nations General Assembly voting, to represent soft power.

There are two types of affinity index of nations based on the United Nations General Assembly voting. The older and most widely used one is Signorino and Ritter's (1999) S score, basing on dyadic similarity of vote choices. It treats United Nations General Assembly votes as mediate measures of national preference between a yea and a nay vote (excluding absences). The S Score is a Euclidean measure of distance in the United Nations General Assembly between every dyad. However, since S scores and their associated similarity indicators assume a simple and direct relationship between how often two countries vote together and similarity of their political preference, which presumption overlooks the fact that coincidence of voting is also impacted by what resolutions countries vote on.

The newer type of affinity index is also based on United Nations General Assembly

votes and calculated by Bailey, Strezhnev, and Voeten[30]. They used empirical methods (e.g. Poole 2005) of spatial models and item response theory (IRT) to establish a state-of-the-art ideal point model, estimating dynamic national ideal points across a single dimension between 1946 and 2012. For each vote, if the United States voted yes, they set the correlation coefficient equal to 1 and set that -1 if the United States voted no. Use the United Kingdom as a reference point if the United States did not vote; set the correlation coefficient as 0 if neither the United States nor the United Kingdom voted. Eventually, each state gets its ideal point every year during the test period. All of the ideal points are on the number axis and the absolute distances between each pair states are the indicators for how far their political preference is with each other. The further the distance is, the less affinity they have. The distance for each pair of them is called ideal point similarity. And we take the ideal point similarity multiply with -1 as the affinity index.

The IRT model identifies the shift of preference over time by taking advantage of the fact that certain resolutions were voted in multiple years by the United Nations General Assembly. And they use year-over-year identical resolutions to serve as bridge observations to help make estimates of preference comparable over time. Therefore, in identifying meaningful shifts in foreign policy orientations, IRT model is better than S scores in distinguishing signal from noise. It offers a clear and specific theory of how countries convert preferences into votes in a sort of way that does not ebb and flow in a voting body based on the composition of votes.

As mentioned before, the IRT model Affinity index was used by Soft Power Today. But the report only used the ideal point similarity to represent political influence, not soft power. And the report only used 26 countries as their samples.

Since the ideal point similarity produces by the IRT model shows in dyadic style, this paper is going to use the sum of each country's ideal point similarity with all other countries. In this way, each country will have an overall ideal point similarity with all other countries recorded. That result multiplies with -1 is the representation of how much influence each country has an international system. Also, it is taken as measuring the level of each country's soft power.

Models

The available data sample covers 181 countries from 1999 to 2014. Most of the data used for the empirical test of this paper can be dated back to 1946, but the analysis in this paper is limited to 16 years, between 1999 and 2014. Because the concept "soft power" was promoted by 1990 and did not get much attention by decision makers until 11th September 2001, the horrible day. Also, many Third World countries got independence by the 1990s and the collapse of the Soviet Union released more political diversity than the period of the Cold War. Last but not least, large-scale cross-board tourism started by the

---

[30] Bailey, Michael A., Anton Strezhnev, and Erik Voeten, *Estimating Dynamic State Preferences from United Nations Voting Data,* Journal of Conflict Resolution, page 430-56, February 2017.

late 1990s.

The empirical analysis of this paper adopts two regression methods, both are panel data regressions. The first is the fixed effects model (this model). The second is the random effect model (GLS model).

To begin with, panel data (as well defined as longitudinal or cross-sectional time series data) is a dataset through which entity behavior is observed over time. It enables researchers to control variables that can not be detected or evaluated such as cultural factors or differences in business practices across firms; or variables that vary across time but not across entities (i.e. government regulations, political decisions, international conventions, etc.). That is, individual heterogeneity is accounted for.

Fixed Effects Model examines the connection within an entity (nation, individual, corporation, etc.) between predictor and outcome variables. Each entity seems to have its unique characteristics that might or might not affect predictor variables (for instance, a particular country's politics might have some impact on trade or GDP). When using the Fixed Effects Model, researchers assume that the predictor or outcome variables can be affected or biased by something within the individual, and it is required to control them. This is the rationale for assuming the correlation between the error term of the entity and the variables of the predictor. Fixed Effects Model eliminates the effect of these time-invariant features to evaluate the net impact of the predictors on the result variable. Another valuable assumption of the Fixed Effects Model is that these time-invariant features are distinctive to the individual and should not be associated with other individual qualities. Therefore, the error term of the entity is different from each object and the constant (which illustrates individual characteristics) should not be associated with the others. If the terms of error are correlated, then the Fixed Effects Model is not appropriate because inferences may not be correct and researchers need to model that relationship (probably using random effects).

The rationale underneath the Random Effects Model is that the variation across entities is assumed to be random and uncorrelated to the predictor or independent variables included in the model, which rationale   is different from that of the Fixed Effects Model: The fundamental difference between fixed and random effects is whether the non-observed individual effect represents elements correlated with the model's regressors, not about whether or not these effects are stochastic. If differences between entities affect the dependent variable, then random effects should be used as the research method.

The main strategy for determining between the Fixed Effects Model and Random Effects Model is the Hausman test, in which the null hypothesis is that the preferred model is random effects vs. the alternative the fixed effects. It essentially tests whether the distinctive errors are strongly associated with the regressors, the null hypothesis is they are not.

The result of Hausman test in this paper is:

Chi2 = 27.57

Prob>chi2 = 0.0000

This result means that the time-invariant features are unique to the individual and are uncorrelated with other individual features. Therefore, we take the Fixed Effects Model in this research paper. And the advantage of this model is that it can produce stable standard deviation estimation without the interference of heteroscedasticity and autoregressive. It is generally believed that the Fixed Effects Model will be considered to be more robust if the same or similar empirical findings are found in different model Settings.

Besides, considering the time-sensitive characteristics of the independent variables, the author processed them in time series, specifically, they were lagged by one year, two years, three years, four years and five years. Thus, there will be six models, respectively for zero to five years of lagged effects. The rationale for the lag is that cross-border tourists need time to digest their feeling and play the role expected by the author. It is reasonable to expect a long or short gap between the return to their home countries and their impact on their policies. This process makes the model more rigorous and helps observe the trends of the effects.

Analysis

According to the joint hypotheses test (the F-test), the model chosen here is significant. However, The three measures selected, as with any quantitative method, are operational measures of a wide category of variables. The actual effects may be greater and more comprehensive than those provided here.

The Number of Tourists' Arrivals

Figure 1. shows the effects of the number of international tourists' arrivals on Soft Power. It is clear that the effects are positive during all six years tested here and the effects are not significant until one year later. That means the arrivals of tourists take one-year producing impacts. As time passes, the effect increases both significantly and strongly. It will reach the highest point by 3 years later, then becomes both less significant and weaker by five years later.

This regression result proves the author's Hypothesis 1*:*

*People visiting a country are likely to **increase** its soft power.*

Two perspectives are explaining this phenomenon, respectively from tourists and receiving countries. Firstly, tourists traveling abroad are subjective voluntary. They already

have their motivations to visit the country. And before traveling, they have established a re-imagination of the destination country with basic language skills, which is one of the most important tools to live comfortably in any community. Even if they do not speak the local language, they may choose group tours with guidance, which helps them understand destination countries. So, they are ready, even proactive and willing to face the new culture and environment. Besides, for exploring markets, tourism countries usually produce many attractive advertisements in origin countries. Those advertisements help tourists deepen their good memories about and the positive attitudes towards the destination countries. Besides, the destination countries are like storytellers who may invest millions of money and human resources in polishing their stories, promoting cultural values and painting their national images. Similar to tourists, destination countries are also well-prepared in showing a good image and cast a nice experience for tourists. Therefore, they are more likely to have a positive image of the country they visit.

Figure 1.

Independent	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Arrivals (same year)	.0002 0.366					
Arrivals (1-year lagged)		.0007 0.007***				
Arrivals (2-year lagged)			.0011 0.000***			
Arrivals (3-year lagged)				.0013 0.000***		
Arrivals (4-year lagged)					.0012 0.000***	
Arrivals (5-year lagged)						.0009 0.009***

*** = 99% Significant
** = 95% Significant
* = 90% Significant

The Number of International Tourists' Departures

Figure 2. shows the regression analysis results in the number of international tourists' departures. Unfortunately, it casts a negative effect on Soft Power. Compared with the effects of tourists' arrivals, tourists' departures have longer but smaller influence. Its effects are significant since the same year and become insignificant by five years later, one year longer than the effects of arrivals. The negative effects increase as time passes and reach its highest point by four years later, then decreases. This result

means that the more people a country sends abroad for traveling the less soft power it will gain. This result disproves Hypothesis 2:

*Sending people traveling abroad is **Decreasing** origin countries' soft power.*

The author is going to explain this phenomenon for three reasons.

First of all, different from tourists, who are well-prepared stepping on the new place and have opportunities polishing their feels by domestic advertisements, locals in destination countries are forced to accept outsiders "invading" their lives. They are like the "victims" of tourism, especially when the living cost increases dramatically, the ecological environment is damaged, and local culture is fading because of these visitors. Besides, some tourists may have problematic behaviors in other countries, such as bathroom etiquette, spitting manners. And they may lack understanding of the local customs and lack of respect, intentional or unintentional break of local laws. Due to the improper guidance from travel agencies, tourists may overprotect their rights and benefits.

Second, both the choice of tourists and government policies can produce isolation that could contribute to misinterpretations and cultural conflicts, damaging people-to-people relationships and creating undesirable impressions of each other. To be specific, many people choose the group tour, which requires incredibly low tour costs and provides accommodation, transportation, and attractions in high quality. Group tour limits interaction between the tourists and the locals. This lack of direct communication with the locals may leave the impression that tourists are not interested in the host culture[31]. Besides, sometimes, for good experience, governments set some special areas for tourism, which are disconnected, misinterpreted, decontaminated and even isolated from the cultural space and living space of the tourism destination. This one-way satisfaction for tourists, once they intervene in the daily life of the destination, will most likely to arouse the aversion and conflict between the host and the guest, leading to negative attitudes towards the sending country.

Last but not least, people everywhere rightly treat governments with suspicion. Because Governments are self-interested players with well-known lying, deceiving, and manipulating propensities. When millions of people from the same country flock in one place, the receivers mainly take this movement as an official policy for propaganda or even cultural colonialism. And it is easy to arouse unpleasant emotion.

Therefore, sending people traveling abroad is unhelpful in building soft power.

---

[31] Honggang Xu, Ke Wang, and Young Mi Song, *Chinese outbound tourism and soft power,* Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events, 2018.

Figure.2.

Independent	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Departures (same year)	-.0003 0.021**					
Departures (1-year lagged)		-.0005 0.001***				
Departures (2-year lagged)			-.0007 0.000***			
Departures (3-year lagged)				-.0008 0.001***		
Departures (4-year lagged)					-.0007 0.009***	
Departures (5-year lagged)						-.0007 0.022**

*** = 99% Significant

** = 95% Significant

* = 90% Significant

The Average Expenditures of Each Tourist

Although the number of tourists' arrivals produces positive effects on soft power building, the average expenditures of each tourist show negative effects. *Figure 3.* shows that the negative effects of average expenditures become very significant from the same year tourists to arrive and are the strongest among the three variables. Fortunately, it decreases as time passes and loses its significance by three years later, much shorter than the effects of arrivals and departures number.

This result disproves the Hypothesis 3., meaning that:

*The more money people spend in a country, **Less** soft power it gains.*

The author finds "the marginal consumption utility" as the explanation. To be specific, destination countries have the opportunity to bait customers by low priced shopping coupled with products of generally high quality. When people spend lots of money, they rightly have high expectations and are easily disappointed. In this way, it is easy to produce negative attitudes towards the destination country. While in contrast, when people only spend very little money, they rightly will decrease their expectations and are easily pleased. Thus, they will tell their families and friends a good feeling after they back to their mother countries. As time passed, tourists will forget the pains of paying but do remember the nice experience, which will be less biased because of money. Even if they do not have good memories, pictures and souvenirs will positively remind

them. Thus, the negative effects of spending money will decrease and become insignificant after three years.

Figure.3.

Independent	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Average expenditures (same year)	-.0020 0.001***					
Average expenditures (1-year lagged)		-.0013 0.029**				
Average expenditures (2-year lagged)			-.0011 0.088*			
Average expenditures (3-year lagged)				-.0009 0.175		
Average expenditures (4-year lagged)					-.0008 0.205	
Average expenditures (5-year lagged)						-.0001 0.879

*** = 99% Significant

** = 95% Significant

* = 90% Significant

According to the result of this empirical test, countries receiving much more than sending tourists are easily rewarded in soft power. The author found some countries did gain benefits from this way. They are the Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, Panama, Mauritius, Seychelles, Morocco, Maldives, Thailand, Cambodia, Vanuatu, Fiji, etc. While countries sending much more than receiving tourists are easily punished in soft power, such as Turkmenistan, Bangladesh, Kuwait, Lithuania, Gambia, Israel, Malaysia, Tuvalu, and so on. For those countries holding high average expenditures are easily punished too, such as Belgium, Denmark, Norway, Luxembourg, Iceland, Iran, Marshall Islands, Sudan, Libya, Venezuela, Central, African Republic, Iraq, and so on. Expensive countries with many more people traveling abroad than tourists arriving are the most likely to get punished, such as the United Kingdom, Germany, and Israel. However, as mentioned before, this empirical test only covers three widely categorial variables. Therefore, further researches are needed to make more accurate predicts.

Conclusion

To conclude, cross-border tourism is beneficial for countries receiving tourists. But sending people traveling abroad may be harmful in building soft power. And high costs tourism strong but short negative effects on building soft power.

Therefore, there are two suggestions for building soft power by international tourism. First of all, a country should focus on its charm to attract people to visit rather than counting on sending people traveling abroad too much, because senders may get punishment in building soft power. Broadcasting compelling culture has been one of the essential methods to construct a national image (Nye, 2008a), and promoting the positive communication of cultural values to foreigners is important in building soft power (Gill & Huang, 2006). Secondly, excessive tourists' spending reduces receiving the country's soft power. So, government sponsors or cooperation in decreasing costs of cross-border tourism is possibly helpful. But too much official involvement in tourism may produce side effects due to the public's natural antipathy towards the government.

However, since the measures chosen are limited due to the data availability and this paper only tested the general rule of countries in the United Nation General Assembly, further researches are needed. For example, take some almost pure receivers' and pure senders' countries, or some countries both receiving and sending large volume cross-border tourists as a case study.

Reference

1. Admin, *Engaging cities: the growing relevance of soft power to city reputations in Asia pacific,* corporate communication, Forum for Asia, city reputation, Engaging Cities, soft power. December 16, 2014.
2. Bailey, Michael A., Anton Strezhnev, and Erik Voeten, *Estimating Dynamic State Preferences from United Nations Voting Data,* Journal of Conflict Resolution, page 430-56, February 2017.
3. Barry Buzan, *Confusing Public Diplomacy and Soft Power,* Asia Dialogue, 10 March 2016.
4. Bunakov, Oleg, *Tourism as a Method of "Soft Power" in Modern Diplomacy on the Example of the Russian Federation,* 2008.
5. Chen, Yuwen. and Duggan, N. *Soft power and tourism: a study of Chinese outbound tourism to Africa,* Journal of China and International Relations, 4(1), pp. 45-66, 2016.
6. Fan, S. P. , *The effects of China's tourism diplomacy and a "united front"*, China: An International Journal, 8(02), page 247–281, 2010.
7. Gartzke, Erik, *The Affinity of Nations Index, 1946-2002*, 2006.
8. Hollinshead, Keith & Xiao Hou, Chun, *The Seductions of "Soft Power": The Call for Multifrontal Research into the Articulative Reach of Tourism in China,* Journal of China Tourism Research. 8. 227-247. 2012.
9. Honggang Xu, Ke Wang, and Young Mi Song, *Chinese outbound tourism and soft power,* Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events, 2018.
10. Hussin, H., Gastronomy, *Tourism, and the Soft Power of Malaysia.* SAGE Open, 2018.
11. Irene S. Wu, Ph.D. *Measuring Soft Power with Conventional and Unconventional Data,* Science, Technology, and Environmental Policy Issues, Dupont Summit 2014.
12. Jin, Xin, and Ying Wang, *Chinese Outbound Tourism Research: A Review,* Journal of Travel Research 55, page 440–53 April 2016.
13. Kurlantzick, Joshua, *The Decline of American Soft Power,* New York, N.Y. 1941, Current history, page 104, 2005.
14. Kwek, Anna, Ying Wang, and David B. Weaver, *Retail Tours in China for Overseas Chinese: Soft Power or Hard Sell?* Annals of Tourism Research 44, January 1, 2014.
15. Lu Lingyu, *The fable of soft power?* World Economics and Politics, Pages 28-68+156-157, April 2018.
16. Max Roser, *Tourism*, online at OurWorldInData.org, 2019. https://ourworldindata.org/tourism.
17. Niall Ferguson, *Think Again: Power, Foreign Policy,* November3, 2009.
18. Nye, J., *The Changing Nature of World Power,* Political Science Quarterly, 105(2), page 177-192, 1990.

19. Nye, J., *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics,* New York, Public Affairs, page 208, 2004.
20. Nye, J., *Think Again: Soft Power, Foreign policy,* February 23, 2006.
21. Nye, Joseph S., *Public Diplomacy and Soft Power,* The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 616, page 94–109,March 2008.
22. Nye, J. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics.* Public Affairs. 2009.
23. Oleg A. Bunakov, Natalia A. Zaitseva, Anna A. Larionova, Vadim A. Zhukov, Marina A. Morozova, Nina V. Dmitrieva, *The use of the «soft power» concept in the modern Russian tourism industry,* 2018.
24. Ooi CS, Soft power, tourism, Jafari J., Xiao H, *Encyclopedia of Tourism,* Springer, Cham, 2015.
25. Pallavi Sharma, *Beyond the Euro-trip: Tourism as Means To European Union Soft Power*, South Asian University Year of submission: 2014.
26. Servaes, Jan, *Soft power and public diplomacy: The new frontier for public relations and international communication between the US and China,* Public Relations Review, page 643-651, 2012.
27. Steve Webel, *Understanding China's "Soft Power" and Influence*, Friendsofeurope.org. December 2107. https://www.friendsofeurope.org/sites/default/files/2017-12/Tourism_report_web_rev.pdf
28. Stuart MacDonald, *Soft Power Today: measuring the influences and effects,* Digital Diplomacy, British Council from the University of Edinburgh, Oct 24, 2017.
29. Tony S.M. Tse, *Chinese Outbound Tourism as a Form of Diplomacy*, Tourism Planning & Development, page 149-158, 2013.
30. *The soft power 30*, a global ranking of soft power, Portland. USC center on public diplomacy, 2018.
31. Voeten, Erik, *Data and Analyses of Voting in the UN General Assembly,* July 17, 2012.
32. Voeten, Erik; Strezhnev, Anton; Bailey, Michael, *United Nations General Assembly Voting Data,* Harvard Database, 2009.
33. Wang, Ying, David B. Weaver, and Anna Kwek, *Beyond the Mass Tourism Stereotype: Power and Empowerment in Chinese Tour Packages*, Journal of Travel Research 55, page 724–37, July 2016.
34. Wang, Yiwei, *Public Diplomacy and the Rise of Chinese Soft Power,* The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, page 257–73, March 2008.