

CORPORATES' ROLE BEYOND CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
– THE CASE OF SOUTH KOREA
Hyunju Christine Yoo

An effective public diplomacy requires a strategic, symmetrical communications program with well-networked stakeholders. These stakeholders- individuals, NGOs or multinational corporations play an important role in legitimizing and building credibility to the state's public diplomacy policies. They also provide an expertise in their field to improve the effectiveness to a strategic public. When targeting a specific type of public, Multinational Enterprises (MNEs) show strength in this field because marketing itself is targeted to a selected group of customers. Thus, it is not surprising to see a well-networked collaboration with the government and the corporations in public diplomacy. In recent years, Korea's efforts to improve its country image and its diverse programs have been associated with diverse actors, including Korean MNEs. Research finds that many of these efforts have been humanitarian programs as a part of their Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) program. This paper examines what is corporate diplomacy and analyzes what makes an effective corporate public diplomacy, with its challenges. It first begins with highlighting the importance of collaborative public diplomacy and that it requires a 'strategic stakeholder engagement'. By introducing corporates as effective actors for public diplomacy, this research examines roles and capacities of MNEs in public diplomacy. This paper will apply the case of Korea looking at the successful cases and challenges of the Korean corporate public diplomacy. This paper will conclude in providing a more expansive role for the MNEs in public diplomacy, in which exceeds further than CSR activities. MNEs have become essential actors in public diplomacy and it is necessary to incorporate them as effectively as possible.

Hyunju Christine Yoo is an MA candidate in International Area Studies at the Graduate School of International Studies, Seoul National University. Her research focuses on global marketing strategies and global value chains in Latin America. Hyunju graduated from the University of Toronto with an Honours Bachelors of Arts in Latin American Studies, with minors in Political Science and History. She is also currently working as Marketing Communications Associate at AMOREPACIFIC.

Introduction

Traditional diplomacy, New Public diplomacy, Public relation, Propaganda, Media diplomacy, Media-broker diplomacy, Individual diplomacy, Soft Power, Smart Power... These are some of many terms that describe what is called 'Public Diplomacy'. It is fairly a new terminology, under multidisciplinary, and there are still many discussions on the effectiveness or/and how to categorize or to study them. But one thing for sure is that Public Diplomacy has become very important when it comes to international relations today. One of the clearest definition of public diplomacy comes from Signitzer and Coombs defining it as "the way in which both government and private individuals and groups influence directly or indirectly those

public attitudes and opinions which bear directly on another government's foreign policy decisions".¹ This definition acknowledges that public diplomacy is broad and that the number of actors practicing public diplomacy is diverse. Unlike traditional diplomacy, public diplomacy allows diverse non-state actors such as non-governmental organizations, multi-national corporations, and even individuals to promote the national interests. Acknowledging different actors involved in public diplomacy, and diverse methods in this discipline, this paper emphasizes collaboration and communication skills as the most important elements of an effective

¹ Signitzer, Benno, and Timothy Coombs. "Public relations and public diplomacy: Conceptual divergence." *Public Relations Review* 18 (2): 137-47, 1992.

public diplomacy. In order to have an effective public diplomacy plan, the government being the main actor must cooperate with non-state actors- such as multinational enterprises (MNEs). Undoubtedly MNEs have risen as key players in the global arena as companies expand their markets globally. Even if these companies began with simple type of sales in overseas, today big conglomerates such as General Electric, Coca-Cola, and Toyota are involved in adding values to the global customers with their corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities. Today, these big MNEs collaborate with governments in public diplomacy activities- and so the so-called Corporate Diplomacy has also become a new terminology in public diplomacy. Rather than companies involved in their “good deeds” as they mostly do in their CSR activities, in corporate diplomacy, companies take part in the government’s public diplomacy agenda. This paper examines what is corporate public diplomacy, and argues that corporates are the important actors in public diplomacy. By examining the role and capabilities of corporates in public diplomacy, this paper analyzes the realities of corporates’ roles in public diplomacy in the case of South Korea. The history of public diplomacy is short and has not received thorough research over the course of time. However, after a thorough research of the Korean corporate diplomacy, this paper will conclude by suggesting that the South Korean government and corporates need to extend the roles of corporates out of CSR activities.

Background: Public Diplomacy as collaborative diplomacy

The major acknowledgement that the public diplomacy has grown its importance is very recent. Perhaps there are many explanations to this, but to speak in the “realist” realm- where states are the main actors- perhaps it is sufficing to say that international structure has become a world that the threats to the states’ status quo is not another state. As we have seen since the Cold War, enemies might seem like other “States”, but it is rather a conglomerate of states united within an ideology, religion, extremist views, etc. Ever since 2001, it has been clear that the enemy is those on the side of extreme terrorist views. Zaharna gives the case of

the U.S. after the September 11 attacks. It was of no one’s expectation how the global public opinion on the U.S. could change so dramatically even after so much compassion. She argues that public diplomacy is no longer limited to promotion campaigns and direct government contacts with foreign public services.² The goals of public diplomacy are to achieve increasing people’s familiarity, appreciation, and engaging people with one’s country. In this sense, this paper would like to expand this view to argue that public diplomacy is wider and broader than the traditional diplomacy. The difficult and confusing part of public diplomacy is that not only that its importance has grown fairly recently, but it is constantly developing and changing with the new tools and players emerging. That is what makes public diplomacy complex and interesting at the same time.

Moreover, many authors have related public diplomacy with branding and public relation (Leonard, Stead, & Smewing, 2002; Ledingham, 2003; Grunig, 1993; Fitzpatrick, Fullerton & Kendrick, 2013). National Branding is definitely different from public diplomacy. Branding is a form derived from marketing, whereas diplomacy derives from politics and relational. As argued by Gilboa, it could be easier to say that public diplomacy holds a broader aspect than public relation and branding.³ For example, public diplomacy just cannot be summed up in an image, or slogans. The fundamental importance of diplomacy is to be able to communicate well with the other part by delivering your message clearly and to be able to listen to the counterpart. This involves a significant communications skill set and collaboration of communications experts- and the diverse engagement and collaboration is a crucial difference of public diplomacy from traditional diplomacy. Networking and collaborative public diplomacy is

² Zaharna, Rhonda S. *Battles to Bridges: U.S. Strategic Communication and Public Diplomacy after 9/11*. Edited by Donna Lee and Paul Sharp, *Studies in Diplomacy and International Relations*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. Original edition, 2010. Reprint, 2014 (Chapter 4), 2010.

³ Gilboa, Eytan. “Searching for a Theory of Public Diplomacy.” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616 (1):55-77, 2008.

complex and difficult. Each actor has different interests, thus collaboration will only occur when each actor's interests match in line with the government's diplomacy agenda.⁴ So then what is an effective collaborative public diplomacy? Looking at a holistic view of the world and acknowledging non-state actors such as NGOs, individuals, experts, etc.- an effective collaborative public diplomacy would be being able to pursue a policy partnering with all of the actors mentioned because they believe that it will benefit them as well. It could also be considered effective when you are able to carry out a policy without others having misconceptions or stereotypes on the motifs. Then these actors become 'Strategic Stakeholders'. When targeting a specific type of public, MNEs show strength in this field because their marketing and PR skills are trained to target a selected group of customers. Thus it is not surprising to see a well-networked collaboration with the government and the corporations in public diplomacy. The importance of public diplomacy is increasing as states see the importance of the influence of soft power to the general public around the world. The networked society today allows the world to be more connected to every single corner around the world. This involves a significant difference in the communication tactics compared to the traditional diplomacy, where the targeted public only consisted of public servants in the Foreign Ministry, or other government officials. Thanks to the social media and internet, the expansion of the tools and the delivery of these messages deserve a different method. Geoffrey Cowan and Amelia Arsenault have emphasized the importance of shifting from monologue dialogue to a collaborative communication in public diplomacy.⁵ The different types of communication exist still today- since traditional diplomacy still is present. But in terms of public diplomacy, collaborative method is more effective and needed. Delivering key policies of a country and the image of the country is crucial in

⁴ Cowan, G., and A. Arsenault. "Moving from Monologue to Dialogue to Collaboration: The Three Layers of Public Diplomacy." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616 (1):10-30, 2008.

⁵ Ibid.

public diplomacy, and it is more accountable and delivered without being felt as a propaganda when done by non-state actors (Zatepilina, 2009).

Strategic Stakeholder Engagement in public diplomacy

In order for public diplomacy programs to be more robust and more effective the main actors of the public diplomacy should not be limited to the government only. The collaboration of non-state actors with the government has been emphasized by many scholars (Kelley, 2010; La Porte, 2012; Riordan, 2005; Zatepilina, 2009; Zaharna, 2011). Many scholars such as Rhonda Zaharna acknowledge the roles of non-state actors as strategic stakeholders for government to cooperate with. Zaharna's 'Strategic Stakeholder Engagement' theory provides how to distinguish strategic stakeholders in public diplomacy and what constitutes a strategic engagement. She calls for the 'Strategic Stakeholder Engagement' where the right type of stakeholders with the right level of engagements is aligned with the goals of public diplomacy initiatives.⁶ This would provide a more aligned and transparent message to the broad public. Riordan also calls for 'Public Diplomacy Entrepreneurs' - a role for public diplomats to look for and identify opportunities for engagement, then communicating them to the relevant non-governmental agents, and facilitating the first steps in engagement.⁷ This would allow them to build credibility and consistency in their messages. He emphasizes the roles of non-state actors such as agents, NGOs, Universities, and enterprises. Zaharna and Riordan also strongly agree on the importance of engaging domestic public and the foreign public when it comes to distinguishing stakeholders. The actors of public diplomacy should not mistake that domestic and foreign public are

⁶ Zaharna, Rhonda S. "The Public Diplomacy Challenges of Strategic Stakeholder Engagement." In *Trials of Engagement: The Future of US Public Diplomacy*, edited by Ali Fisher and Scott Lucas. Leiden, Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2011.

⁷ Riordan, Shaun. "Dialogue-based public diplomacy: a new foreign policy paradigm?" In *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, edited by Jan Melissen. New York NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

merely audiences. They also are strategic publics as argued by Kathy Fitzpatrick.⁸ ‘Public’ and ‘Stakeholders’ are similar, but they are different from a targeted audience or customer perspective. They can be either your targeted audience or just a rational “active public” that is passing by. Stakeholders are by no means targeted audience according to Fitzpatrick. In Fitzpatrick’s article, she provides extensive list of definitions provided by fellow experts in defining who are the ‘public’ and who are the ‘stakeholders’.⁹ The networked society today has made communication faster, easier, more transparent, but has made communication web ever more complex. The relationship cannot be limited to a simple ‘organization-public’ relationship. While many authors would prefer to group publics, stakeholders, and actors- and see the relation with the organization dyadic; they simply cannot be grouped into one ‘stakeholders’ group. No organization deals with a group of stakeholders with a single kind of interest. These actors are intertwined with different interests and opinions, which makes it far more complicated. This is why it is not easy to specify who exactly public is and what public relations or diplomacy is limited to. Publics evolve over time and communications evolve over time especially in such a networked society like today.

As for strategic engagement, Zaharna goes further to to emphasize what is a strategic engagement. Rather than used as to explain audience involvement or participation in public diplomacy initiative, it now means relationship building. Here she brings that corporate social responsibility (CSR) programs by corporates focus on strategic ‘stakeholder engagement’. Ideal elements that describe an effective ‘stakeholder engagement’ would be that they are not one-time projects, but on-going programs. Also, they tend to be proactive in identifying the group of stakeholders impacted by the organization’s policies or activities in developing programs related to the stakeholder’s

interest and concerns.¹⁰ Additionally, they tend to have programs that include participation and collaboration of the local community. This type of participatory communication and collaboration becomes an essential element of strategic ‘stakeholder engagement’. In sum, they are relationship building, more engaging, and experiencing, rather than one-way.

Corporate Diplomacy

Among diverse actors, MNEs arise to be important actors of public diplomacy. This paper expands the views of Enric Ordeix-Rigo and Joao Duarte in their ambitious argument that corporate public diplomacy is more than “just the participation of corporations in public diplomacy.” They rather believe that corporates have the initiative and resources needed to lead the public diplomacy programs. They argue that major transnational corporations are able to develop to draft and implement their own programs, independent from the government’s initiative to pursue the diplomatic aims by the government. They believe in the roles of MNEs that they will acquire a status that goes beyond a license to operate, and the source of its legitimacy to do so. In sum, corporate diplomacy is about building trust, providing perspectives and help government in their transformational agenda just as any other actors. Furthermore, corporates play at the company level, but also represent the industry, the country, and further the country brand; and this may be the key difference that corporates carry compared to other actors. The power of branding cannot be ignored. When used effectively, they have a strong branding power. Also, MNEs, based on the fact that they are profit-driven, object-oriented organizations, they can more easily engage in strategic stakeholder engagement.

MNE’s branding power in public diplomacy

Branding diplomacy, first introduced by Leonard, Stead, and Smewing (2002) mentioned the key strengths that branding brings to the public. Brands such as Coca-Cola and Levi’s have an emotive pull of associations with the American way of life, its

⁸ Fitzpatrick, Kathy R. “Defining Strategic Publics in a Networked World: Public Diplomacy’s Challenge at Home and Abroad.” *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 7 (4):421-440, 2012.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Zaharna, 2011.

values and freedom.¹¹ By automatically, when people think of SONY or Nintendo, they can assume the lives of Japan and associate them with technological sophistications. There are challenges to this aspect as mentioned by Leonard, Stead, and Smewing that branding towards a massive public is difficult and at times no manageable. Hence, just as corporates do, choosing a targeted public is essential in public diplomacy. Moreover, transnational corporations tend to have an expert team in charge of public affairs. Public affairs is mostly aimed at internal affairs of the domestic community of the country, while public diplomacy targets the foreign public; however the need for increase in familiarity with the country, appreciation of that country, and willingness to engage with the country is needed for both.¹²

'Strategic Stakeholder Engagement' in corporate diplomacy

Before bringing Zaharna's complete theory of 'strategic stakeholder engagement' theory, this part of the paper will examine in what ways corporates can commit to the strategic public diplomacy. Jacquie E'tang argues that diplomacy is part of an organization's strategic public relations and skills of diplomacy are important to an effective PR. By looking at the nature of corporates, the existence of corporates in this world is delivered through PR activities. The 'Excellence Theory' provides an empirical framework to study public relation activities.¹³ By examining the direction (one-way vs. two-way), purpose (asymmetrical vs. symmetrical), channel (interpersonal vs. mediated), and ethics- this framework brought a new measurement for public relations activities. There have been significant differences in the PR activities done by MNEs as well. They take this notion and companies

¹¹ Leonard, Mark, Catherine Stead, and Conrad Smewing. *Public Diplomacy*. London: UK: Foreign Policy Centre, 2002.

¹² Ordeix-Rigo, Enric, and João Duarte. "From Public Diplomacy to Corporate Diplomacy: Increasing Corporation's Legitimacy and Influence." *American Behavioral Scientist* 53 (4):549-564, 2009.

¹³ Grunig, L. A., Grunig, J. E., & Dozier, D. M. "Excellent public relations and effective organizations: A study of communication management in three countries." Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 2002.

have taken more value-based PR, which includes CSR activities and branding of the company.¹⁴ In Zaharna's argument, strategic stakeholder engagement should include long-term participation with the public and the organization to be engaged in value sharing.¹⁵ E'tang is a strong supporter of the correlation of activities and elements of public relations and diplomacy. Compared to other non-state actors, MNEs show the most correlation to perform a 'strategic stakeholder engagement' with the public. She also emphasizes current era of globalization and sees that globalization has significant political and cultural effects to MNEs, raising major PR issues and CSR challenges. As we see in the case of global multinational corporations, many companies began to engage in corporate social responsibility programs and actively involved in sustainability as of the 21st century. The latter part of the paper will look at specifically the South Korean corporates and their 'strategic stakeholder engagement' in Korean public diplomacy.

Case Study

This part of the paper will analyze the Korean public diplomacy programs. Official Korean public diplomacy began after its official launch in 2010. Korean public diplomacy was incorporated as one of the three diplomacies: along with political diplomacy and economic diplomacy- the "hard powers". The objectives for Korean public diplomacy became "to win the hearts and minds of people", and the government has focused mainly on cultural diplomacy to support public diplomacy agenda. More specifically, Korean public diplomacy has focused on the elements of cultural diplomacy to initially promote Korean soft power to influence the public. Some of the strong elements of Korean soft power as described by Ambassador Ma Young-Sam are its model for developing, major global companies, *hallyu*, sports capabilities, Korean language, clothing, and cutting edge IT (information technology). His article, published by the Asan Institute for Policy Studies, has argued that with

¹⁴ L'Etang, Jacquie. "Public Relations and Diplomacy in a Globalized World: An Issue of Public Communication." *American Behavioral Scientist* 53 (4):607-626, 2009.

¹⁵ Zaharna, 2011

such abundant resources of Korean soft power, private individuals, corporations, NGOs, and media should perform much of the activities. This goes in line with many arguments from authors that see the importance of collaboration of the government with non-state actors in the public diplomacy agenda. A research done by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs along with Yonsei University has examined meticulously the current status of Korean public diplomacy analyzing the roles of each stakeholders of Korean public diplomacy and concluding with a suggestion for a control tower of public diplomacy. Both article by Ma and the MOFA state the importance of the roles of non-state actors in public diplomacy. For the interest of this paper, the role of MNEs in Korean public diplomacy should be tested.

Korean corporates in public diplomacy

Korean major companies such as Samsung, LG, Hyundai, SK, and POSCO have become global players in business world today. Hyundai and Kia cars are sold all over the world, and Samsung's smartphones have become a rival product for Apple's iPhone. Theoretically speaking, the field of public diplomacy has already acknowledged the important roles of corporations in promoting country's brand and image across the world. According to both the article by the Asan Institute for Policy Studies, and by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, major corporate public diplomacy programs are through various CSR programs. Companies such as Samsung, Hyundai Motors, POSCO, and LG have participated in humanitarian activities in different countries. Many of these companies have participated in a collaborative program with NGOs. POSCO have collaborated with HABITAT Korea, and LG have cooperated with Good Neighbours Volunteer group.

Corporate social activities of Korean companies began in early 2000s as companies started realize that that they are important members of the society, and to be a member, they need to seek more than just profit. Ordeix-Rigo and Duarte have asserted the fact that modern transnational corporations seek ways to enhance their active participation and presence in the society by adding new dimensions to their "traditional perceived role or generating wealth, employment, and quality products or services". In

Korea, transnational corporations such as mentioned above have actively spent time and money on corporate social responsibility activities.¹⁶ This paper will look deep into three main companies that highlighted their activities in corporate diplomacy - Hyundai, POSCO, and LG.

Hyundai

Hyundai Motors initiated the CSR programs since 2005. In 2008, they created 'Happy Move Youth Volunteer' CSR program where they collaborated with young university students. In 2008, they began with the objective to promote Korea's citizenship in the world cooperating with the country's future leaders in countries such as China, India, Turkey, Thailand and Hungary. Over the course of 16 years, the list of recipient countries expanded to Brazil, Egypt, Ghana, Malaysia, and Indonesia- but the main targeted countries remained to China and India. Although they had many different CSR programs domestic and internationally, the 'Happy Move Youth Volunteer' program existed to not only benefit the global society, but to help Korean students to gain international humanitarian volunteer experience. Through this program, Hyundai seeks to increase their network with the possible youth future employees. Their activities were diverse including cuisine programs, cultural programs, environment programs, etc. Most of the locations that the youth volunteers went to volunteer were Hyundai-related sites. But other than that, Hyundai Group is participating diverse activities other than CSR such as SAFE transportation safety Campaign and Scholarship donations in China, and Youtube Orchestra sponsorship in Australia.¹⁷

POSCO

POSCO has been actively involved with CSR activities related to domestic education and youth sponsorship. Since 2007, POSCO created the first volunteer group collaborating with university students and carried out first international humanitarian volunteer programs. This company's

¹⁶ Official Website of Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Republic of Korea. Accessed May 23, 2016. <http://www.mofa.go.kr/ENG/main/index.jsp>.

¹⁷ Official Website of Hyundai Motors. Accessed May 23, 2016. <https://www.hyundai.com/worldwide/en>.

focus has been Local Community, Future Generation, Green Planet, Diverse Society, and Cultural Heritage. Each focus area consists of domestic program and international program. For example, for the Local Community sector, POSCO not only supports the domestic community, but also the international community. In 2003, POSCO Volunteer group have initiated Global Volunteer Week that plans for a specific volunteer program for countries that POSCO has expanded to. This program has specialized themes such as environment, child education, health to suit each need of the community. Moreover, POSCO's Local Community project extends to emergency aid in the cases of natural disasters. Starting in 2006 earthquake in Indonesia, they have supported domestic and international communities in times of flood, typhoon, earthquake, etc. POSCO also collaborates with other organizations such as HABITAT Korea in building houses for the needs especially in developing countries. Last but not least, POSCO has joined the United Nations Global Compact in 2012 ensuring the policies and regulations compatible with global standards. Responsible management is not necessarily in line with public diplomacy agenda, but through their roles as active members to responsible management, POSCO makes its presence as a member of society.¹⁸

LG Electronics

LG has a long history and has diverse foundations that are base to the CSR activities. Their objectives are focused to benefit the society and the environment through ethical programs, and youth-related programs. Because LG has different subsidiaries in many diverse sectors, each subsidiary has its own program to make its presence as a member of the society. Most companies focus on programs that are highly correlated to their communities- domestic and international. To have a closer look, this paper will look at LG Electronics for their CSR activities and examine public diplomacy activities.

The goal of CSR activities of LG Electronics is to support the UN MDGs specifically in the areas of health, environment and poverty. For the year of 2014, LG Electronics have spent most of their CSR budget on environment. Their programs were more focused in foreign communities rather than Korean communities. Some of the highlights from 2014 activities were LG Hope Village in Ethiopia. LG has also cooperated with the NGO 'Good Neighbors' in creating synergy with volunteer programs.¹⁹

Findings of Korean corporate diplomacy

The analysis of three companies is an example of Korean companies' public diplomacy activities and their CSR activities. This paper has found that the public diplomacy activities by the Korean MNEs were actually their CSR activities. Surprisingly many of these programs had common elements. First, the target audience was all developing countries. Second, the foreign public was the country where these companies had their subsidiaries. Third, specific topics were limited to environment, health, and youth. Lastly, their volunteer programs included cooperating young students. There is nothing wrong with the major companies participating in these humanitarian activities. However, it could be argued that their programs are merely CSR programs, not completely in line with government's public diplomacy agenda. However, at the same time it is quite difficult to argue that these programs are not in line with Korea's public diplomacy policies. The fact is that Korean public diplomacy agenda is not yet all clear, as there is no control tower for public diplomacy, and many of the public diplomacy agenda are in line with cultural diplomacy. However, it is quite striking that none of the programs by the companies include any agenda related to the government's public diplomacy policy. This raises the big silo of agenda and implementation issue that the Korean public diplomacy is facing.

The first challenge raised should be the target audience of corporate diplomacy. Korean transnational corporates are big conglomerates expanded to different parts of the world,

¹⁸ Official Website of POSCO. Accessed May 23, 2016. <http://www.posco.co.kr/homepage/docs/kor5/jsp/s91a0000001i.jsp>.

¹⁹ Official Website of LG Electronics. Accessed May 23, 2016. <http://www.lg.co.kr/index/index.dev>.

cooperating and communicating with the foreign public. Their marketing and public relations skills have been well acknowledged by the foreign public, and many people around the world recognize brands such as Samsung, Hyundai, and LG. The target customers for their products may differ from ages, to gender, countries, etc. - but all of these countries have the ability to effectively deliver the messages to promote their brands. In the case of their corporate diplomacy activities, the targeted audience clearly is not in line with the public diplomacy audience. As mentioned from the beginning part of this article, the objective of the Korean government is to “win the hearts and minds of people”. To do this, they have focused on targeted audiences specifically for cultural diplomacy. Although there is no clear evidence of the Korean government declaring that the target audience for foreign public, seeing that Korea’s abundant resources are in culture, as mentioned by Ma, the MNE’s target audience does not match the public diplomacy audience.

Secondly, it seems a bit problematic that all the MNEs are engaging in the same kind of activities. They are either humanitarian activities in environment, scholarship, or volunteer programs. Each corporate has its own expertise and strengths, but it seemed like they are all engaging in same kind of CSR activities. Their sectors may be different, but their target public, youth volunteers all align in the same kind of activities. It creates an overlapping of agenda and programs. Their activities become less effective. These facts must be considered when corporates are implementing CSR activities. As public diplomacy perspective, it does not create a positive way to influence the foreign public that is in line with the targeted public by the government. Although Zaharna and L’etang are that CSR activities are part of ‘strategic stakeholder engagement’, if all corporates are engaging in the same kind of activities, it does not seem effective in the long-run, because they are only targeting one type of foreign public.

Suggestions for Korea: extension of corporates’ roles in public diplomacy

Surely, when it comes to the challenges and limitations of Korean public diplomacy, there are

many issues to raise. The fact that these challenges exist could be explained in many reasons, but the fact that there is no control tower for public diplomacy, and no specific guideline to the public diplomacy agenda creates confusion for both the control tower and the practitioners. According to the challenges of Korean public diplomacy raised by the MOFA and Yonsei, the government and the stakeholders realize the “overlapping-ness” of agendas and too much dependency on cultural contents. By using the argument of Ordeix and Duarte, this part of the paper will like to suggest that corporates need to take a more active role in public diplomacy. Authors argue that corporates have the initiative and the resources needed for public diplomacy. They should not only be part of practicing public diplomacy, but should be part of agenda setting.²⁰ This creates more legitimacy, accountability, and increases representation for both states and the actors- in this case corporates. Ordeix and Duarte suggests in using the power and legitimacy that corporates hold. For example, corporate diplomacy is a way to strengthen the network of stakeholder relationships for a company and thus a valid stakeholder management strategy for the state as well.

Moreover, Korean government should not limit the public diplomacy activities of MNEs to only CSR. As a matter of fact, many other companies are involved in public diplomacy agenda. For example, as in one of the pillars of public diplomacy, Korea aims to promote culture, food, and sports. There are many small, medium, and big enterprises that work to create contents to promote these elements. They can be part of public diplomacy process. More collaborative cooperation is needed with these stakeholders. Also in many cases, corporations have a list of what the foreign market, or public wants or needs. They are more up-to-date on technology and trends- public diplomacy can definitely make use of this. Although the roots of the public diplomacy agenda may not change, the more effective way to

²⁰ Zatepilina, Olga. “Non-state Ambassadors: NGO’s Contribution to America’s Public Diplomacy.” *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* 5 (2):156-168, 2009. And

deliver these communication tools can be achieved with corporations.

One last example that should be mentioned is the use of private corporates by the '130 years of Friendship between France and Korea'.²¹ Since mid-2015, both countries have been engaging in promoting the relations between themselves through diverse collaboration in endless sectors - sports, music, art, literature, academia, scholarship, etc. This well-planned public diplomacy project was allocated well with private sector as well. Although some parts may seem too much as propaganda, as Leonard, Stead, Smewing would mention (2002), at times it could be seen as a government scheme to get money from companies, rather than a strategic use of their assets to improve their market position and the national brand. In this case, there has been significant feedback (on the French side) how aggressive these advertisements and announcements seemed. However, in terms of delivery, the strategic stakeholders were able to pull out a public that later participated in these events and were able to engage. According to Zaharna's definition, this event needs to be a long-term event. But if the Korean government can manage to host these types of cultural events celebrating friendships with other countries, it can become a 'strategic stakeholder engagement'. It can also bring interest and benefits for the corporates as well. In the end, corporates are profit-oriented organizations.

Conclusion

This paper has touched upon a new field of public diplomacy- corporate diplomacy. Rather than providing a simple terminology of corporate diplomacy and the role of corporates in public diplomacy- this paper has argued that the branding abilities of corporates and their 'strategic stakeholder engagement' abilities as a strength to public diplomacy. A thorough analysis of Korean public diplomacy and the roles of MNEs in public diplomacy as found out that the so-claimed corporate diplomacy by the Korean Ministry of Foreign Affairs is limited to Corporate Social

Responsibility activities only. This paper has suggested in a more active role of corporates in public diplomacy, by giving a case of '130 years of Friendship between France and Korea' as a case. Needless to say, corporations have become important members of today's globalized society, and they seek for activities to maintain symbiotic relationship with key stakeholders.²² Many transnational corporations are drifting from their narrow mission of producing a product or service with the aim of meeting clients' needs or to get profit. We have already seen this with corporates' active engagement in CSR activities. Corporations need the legitimacy of governments' and to be associated with them in order to show that they are accountable. The government should make most of these needs and utilize the expertise that corporates have in power branding and their ability for 'strategic stakeholder engagement'.

Bibliography

Brown, Robin. "The Four Paradigms of Public Diplomacy: Building a Framework for Comparative Government External Communications Research." International Studies Association Convention, San Diego, 2012.

Cowan, G., and A. Arsenault. "Moving from Monologue to Dialogue to Collaboration: The Three Layers of Public Diplomacy." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616 (1):10-30, 2008.

Fisher, Ali. "Standing on the Shoulders of Giants: Building Blocks for a Collaborative Approach to Public Diplomacy." In *Relational, Networked and Collaborative Approaches to Public Diplomacy: The Connective Mindshift*, edited by R.S. Zaharna, Amelia Arsenault and Ali Fisher, 209-226. New York, NY: Routledge, 2013.

Fitzpatrick, Kathy R. "Advancing the New Public Diplomacy: A Public Relations Perspective." *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 2 (3): 187-211, 2007.

²¹ Website of 130 years of Friendship of France and Korea. Accessed May 23, 2016. <http://anneefrancecoree.com/>.

²² Ordeix-Rigo, Enric, and João Duarte, 2009.

- Fitzpatrick, Kathy R. "Defining Strategic Publics in a Networked World: Public Diplomacy's Challenge at Home and Abroad." *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 7 (4):421-440, 2012.
- Fitzpatrick, Kathy R., Jami Fullerton, and Alice Kendrick. "Public Relations and Public Diplomacy: Conceptual and Practical Connections." *Public Relations Journal* 7 (4), 2013.
- Gilboa, Eytan. "Searching for a Theory of Public Diplomacy." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616 (1):55-77, 2008.
- Gregory, Bruce. "Public diplomacy: Sunrise of an academic field." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616 (1):274-290, 2008.
- Grunig, James E. "Public relations and international affairs: Effects, ethics and responsibility.", 1993.
- Grunig, L. A., Grunig, J. E., & Dozier, D. M. "Excellent public relations and effective organizations: A study of communication management in three countries." Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 2002.
- Hocking, Brian L. "Reconfiguring Public Diplomacy: From Competition to Collaboration." In *Engagement: Public Diplomacy in a Globalised World*, edited by Jolyon Welsh and Daniel Fearn. London: UK: Foreign and Commonwealth Office, 2008.
- Kelley, John Robert. "The New Diplomacy: Evolution of a Revolution." *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 21 (2):286-305, 2010.
- Kim, Taehwan. "Paradigm Shift in Diplomacy: A Conceptual Model for Korea's 'New Public Diplomacy'." *KOREA OBSERVER* 43 (4): 527-555, 2012.
- La Porte, Teresa. "The Impact of 'Intermestic' Non-State Actors on the Conceptual Framework of Public Diplomacy." *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 7 (4):441-458, 2012.
- Ledingham, John A. Explicating Relationship Management as a General Theory of Public Relations." *Journal of Public Relations Research* 15 (2):181-198, 2003.
- L'Etang, Jacquie. "Public Relations and Diplomacy in a Globalized World: An Issue of Public Communication." *American Behavioral Scientist* 53 (4):607-626, 2009.
- Leonard, Mark, Catherine Stead, and Conrad Smewing. *Public Diplomacy*. London: UK: Foreign Policy Centre, 2002.
- Ma, Youngsam, Junghe Song, and Dewey Moore. "Korea's Public Diplomacy: A New Initiative for the Future." The Asian Institute for Policy Studies, Seoul, Korea, 2012.
- Melissen, Jan. "The New Public Diplomacy: Between Theory and Practice." In *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, edited by Jan Melissen. New York, NY, 2005.
- Official Website of Hyundai Motors. Accessed May 23, 2016. <https://www.hyundai.com/worldwide/en>.
- Official Website of LG Electronics. Accessed May 23, 2016. <http://www.lg.co.kr/index/index.dev>.
- Official Website of Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Republic of Korea. Accessed May 23, 2016. <http://www.mofa.go.kr/ENG/main/index.jsp>.
- Official Website of POSCO. Accessed May 23, 2016. <http://www.posco.co.kr/homepage/docs/kor5/jsp/s91a0000001i.jsp>.
- Ordeix-Rigo, Enric, and João Duarte. "From Public Diplomacy to Corporate Diplomacy: Increasing Corporation's Legitimacy and Influence." *American Behavioral Scientist* 53 (4):549-564, 2009.

Riordan, Shaun. "Dialogue-based public diplomacy: a new foreign policy paradigm?" In *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations*, edited by Jan Melissen. New York NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Signitzer, Benno, and Timothy Coombs. "Public relations and public diplomacy: Conceptual divergence." *Public Relations Review* 18 (2): 137-47, 1992.

Website of 130 years of Friendship of France and Korea. Accessed May 23, 2016.
<http://anneefrancecoree.com/>.

Zaharna, Rhonda S. *Battles to Bridges: U.S. Strategic Communication and Public Diplomacy after 9/11*. Edited by Donna Lee and Paul Sharp, *Studies in Diplomacy and International Relations*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. Original edition, 2010. Reprint, 2014 (Chapter 4), 2010.

Zaharna, Rhonda S. "The Public Diplomacy Challenges of Strategic Stakeholder Engagement." In *Trials of Engagement: The Future of US Public Diplomacy*, edited by Ali Fisher and Scott Lucas. Leiden, Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2011.

Zaharna, Rhonda S. "The 4th Quadrant of Public Diplomacy." *E-International Relations*, 2012.

Zaharna, Rhonda S. "Network Purpose, Network Design: Dimensions of Network and Collaborative Public Diplomacy." In *Relational, Networked and Collaborative Approaches to Public Diplomacy: The Connective Mindshift*, edited by R.S. Zaharna, Amelia Arsenault and Ali Fisher, 173-191. New York, NY: Routledge, 2013.

Zatepilina, Olga. "Non-state Ambassadors: NGO's Contribution to America's Public Diplomacy." *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* 5 (2):156-168, 2009.

김기정, 최종건. "한국 공공외교 수행 체계 연구". 외교통상부 연구용역과제 보고서. 대한민국 외교통상부, 2012.