



KULTÚRNA DIPLOMACIA A JEJ ORGANIZAČNO- INŠTITUCIONÁLNE MODELY V PRAXI VYBRANÝCH ŠTÁTOV

CULTURAL DIPLOMACY AND ITS ORGANIZATIONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MODELS IN SELECTED STATES

*Erik Pajtinka*¹

Kultúrna diplomacia je v praxi jednotlivých štátov realizovaná prostredníctvom rôznych typov aktérov, z ktorých za najvýznamnejšie možno vo všeobecnosti považovať diplomatické misie, ale aj kultúrne inštitúty, ktoré môžu byť diplomatickej, ale rovnako aj nediplomatickej povahy. Na základe typov aktérov, ktoré sa podstatným spôsobom podieľajú na výkone kultúrnej diplomacie daného štátu, ako aj ich početnosti a charakteru vzájomných vzťahov medzi nimi, možno rozlišovať rôzne organizačno-inštitucionálne modely kultúrnej diplomacie. Konkrétne napríklad pre organizačno-inštitucionálny model kultúrnej diplomacie Francúzskej republiky a Slovenskej republiky je charakteristické okrem iného to, že väčšina kultúrno-diplomatických aktivít je zabezpečovaná diplomatickými orgánmi, zatiaľ čo napríklad pre model v Spolkovej republike Nemecko je charakteristická vyššia miera participácie subjektov nediplomatickej povahy.

Kľúčové slová: kultúrna diplomacia, kultúrny pridelenec, kultúrny inštitút.

In practice, cultural diplomacy is implemented through different types of actors. Diplomatic missions can be considered the most important ones of

¹ PhDr. Erik Pajtinka, PhD. Department of International Relations and Diplomacy, Faculty of Political Science and International Relations, Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica, Kuzmányho 220/1, 97401 Banská Bystrica, Slovak Republic, e-mail: erik.pajtinka@umb.sk.

Erik Pajtinka is a graduate of master's study (Mgr.) and doctoral study (PhDr.) in the field of International Relations and Diplomacy. He holds a post-graduate degree (PhD.) in the field of International Relations. Currently he is a lecturer at the Department of International Relations and Diplomacy of the Faculty of Political Science and International Relations of the Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica and an external lecturer at the Faculty of Social Sciences of the Charles University in Prague (Czech Republic). In the past he was a visiting scholar at the Netherlands Institute of International Relations "Clingendael" in the Hague (Netherlands) and a lecturer at the University of Economics in Bratislava. In his research and publications he specialises in issues of current theory and practice of diplomacy, particularly bilateral diplomacy and diplomacy of the European Union.

them, but also cultural institutes play a vital role. They may have diplomatic or non-diplomatic status. Based on the types of actors that are substantially involved in the exercise of cultural diplomacy as well as on their number and the nature of interactions between them, various organizational models of the cultural diplomacy can be distinguished in different states. For example, a typical feature of the organizational model of the cultural diplomacy in the French Republic and the Slovak Republic is the fact that most of the cultural-diplomatic activities are conducted by diplomatic organs. By contrast, greater involvement of non-diplomatic entities is an inherent part of the model of cultural diplomacy in the Federal Republic of Germany.

Key words: cultural diplomacy, cultural attaché, cultural institute.

JEL: H11

1 INTRODUCTION

Cultural diplomacy as a “specific part of diplomacy, which focuses on the implementation of foreign-policy interests of a state primarily in the field of cultural policy” (Pajtinka 2013, p. 92) is nowadays an important part of the foreign-policy activities of a majority of states. The actual performance of the activities in the field of cultural diplomacy can be undertaken in the practice by various actors in cultural diplomacy whose legal status, number and the extent of delegated cultural diplomacy tasks depends on each individual state and its organizational and institutional model of cultural diplomacy.

The aim of this study is to describe, compare and analyse various types of organizational and institutional models of cultural diplomacy, as well as their application in the current diplomatic practice using the examples of selected states.

In the first part of this paper emphasis will be laid on the characteristics of the individual basic types of actors in cultural diplomacy, specifically diplomatic missions and cultural institutes. The second part will in turn briefly describe specific organizational and institutional models of cultural diplomacy in the selected four states, with a special focus on the characteristics of the most important cultural diplomatic actors in terms of their formal legal status, but also the mutual relations between them. The selected states whose models of cultural diplomacy will be the subject of analysis, include two states with a superpower status – Republic of France and the Federal Republic of Germany – and two small states (Republic of Austria and the Slovak Republic), so that a comparison of various categories of states can be made.

We should not omit the fact that this study will analyse the actors and organization and institutional models of cultural diplomacy exclusively in the context of bilateral relations and bilateral diplomacy, i.e. it will not study cultural diplomacy institutions active as a part of multilateral cultural diplomacy (at international organizations). At the same time the scope of study will include only permanent diplomatic missions, which perform cultural diplomacy activities on a principally

permanent basis, and not merely temporary diplomatic bodies, which exercise cultural-diplomatic tasks only occasionally and/or for a limited time.²

The sources used in preparation of this paper include particularly the official websites of numerous cultural-diplomatic institutions, but also relevant documents, scientific and specialized studies and various other specialized publications dedicated to the topic of cultural diplomacy.

2 BASIC ACTORS OF CULTURAL DIPLOMACY

2.1 Diplomatic missions

Within bilateral diplomacy diplomatic missions are considered the primary actors in cultural diplomacy, i.e. entities participating in the implementation of tasks of cultural diplomacy. In the structures of these diplomatic bodies of the state active abroad on a permanent basis, the fulfilment of tasks in the field of cultural diplomacy is often assigned to a specialized diplomat usually called the “cultural attaché”. In some cases a number of cultural attachés can work at a diplomatic mission, in which case each of them fulfils tasks in a specific area of cultural diplomacy and is responsible for a certain area of cultural relations with the relevant foreign state. Vice versa, in some cases a separate position of a cultural attaché is not set up at all, whereby the exercise of tasks in the field of cultural diplomacy is allocated to one of the diplomats with “universal” agenda who – besides carrying out cultural diplomacy activities – also fulfils other diplomatic tasks in other spheres of diplomacy.³

Cultural attaché or cultural attachés in some cases work as a part of a separate specialized organizational unit of the diplomatic mission, which concentrates on the performance of the cultural-diplomatic agenda and which is usually called the “cultural department” or “cultural section”⁴ (of a diplomatic mission).⁵ In practice, however,

² In practice the role of a temporary body of cultural diplomacy can be fulfilled for example by a Minister of Culture who negotiates with his foreign partners international treaties regulating issues of cultural cooperation between the states.

³ In practice the number of cultural attachés in a diplomatic mission of a certain (sending) state in a specific (host) state is usually determined by a number of factors, particularly by the extent and intensity of foreign cultural policy between the sending and the host state, ambitions of the sending state in the field of foreign cultural policy (in general, as well as in relation to the specific host state), but also by the available (personnel and material) capacities of the foreign service of the sending state.

⁴ The official name of organizational units of diplomatic missions specialising in the field of cultural diplomacy may differ in the diplomatic practice of individual states. For example, in the case of diplomatic missions of the Federal Republic of Germany the organizational unit specialising in cultural diplomacy is entitled as the “culture department” (in German: *Das Kulturreferat* – see for example *Deutsche Botschaft Pressburg – Kulturreferat*), in the case of diplomatic missions of France the title “department for cooperation and cultural activity” is

such separate organization unit might not necessarily be a part of each diplomatic mission – not even in the case where there is a position of a cultural attaché established at that diplomatic mission.

2.2 Cultural institutes

Apart from diplomatic missions and their cultural departments and cultural attachés, nowadays the performance of tasks of cultural diplomacy in the foreign-policy practice of a number of states also includes another type of entities that are usually collectively known as cultural institutes. There are considerable differences among the cultural institutes of the respective states, not only in the official name of these entities, but also in their formal legal status and in the extent and focus of the cultural-diplomatic tasks performed by them.

One of the most important attributes distinguishing the respective cultural institutes is their formal legal status. On that basis one can distinguish two basic categories of cultural institutes:

- a) cultural institutes with a diplomatic status; and
- b) cultural institutes without a diplomatic status.

The characteristic feature of cultural institutes with a diplomatic status is that from an organizational point of view they are usually attached to the diplomatic missions of their “parent” states⁶, and therefore the international law provisions of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations apply to them as appropriate, given that they are considered organizational units of diplomatic missions. In contrast, cultural institutes without a diplomatic status are characterized by not being an organizational part of diplomatic missions of the “parent” states; instead they operate “in parallel” to them as independent entities. Given that cultural institutes of this type are not part of diplomatic missions, as a standard the provisions of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations do not apply to them.⁷ In practice the first category includes French Institutes (*Institut Français*),⁸ Russian Centres of Science and Culture

used (in French: *Service de Coopération et d’Action Culturelle* – see for example *Service de Coopération et d’Action Culturelle – La France en Slovaquie*).

⁵ A cultural institute may in some cases fulfil the role of the cultural department of a diplomatic mission (see the next part of the chapter for details).

⁶ In this respect please note that in the diplomatic practice of some states cultural institutes directly substitute cultural departments or cultural sections of diplomatic missions.

⁷ There are certain exceptions to this rule – for example, some states recognize the diplomatic status of British Councils even though they are not parts of diplomatic missions. Such status is recognized on the basis of a specific treaty between Great Britain and the relevant host state.

⁸ The names of cultural institutes in the language of their “parent” state (in brackets) are stated always in the singular.

(*Российский центр науки и культуры – Rossijskij centr nauki i kul'tury*), Austrian Cultural Forums (*Österreichisches Kulturforum*), Polish Institutes (*Instytut Polski*), as well as the Slovak Institutes (*Slovenský inštitút*). The second category in turn includes British Councils, German Goethe's Institutes (*Goethe-Institut*) or Spanish Cervantes' Institutes (*Instituto Cervantes*).

Table 1: Official names and numbers of branch offices of cultural institutes of selected states

<i>State</i>	<i>Cultural institute (official name)</i>	<i>Number of offices abroad</i>	<i>Number of states with presence</i>
Republic of France	French Institute	200	88
Federal Republic of Germany	Goethe's Institute	145	93
Russian Federation	Russian Centre of Science and Culture	88	77
Kingdom of Spain	Cervantes' Institute	77	46
United Kingdom	British Council	189	109
Czech Republic	Czech Centre	22	20
Republic of Hungary	Hungarian Institute	22	20
Republic of Poland	Polish Institute	22	19
Republic of Austria	Austrian Cultural Forum	29	27
Slovak Republic	Slovak Institute	8	8

Notes: All data from official websites updated in 2014. Data for the United Kingdom updated in 2013. While some states have branch offices also at home, the column "Number of states with presence" does not include the home state. The number of cultural institutes of the Republic of France includes only the French Institutes and does not include Cultural Centres (currently 6 centres in 6 states) and French Houses (currently 2 houses in 2 states).

Source: Data compiled by the author from a combination of sources: Republic of France (Institut Francais 2014), Federal Republic of Germany (Goethe-Institut 2014), Russian Federation (Rossotrudničestvo 2014), Kingdom of Spain (Instituto Cervantes 2014), United Kingdom (British Council 2013), Czech Republic (Česká centra 2014), Republic of Hungary (Balassi Institute 2014), Republic of Poland (Instytut Polski 2014), Republic of Austria (BMEIA 2014b) and Slovak Republic (MZVaEZ 2014).

Besides differences in the formal legal status, official name and other attributes the individual cultural institutes also show significant differences in the size of the network and their branch offices and the number of foreign states, in which such

branch offices are present. In this respect there are considerable differences especially between states with superpower status (superpowers), where there is usually a wide-ranging network of cultural institutes, and small states that usually have at their disposal a relatively more limited network of such entities. These differences in size of networks of cultural institutes of superpowers and small states can be generally attributed to widely differing ambitions of the respective types of states in foreign policy, which usually affects the amount of resources that the states are “willing“ to earmark for their cultural diplomacy and its institutional background (which encompasses cultural institutes).

Differences in the size of networks of cultural institutes of superpowers and small states can be illustrated in specific numbers of branch offices of cultural institutes of selected states that are outlined in Table 1.

As is evident from data in Table 1, in some cases there are relatively significant differences in the sizes of networks of cultural institutes also among the individual superpowers and small states, respectively. In this respect, for instance, the Republic of Austria, which ranks among small states, has much more offices of its cultural institutes abroad than for example Slovak Republic, Czech Republic, Republic of Poland or Republic of Hungary, which are equally considered small states (whereby in comparison with the Slovak Republic, for example, the size of the network of cultural institutes of the Republic of Austria is more than threefold). These differences in the size of networks of cultural institutes can be attributed to a certain extent to the significantly different economic potential of the Republic of Austria and the V-4 states – it can be assumed that the Republic of Austria as a relatively “richer” state is realistically able to afford to allocate more resources in its budget for cultural diplomacy and the operation of cultural institutes than the other cited states, which are relatively “poorer” states.⁹ The differences in sizes of networks of cultural institutes among the individual small states or superpowers, respectively, however, do not have to be caused exclusively by their varied economic potential. Even small states with approximately identical economic level in some cases display relatively important differences in the size of networks of their cultural institutes. This can be showcased on the comparison of size of network of cultural institutes of the Slovak Republic on the one hand and the Czech Republic or the Republic of Hungary on the other hand, where Czech Republic and Republic of Hungary both have an almost threefold number of cultural institute offices abroad in comparison with the Slovak Republic (see Table 1). The causes of such differences can be attributed to other factors that can affect the size of networks of cultural institutes and which include the significance of cultural

⁹ The importance of economic potential and national income of the state as one of the factors affecting the size of its network of cultural institutes has been indirectly pointed out also by Mattoš (2013, p. 379), according to whom the support of entities in cultural diplomacy by the state is carried out in the extent reflecting the available financial resources of that state.

institutes in the concept of cultural diplomacy of the state in question, but also the relative importance of cultural diplomacy (and cultural institutes) in the overall concept of implementation of foreign policy of the state in question.

3 ORGANIZATIONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL MODELS OF CULTURAL DIPLOMACY OF SELECTED STATES

3.1 Organizational and institutional model of cultural diplomacy of the Republic of France

Within the foreign-policy structure of the Republic of France numerous institutions of both diplomatic and non-diplomatic nature are charged with the fulfilment of tasks in the field of cultural diplomacy.

From the range of diplomatic institutions of the Republic of France the exercise of tasks in the field of cultural diplomacy is primarily undertaken by diplomatic missions, within which the steering of the cultural diplomacy agenda is entrusted to specialised diplomats, officially called cultural advisors or advisors for cooperation and cultural activity (*conseillers de coopération et d'action culturelle*). At some diplomatic missions (usually the larger ones) the cultural advisor is assisted in the performance of cultural diplomacy activities by other cultural attachés (subordinate to him) who bear the official title of attaché and who in their agenda specialise in various fields of cultural diplomacy activities.¹⁰ The cultural advisor himself is directly subordinated to the head of the relevant diplomatic missions of the Republic of France.

By virtue of his office the cultural advisor is at the same time the director of the local cultural institute – the French Institute – which forms a part of the organizational structure of the relevant diplomatic mission of the Republic of France. If the host state in question is home to other French Institutes in other cities (besides the French Institute in the place of seat of the diplomatic mission), their directors are also subordinated to the cultural advisor from an organizational point of view (he is the director of the “main” French Institute in the place of seat of the diplomatic mission). The directors of such “regional” French Institutes, in contrast to the director of the “main” French Institute in the place of seat of the diplomatic mission, do not hold the position of a cultural advisor and usually they do not have the status of a diplomat.

Besides managing the French Institutes and other cultural attachés at a diplomatic mission, the cultural advisor is also charged with the coordination of activities of other cultural diplomacy institutions of the Republic of France in the relevant host state (specifically the French Alliances, for instance).

¹⁰ Given that the dissemination of the French language constitutes a significant part of the cultural diplomacy agenda of the Republic of France, at many diplomatic missions of the Republic of France the position of a cultural attaché for language cooperation has been established.

The above-mentioned French Alliances rank among the most important institutes of non-diplomatic nature participating in the performance of cultural diplomacy in the Republic of France, whereby currently there is a total 850 of them in 136 states (Alliance française 2014). French Alliances, in contrast to French Institutes, from a formal legal point of view do not constitute parts of structures of diplomatic missions, but rather co-exist in parallel to them as independent entities, whereby their activities are subject to the national law of the relevant host state.¹¹ Even though each French Alliance is formally an independent entity, in practice its activities are coordinated by the geographically competent diplomatic mission of the Republic of France (specifically by its cultural advisor). Besides, at the central level the activities of the entire network of French Alliances are coordinated by the Foundation of French Alliance (*Fondation Alliance Française*) in Paris (Alliance française 2014).

3.2 Organizational and institutional model of cultural diplomacy of the Federal Republic of Germany

A number of both diplomatic and non-diplomatic institutions are involved in the exercise of cultural diplomacy of the Federal Republic of Germany, similarly to the Republic of France.

From among the permanent diplomatic institutions it is the diplomatic missions that participate in the implementation of cultural diplomacy of the Federal Republic of Germany, whereby the exercise of cultural diplomacy agenda is usually delegated to a special department – the cultural department (*Kulturreferat*). The cultural department may consist of one or more diplomats – cultural attachés (*Kulturattaché*), who are regular members of the diplomatic corps of that diplomatic mission and – just like the other members – are subordinated to the head of the mission.

With regards to the non-diplomatic institutions that actively participate in the implementation of the cultural diplomacy of the Federal Republic of Germany, the most significant role is played by Goethe's Institutes, the network of which currently comprises 145 offices in 93 states outside of the Federal Republic of Germany (Goethe-Institut 2014)¹² actively, and some smaller so-called Goethe's Centres in other cities. Goethe's Institutes are – analogously to the French Alliances – non-governmental (non-diplomatic) entities that exist separately from the diplomatic missions of their parent state, whereby their functioning is governed by the national law of the relevant host state. Similarly to the French Alliances, Goethe's Institutes, despite their non-diplomatic status and formal (and often publicly declared) independence from diplomatic structures, in practice have to cooperate with the

¹¹ The provisions of the international public law and diplomatic law contained in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations therefore do not apply to French Alliances.

¹² Goethe's Institutes are active not only abroad, but also in the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany.

diplomatic mission of their parent state in the host state. Besides, each director of the Goethe's Institute is obliged to inform the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany of the conducted activities, whereby the ministry is authorized directly to prohibit certain activities of the institute, if it believes that they contradict the foreign-policy objectives of the state (Tomalová 2008) or, vice versa, request the Goethe's Institute to organize a certain event (Kurucz 2007) whose organization is in the interest of Federal Republic of Germany. At the central level the activity of all Goethe's Institutes is steered by a directorate with its seat in Munich, although the individual branch offices have a relatively wide organizational autonomy.

3.3 Organizational and institutional model of cultural diplomacy of the Republic of Austria

In the Republic of Austria it is primarily the diplomatic missions (a total of 82) and general consulates (a total of 11) that are charged with the practical exercise of the majority of tasks in the field of cultural diplomacy. Within the structures of some diplomatic missions and general consulates of the Republic of Austria the implementation of cultural diplomacy activities is delegated to specialized organizational units – the cultural institutes that are officially called Austrian Cultural Forums.

From a formal legal point of view the Austrian Cultural Forums are a part of structures of diplomatic missions of the Republic of Austria or of the general consulates of the Republic of Austria. Each Austrian Cultural Forum is headed by a director who – in the case of Austrian Cultural Forums present by the diplomatic missions of the Republic of Austria – is a member of the diplomatic corps of the relevant diplomatic mission, or – in the case of Austrian Cultural Forums present at the general consulates of the Republic of Austria – a member of the consular corps (having the status of a consular officer) of the relevant general consulate.

Currently the Republic of Austria has globally more than 29 Austrian Cultural Forums, out of which 26 are established by diplomatic missions and 3 by general consulates (BMEIA 2014a).

3.4 Organizational and institutional model of cultural diplomacy of the Slovak Republic

In the case of the Slovak Republic, the performance of the cultural diplomacy is assigned primarily to diplomatic missions (64 in total), general consulates (8), as well as permanent representations of the Slovak Republic abroad (for example the branch office of diplomatic mission in Pristina and Slovak Economic and Cultural Office in Taipei).¹³ Within the structure of the said bodies the exercise of the cultural

¹³ Status as of 1 December 2013 (MZVaEZ 2013).

diplomacy tasks is usually delegated to individual staff members – diplomats or consular officers, respectively – who besides cultural diplomacy activities often also take care of other diplomatic or consular functions. In the case of some diplomatic missions of the Slovak Republic separate specialized organizational units – cultural institutes – are charged with the implementation of cultural diplomacy activities. They are officially called the Slovak Institutes.

From a formal legal point of view the Slovak Institutes are a part of the structures of diplomatic missions of the Slovak Republic in their host state. Each Slovak Institute is headed by a director who by virtue of his office also holds the post of cultural attaché in the diplomatic mission of the Slovak Republic in that host state, whereby he is a regular member of the diplomatic corps. As a member of staff of a diplomatic mission each director of a Slovak Institute is directly subordinated to the head of the relevant diplomatic mission of the Slovak Republic.

Currently the Slovak Republic has a total of 8 Slovak Institutes globally, which are active by diplomatic missions of the Slovak Republic, specifically: by the Embassy of the Slovak Republic in the Czech Republic in Prague, by the Embassy of the Slovak Republic in the Republic of France in Paris, by the Embassy of the Slovak Republic in the Republic of Hungary in Budapest, by the Embassy of the Slovak Republic in the Federal Republic of Germany in Berlin, by the Embassy of the Slovak Republic in the Republic of Poland in Warsaw, by the Embassy of the Slovak Republic in the Republic of Austria in Vienna, by the Embassy of the Slovak Republic in the Russian Federation in Moscow, by the Embassy of the Slovak Republic in the Republic of Italy in Rome (MZVaEZ 2013).

4 CONCLUSION

To conclude, in individual states one may encounter different forms of organization and institutional structure of cultural diplomacy, which differ in terms of their formal legal nature, but also in terms of the quantity of decisive (cultural diplomacy) actors. In some states, for example in the Republic of France and in the Slovak Republic, the exercise of a majority of functions of cultural diplomacy is assigned to diplomatic bodies, specifically diplomatic missions and cultural institutes that have a diplomatic status. In other states, e.g. Federal Republic of Germany, the implementation of a substantive part of tasks in the field of cultural diplomacy is assigned to entities of non-diplomatic nature. However, even in such states – as is evident from the cited example of the Federal Republic of Germany – the diplomatic bodies have a certain indirect and/or informal influence on non-diplomatic entities performing cultural diplomacy, thus even if they do not carry out the majority of cultural diplomacy activities themselves, they can effectively control and coordinate it.

There are considerable differences among the individual states not only with respect to the organizational and institutional model of cultural diplomacy, but also the

extent of its institutional basis, which can be illustrated for example on the varied size of networks of cultural diplomacy institutions. In this respect greatest differences exist between states with a superpower status that usually have at their disposal sizeable networks of cultural diplomacy institutions abroad and small states, which normally use only a relatively limited number of such entities. Such differences are understandable particularly with regards to the different foreign-policy ambitions of superpower states and small states, which are reflected in the resources that such states are willing and able to allocate for cultural diplomacy (and which then affect the extent of necessary and affordable cultural diplomacy infrastructure). In some cases relatively significant divergence is however visible also in the extent of institutional basis of cultural diplomacy of individual smaller states, which cannot always be attributed solely to their diverse economic strength of financial possibilities – it also reflects the relative importance that individual states ascribe to cultural diplomacy within their foreign policy implementation.

REFERENCES:

1. ALLIANCE FRANCAISE. (2014): *Qui sommes-nous?* [Cited 20. 11. 2014.] Available online: <<http://www.alliancefr.org/sommes-nous>>.
2. BALASSI INSTITUTE. (2014): *International Directorate*. [Online.] [Cited 10. 10. 2014.] Available online: <<http://www.balassiintezet.hu/en/international-relations/international-directorate/>>.
3. BMEIA. (2014a): *Verzeichnis der Österreichischen Vertretungsbehörden*. [Online.] [Cited 16. 11. 2014.] Available online: <http://www.bmeia.gv.at/fileadmin/user_upload/oracle/oe_vertretungen_de.pdf>.
4. BMEIA. (2014b): *Welche Arten von österreichischen Vertretungen gibt es?* [Online.] [Cited 10. 10. 2014.] Available online: <<http://www.bmeia.gv.at/botschaften-konsulate/suche-nach-oesterreichischen-vertretungen/welche-arten-von-vertretungen-gibt-es/>>.
5. BRITISH COUNCIL. (2013): *Annual Report 2012-2013*. [Online.] [Cited 22. 9. 2014.] Available online: <<http://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/britishcouncil.uk2/files/annual-report-2012-13.pdf>>.
6. ČESKÁ CENTRA. (2014): *Sit' českých center*. [Online.] [Cited 10. 10. 2014.] Available online: <<http://www.czechcentres.cz/o-nas/sit-cc/>>.
7. GOETHE-INSTITUT. (2014): *Jahrbuch 2013/2014*. Munich: Goethe-Institut e.V. Zentrale, 2014.
8. INSTITUT FRANCAIS. (2014): *Les Institutes Françaises dans le monde*. [Online.] [Cited 22. 9. 2014.] Available online: <<http://www.ifmapp.institutfrancais.com/les-if-dans-le-monde>>.

9. INSTITUTO CERVANTES. (2014): *Sedes en el mundo*. [Online.] [Cited 22. 9. 2014.] Available online: <http://www.cervantes.es/sobre_instituto_cervantes/direcciones_contacto/sedes_mundo.htm>.
10. INSTYTUT POLSKI. (2014): *O nás – Poľský inštitút Bratislava*. [Online.] [Cited 10. 10. 2014.] Available online: <<http://www.polinst.sk/sk/o-nas.html>>.
11. KURUCZ, M. (2007): Kultúrna dimenzia diplomacie. In *Zahraničná politika a diplomacia Slovenskej republiky v kontexte európskej integrácie*. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo EKONÓM, 2007. Pp. 63-71. ISBN 978-80-225-2467-4.
12. MATTOŠ, B. (2013): Kultúrna dimenzia diplomacie ako nástroj zahraničnej politiky štátu a príklad Rakúskej republiky. In *Ekonomické, politické a právne otázky medzinárodných vzťahov 2013*. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo EKONÓM, 2013. Pp. 377-383. ISBN 978-80-225-3659-2.
13. MINISTERSTVO ZAHRANIČNÝCH VEČÍ A EURÓPSKÝCH ZÁLEŽITOSTÍ SLOVENSKEJ REPUBLIKY. (2013): *Správa o stave siete zastupiteľských úradov SR v zahraničí v roku 2013 a východiská pre jej ďalší rozvoj*. Bratislava: MZVaEZ SR, 2013. Document No. 392.470/2013-POLS.
14. MINISTERSTVO ZAHRANIČNÝCH VEČÍ A EURÓPSKÝCH ZÁLEŽITOSTÍ SLOVENSKEJ REPUBLIKY. (2014): *Slovenské inštitúty*. [Online.] [Cited 24. 9. 2014.] Available online: <http://www.mzv.sk/sk/ministerstvo/slovenske_zastupitelstva-slovenske_instituty>.
15. PAJTINKA, E. (2013): *Slovník diplomacie*. Bratislava: PAMIKO, 2013. ISBN 978-80-85660-08-1.
16. ROSSOTRUDNIČESTVO. (2014): *Predstavitel'stva v mire*. [Online.] [Cited 22. 9. 2014.] Available online: <<http://www.rs.gov.ru/missions>>.
17. TOMALOVÁ, E. (2008): *Kulturní diplomacie. Francouzská zkušenost*. Praha: Ústav mezinárodních vztahů, 2008. ISBN 978-80-86506-73-9.