



한국 신문에 나타난 미국의 이미지 : 한국에서 미국의 공공외교는 성공하고 있는가?

•이병중*

숙명여대 국제관계대학원

미국은 전 세계에서 자국의 브랜드 이미지를 개선하기 위해 현지 대중들과의 깊은 커뮤니케이션을 통해 적극적으로 공공 외교를 수행해 왔다. 그러나 세계에서 미국의 이미지는 두 가지의 얼굴을 가진다. 한편으로는 자유와 민주주의의 자비로운 수호자로서 모습을 가지지만 다른 한편으로는 일방적 외교 정책을 고수하는 가혹한 패권 국가의 모습을 지닌다. 60년간 “혈맹”의 관계를 갖고 있는 한국에서의 미국의 이미지를 살피기 위해 이 논문은 한국 신문의 미국 관련 보도 뉴스 프레임 분석했다. 그 결과 한국에서의 전체적인 미국의 이미지는 약간 부정적인 것으로 나타났다. 미국의 문화는 역동적이고 다양한 이미지를 보였지만, 미국의 정치, 경제, 사회 이미지에 관한 뉴스 프레임은 분열적이고, 침체적이며 차별적인 측면을 강조했다. 이러한 이미지는 미국정부가 한국에서 전하려는 메시지와는 차이가 있었다. 이런 결과들은 한국에서 미국의 공공외교가 완전한 성공을 거두지 못하고 있음을 보여준다.

▶투고일 : 2014년 6월 18일
▶심사일 : 2014년 6월 27일
▶게재확정일 : 2014년 7월 09일

주제어 : 국가 이미지, 공공외교, 미국, 한미관계, 뉴스프레임

*교신저자(bjee@smac.kr)

1. Introduction

South Korea (referred to as Korea hereafter) has been a key ally of the U.S. since the 1950-1953 Korean War. The U.S. not only saved the South from North Korea's aggression, but also helped Korea's economic development with generous aids. Yet, the image of the U.S. among the Koreans is not always favorable. While Korea's older generation who experienced the Korean War generally views the U.S. positively as a sincere supporter and defender of democracy, younger Koreans are more critical of the U.S., citing its hegemonic and sometimes unilateral foreign policies. Indeed, the U.S. has been seen by the world with both admiration and distaste. In a 2013 global survey, its favorability was 58 percent in Europe and 64 percent in Asia, but only 21 percent in the Middle East (Pew Research Center, 2014). In Korea, it was high at 78%, but in China it was 40 percent.

In order to improve its overseas image, the U.S. has for nearly a century carried out active public diplomacy, defined as efforts of a nation to communicate and build relations with foreign publics (Melissen, 2007). During the two world wars and the Cold War, the U.S. government used various institutions such as the U.S. Information Agency and the Voice of America "to tell the American story to the world" (Wang, 2007). The September 11 terrorist attacks in particular motivated the U.S. to step up its public diplomacy

in order to mitigate anti-American feelings in the Middle East and elsewhere (Ham, 2007).

While public diplomacy and public relations practitioners have watched and evaluated recent U.S. public diplomacy with great interest, scholarly attention to this subject has been rather scarce and limited to its effectiveness in the Muslim world (Ham 2007; Vlahos, 2009). U.S. public diplomacy in Asia, in particular, has received relatively little academic attention. Exceptions are several researches on U.S. public diplomacy in China which is vying with the U.S. to become a super power. Zhong and Lu (2013), for example, examined how the U.S. embassy in Beijing used social media to communicate with the Chinese people.

But these studies didn't address the essential question whether U.S. public diplomacy is working in Asia. Evaluating the effectiveness of public diplomacy is of course not an easy task because public diplomacy usually takes a long time to take effect (Melissen, 2007). Yet one can still try to assess the effectiveness by comparing the messages or image a subject nation attempts to send and the messages and image its object nation actually receives. If there is a considerable degree of congruence between the two, one can argue that that particular nation's public diplomacy is working.

Based on this assumption, this paper will try to evaluate the effectiveness of U.S. public diplomacy in Korea by comparing the message

the U.S. government is trying to send to Korea and the actual U.S. image the Koreans have. For that, this paper will first identify key messages the U.S. embassy in Seoul is spreading through its speeches, blogs and other means of media diplomacy. Then it will analyze the image of the U.S. depicted in Korea's major newspapers through a news frame analysis. Given the importance of Korea to the U.S. as its key ally, this study can provide some insights and suggestions for the overall public diplomacy policy of the U.S. government.

2. Literature Review

1) Public Diplomacy and National Image

Public diplomacy is defined as “a government’s process of communicating with foreign publics in an attempt to bring about understanding for its nation’s ideas and ideals, its institutions and culture, as well as its national goals and current policies” (Tuch, 1990). Because of its government-to-public aspect, it is different from traditional diplomacy that focuses on government-to-government or diplomat-to-diplomat relations. Public diplomacy has been practiced by many countries for a long time, but its importance grew recently as a result of the U.S. government’s renewed efforts to win the “hearts and minds of foreign publics” after the September 11 terrorist attacks (Melissen,

2007). Public diplomacy consists of several components, such as listening, advocacy, cultural exchanges, educational programs and international broadcasting (Cull, 2009).

According to Hocking (2007), there are five reasons for the rise of public diplomacy: rising democratic accountability; the intensification of social networks; technological developments; electronic media power dubbed as ‘CNN effect¹⁾’; and the preoccupation with image and brand in international politics. National image or reputation in particular is becoming an essential part of a nation’s ‘soft power,’ as opposed to ‘hard power’ represented by military or economic power. Nye (1990; 2004) first coined the term ‘soft power,’ defining it as “the ability to get what you want through attraction rather than coercion (military means) or payment (economic means).” According to Nye, culture, political values and foreign policies are major elements of a nation’s soft power. In today’s international relations, public diplomacy is seen as key instrument for enhancing a nation’s soft power. Cultivating and managing a favorable international and world opinion toward a nation-state has been the mandate of public diplomacy (Wang, 2006).

National image is a complex schema consisting of various information on a nation’s politics, economy, society and culture (Lee, 2007b). Scott

1) According to Gilboa (2002), CNN effect refers to the ability of electronic media to shape international relations and foreign affairs by mobilizing global public opinion.

(1996) listed politics, economy, nation/national, culture and nature as key elements of national image. National image is a type of stereotype that is hard to change once formed in people's mind (Martin & Nakayama, 2010). While national image is abstract, national brand is more concrete and commercial (Lee, 2010). Borrowed from the field of corporate marketing, national brand gains importance as marketing techniques improve. Nation branding becomes important as nation-states compete to attract more tourists and investors, while trying to increase exports (Dinnie, 2008). Compared with public diplomacy which is more modest, nation branding is more ambitious and holistic, requiring a much greater and coordinated effort (Melissen, 2007). While the former is about identity, the latter is about relationship.

2) Media Diplomacy and Media Frame

Media diplomacy is a major component of public diplomacy. As the power of mass media, particularly 24-hour satellite television and other electronic media, grows, nation-states pay much attention to global media, such as CNN and BBC, that can shape global public opinions and international relations. According to Gilboa (2002), global media can play four roles in international politics. First as a controlling actor, it replaces the role of traditional diplomats. Second, it constraints the behaviors of diplomats and foreign-policy makers Third, global media intervene in international affairs. Finally,

it is instrumental in international negotiations and arbitrations. Even before the arrival of CNN, Al Jazeera and other global media, major powers like the U.S. have used their own state broadcaster like the Voice of America to promote their policies and values as part of media diplomacy (Cull, 2009). More recently, as a result of technological developments, many other nation-states have set up and run their own media to make their voices heard throughout the world. Examples are the 24-hour English television news outlets of China, France, Russia, Japan, Singapore and Korea (O'keeffe & Oliver, 2010). Particularly alarmed by aggressive investment by China in this field, former U.S. State Secretary Hilary Clinton referred to this as a "media war" (Chosun Ilbo, 2012).

Nation-states' heavy emphasis on media, especially news media, is because a nation's image or brand is very much determined by news (Moffit, 1994). Most people form their opinions about foreign countries by reading newspapers or watching television. Particularly international print and electronic news media play a significant role in the formation of national images (Kunczik, 1997). Yet national images created by international media tend to be fractured and even distorted, rather than comprehensive and truthful, as news often depicts reality with the subjective perspective of journalists (Kotler & Gertner, 2002). Tuchman (1978) called news a window framed by journalists, not a mirror reflecting reality. Journalists often interpret reality based on their own values and

norms, particularly when it comes to international news because readers or viewers cannot easily check the reality of foreign places (Louw, 2004). This problem of incomplete or inaccurate international news reporting has been confirmed by many studies (Gitlin, 1980; Hallin, 1987; Entman, 1991; 1993; Herman & Chomsky, 2002).

In constructing the reality of foreign places, media frequently use media frames. By organizing and arranging events and facts in a certain frame, news media can shape the world perceived by news users (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989). There are two types of frames – media frames and receiver frames. The former is the frame media use by selecting, stressing or eliminating certain aspects of facts (Gitlin, 1980). The latter, also called schema, is the frame of individuals who receive news (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989). Media frames can be used not only for specific events or issues, but also for broader subjects like national images. He and others (2012), for example, argue that the image of the U.S. can be identified by interpreting the “larger meaning” reflected in the sum of specific news frames or undertones.

3) U.S. Image and Public Diplomacy

For nearly a century, the U.S. has been one of the most active conductors of public diplomacy. In order to garner domestic and overseas supports for its war efforts, the U.S. State Department

operated the Committee on Public Information during the First World War and the Office of War Information during the Second World War (Wang, 2007). To win the Cold War through public diplomacy, the U.S. government set up the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) in 1948. Its mission was “to promote a better understanding of the U.S. in other countries and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the U.S. and the people of other countries.” The USIA was important in projecting U.S. ideas and images to the public in different parts of the world (Melissen, 2012). Additionally, the U.S. government ran the Voice of America and other state broadcaster like Radio Free Europe to send the messages of freedom and liberal democracy to the Soviet bloc “as an important element in the U.S. soft-power armaments in the Cold War” (O’keeffe & Oliver, 2010). All these efforts helped the U.S. enhance its soft power by promoting American-style democracy and freedom in the global arena and “telling the American story to the world” (Wang, 2007).

After the Cold War ended, however, the U.S. government scaled down its public diplomacy and closed down the USIA in 1999 by folding some of its operations into the State Department. With the Soviet Union dissolved, it didn’t see much need for further public diplomacy. But the September 11 terrorist attacks again awakened the U.S. to the necessity of continuous public diplomacy. In an effort to answer “why do they

hate us so much?” and win the “war on terror,” the Bush administration stepped up its public diplomacy efforts and launched various information and outreach programs, particularly in the Middle East (Taylor, 2009). Yet these efforts were designed to simply get out more information about the U.S., rather than building relations with foreign publics, “based on the premise that more information leads to better communication” (Snow, 2009). Instead of connecting with foreign publics, the Bush administration demanded their “submission” and its messages mainly targeted domestic, not overseas, audiences for political purposes, contributing to the failure of the war on terror (Vlahos, 2009).

Since the inauguration of the Obama administration, U.S. public diplomacy has improved gradually, learning lessons from the past mistakes. Particularly one-way campaigns that didn’t work in the context of social media were shunned (Zhong & Lu, 2013). Having seen the surging power of non-traditional media like websites, blogs and social media, the Obama administration tried to incorporate these new technologies into its public diplomacy strategy for closer, two-way communications. Former U.S. Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy James Glassman called this “Public Diplomacy 2.0” (Zhong & Lu, 2013). Due partly to these efforts, the global image of the U.S. has improved over the years. The percentage of people who give the U.S. a positive rating has increased significantly in 19 of the 28 countries polled both in 2007 and 2013, Pew Research Center (2014) reported, adding

“America’s improved image is coincident with Barack Obama assuming the presidency in 2009.” Yet the overseas image of the U.S. is not simple and one-dimensional. According to a study on the U.S. image in Chinese media, for example, the U.S. is seen as both democratic and hypocritical and free and biased (He et. al., 2012).

4) U.S. Public Diplomacy in Korea

As a key ally, the U.S. has for long practiced active public diplomacy in Korea. Having saved Korea from the aggression of Communist North Korea during the Korean War and given generous financial aids for Korea’s economic development, the U.S. considers Korea as an important testament to the superiority of its system of liberal democracy and capitalism (Lee, 2009). Right after the Korean War, the U.S. set up its information agency in Seoul to distribute books, movies and other materials, while explaining U.S. policies to the Korean public. In the late 1950s, it was divided into the Information Branch and the Cultural Branch to fulfill the dual functions of U.S. public diplomacy. In the 1960s, additional public diplomacy offices were established in Busan, Daegu and Gwangju with a total staff of about 150. Main purposes of U.S. public diplomacy in Korea were to build closer relations with opinion leaders, actively use the Voice of America and publish press materials to send messages to the Korean public (Lee, 2009).

These initial public diplomacy efforts have succeeded to a great degree in instilling a positive image of the U.S. in the Koreans. For example, documentary movies about the U.S. life and history shown to the Korean people during the 1950s created the image of the U.S. as a “caring and sound citizen,” a “decent pioneer,” and a “rich friend” (Cha and Yeom, 2012). According to Shin (2012), the U.S. was the object of “admiration” for the Koreans until the early 1980s as its economic and military power far outweighed that of Korea. Since Korea was constantly threatened by belligerent North Korea, the U.S. public diplomacy in Korea used the “security frame” which was easily accepted by the Korean public who very much valued anti-Communist security alliance between the two countries (Lee, 2009). The U.S. mainly targeted Korean opinion leaders and heavily used direct media, such as movies.

But the Korea-U.S. relationship began to change from the 1990s as Korea’s economic position rose gradually and the perceived threat from the North decreased due partly to increased inter-Korean contacts (Shin, 2012). Korea’s democratic progress affected the identity of the Koreans, allowing them to reevaluate their relations with the U.S. Frequent trade disputes with the U.S., the arrival of liberal governments in Seoul and reconciliation between the two Koreas in the 2000s led many Koreans to view the security-based Korea-U.S. relations unfair and obsolete, resulting in occasional anti-American

protests. Particularly liberal Koreans began to question what they considered was a patron-client relationship. Shin (2012) argues the view is based on the fact that the U.S. is a matter of identity for Korea, while Korea is only a matter of policy for the U.S. In response to that, U.S. public diplomacy in Korea gradually shifted from “security frame” to “market frame” (Lee, 2009).

More recently, the U.S. has worked to project its image in Korea as a partner, not a patron. Having celebrated its 60 years of military alliance with Seoul in 2013, Washington claims that the relationship has developed into “a global partnership which is a core axis of peace and security in the Asia Pacific region” (U.S. Department of State, 2014). Yet some Koreans, particularly progressive youth, believe the relationship is still imbalanced in favor of the U.S. which often works as a patron, if not a bully (Lee, 2009). This anti-U.S. feeling sharply contrasts with the pro-U.S. sentiment of many conservative, older Koreans who are still grateful to the U.S. support in the past. Reflecting this mixed views on the U.S. among the Koreans, Shin (2012) found that liberal newspapers in Korea are more negative toward the U.S., compared with their conservative counterparts. Seol (2012) also found that Korean newspapers describe the U.S.-Korea relations with both “cooperation” and “conflict” news frames. In other words, U.S. images in Korea are still very complex and complicated, warranting a careful analysis.

Based on such an analytical framework, the following research questions are drawn:

RQ1: What is the key message the U.S. is trying to convey to Korea through its public diplomacy?

RQ2: What is the key image of the U.S. shown in Korea's news media?

The second question can be further divided into several sub-questions since a nation's image consists of many different elements. Lee (2007b) and Scott (1996), for example, noted a national image is mainly composed of political, economic, social and cultural images. He and others (2002) also divided U.S. image in China into political, economic, social and cultural ones.

RQ2-1: What is the key political image of the U.S. in Korea's news media?

RQ2-2: What is the key economic image of the U.S. in Korea's news media?

RQ2-3: What is the key social image of the U.S. in Korea's news media?

RQ2-4: What is the key cultural image of the U.S. in Korea's news media?

RQ3: Is the U.S. succeeding in its efforts to convey its message to Korea accurately?

3. Method

In order to answer the RQ1, this researcher identified key messages found in the speeches and blogs of U.S. ambassadors in Seoul. Representing the U.S. in Korea, the ambassadors have always worked to convey their government's messages to the Korean public. Their speeches mainly target older opinion leaders with official messages, while the blogs target younger Koreans with personal or unofficial messages. Current U.S. Ambassador to Korea Sung Kim's 13 official speeches and three op-ed pieces, posted on the embassy website, were analyzed (U.S. embassy in Seoul, 2014). For the blogs, those of Ambassador Kim and his predecessor Kathlene Stephens were analyzed (U.S. embassy in Seoul, 2014). During her three-year tenure in Seoul from 2008 to 2011, Ambassador Stephens posted 144 blogs, while Ambassador Kim posted 98 blogs from late 2011 to June 2014. The 242 posts were analyzed in a subjective, qualitative manner to find key words, rather than through a more quantitative frame analysis used for the RQ2. It was because the speeches and blogs were rather straightforward in meaning, unlike the news articles that used complex frames to convey meaning. Additionally, the embassy's minister counselor for public diplomacy was interviewed in Seoul in June 2014 for about two hours to clarify the messages found in the analysis and identify the overall direction of U.S. public diplomacy in Korea. As a career

diplomat who served in Korea before, he has worked in his current position for the last three years, developing and executing key public diplomacy programs.

For the RQ2, this paper content-analyzed the U.S. image reflected in Korea's major newspapers through a news frame analysis. Although the news frame is not identical to the image, there can be a considerable degree of connections between the two as news heavily affects people's images of foreign countries (Kunczik, 1997). Many studies in fact analyzed news frames to identify national images (He et. al., 2012; Lee, 2007b; Lee, 2010). For this study, four major Korean newspapers – Chosun Ilbo, Donga Ilbo, Hankook Ilbo and Hankyeore – were selected. Chosun and Donga are two of the three largest conservative papers in Korea and Hankook and Hankyeore are two major liberal papers. As Shin (2012) argued, liberal and conservative papers in Korea are likely to show different views toward the U.S.

To review the Obama administration's "Public Diplomacy 2.0," the four papers' articles about the U.S. from 2009 (the year of Obama's

inauguration) to 2013 were chosen as samples. The samples of Donga, Hankook and Hankyeore were drawn from the Kinds news archive site run by the Korea Press Foundation, while Chosun samples were drawn from its own digital site because Chosun doesn't provide its contents to Kinds. For the search, "the U.S." or "Americans" were used as key words and both news articles and editorials were collected. Short stories with less than 300 words were discarded since they were mostly straight stories without any relations to the U.S. image. As a result, a total of 875 articles were found. After eliminating articles that didn't directly deal with the U.S. or the Americans, a total of 475 articles were chosen as final samples, as shown in Table 1.

In April and May this year, two graduate students studying communication analyzed the contents of the 475 articles. They coded the subjects, favorability and key frames of the articles. The subjects were divided into 1) U.S. politics, 2) U.S. economy, 3) U.S. society and 4) U.S. culture. U.S. politics was then further divided into 1-1) Korea-U.S. relations, 1-2) U.S. position

Table 1. The Number of Final News Article Samples

Year	Hankyeore	Hankook	Donga	Chosun	Total
2009	35	35	34	37	141
2010	21	19	39	19	98
2011	25	19	20	13	77
2012	19	15	18	13	75
2013	23	28	17	16	84
Total	133	116	128	98	475

toward North Korea, 1-3) U.S. domestic politics and 1-4) U.S. foreign policy. Favorability was measured by coding the articles into 1) positive, 2) negative and 3) neutral, depending upon their overall attitudes toward the U.S. or Americans. Holsti inter-coder reliability was calculated using 10 percent of the samples, or 48 articles. The reliability was 0.85 for subject, 0.80 for favorability and 0.73 for news frame.

The coders then analyzed the frames of the articles to find the overall image of the U.S. To identify major frames used in the stories, both inductive and deductive methods were used. For the frame of Korea-U.S. relations, for example, the study on Korea-U.S. summit talks news frame by Seol (2012) was used. For news frames on U.S. attitudes toward North Korea, the study on international news frames on North Korea (Lee,

2007a) was used. For other subjects, the frames from the study by He and others (2012) on U.S. image in Chinese media were borrowed. Several new frames were added in the process of coding as some articles revealed strikingly different frames. Key frames are explained in Table 2.

To answer the RQ3, this paper compared and contrasted the messages found in the RQ1 and the images found in the RQ2. In other words, the paper tried to see whether there is congruence between the image the U.S. government is trying to project to Korea and the U.S. image the Korean public actually has. More specifically, a comparison was made between the key messages of the U.S. embassy in Seoul and the dominant frames of Korean news articles about the U.S. in each subject to assess the effectiveness of U.S. public diplomacy in Korea.

Table 2. Key Frames for Korean Newspapers' Coverage of the U.S. Image

Subject	Key Frame	Key Concept
Korea-U.S. Relations	Partnership	U.S. treating Korea as equal partner
	Patronage	U.S. still as Korea's big brother
Attitude toward North Korea	Dialogue & Aid	Engaging N. Korea with dialogue
	Sanction & Threat	Containing N. Korea with sanction
U.S. Domestic Politics	Democratic & Open	Cooperative political parties
	Divisive & Inactive	Confrontational political parties
U.S. Foreign Policy	Cooperative	Multilateral cooperation
	Confrontational	Unilateral confrontation
U.S. Economy	Innovation & Recovery	Economic recovery via innovation
	Decline & Crisis	Continuous economic decline
U.S. Society	Inclusive & Diverse	Inclusive of diverse social groups
	Discriminative	Racial and other discrimination
U.S. Culture	Vibrant & Dynamic	Vibrant and dynamic culture
	Decadent & Vulgar	Cheap and decadent culture

4. Results

1) RQ1: Key Message of the U.S. Embassy in Korea

(1) U.S. Politics

Many of the speeches and blogs of U.S. ambassadors in Korea focused on U.S.-Korea relations and their key message was “partner,” “partnership” or “global partnership.” Upon arrival in Seoul in November 2011, Ambassador Kim said: “It is a special partnership based on shared history, values and experience.” Celebrating the 60th anniversary of the military and security alliance in 2013, Kim also emphasized “60 years of our partnership and shared prosperity with Korea,” promising “further cooperation in the next 60 years.” Such remarks were based on the U.S. realization that the old patron-client relations has shifted into an equal partnership as Korea’s economic and other powers rose in the world. In the interview, the minister counselor for public diplomacy added: “We do share many values, such as democracy, market economy and human rights.”

In fact, the U.S. stresses the necessity of Korea working together with the U.S. to tackle global issues, such as terrorism, climate control, piracy or nuclear proliferation. Noting that Korea became the first country in the world to transform from a recipient to a donor of international aid due largely to U.S. aids, the ambassador expected Korea’s greater role in resolving global problems

as “one of the wealthiest nations in the world.” Korea’s increasing financial contributions for 28,000 U.S. troops stationed in Korea were also seen as an example of the equal partnership.

Regarding North Korea, the U.S. tried to send dual messages of “dialogue” and “sanction.” On the one hand, it offered chances for talks to resolve nuclear and other issues threatening the security of Northeast Asia. At the same time, however, the U.S. sternly warned against the North’s nuclear and missile tests and other provocative behaviors by calling for international sanctions. After the third nuclear test in early 2013, Ambassador Kim warned: “The danger posed by North Korea’s threatening activities warrants further swift and credible action by the international community.” But in a March 2014 speech for Korean journalists, he also asked the North to “return to an authentic and credible diplomatic process toward an ultimate goal of denuclearization.”

The U.S. message about its domestic politics is “democracy,” “freedom,” or “opportunity.” Right after the 2008 election of President Obama, Ambassador Stephens praised “American democracy in action,” in her blog, adding Obama was “a man of diverse ethnic background and humble origins.” In a separate blog in 2012, she took pride in that “the U.S. is the oldest constitutional democracy in the world” with 234 years of history. After Obama’s reelection in 2012, Kim also commented in his blog about the

U.S. as a land of opportunity.

As for U.S. foreign policy or relations, the key message was a “caring, cooperative, peace-loving friend.” Many blogs touched upon U.S. efforts to help needy people struck by human or natural disasters like earthquakes. As “warm friends,” both ambassadors sent sincere condolences to the victims and their families of Korea’s sunken ships Cheonan and Sewol as well as flooding incidents. As a former Peace Corps volunteer in Korea, Stephens often talked about her experiences of helping Koreans in poor, rural areas in the 1970s. In an October 2011 blog, she also remembered nearly 1,000 U.S. soldiers from Minnesota who were killed or missing during the Korean War, honoring their “sacrifice for the peace of the Korean peninsula.”

(2) U.S. Economy, Society and Culture

Key messages regarding the U.S. economy were “innovation” and “fair and free trade.” Particularly U.S. companies were seen as future-oriented “innovators” that improve the quality of life. “America has a proud tradition of innovation,” said Kim in a 2013 speech before business leaders in Korea. In the wake of the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement that went into effect early 2013, the U.S. also emphasized the image of the U.S. as a “fair competitor.” Another message was U.S. companies as “local contributors” creating jobs and other opportunities in Korea and “environmentalists” who work for sustainable development. On the

occasion of the opening of the American Pavilion at the 2012 Yeosu Expo in southern Korea, Kim noted in his blog about U.S. corporate efforts “to protect clean ocean and coasts.”

For the U.S. society, main messages were that of “inclusiveness,” “family values” and “altruism.” In a 2008 blog, Stephens introduced several African Americans whose story was “triumph over racial discrimination.” Many other blogs and speeches also depicted the image of the U.S. as an open society where different races, including Korean Americans, are warmly embraced. The image also included gender equality. After U.S. State Secretary Hilary Clinton’s visit to a women’s university in Seoul in 2009, Stephens noted in her blog: “Advancing the cause of women advances everyone.” Another key message was Americans’ love for family. Kim especially mentioned in his blogs repeatedly about his wife and two daughters.

Finally, key messages about U.S. culture were “diversity” and “dynamism.” The blogs particularly emphasized Americans’ affection for dynamic sports like baseball. The two ambassadors also displayed this trait through their own sports activities. As an avid biker, Stephens chronicled in her blogs about her frequent bike trips across Korea. Kim also talked about his tennis and other dynamic sports activities. They also introduced the diverse world of the U.S. art and culture, ranging from classical music and musicals to literature to pop music. While Kim blogged about U.S. symphonic orchestras’ “superb performances” in Korea,

Stephens praised the talent of U.S. musical shows introduced to Korea.

2) RQ2: Key Image of the U.S. in Korea's News Media

(1) Subjects of News Articles

Of the 475 articles, political stories were 200, or 42 percent, followed by 110 economic stories, 100 social stories, 60 cultural stories and 5 other stories. Korean newspapers pay greatest attention to U.S. politics because that includes not only U.S. domestic politics, but also its relations with Korea, North Korea and the rest of the world. Of the 200 political articles, 102 were on U.S. domestic politics, 65 on foreign policy, 21 on North Korea and 12 on Korea-U.S. relations.

By year, political stories increased during and right after the 2008 and 2012 U.S. presidential elections, but decreased in other times, as seen in Table 3. Economic stories peaked in 2009 due to the 2008-2009 U.S. financial crisis, but has since declined steadily as the U.S. economy gradually recovered. Social and cultural stories didn't show any particular patterns.

By newspaper, the conservative Chosun covered politics much more frequently than the other three, while underreporting social stories, as seen in Table 4. Donga, another conservative paper, focused heavily on economic stories. On the other hand, the liberal Hankook and Hankyeore reported more frequently on U.S. society than the two conservative papers. As seen in later analysis, social stories are highly critical

Table 3. News Subjects by Year

percentage in parenthesis

Subject	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Politics	61(43.3)	43(43.9)	27(35.1)	32(42.7)	37(44.0)	200(42.1)
Economy	42(29.8)	25(25.5)	18(23.4)	15(20.0)	10(11.9)	110(23.2)
Society	29(20.6)	17(17.3)	17(22.1)	15(20.0)	22(26.2)	100(21.1)
Culture	9(6.4)	13(13.3)	13(16.9)	13(17.3)	12(14.3)	60(12.6)
Others	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(2.6)	0(0.0)	3(3.6)	5(1.1)
Total	141(100)	98(100)	77(100)	75(100)	84(100)	475(100)

Table 4. News Subjects by Newspapers

percentage in parenthesis

Subject	Hankyeore	Hankook	Donga	Chosun	Total
Politics	55(41.4)	44(37.9)	48(37.5)	53(54.1)	200(42.1)
Economy	32(24.1)	24(20.7)	36(28.1)	18(18.4)	110(23.2)
Society	32(24.1)	29(25.0)	26(20.3)	13(13.3)	100(21.1)
Culture	14(10.5)	17(14.7)	15(11.7)	14(14.3)	60(12.6)
Others	0(0.0)	2(1.7)	3(2.3)	0(0.0)	5(1.1)
Total	133(100)	116(100)	128(100)	98(100)	475(100)

of the U.S. The two liberal papers, which are found to be more negative of the U.S. than the conservative papers in later analysis, naturally focused more on U.S. society than other areas.

(2) Favorability of News Articles

The overall favorability of Korean news articles on the U.S. was neutral. Of the 475 articles, 241 stories, or 51 percent, were neutral. Of the remainder, however, negative stories outnumbered positive stories by 147 to 87 articles, or 31 to 18 percent. Despite U.S. efforts to be a friendly partner of Korea, the overall perception of the U.S. in Korea's newspapers is still unfavorable.

By year, negative stories increased gradually, probably reflecting Koreans' growing opposition to the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement that went into effect in early 2013. Many Koreans believe the deal will adversely affect Korea's agricultural and services industry. Positive stories dropped

from 21 percent in 2009 to 6 percent in 2013, while neutral stories increased from 47 percent to 62 percent, as seen in Table 5. Negative stories unchanged at 32 percent.

By newspaper, favorability differed greatly. The liberal Hankyore and Hankook had more negative stories about the U.S. than the conservative Donga and Chosun. The former was 35 percent and the latter 26 percent on average. Chosun, Korea's most influential paper read by older opinion leaders who tend to be more pro-U.S., had only 21 percent negative stories. The conservative papers also had more positive stories than the liberal ones (21 to 16 percent), as seen in Table 6.

By subject, favorability also differed a lot, as seen in Table 7. Perhaps reflecting the U.S. financial crisis, economic stories were most negative, followed by social, political and cultural stories. In other words, stories depicting U.S.

Table 5. Favorability by Year

percentage in parenthesis

Favorability	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Positive	30(21.3)	21(21.4)	18(23.4)	13(17.3)	5(6.0)	87(18.3)
Negative	45(31.9)	31(31.6)	29(37.7)	15(20.0)	27(32.1)	147(30.9)
Neutral	66(46.8)	46(46.9)	30(39.0)	47(62.7)	52(61.9)	241(50.7)
Total	141(100)	98(100)	77(100)	75(100)	84(100)	475(100)

Table 6. Favorability by Newspaper

percentage in parenthesis

Favorability	Hankyore	Hankook	Donga	Chosun	Total
Positive	23(17.3)	18(15.5)	26(20.3)	20(20.4)	87(18.3)
Negative	48(36.1)	40(34.5)	38(29.7)	21(21.4)	147(30.9)
Neutral	62(46.6)	58(50.0)	64(50.0)	57(58.2)	241(50.7)
Total	133(100)	116(100)	128(100)	98(100)	475(100)

Table 7. Favorability by Subject

percentage in parenthesis

Favorability	Politics	Economy	Society	Culture	Others	Total
Positive	33(16.5)	17(15.5)	20(20.0)	17(28.3)	0(0.0)	87(18.3)
Negative	47(23.5)	47(42.7)	37(37.0)	13(21.7)	3(60.0)	147(30.9)
Neutral	120(60.0)	46(41.8)	43(43.0)	30(50.0)	2(40.0)	241(50.7)
Total	200(100)	110(100)	100(100)	60(100)	5(100)	475(100)

economy and society had the most unfavorable images. Economic stories were 43 percent negative, compared with the average of 31 percent. Social articles were 37 percent negative. On the other hand, cultural stories were only 22 percent negative. As for positive stories, cultural stories had the highest figure of 28 percent, far above the average of 18 percent. As seen in later frame analysis, cultural stories generally depicted the dynamic and diverse world of U.S. art and culture, while social stories focused on divisive and discriminate nature of the U.S. society.

(3) Frame for U.S. Political Image

U.S. political image in Korea's newspapers was divided into four areas – Korea-U.S. relations, U.S. attitudes toward North Korea, U.S. domestic politics and U.S. foreign policy. For Korea-U.S. relations, the most frequently used frame was “patron” or “bully.” The “partner” frame emphasized by the U.S. government was secondary. For example, a 2010 Hankyore article argues that key issues with North Korea are handled by the U.S., not Korea. A 2011 Hankyore article notes some parts of the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement heavily favor the U.S. All these articles depict the U.S. as a patron

or even bully who can easily “dictate Korea’s future.” As for the “partner” frame, a 2010 Chosun article writes about a U.S. Congress resolution reaffirming “the firm partnership.”

The most dominant frame for articles on U.S. attitude toward North Korea was “sanction,” or “threat.” The “dialogue” or “aid” frame came second. A 2013 Hankook article points out “stern sanctions” by the U.S. against Myanmar companies that did business with the North. A Chosun article in 2009 highlights the “confrontational relations” between Washington and Pyongyang, despite Obama’s conciliatory foreign policy. In 2010, the paper also reported Americans believe North Korea is the second most serious threat after Al Qaeda.

As for U.S. domestic politics, the most favored frame was “divisive” or “inactive.” The “democracy” or “open” frame was second, although that was the key message the U.S. government wants to send overseas. The “oppressive” or “closed” frame was also found as third most popular frame. A 2009 Donga article argues the Congress is waging an “ideology war” regarding government budget. A 2009 Chosun editorial criticizes “severe torture” by the U.S. against terror suspects. As for the “democracy” frame, a 2009 Chosun article features

Table 8. Major News Frames on U.S. Politics

Subject	News Frame	N	Key Description
Korea-U.S. Relations	Patron, Bully	6	U.S. dictating Korea's future
	Partner	3	Friendly, equal partnership
Attitude Toward N. Korea	Sanction, Threat	12	Security threat to Americans
	Dialogue, Aid	6	U.S.-N. Korea Dialogue for Peace
	Balance	3	Cautious U.S. Position on Pyongyang
U.S. Domestic Politics	Divisive, Inactive	54	Democrat-Republican Ideology War
	Democratic, Open	24	Obama's frequent talks with public
	Oppressive, Closed	11	Severe Torture on Terror Suspects
U.S. Foreign Policy	Confrontational	36	Persistent U.S. pressures on China
	Diplomatic Failure	16	Rising civilian casualties in Afghanistan
	Cooperative	10	Obama's Middle East peace efforts
	Diplomatic Success	3	Saving American hostages held by pirates

President Obama who keeps personal letters from ordinary Americans “to reflect them on state affairs.”

Dominant frame for U.S. foreign policy was “confrontation” or “unilateral.” Second most popular frame was “diplomatic failure.” “Cooperation” or “multilateralism” was only third. A 2011 Hankyeore article writes about U.S. “persistent pressures” on China regarding foreign exchange rates. A 2013 Chosun article talks about the U.S. government’s spying activities in China, Russia and other adversaries. As for “failure,” a 2012 Chosun article warns about growing civilian casualties in Afghanistan. These political frames are explained in Table 8.

(4) Frame for U.S. Economic, Social and Cultural Images

The most dominant U.S. economic frame found in Korea’s newspapers was “decline” or “crisis.”

“Inequality” or “income gap” was second. “Innovation,” which is promoted by the U.S. as its main economic message, came third. “U.S.-style capitalism is coming to an end,” Hankook argued in a 2009 editorial. Even in 2013, much after the gradual recovery, a Hankyeore article warns of a “crisis” in financial reform, citing Wall Street resistance. As for “inequality,” a 2012 Hankyeore article argues “rich-poor gap” has become “the strongest axis of tension” in the U.S. Regarding “innovation” or “recovery,” a 2010 Donga article praises the “glorious return” of GM that almost went bankrupt during the crisis.

In U.S. social stories, the most frequently used frame was “discrimination” or “conflict.” Second one was “inclusive” or “forgiving.” “Justice” or “reason” came third. In a 2011 article, Donga writes about “bamboo ceiling” in the U.S. that discriminates Asians or Asian-Americans. Describing “conflict,” a 2013 Hankook article attributes falling life

expectancy in the U.S. to gun violence. As for “inclusiveness,” a 2013 Hankyeore article writes about growing public supports for gay marriage in the U.S. To show “justice,” a Hankook article praises that “rich Americans consider charity a social obligation.”

The dominant frame for articles on U.S. culture was “dynamism.” The “diversity” frame was second. Several articles report on Americans’ love for sports to show “dynamism.” A 2009 Hankyeore article writes about American families who enjoy partying before watching sports games, adding “sport is part of American life.” To emphasize cultural “diversity,” a 2011 Hankook article reports on Hollywood movies that embrace foreign actors and directors for commercial success. A 2013 Hankook article also notes that Americans enjoy various museums or art galleries that are abundant everywhere because of generous donations by rich business people. These frames are explained in Table 9.

3) RQ3: Is U.S. Public Diplomacy Succeeding in Korea?

Based on the results of the RQ1 and the RQ2, the answer to the RQ3 is rather negative. In other words, U.S. public diplomacy in Korea is not that successful as Korea’s news media do not fully reflect U.S. government messages in their news articles. The images of the U.S. politics, economy and society in Korea’s newspapers were different from the messages the U.S. government tries to convey to the Korean public. While the U.S. government’s key message for its relations with Korea was “partner” or “friend,” the dominant news frame in Korea’s newspapers was “patron” or “bully.” The “partner” frame was second. The U.S. message for its attitude toward North Korea was both “sanction” and “dialogue,” but the actual news frame tilted more toward “sanction.” The U.S. message for its domestic politics was “democracy,” but the most dominant frame was “divisive” or “inactive.” “Democracy” was second. The U.S. wanted to project the image of a “cooperative and

Table 9. Major News Frames on U.S. Economy, Society and Culture

Subject	News Frame	N	Key Description
U.S. Economy	Decline, Crisis	55	Collapse of U.S.-style capitalism
	Inequality, Income gap	19	Growing gap between rich and poor
	Innovation, Recovery	11	Glorious return through innovation
U.S. Society	Discrimination, Conflict	56	Frustration in land of opportunity Bamboo ceiling against Asians
	Inclusive, Forgiving	16	Easing regulation on illegal residents
	Justice, Reason	11	Charity as social obligation
U.S. Culture	Dynamism	21	Sport as part of American life
	Diversity	11	Hollywood movies as melting pot

caring peace lover,” for its foreign policy, but the most frequent news frame was “confrontational” or “unilateral.” The “cooperative” frame was third, after the “diplomatic failure” frame.

As for its economy, the U.S. emphasized the message of “innovation,” but the most dominant frame was “decline” or “crisis.” The “innovation” frame came third, after the “inequality” or “income gap” frame. The key message of the U.S. government for its society was “inclusive” and “forgiving,” but that frame was second in Korea’s news articles after the “discrimination” or “conflict” frame. The image of the U.S. culture in Korea’s newspaper was the only one that roughly matched the messages of the U.S. government. The U.S. wanted to project the image of a “dynamic” and “diverse” U.S. culture and that frame was what was found in the analysis of Korea’s news articles. These findings are explained in Table 10.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

By analyzing the messages of the U.S. embassy in Korea and the actual images of the U.S. found in Korea’s newspapers, this study tried to assess the effectiveness of U.S. public diplomacy in Korea. The results are rather disappointing. While the U.S. cultural image corresponded to the messages of the embassy, its political, economic and social images didn’t. The overall favorability of the U.S. in Korea’s newspapers was also slightly negative, although the majority of the stories analyzed here had neutral tones.

There could be many reasons for this. As seen in the analysis, the U.S. financial and economic crisis and the ensuing decline of the U.S. influence in global matters, coupled with the rise of China, was one major reason. Divisive partisan politics in Washington and continuing racial issues furthered the negative image. Korea’s rising stand in the

Table 10. U.S. Government Messages and the U.S. Images in Korea

Subject	U.S. Government Message	Key U.S. Image in Korea
Korea-U.S. Relations	Partner Friend	Patron Bully
U.S. Attitude on North Korea	Sanction Dialogue	Sanction Threat
U.S. Domestic Politics	Democracy Freedom	Divisive Inactive
U.S. Foreign Policy	Cooperative Peace Lover	Confrontational Unilateral
U.S. Economy	Innovation Fair Trader	Decline Crisis
U.S. Society	Inclusive Forgiving	Discrimination Conflict
U.S. Culture	Dynamic Diverse	Dynamic Diverse

world with its growing economic and cultural prowess also led Koreans to view more critically about Korea-U.S. relations. Particularly young Koreans tend to see the relationship obsolete, reflecting the older patron-client relations, despite the U.S. government's continuous emphasis on an equal partnership.

Yet there needs to be some caution in interpreting the results. The U.S. images in Korea's news media might not fully represent the actual images engrained in Koreans' mind. In fact, Korea's news media are known to be unnecessarily critical of foreign nations at times because of their nationalism (Shin, 2012). Significant democratic progress and the resulting rise in press freedom in Korea over the past few decades might have also emboldened Korea's news media, leading them to criticize more harshly about the U.S. than needed. This might explain why a survey by Pew Research Center (2014) shows that 78 percent of Koreans have a favorable opinion on the U.S. More studies are called for to examine this possible gap between the media frame and the actual image of the U.S.

For example, future researches can look into interactions between U.S. diplomats and Korean journalists to see what kind of media relations they have. If the U.S. is failing to communicate with the Korean news media, there must be some reasons. One possible explanation can be intercultural communication problems. The high-context communication style of Korea might clash with the

low-context style of the U.S. (Martin & Nakayama, 2010), leading to the gap between the message sent and the image received. Perhaps Korean journalists want more contextualized, less direct messages from U.S. diplomats. Such communication clashes can be also studied by observing media relations between Korean journalists and other Western embassies or multinationals in Korea.

Also, this study dealt with only the media part of U.S. public diplomacy in Korea. As noted before, public diplomacy consists of many different elements, such as cultural exchanges and educational programs. In fact, the U.S. has for long worked in Korea to promote its culture and engage with Korea's opinion leaders by inviting them to the U.S. through Fulbright and other exchange programs. A more comprehensive study including all these elements can show a better picture of U.S. public diplomacy in Korea.

Yet the fact is that the image of the U.S. in Korea is highly volatile. As the embassy's minister counselor admits, Koreans' favorability of the U.S. was low at about 30 to 40 percent only 10 years ago. A series of events, such as the killing of two Korean middle school students by a U.S. armored vehicle in a traffic accident in 2002, touched off a wave of anti-U.S. pretexts. The 2008 nationwide demonstrations against the imports of U.S. beef was another example of the volatility of the U.S. image. To many Koreans, the U.S. is still the object of both admiration and distaste.

That reason alone requires the U.S. to engage with the Korean public in a more sincere and interactive manner. Particularly to reach out to the critical youth, social media and other latest tools of public diplomacy need to be employed more actively. Given the fact that Korea is a highly digitalized society with one of the world's highest Internet and smartphone penetration rates, a success of U.S. digital diplomacy in Korea could be applied in many other nations. If the U.S. fails in persuading the people of its "blood ally" and winning their "hearts and minds," it would be hard to expect U.S. public diplomacy success elsewhere.

References

- Cha, J. & Yeom, C. (2012). The 1950s documentary movies by the USIA in Korea and the formation of the U.S. image. *The Korean Journal of Journalism & Mass Communication Studies*, 56(1), 235-263.
- Chosun Ilbo (2012). *China invests 8 trillion won: Producing Chinese-made news in developing countries* (August, 18, 2012). Retrieved on March 28, 2014 from http://news.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2012/08/18/2012081800146.html
- Cull, N. (2009). *Public diplomacy: Lessons from the past*. Los Angeles: Figueroa Press.
- Dinnie, K. (2008). *Nation branding*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Entman, R. M. (1991). Framing U.S. coverage of international news: Contrasts in narratives of the KAL and Iran air incidents. *Journal of Communication*, 41(4), 6-27.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58.
- Gamson, W. A. & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 95(1), 1-37.
- Gilboa, E. (2002). Global communication and foreign policy. *Journal of Communication*, 52(4), 731-748.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hallin, D. (1978). *Uncensored war*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ham, P. (2007). Power, public diplomacy and the Pax Americana. In J. Melissen (Ed.), *The New public diplomacy* (pp. 47-66). Hampshire, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- He, Z., Xianhong, C., & Xing, W. (2012). The image of the U.S. in Chinese media: An examination of the evaluative component of framing. *Public Relations Review*, 38, 676-683.
- Herman, E. & Chomsky, N. (2002). *Manufacturing Consent: The political economy of the mass media*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Hocking, B. (2007). Rethinking the New public diplomacy. In J. Melissen (Ed.), *The new public diplomacy* (pp. 28-46). Hampshire, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kotler, P. & Gertner, D. (2002). Country as brand, product and beyond. *Journal of Brand Management*, (9), 249-261.
- Kunczik, M. (1997). *Image of nations and international public relations*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lee, B. (2007a). *A Comparative Study on News Frames of Foreign Correspondents in Seoul: Focusing on North Korea's Nuclear Stories*. A Ph. D. dissertation submitted to Yonsei University.
- Lee, B. (2010). A study on changing images of Korea on the New York Times. *The Korean Journal of Public Relations Research*, 14(3), 150-184.
- Lee, S. (2009). *Changing U.S. public diplomacy strategy and Korea-U.S. relations*. Seoul: Sidaebooks.
- Lee, Y. (2007b). Korean state image and the change of storytelling/narrative in Britain. *Korean Journal of Journalism and Communication Studies*, 51(1), 32-58.
- Louw, P. (2004). Journalists reporting from foreign places. In A. Beer & G. Merrill (Eds.), *Global media topical issues and media systems* (pp. 151-162). New York: Person.
- Martin, J. & Nakayama, T. (2010). *Intercultural communication in context*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Melissen, J. (2007). The new public diplomacy: Between theory and practice. In J. Melissen (Ed.), *The New public diplomacy* (pp. 3-27). Hampshire, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Melissen, J. (2012). *Public Diplomacy*. A paper presented to the 2012 International Symposium on Korea Public Diplomacy Forum in Seoul.

- Moffit, M. (1994). A cultural studies perspective toward understanding corporate images. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 6(1), 41–66.
- Nye, J. (1990). *Bound to lead: The changing nature of American power*. New York: Basic Books.
- Nye, J. (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. New York: Public Affairs.
- O'keeffe, A. & Oliver, A. (2010). *International broadcasting and its contribution to public diplomacy*. Sydney: Lowy Institute.
- Pew Research Center (2014). *America's global image remains more positive than China's*. Retrieved April 2, 2014 from <http://pewglobal.org>.
- Scott, W. A. (1996). Psychological and social correlates of international images. In H. Kelman (Ed.), *International behavior*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Seol, W. (2012). A comparative analysis of news frames employed by the New York Times and the Chosun Ilbo in reporting Korea-U.S. *Media, Gender & Culture*, 21, 45–58.
- Shin, G. (2012). Identity politics and public disputes in U.S.-Korea relations. *Political Science Quarterly*, 127(2), 289–310.
- Snow, N. (2009). Rethinking public diplomacy. In N. Snow & P. Taylor (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy* (pp. 3–11). New York: Routledge.
- Taylor, P. (2009). Public diplomacy and strategic communication. In N. Snow & P. Taylor (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy* (pp. 12–23). New York: Routledge.
- Tuch, H. N. (1990). *Communicating with the world: U.S. public diplomacy overseas*. New York: Martin's Press.
- Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making News*. New York: Free Press.
- U.S. Department of State. (2014). *Assessing threats facing the U.S.-Korea alliance: Remarks made by Assistant Secretary Russel*. Retrieved April 30, 2014 from <http://www.state.gov/p/eap/rls/rm/2014/06/227842.html>.
- U.S. Embassy in Seoul, Korea. (2014). *Speeches and transcripts by Ambassador Sung Kim*. Retrieved April 30, 2014 from http://seoul.usembassy.gov/p_amb_speeches11.html.
- U.S. Embassy in Seoul, Korea (2014). *Caf USA: All about Sung Kim*. Retrieved April 30, 2014 from <http://cafe.daum.net/usembassy>.
- U.S. Embassy in Seoul, Korea (2014). *Caf USA: Ambassador Stephens Blog*. Retrieved April 30, 2014 from <http://cafe.daum.net/usembassy>.
- Vlahos, M. (2009). Public diplomacy as loss of world authority. In N. Snow & P. Taylor (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of public diplomacy* (pp. 24–38). New York: Routledge.
- Wang, J. (2006). Managing national reputation and international relations in the global era: Public diplomacy revisited. *Public Relations Review*, 32, 91–96.
- 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.
- Zhong, X. & Lu, J. (2013). Public diplomacy meets social media: A study on the U.S. embassy's blogs and micro-blogs. *Public Relations Review*, 39, 542–548.



The Image of the U.S. in Korea's News Media : Is U.S. Public Diplomacy Working in Korea?

•Byung Jong Lee, Assistant Professor*

Sookmyung Women's University

The U.S. has been actively conducting public diplomacy throughout the world to improve its brand image through engaged communication with local publics. Yet its global image is two-faced. On the one hand, the U.S. is seen as a compassionate defender of freedom and democracy. On the other hand, it is also viewed as a harsh hegemonic power with unilateral foreign policy. To examine the image of the U.S. in Korea, its "blood ally" for 60 years, this paper analyzed Korean newspapers' frames on the U.S. The overall U.S. image in Korea was slightly negative. The news frames displayed the divisive, declining and discriminative images of the U.S. politics, economy and society, while U.S. cultural image was dynamic and diverse. These images are a little different from the messages the U.S. government is trying to convey to the Korean public. These results indicate U.S. public diplomacy in Korea is not fully successful.

Keywords : national image, public diplomacy, U.S., Korea-U.S. relations, news frame

*Corresponding author(bjlee@sm.ac.kr)