

Two-Way Engagement in Public Diplomacy The Case of Talk Talk Korea

Felicia Istad*

Ph. D. Candidate, Department of Public Administration, Korea University

Abstract

Proponents of new public diplomacy emphasize the importance of two-way engagement with foreign publics. Despite theoretical support for mutual dialogue, there is a lack of studies that examine the means by which governments and other actors of public diplomacy engage with civic stakeholders. Responding to this gap in the research literature, the present study introduces the case of Talk Talk Korea and critically examines how the Ministry of Foreign Affairs engage with foreign publics through online contests. The contest format has received limited attention in the research literature as a tool of political communication, despite being a popular platform among government agencies in South Korea. This study highlights the role of online contests in public diplomacy and examines seven rounds of contest participation in Talk Talk Korea from 2012 to 2018. Through examinations of both participation guidelines and user submissions, it is observed that the online format enables the government to steer direction of the dialogue, and to collect public views on topics of particular interest to South Korea. At the same time, it is argued that a contest premised on incentives requires particular attention to critical dialogue. The study concludes with a discussion of policy implications for two-way engagement in public diplomacy.

Keywords: South Korea, foreign policy, digital platforms, public engagement, two-way communication

*feliciaistad@korea.ac.kr

Democratization, globalization and developments in ICT make governments subject to more scrutiny than ever before. Not only do national leaders seek to win the support of their fellow citizens, they also need to consider the opinion of foreign publics. Human migration has rapidly increased, while new technologies enable people from different cultures to interact and exchange information online. The fast-spreading dissemination of national news and personal views has implications for diplomatic relations, which no longer can be considered an affair limited to government bureaucracies (Potter, 2003).

Over the past few decades, increased efforts have been diverted to the field of public diplomacy. Public diplomacy is defined in various ways, depending on the understanding of goals, actors and tools involved (Gilboa, 2008). This study employs the definition put forward by Cull (2009b): "public diplomacy is an international actor's attempt to manage the international environment through engagement with a foreign public" (p. 12). According to this understanding, the core of public diplomacy lies in the emphasis on foreign publics as important political stakeholders in global affairs. With ordinary citizens claiming a stronger voice in politics within and across borders, international actors are increasingly realizing the importance of winning the hearts and minds of the people. Similar to conventional diplomacy, the goal is to influence the political opinion of foreign nations, but to do so by communicating with ordinary citizens as well as diplomats and country leaders.

With the rise of globalization and communication technologies, it has become increasingly easy for governments to disperse images of their countries to the wider public, and to convey their foreign policies. The use of new technologies to project favorable country images has been met with criticism by scholars (Cull,

2013; Gilboa, 2006; Melissen, 2005; Nye, 2010), who call for governments to move beyond one-way communication to actively engage in dialogue with people of other countries. New public diplomacy has emerged within this context, and emphasizes the importance of listening to foreign publics (Cull, 2009b). Despite new public diplomacy having gained foothold in scholarly circles, there is still a lack of studies that examine how governments engage in two-way communication with public stakeholders.

This study seeks to fill a gap in the literature by introducing the use of online contests as a platform of two-way communication between the Korean government and foreign publics. Specifically, this study examines the case of Talk Talk Korea, a long running initiative by the Public Diplomacy and Cultural Affairs Bureau, under the Korean Ministry of Foreign Affairs (hereinafter MOFA). On one hand, it is argued that the platform enables state actors to steer the dialogue with foreign publics and to collect their views of South Korea. On the other hand, it is also observed that the competition format is vulnerable to positively biased responses if only favorable images are encouraged and rewarded. It is argued that the outcome of online contests like Talk Talk Korea will depend on design and intention. While the platform can provide an effective tool for policy makers looking to achieve meaningful communication with foreign publics, the findings of this study challenges the notion that two-way communication necessarily results in critical dialogue.

The article is structured as follows. First, a conceptual framework of public diplomacy is provided and a brief review of the literature is presented. Next, public diplomacy in South Korea is explained and the case of Talk Talk Korea is introduced. The research design is then described, before proceeding to an

analysis of the government's contest guidelines and the emerging themes in corresponding submissions. Finally, the study concludes with a discussion of the findings and implications for future research on digital communication in public diplomacy.

Public Diplomacy

The practice of diplomacy has been around as long as there have been nation states. From kings to presidents, country leaders have engaged with one another through warfare and dialogue for centuries. In more recent times, governments have also reached out to foreign publics. Propaganda strategies advanced during the World Wars and continued to be employed in the Cold War era, when ideological warfare spiraled against the backdrop of a nuclear arms race (Gilboa, 2008).

In 1965, the term public diplomacy was coined by the dean of Tufts University's Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Edmund Guillon, as he launched the Edward R. Murrow Center of Public Diplomacy. Although the concept took strong foothold in American policy circles over the next few decades, it was not until the end of the Cold War that the term was adopted more widely by governments across the globe (Cull, 2009a).

The end of the Cold War also marked the beginning of a new era in communications and information technologies. Ordinary people were increasingly exposed to international issues and the affairs of foreign governments through real time news coverage on television and information disseminated through the Internet (Cull, 2009b; Sharp, 2001). Consequently, foreign policy decision makers had to pay more consideration to the public opinion, both at home and abroad (Kelley, 2010). In the words of Paul Sharp (2001), "the era of the ordinary person has finally arrived in

international relations" (Sharp, 2001, p. 136)

In particular, the rise of social media has provided actors of public diplomacy with a new platform through which they can reach and communicate with foreign publics. While sharing commonalities with traditional media, such as the dissemination of information, digital platforms also enable governments and activists to engage in a mutual dialogue with the target audience. The emphasis on two-way communication is key to new public diplomacy (Zaharna, Arsenault & Fisher, 2013), which is defined by Gilboa (2008) as "an attempt to adjust public diplomacy to the conditions of the information age" (p. 58). Approaching public diplomacy from the field public relations, Fitzpatrick, Fullerton and Kendrick (2013) argue that this shift is reflective of a "contemporary view of public relations as a collaborative enterprise" in which "publics are viewed as participants (as opposed to audiences) in organization-public relationships" (p. 7). The authors link this theoretical development to the excellence theory, which in turn draws upon stakeholder theory, and argue that organizations are most effective when they take account of stakeholder interests by communicating symmetrically (Dozier, Grunig & Grunig, 1995; Grunig, 1992). The emphasis on symmetrical communication signals a departure from other forms of top-down, unidirectional messaging, observed in previous work by Grunig and Hunt (1984). Here, the authors suggest four models of public relations, which are distinguished by the direction of communication, either as one or two ways, and by the purpose of a message, either as promotion or engagement.

In a critical review of what engagement entails within the sphere of public diplomacy, Comor and Bean (2012) argue that "engagement is meant to be strategic rather than free-flowing" (p. 205). In this view, public diplomacy is closer to a policy instrument, in which communication is applied as a tool to both

inform, but also collect information from foreign publics (Wang, 2007). This approach is conceptualized as 'listening' by Cull (2008), who defines listening as "an actor's attempt to manage the international environment by collecting and collating data about publics and their opinions overseas and using that data to redirect its policy or its wider public diplomacy approach accordingly" (p. 18). Cull (2010) argues that listening is key to effective public diplomacy, and that it precedes all other elements of successful diplomacy, including advocacy, cultural diplomacy, exchange diplomacy, and international broadcasting.

Literature Review

Despite a normative consensus for governments to move beyond top-down communication and to initiate mutual dialogue with foreign publics (Cull, 2009a; Gilboa, 2006; Melissen, 2005; Nye, 2010), research on the use of online tools in diplomatic activities reveals a persistent tendency towards unidirectional communication. In a study of 41 Twitter accounts run by Central-Eastern European and Western Embassies, Dodd and Collins (2017) find that social media is employed to spread information, rather than engaging with foreign publics. The findings are echoed by Lee (2017), who examines the Twitter accounts of eight embassies located in South Korea, and finds that the diplomacy corps continue to pursue an informational approach although communication strategies that engage the audiences yield more response. In addition to Twitter, researchers have also looked into public diplomacy activities on other social media platforms. Spry (2018) collects data from in total 161 Facebook pages across 22 host nations and observes more activity in smaller, closed, and less developed countries.

The study also identifies differences in the approaches employed by the embassies, ranging from one-way information sharing to mutual dialogue. In another comparative study of Facebook activities by government-affiliated institutions in South Korea and Japan, Park and Lim (2014) find that Korean public diplomacy is more successful in engaging with foreign audiences, and credit this success to the employment of interactive communication strategies. The findings are supported by Lee (2019), who examines the evolution of public relations in Korean foreign policy and observes an increased emphasis on two-way engagement by actors in public diplomacy. The present study further extends the research on digital communication strategies in public diplomacy by focusing on online contests as a platform for state interactions with foreign publics.

Korean Public Diplomacy

In 2010, South Korea officially adopted public diplomacy by launching the “Korea Public Diplomacy Forum” (MOFA, 2011). The civil advisory group was set up in collaboration between MOFA and the Korea Foundation (hereinafter KF), both key stakeholders in Korean public diplomacy. The establishment of a public diplomacy forum was followed by the appointment of Korea’s first public diplomacy ambassador in 2011 (MOFA, 2012). In the year after, MOFA relaunched the Division of Cultural Diplomacy as the Division of Public Diplomacy (currently the Public Diplomacy and Cultural Affairs Bureau). By 2013, public diplomacy was designated as the third pillar of Korean diplomacy, together with political and economic diplomacy (MOFA, 2013). Finally, in 2016 South Korea established the Public Diplomacy Act and followed up by launching the first five-year

plan for public diplomacy in 2017 (MOFA, 2017).

Within the Korean government, there are a number of ministries, public agencies, and institutes involved in activities relating to public diplomacy. The Public Diplomacy and Cultural Affairs Bureau runs under MOFA, which in 2020 is one of 17 central government ministries to carry out public diplomacy activities, along with 17 subnational governments (MOFA, 2020). Examples of administrations involved include among others the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism (hereinafter MCST) and the Ministry of Education.

Reflecting the diversity of activities and the number of stakeholders in Korean public diplomacy, scholars have examined a variety of related initiatives run by the Korean government and affiliated institutions. ODA programmes have been evaluated as a platform for citizen diplomacy (Lee, 2018) and as a tool for middle power diplomacy (Lee, 2014). The role of people-to-people exchanges has been examined in the context of education (Yun, 2014; 2015), sports (Kim & Lee, 2009; Kim, Lee, Choi & Lim, 2016; Lim, Chang & Kim, 2014), NGOs (Ayhan, 2018; Han & Yang, 2017), and think-thanks (Paik & Yang, 2018). The evolution of Korean public diplomacy has been accompanied by studies that critically evaluate the government's approach (Cho, 2012) to middle power (Howe, 2017; Kim, 2012; Kim, 2013; Lee, 2012; Lee, 2015; Lee, 2016; Melissen & Sohn, 2015), cultural assets (Istad, 2016; Jang & Paik, 2012; Lee, 2009), soft power (Kalinowski & Cho, 2012; Kim & Marinescu, 2015; Lee, 2011), nation branding (Cull, 2012; Hong, 2014; Schmuck, 2011), cultural diplomacy (Kang, 2015; Kim, 2011; Kim, 2018; Kim & Jin, 2016), gastrodiplomacy (Pham, 2013), and digital diplomacy (Park & Lim, 2014; Robertson, 2018). While the literature into Korean public diplomacy is growing, there are few studies that focus on strategies of communication (but see Lee, 2019; Park & Lim, 2014;

Robertson, 2018). This study examines the online contest Talk Talk Korea as a platform for communication between the Korean government and foreign publics.

Talk Talk Korea

Talk Talk Korea was first launched in 2012 and is run annually by MOFA under the Public Diplomacy and Cultural Affairs Bureau. According to MOFA (2013), Talk Talk Korea and other online contests were first hosted as pilot projects with the intention of utilizing public responses to inform the establishment of an effective national image. The use of contests to communicate with foreign publics remains a popular practice with MOFA, MCST, and affiliated institutes. Examples include among others Quiz on Korea, Taste of Korea and the King Sejong Speech Contest. As such, Talk Talk Korea represents a popular practice by Korean government agencies that are tasked with communicating the country and its culture abroad.

While many government contests limit participation through offline organization or target particular themes like food and language, Talk Talk Korea maintains a broad reach in terms of both theme and participation. The event is accessible online and is open to anyone who is not a Korean citizen. In 2013, the Korean government received 464 submissions from participants of 85 different countries. By 2017, the submission rate had increased to 31,055 contributions from people of 135 different nationalities (MOFA, 2014; 2018). The contest is advertised through national entities, including diplomatic missions, the tourism organization, and broadcasting channels. Winners of the contest are rewarded with prizes of monetary value.

Talk Talk Korea is one of the longest running programs of its

sort, making it possible to observe how the Korean government has communicated with foreign publics over time. Approaching Talk Talk Korea as a case study (Gerring, 2004), this study examines seven rounds of contest participation from 2012 to 2018, with a total sample of 60 submissions. The number of submissions are evenly distributed across the seven years. The final sample in this study includes all submissions made publicly available on the homepage of the Public Diplomacy and Cultural Affairs Bureau. While the publicly available sample of 60 submissions reflects a small share of the total responses submitted to Talk Talk Korea, this is not considered a significant drawback to the analysis. The focus of this study is to understand how the Korean government as an actor of public diplomacy chooses to engage with foreign publics, and to examine the subsequent dialogue that occurs between the two parties. Here, MOFA represents the actor, Talk Talk Korea is the tool of communication and contest participants reflect the foreign publics. In particular, the analysis investigates how MOFA as the initiator steers the dialogue and the themes that emerge within submissions by foreign publics. To this end, each submission has been reviewed both as a response to instructions, for example by focusing on episodic storytelling or affective images, and in terms of themes that emerge in correspondence with or independent of the contest guidelines. Each submission in the sample has been coded for analysis, following common practice in qualitative textual readings (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). The following sections first examine contest instructions, followed by a thematic analysis of submissions. The two-part analysis concludes with a discussion in which the public responses are linked to the contest guidelines.

Invitation to Dialogue

The contest instruction of Talk Talk Korea is key to understanding what kind of input MOFA intends to elicit from foreign publics through two-way communication online. While the guidelines change somewhat from year to year, the contest primarily invites foreign publics to convey their associated images of South Korea (see Appendix A). The following section reviews the evolution of Talk Talk Korea over seven years, and examines the development in light of contemporary government policies.

In the first couple of rounds of Talk Talk Korea, MOFA invited foreign publics to share favorable impressions of South Korea. Participants were asked to describe “why you love Korea,” and to introduce “your best Korean friend” or “your favorite Korean food.” The descriptions called for “impressions” of Korea, as well as “personal experiences.” Positive images were encouraged with wordings like “good impression” and “good influence.” The emphasis on favorable images is reflective of popular practice in nation branding (Dinnie, 2008), and these first two rounds of Talk Talk Korea correspond with the final years of the Presidential Council on Nation Branding. Established in 2009 by former president Lee Myung-bak, the committee sought to improve the Korean nation brand. Enhancing the national image of South Korea had high priority within the government at the time, and is reflected in the request for favorable images in contest submissions to the Public Diplomacy and Cultural Affairs Bureau.

In 2013, President Park Geun-hye took office and the Presidential Council on Nation Branding was disbanded. The new government operated under the direction of promoting a ‘creative economy’, which sought to foster new industries and

enhance innovation. In this period, the contest description took on a more neutral tone, with no use of positive superlatives like “good,” “best,” and “favorite.” Instead, the invitation for submissions became more detailed, calling for participants to share their “thoughts, experiences, and impressions of Korea.” Whereas previous rounds of the contest sought to identify favorable images by foreign publics, this round encouraged participants to try and explain why they associated and favored certain images of Korea. In other words, the government encouraged reflection on the appeal of South Korea. This second period of Talk Talk Korea coincided with a number of other cultural initiatives at home and abroad, including among others the grand vision of a ‘Culture and Creativity Fusion Belt,’ the local tourist attraction K-Travel Bus and the opening of K-pop academies at the Korean Culture Centers. In a period focused on enhancing national innovation, particularly in the creative and cultural industries, Talk Talk Korea served as a platform to gain insights and perspectives from foreign publics.

In the subsequent three rounds of Talk Talk Korea, the call for associative images of Korea continued. Instead of asking what foreigners think of when they are asked about Korea, the government called for submissions that share the impact of South Korea on the lives of foreigners. The new approach was first employed in 2016 with “Korea in your eyes!” followed by “Bring your own Korea” in 2017 and “Find Korea in your country” in 2018. Using the possessive noun “your,” descriptions called for more ownership by contest participants, by encouraging personal stories that moved beyond impressions, to reveal the influence of South Korea on the lives of foreign publics.

Images of South Korea

In response to calls for submission, Talk Talk Korea has elicited thousands of responses, among some of which are featured on the homepage of the country's division for public diplomacy. A review of the publicly available sample shows that participants employ a variety of materials in their responses to the contest. The first few rounds were limited to video format, but subsequent rounds have included photos, drawings, and cartoons. Many combine different elements, such as photos and videos. Also, several entrants employ effects like textiles and food to form images. Most of the submissions are in English, Korean or a combination of the two. A few videos feature other languages, with subtitles in English. While some people participate alone, others include family, friends, and classmates in their submissions. Talk Talk Korea is open to all topics, but provides suggestions in the guidelines, including special themes such as peace on the Korean peninsula in 2018. The following section details recurring themes in the submission entries, including both directed and self-initiated topics.

The first theme is South Korea's national costume, referred to as *hanbok*. The theme was introduced as a special topic in 2016, but occurs frequently throughout all seven rounds of submissions. As a piece of clothing, *hanbok* is something that foreign publics wear to identify with Korean culture. As a national costume, *hanbok* represents the Korean peninsula in its entirety. For example, a cartoon telling the story of two sisters who are reunited after being separated in the Korean war, shows both of them wearing national costumes of similar colors. In a romantic twist of the previous story, one video depicts a couple in *hanboks* divided by a gap in the ground and subsequently reunited as the gap closes. The costume is also featured together

with the flags of North and South Korea. In a drawing of two young girls sitting close and smiling, both are wearing *hanboks* while birds on their shoulders are holding the flags of North Korea on one side and South Korea on the other side. Notably, flags are used to contrast North and South, while *hanbok* appears as a symbol of unity.

The second theme observed in this study is Korean popular culture, including music and dramas. According to the narratives shared by contest participants, mainstream culture oftentimes serves as a door-opener that sparks further interest in Korean language, literature, food, or traditional culture. Additionally, popular culture appears to have an emotional appeal and a social function. Both K-pop and K-dramas are illustrated as something participants enjoyed doing together with their friends. One video shows two girls laughing and crying together while watching Korean television. Another participant writes that Korean shows and dramas “have brought many smiles to [her] life.”

The third theme, language, is commonly illustrated with the statue of King Sejong in drawings, photos, and videos, or with *hangul* letters formed by textiles, food, and drawings. In submissions that go beyond symbolism and dive into personal narratives, learners of the Korean language often cite an initial interest in Korean pop culture, where motivation to learn the language is explained as a way of gaining a better understanding of the host culture. Also, some people say that they learn Korean in order to communicate with friends or acquaintances. Videos and photos depict participants studying with classmates at educational institutions in and outside of South Korea, pinpointing classrooms as a platform to connect with other people who are interested in the same culture.

In Talk Talk Korea, interactions between people emerge as a fourth major theme. People are not merely featured as

communicators of culture, values, and history. Rather, it becomes evident that human connection in itself can be a driver of country attraction. In 2012, one participant responded to the theme “I love Korea because...” with “I love Korea because I love its people.” Similarly, in 2014, participants were asked to share what Korea is to them, upon which a pair responded “to us, Korea is the people.” Also, several submissions discussed the concept of *jeong*. The phrase might be understood as a sense of attachment that develops between people over time. Participants cited *jeong* as a point of appeal, and explained it as something unique to Korean culture.

The fifth emerging theme in Talk Talk Korea is food. Throughout submissions, Korean food is praised for being colorful, healthy, tasty, versatile, and social. In 2013 and 2018, Talk Talk Korea specifically requested participants to introduce their favorite Korean food. By highlighting food as a category, it was possible to better understand why people favored Korean food in general and certain dishes in particular. According to the participants, *bibimbap* is healthy and easy to prepare, while *samgyeopsal* has the ability to connect people over a meal. In agreement with the aforementioned observations regarding *jeong* and human interaction, several submissions point to Korean meals as a point of social connection.

The sixth theme observed in this study is aid. South Korea operates a variety of ODA initiatives, and several of the submissions to Talk Talk Korea features participants of developing countries who have received help from the Korean Government Scholarship Program (KGSP) and Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA). However, apart from recipients of Korean ODA, only few participants mention Korean aid efforts in their submissions.

Finally, ‘Peace on the Korean Peninsula’ was introduced as

an official theme to Talk Talk Korea in 2018. Both North and South Korea have declared unification as a long term goal, but the inter-Korean relations have long been tumultuous. Submissions by participants in the 2018 Talk Talk Korea contest round reflect upon multiple contexts of diplomacy. On the one hand, a number of contributions show interactions between country leaders. In an image drawn up of beans and corn attached to paper, Kim Jong-un and Moon Jae-in are seen shaking hands at the border between North and South Korea. Other submissions show the two leaders holding hands and smiling. Yet, far more submissions emphasize the interpersonal relation between North and South Korean citizens. One cartoon depicts two sisters divided by the war and reunited in old age. Photos and drawings show pairs of people dressed in hanboks while holding the flags of North and South Korea respectively. With the flags as a backdrop, people of the two countries are seen dancing, embracing each other, sitting shoulder to shoulder, and greeting hands.

Discussion

The preceding analysis has identified a number of recurring themes, ranging from food to peace on the Korean peninsula. Perhaps most prevalent are the themes of traditional and modern Korean culture. Cultural images are often applied to emphasize contrast, or to highlight the balance between old and new. Culture can take on specific forms like songs, instruments, visual effects, but it is also implicit in activities like cooking, sports, and social interactions. Language is another dimension that operates in multiple directions. Submissions to Talk Talk Korea show language as both something that can be the first step into a new

culture or the result of an already established interest. Similarly, foreigners might get to know South Korea through meetings with Korean people, or their desire to learn Korean might encourage them to seek out people from South Korea. When these dynamics are viewed in the context of international relations, it is evident that different branches of public diplomacy do not exist in isolation, but are highly interrelated.

Whereas culture is visibly recurring in Talk Talk Korea, politics are noticeably absent until 2018, when MOFA encouraged submissions with the theme 'Peace on the Korean Peninsula'. While country images play an important role in long-term relationships with foreign publics, the knowledge and understanding of historical and political issues arguably play an important role in short and medium term foreign policy. In order for an international actor to gain the support of other nations and their people, it is rarely sufficient to have a strong brand image (see Anholt, 2013 for discussion). Effectively communicating foreign policy is a crucial task to actors of public diplomacy. When the Korean government encouraged submissions on the topic of peace in 2018, Talk Talk Korea invited input on bilateral relations, albeit confined to the context of the Korean peninsula. This marks a shift from common practice in online engagement with foreign publics, which is observed to focus predominantly on culture and social issues rather than international affairs (Tam, 2019). Also in the case of Talk Talk Korea, contest instructions prior to 2018 were primarily focused on cultural themes and people exchanges, although it did not restrict other topics. Indeed, the thematic analysis of contest submissions shows that ODA emerges as a theme, despite not being called for explicitly. By simultaneously examining government messages and public responses, this study observes how communication through online contests results in both organically emerging themes and

themes influenced by agenda setting. It can be argued that MOFA has been able to attract a wide variety of submissions by keeping guidelines open and flexible. Furthermore, it has been able to steer the dialogue in accordance with contemporary government interests, by requesting either favorable images, personal narratives or associative perspectives on bilateral relations.

Conclusion

The findings of this research carry implications for governments as they formulate digital diplomacy strategies, and use responses from foreign publics to inform their public diplomacy policies going forward. Observations from Talk Talk Korea show that publicly hosted online contests can serve as a source of insights from foreign publics, while also allowing for the international actor to steer the incoming contents in any desired direction by specifying themes of interest and adjusting contest instructions. As such, online contests provide a platform for governments to engage in two-way communication with foreign publics and to better understand foreign perceptions of their countries. As much as we want people to view our country favorably, there is also a need to comprehend the ways in which we are actually being understood and perceived. The contest format can be useful to this end, but must be designed carefully, as it is based on the premise of an actor incentivizing feedback from the public. In order to engage the audience in a thoughtful dialogue on foreign policy, encouraging critical discussion will be a significant first step.

References

- Anholt, S. (2013). Beyond the nation brand: The role of image and identity in international relations. *Exchange: The Journal of Public Diplomacy*, 2(1), 6-12. Retrieved from <https://surface.syr.edu/exchange/vol2/iss1/1/>
- Ayhan, K. J. (2018). Branding Korea as “My Friend’s Country”: The case of VANK’s cyber public diplomats. *Korea Observer*, 49(1), 51-81. doi:10.29152/KOIKS.2018.49.1.51
- Cho, Y. Y. (2012). Public diplomacy and South Korea’s strategies. *The Korean Journal of International Studies*, 10(2), 275-296. doi:10.14731/kjis.2012.12.10.2.275
- Comor, E., & Bean, H. (2012). America’s ‘engagement’ delusion: Critiquing a public diplomacy consensus. *The International Communication Gazette*, 74(3), 203-220. doi:10.1177/1748048511432603
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cull, N. J. (2008). Public diplomacy: Taxonomies and histories. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1), 31-54. doi:10.1177/0002716207311952
- Cull, N. J. (2009). *Public diplomacy: Lessons from the past*. CPD perspectives on public diplomacy. Los Angeles, CA: Figueroa Press.
- Cull, N. J. (2009). Public diplomacy before gullion: The evolution of a phrase. In N. Snow & P. M. Taylor (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy* (pp. 19-23). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cull, N. J. (2010). Public diplomacy: Seven lessons for its future from its past. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 6(1), 11-17. doi:10.1057/pb.2010.4
- Cull, N. J. (2012). Listening for the hoof beats - Implications of the rise of soft power and public diplomacy. *Global Asia*, 7(3), 8-12. Retrieved from <https://www.globalasia.org/v7no3/cover/listening-for-the-ho-of-beats-implications-of-the-rise-of-soft-power-and-public-diplom>

acy_nicholas-j-cull

- Cull, N. J. (2013). The long road to public diplomacy 2.0: The Internet in US public diplomacy. *International Studies Review*, 15, 123-139. doi:10.1111/misr.12026
- Dinnie, K. (2008). *Nation branding: Concepts, ideas, practice*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- Dodd, M. D., & Collins, S. J. (2017). Public relations message strategies and public diplomacy 2.0: An empirical analysis using Central-Eastern European and Western embassy twitter accounts. *Public Relations Review*, 43, 417-425. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2017.02.004
- Dozier, D. M., Grunig, L. A., & Grunig, J. E. (1995). *The manager's guide to public relations and communication management*. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Fitzpatrick, K., Fullerton, J., & Kendrick, A. (2013). Public relations and public diplomacy: Conceptual and practical connections. *Public Relations Journal*, 7(4), 1-21. Retrieved from <https://doaj.org/article/b4526dd6166f44c5b52135c5a9d11807>
- Gerring, J. (2004). What is a case study and what is it good for? *American Political Science Review*, 98(2), 341-354. doi:10.1017/S0003055404001182
- Gilboa, E. (2006). Public diplomacy: The missing component in Israel's foreign policy. *Israel Affairs*, 12(4), 715-47. doi:10.1080/13533310600890067
- Gilboa, E. (2008). Searching for a theory of public diplomacy. *The Annals of the American Academy*, 616(1), 55-77. doi:10.1177/0002716207312142
- Grunig, J. E. (1992). *Excellence in public relations and communication management*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Grunig, J. E., & Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing public relations*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Han, J. Y. K., & Yang, S. U. (2017). Investigating the role of non-governmental organizations in new public diplomacy:

- Autonomy and collaboration between the Voluntary Agency Network of Korea (VANK) and the Korean government on national reputation. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 27(2), 196-212. doi:10.1075/japc.27.2.03han
- Hong, K. W. (2014). Nation branding of Korea. In H.-K. Lee et al. (Eds.), *Cultural policies in East Asia* (pp. 69-84). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Howe, B. M. (2017). Korea's role for peacebuilding and development in Asia. *Asian Journal of Peacebuilding*, 5(2), 243-266. Retrieved from https://s-space.snu.ac.kr/bitstream/10371/138433/1/04_Brendan%20M.%20Howe_final.pdf
- Istad, F. (2016). A strategic approach to public diplomacy in South Korea. In K. J. Ayhan (Ed.), *Korea's public diplomacy* (pp. 49-80). Seoul, Korea: Hangang Network.
- Jang, G. J., & Paik, W. K. (2012). Korean wave as tool for Korea's new cultural diplomacy. *Advances in Applied Sociology*, 2(3), 196-202. doi:10.4236/aasoci.2012.23026
- Kalinowski, T., & Cho, H. K. (2012). Korea's search for a global role between hard economic interests and soft power. *European Journal of Development Research*, 24(2), 242-260. doi:10.1057/ejdr.2012.7
- Kang, H. S. (2015). Contemporary cultural diplomacy in South Korea: Explicit and implicit approaches. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 21(4), 433-447. doi:10.1080/10286632.2015.1042473
- Kelley, J. R. (2010). The new diplomacy: Evolution of a revolution. *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 21, 286-305. doi:10.1080/09592296.2010.482474
- Kim, B. S., & Lee, J. W. (2009). A study on strengthening the sport diplomatic power of Korea through facilitating official development assistance (ODA) programs using sport. *Korean Journal of Sport Studies*, 48, 101-112. [in Korean] UCI:G704-000541.2009.48.3.020
- Kim, B. S., Lee, R. J., Choi, M. J., & Lim, Y. S. (2016). Sport and international development: Rooting globalization of Korean sport diplomacy. *Korean Journal of Sport Studies*, 55, 59-71. [in Korean]

UCI:G704-000541.2016.55.4.004

- Kim, H. J. (2011). A study on the coordination of cultural diplomacy and international cultural exchange. *The Journal of Cultural Policy*, 26(1), 227-252. [in Korean] UCI:I410-ECN-0101-2013-505-003502268
- Kim, H. S. (2018). When public diplomacy faces trade barriers and diplomatic frictions: The case of the Korean Wave. *Place Branding & Public Diplomacy*, 14(4), 234-244. doi:10.1057/s41254-017-0076-4
- Kim, T. H. (2012). Paradigm shift in diplomacy: A conceptual model for Korea's "new public diplomacy." *Korea Observer*, 43(4), 527-555. UCI:I410-ECN-0102-2013-060-002271904
- Kim, T. Y., & Jin, D. Y. (2016). Cultural policy in the Korean wave: An analysis of cultural diplomacy embedded in presidential speeches. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 5514-5534. Retrieved from <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/5128/1838>
- Kim, W. S. (2013). Korea's middle power public diplomacy. *The Journal of Political Science and Communication*, 16(1), 331-350. [in Korean] doi:10.15617/psc.2013.06.16.1.331
- Kim, Y. M., & Marinescu, V. (2015). Mapping South Korea's soft power: Sources, actors, tools, and impacts. *Rom. Jour. of Sociological Studies*, 1, 3-12. Retrieved from <https://journalofsociology.ro/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Full-text-pdf..pdf>
- Lee, B. J. (2017). Social media-based public diplomacy in Korea: An analysis of major embassies' facebook postings and user reactions. *Asian Communication Research*, 14(2), 69-99. doi:10.20879/acr.2017.14.2.69
- Lee, B. J. (2019). History of Korea's public diplomacy: From message dissemination to relation cultivation. *Asian Communication Research*, 16(3), 75-115. doi:10.20879/acr.2019.16.3.75
- Lee, G. (2009). A soft power approach to the Korean wave. *The Review of Korean Studies*, 12(2), 123-137. UCI:I410-ECN-0101-2020-911-000953 235
- Lee, K. S. (2016). New approach of South Korea's middle power diplomacy: Focusing on global agenda setting. *Global Politics Review*, 2(2), 40-57. Retrieved from <http://www.globalpoliticsreview.com/publications/>

2464-9929_v02_i02_p040.pdf

- Lee, K. S. (2018). The making of a nation's citizen diplomats: Culture-learning in international volunteer training program. *Journal of Contemporary Eastern Asia*, 17(1), 94-112. doi:10.17477/JCEA.2018.17.1.094
- Lee, S. J. (2014). Multilayered world order and South Korea's middle power diplomacy: The case of development cooperation policy. *Korean Political Science Review*, 48(6), 77-101. UCI:I410-ECN-0101-2016-340-001024157
- Lee, S. J. (2011). South Korean soft power and how South Korea views the soft power of others. In S. J. Lee & J. Melissen (Eds.), *Public diplomacy and soft power in East Asia* (pp. 139-161). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lee, S. J. (2012). *South Korea as new middle power seeking complex diplomacy*. Retrieved from East Asia Institute website: http://www.eai.or.kr/data/bbs/kor_report/2012091210545762.pdf
- Lee, S. J. (2015). South Korea's middle power activism and the retooling of its public diplomacy. In J. Melissen & Y. Sohn (Eds.), *In understanding public diplomacy in East Asia: Middle powers in a troubled region* (pp. 107-130). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lim, J. Y., Chang, D. S., & Kim, N. R. (2014). Public diplomacy through sports international exchanges of youth activity. *Journal of Korean Society of Sport Policy*, 12(2), 55-69. [in Korean] UCI:I410-ECN-0102-2015-600-001963034
- Melissen, J. (2005). The new public diplomacy: Between theory and practice. In J. Melissen (Ed.), *The new public diplomacy: Soft power in international relations* (pp. 3-13). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Melissen, J., & Sohn, Y. (2015). *Leveraging middle power public diplomacy in East Asian international relations*. Retrieved from East Asia Institute website: http://www.eai.or.kr/main/english/research_view.asp?intSeq=9434&code=89&keyword_option=&keyword=&gubun=research
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA). (2010). *2010 diplomatic white paper*. [in Korean] Retrieved from Ministry of Foreign Affairs website:

https://www.mofa.go.kr/www/brd/m_4105/list.do

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA). (2011). *2011 diplomatic white paper*. [in Korean] Retrieved from Ministry of Foreign Affairs website: https://www.mofa.go.kr/www/brd/m_4105/list.do

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA). (2012). *2012 diplomatic white paper*. [in Korean] Retrieved from Ministry of Foreign Affairs website: https://www.mofa.go.kr/www/brd/m_4105/list.do

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA). (2013). *2013 diplomatic white paper*. [in Korean] Retrieved from Ministry of Foreign Affairs website: https://www.mofa.go.kr/www/brd/m_4105/list.do

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA). (2014). *2014 diplomatic white paper*. [in Korean] Retrieved from Ministry of Foreign Affairs website: https://www.mofa.go.kr/www/brd/m_4105/list.do

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA). (2017). *The first basic plan for Korean public diplomacy (2017-2021)*. [in Korean] Retrieved from Ministry of Foreign Affairs website: http://www.mofa.go.kr/www/brd/m_4075/view.do?seq=366226&srchFr=&srchTo=&srchWord=&srchTp=&multi_itm_seq=0&itm_seq_1=0&itm_seq_2=0&company_cd=&company_nm=&page=5

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA). (2018). *2018 diplomatic white paper*. [in Korean] Retrieved from Ministry of Foreign Affairs website: https://www.mofa.go.kr/www/brd/m_4105/list.do

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA). (2020). *The 2020 annual public diplomacy implementation plan*. [in Korean] Retrieved from Ministry of Foreign Affairs website: http://www.mofa.go.kr/www/brd/m_22721/view.do?seq=4411&srchFr=&srchTo=&srchWord=&srchTp=&multi_itm_seq=0&itm_seq_1=0&itm_seq_2=0&company_cd=&company_nm=&page=1

Nye, J. S., Jr. (2010). The future of American power: Dominance and decline in perspective. *Foreign Affairs*, 89(6), 2-12. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20788711>

Paik, W. Y., & Yang, C. (2018). An analysis on the South Korean central government-affiliated agencies' public diplomacy toward China.

- Journal of Chinese Studies*, 60, 85-111. [in Korean] doi:10.26585/chlab.2018..60.005
- Park, S. J., & Lim, Y. S. (2014). Information networks and social media use in public diplomacy: A comparative analysis of South Korea and Japan. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 24(1), 79-98. doi:10.1080/01292986.2013.851724
- Pham, M. J. A. (2013). Food as communication: A case study of South Korea's gastrodiplomacy. *Journal of International Service*, 22(1), 1-22. Retrieved from <https://thediplomatistdotcom.files.wordpress.com/2013/01/jis-spring-2013-issue-gastrodiplomacy.pdf>
- Potter, E. (2003). Canada and the new public diplomacy. *International Journal*, 58(1), 43-64. doi:10.1177/002070200305800103
- Public Diplomacy Act 2016. Retrieved from <http://www.law.go.kr>
- Public Diplomacy of Korea (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.publicdiplomacy.go.kr>
- Robertson, J. (2018). Organizational culture and public diplomacy in the digital sphere: The case of South Korea. *Asia and the Pacific Policy Studies*, 5(3), 1-11. doi:10.1002/app5.256
- Schmuck, A. (2011). Nation branding in South Korea: A modern continuation of the developmental state? *Korea: Politics, Economy and Society*, 5, 91-118. Retrieved from <https://brill.com/view/title/20861>
- Sharp, P. (2001). Making sense of citizen diplomats: The people of Duluth, Minnesota, as international actors. *International Studies Perspectives*, 2, 131-150. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44218155>
- Spry, D. (2018). Facebook diplomacy: A data-driven, user-focused approach to Facebook use by diplomatic missions. *Media International Australia*, 168(1), 62-80. doi:10.1177/1329878X18783029
- Tam, L. (2019). Interpersonal approaches to relationship building: Diplomat as a human agent of public diplomacy. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 15(2), 134-142. doi:10.1057/s41254-018-0101-2
- Wang, J. (2007). Telling the American story to the world: The purpose of U.S. public diplomacy in historical perspective. *Public Relations*

Review, 33, 21-30. doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2006.11.005

- Yun, S. H. (2014). Do international students' direct experiences with the host country lead to strong attitude-behavior relations? Advancing public diplomacy research and beyond. *International Journal of Communication*, 8, 787-809. Retrieved from <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/2418/1101>
- Yun, S. H. (2015). Does student exchange bring symmetrical benefits to both countries? An exploration case for China and Korea. *International Journal of Communication*, 9, 710-731. Retrieved from <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/3207/1324>
- Zaharna, R. S., Arsenault A., & Fisher, A. (Eds.). (2013). *Relational, networked and collaborative approaches to public diplomacy: The connective mindshift*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Submission:	September 09, 2020
Review:	November 16, 2020
Decision of publication:	November 16, 2020

Appendix A

Year	Description
2012	Please share why you love Korea and your impression on Korea. Make a 3-minute-long video clip on diverse Korean attractions including Korean traditional culture, K-POP, landscape, economic development or your personal experiences related to Korea.
2013	My best Korean friend is... (neighbor, teacher, colleague or anyone else). Please introduce your best Korean friend (neighbor, teacher, colleague or anyone else) and tell us how he/she has made such a good impression. Please share the good influence this person has had on your life. My favorite Korean food is... Please introduce your favorite Korean food and tell us why it is your favorite. In addition, please share any experience you may have with cooking it or if you have your own special recipe.
2014	When you think of Korea, what first comes to mind? Why do you think so? Do you have any personal and meaningful stories or experiences related to Korea or Korean culture, people, way of life, tradition, entertainment and tour, etc.? If so, what Korea means to you? If you have any interest in Korea or Korean culture, what is it? And what made you interested in it? Please share these thoughts, experiences and impressions of Korea in a 3-minute video, "To me, Korea is..."
2015	What comes to your mind when you think of Korea? Express everything you know about Korea through various contents!
2016	Korea in your eyes! Express Korea through your creative ideas!
2017	Bring your own Korea
2018	Find Korea in your country