



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

Master's Thesis of Global Sport Management

**The Use of the Olympics as a Tool of
Public Diplomacy:
Focusing on the Olympics Host Nations**

공공외교 수단으로서의 올림픽 활용:
올림픽 개최국을 중심으로

2021년 2월

서울대학교 대학원

체육교육과 글로벌스포츠매니지먼트

오 창 원

The Use of the Olympics as a Tool of Public Diplomacy:

Focusing on the Olympics Host Nations

Advisor: KANG Joon-ho

**Submitting a master's thesis of
Global Sport Management**

February 2021

**The Graduate School
Department of Physical Education
Seoul National University
Global Sport Management**

OH Changwon

**Confirming the master's thesis written by
OH Changwon**

February 2021

Chair

KWON Sun-Yong



(Seal)

Vice Chair

LEE Yongho



(Seal)

Examiner

KANG Joon-ho



(Seal)

Abstract

The Use of the Olympics as a Tool of Public Diplomacy: Focusing on the Olympics Host Nations

Changwon Oh

Global Sport Management, Department of Physical Education

The Graduate School

Seoul National University

Today, public diplomacy is everywhere. Most states and many non-states are using this strategy as a means of seeking to advance foreign policy in order to engage foreign audiences. And, many nations are using the Olympics Games as a tool of public diplomacy. The Olympic Games are not only sporting competitions; they are also exercises in the management of relations between states and the public, at home and abroad, in order to increase the attractiveness and influence or soft power of the States concerned.

For years, many nations have used the Olympics as a tool of public diplomacy, but there is a lack of study and analysis in this field. Thus, it is important to point out how the strategy is to be prepared and applied in a correct way for future host cities and nations. The study aims to find features of hosting the Olympics from the perspective of public diplomacy

and to find the beneficial and detrimental aspects of using the Olympics in public diplomacy. The study also attempted to explore the effective way of using the Olympics for public diplomacy.

Qualitative research, consisting of document analysis and in-depth interviews with three different groups: diplomacy, sport, and sport diplomacy, was conducted for the purpose of this study.

In this study, four fundamental features were found as the features of the Olympics from the public diplomacy perspective which are Worldwide Spotlight, International Broadcasting/Media, Public Relations, and Diplomatic Window.

Also, the findings for the beneficial and detrimental aspects of using the Olympics in public diplomacy produced five beneficial aspects and five detrimental aspects. Beneficial aspects are Engagement of Local Publics, Understanding for Foreign Publics, Strong Planning and Coordination, Soft Power, and Government Communication with International Publics. And, detrimental aspects are Inevitable Risks (potential for negative publicity), Political Use, Less preparedness to host, Scandals, and Economic Instability.

Based on findings and research participants' suggestions, the researcher could suggest things to explore the effective way of using the Olympic Games for public diplomacy which are Monitoring, Use of Smart Power, and Strong Planning and Coordination for Public Diplomacy.

A perceived limitation to this study was the one-time data collection event. The features and aspects founded in this study may change over time. For hosting the Olympics, environmental issues or current global issues are increasingly and fully taken care of. The target for this particular study was the use of public diplomacy by hosting the Olympics, but future studies are needed to explore the sport in general as well.

Keyword : Public Diplomacy, Olympic Games, Soft Power

Student Number : 2019-20418

Acknowledgements

It would not be possible to finish my thesis without the endless support and love of many kind people around me. I would like to gratefully acknowledge those who have contributed to this thesis and supported me during my study.

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my one and only advisor, Dr. Joon-ho Kang, for his generous support and valuable guidance. Every time I had meetings with him, I always feel motivated and encouraged. Without his guidance and help, this research would not have happened. Many thanks for your guidance, expertise, and support.

I would also like to express my appreciation to the chair and vice-chair of my thesis committee, Dr. Sun Yong Kwon and Dr. Yongho Lee, for the productive comments and feedback they have given to this research.

Special thanks also to all my friends and colleagues in the Center for Sport Industry (CSI) and Dream Together Master (DTM) office. Without their support and unstoppable discussions, I would not have finished my research. The advice and support received from each of you were crucial to the completion of the research.

Also, I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the 제봉민병욱장학재단, the Student Aid Foundation, for the financial support.

Last but not least and most importantly, to my family – I am extremely grateful to my parents for their love, care, and support. I am also very much thankful to my sisters, brother, and brothers-in-law for their support and valuable discussions. It was very helpful to be there for me, listen to my story, and talk with me when I was having a hard time. It means a lot to me, and I can't thank enough for your tremendous support and love.

I will dedicate my achievement to the endless love and unconditional support that you have given me.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	iv
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Research Purpose	4
1.3. Research Questions	5
1.4. Significance of Study	5
Chapter 2. Literature Review	7
2.1. Public Diplomacy	7
2.1.1. Concept and Definition	7
2.1.2. Cultural Diplomacy	12
2.1.3. Soft Power	13
2.2. The Olympic Games	15
2.2.1. History and Features	15
2.2.2. Olympics from the Political Perspective	16
2.3. Public Diplomacy in the Olympics	18
2.3.1. The 1988 Seoul Olympic Games	19
2.3.2. The 2008 Beijing Olympic Games	21
2.3.3. The 2014 Sochi Olympic Games	24

Chapter 3. Methodology.....	27
3.1. Data Collection	29
3.2. Data Analysis	31
3.3. Research Participants	32
3.4. Interview Questions	34
3.5. Trustworthiness	38
3.6. Research Ethics	40
Chapter 4. Findings	40
4.1. Features of the Olympics from the Public Diplomacy perspective	41
4.1.1. Worldwide Spotlight	43
4.1.2. International Broadcasting/Media.....	48
4.1.3. Public Relations	51
4.1.4. Diplomatic Window	52
4.2. Beneficial and Detrimental Aspects of Using the Olympics in Public Diplomacy	55
4.2.1. Beneficial Aspects of Using the Olympics	57
4.2.1.1. Engagement of Local Publics	57
4.2.1.2. Understanding for Foreign Publics	58
4.2.1.3. Strong Planning and Coordination.....	59
4.2.1.4. Soft Power.....	60

4.2.2. Detrimental Aspects of Using the Olympics.....	61
4.2.2.1. Inevitable Risks and Political Use	61
4.2.2.2. Less Preparedness to Host and Scandals	63
4.2.2.3. Economic Instability	64
Chapter 5. Discussion and Conclusion	66
5.1. Implications of the Study	72
5.2. Limitation and Future Direction	74
5.3. Conclusion	75
References.....	77
국문초록	89

List of Tables

Table 1. Summary of literature based on public diplomacy definition	10
Table 2. Summary of public diplomacy proposed by Cull (2008).....	11
Table 3. Basic information about public diplomacy	13
Table 4. Definition of Soft Power and Soft Disempowerment	14
Table 5. Basic information about research participants	34
Table 6. Interview questions for experts/scholars in the field of public diplomacy	35
Table 7. Interview questions for experts/scholars in the field of sport	37
Table 8. Thematic analysis of RQ1 findings.....	42
Table 9. Thematic analysis of RQ2 findings.....	56

Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1. Background

Public diplomacy, sport and the Olympics are closely linked. Relations between diplomacy and sport are one of the most enduring and pervasive examples of international relations. As an extension of traditional diplomacy, public diplomacy aims to engage foreign citizens to foster favorable international relations and manage the international environment (Zhong & Lu, 2013). This relationship between diplomacy and sport might appear obvious and even familiar, but there is a lack of study and analysis on this field.

Diplomacy is no longer the privilege of nation states (Crikemans, 2006). Public diplomacy is linked to the relationship between governments and nation-states and other nation-states and their citizens. There are still many scholars who consider sport and politics to be totally distinct entities; however, the evidence shows that it is no longer possible and no reason to deny the existence of sport and politics together. State intervention in sport has been demonstrated in many nations throughout history, such as state boycotts of several Olympic Games due to political tension between the nations.

Sport and politics have been interrelated, but the Olympics are the most

political sporting event of all. The use of the Olympics by states to showcase themselves is the most certain example of the co-existence of sport and diplomacy. The Olympic Games are not only sporting competitions; they are also exercises in the management of relations between states and the public, at home and abroad, in order to increase the attractiveness and influence or soft power of the States concerned.

In the broader context of public diplomacy, national branding is usually defined as the use by governments of transparent means to communicate with foreign and domestic audiences about their values and culture in order to advance their national interests and foreign policy objectives (Tuch, 1990). In this vein, the importance of public diplomacy, distinction from the traditional type of diplomacy, covers various actors as effectual means when different states communicate and its role has been emphasized through numerous studies.

Today, public diplomacy is everywhere. Most states and many non-states are using this strategy as a means of seeking to advance foreign policy in order to engage foreign audiences. The concept is commonly concomitant to a Soft Power – which is Joseph Nye's theory – that is defined as 'the ability to get what you want through attraction rather than coercion or payment' (Nye, 2004). Soft Power is characterized here as progressively significant in the global context, and culture is a key field for the pursuit and exercise of soft power, particularly through sporting events, in particular the

Olympic Games. The hosting of the Olympics seems to provide national governments with significant opportunities to increase their soft power through cultural exposure to global media, attract foreign citizens, and build national pride (Grix & Houlihan, 2013).

However, the strategy of using soft power not only has positive outcomes but also has the possibility to have negative outcomes as well. This study also focuses on negative outcomes of using soft power which is defined as Soft Disempowerment. The concept of Soft Disempowerment was coined by Paul Brannagan and Richard Giulianotti (2015). This concept refers to those occasions in which you may upset, offend, or alienate others, leading to a loss of attractiveness or influence (Brannagan & Giulianotti, 2015). The hosting of the Olympics carries inevitable credit risks and may therefore be accompanied by soft disempowerment. Host nations may be unprepared for the high levels of attention and critical analysis from international media, human rights, governmental, sport, and other organizations (Chalip, 2006).

In today's complicated and globalized world, every opportunity to promote a nation's image abroad must be taken, and national governments should be work for with the understanding of how to use this opportunity to fit their aims. Placing the spotlight on a nation through hosting the sporting events can be advantageous and provide worldwide attention to positive changes (Trunkos & Heere, 2017).

1.2. Research Purpose

The purpose of this study is to find features of hosting the Olympics from the perspective of public diplomacy and to find the positive and negative aspects of using the Olympics in public diplomacy and to explore the effective way of using the Olympics for public diplomacy. Anholt (2007) has emphasized the importance of public diplomacy in building the reputation of a nation, region, or city. The way a nation hosts mega sporting events can be a very effective way to communicate the warmth and complexity of national character.

In-depth research on public diplomacy in the Olympics has never taken part in Korea such as happened in European countries and the U.S, so this study would be very unique and timely. This study is a contribution to the field of research in both public diplomacy and sport, adding new perspectives of Olympics diplomacy.

1.3. Research Questions

Two research questions were formulated to meet the objectives of the study.

RQ 1: What are the features of the Olympics from the public diplomacy perspective?

RQ 2: What are the beneficial and detrimental aspects of using the Olympics in public diplomacy?

1.4. Significance of Study

The study of public diplomacy in the Olympics is complex. The role of international sporting events has recently become more complicated as it is now a very productive global business. According to Chalip (2006), sporting events can have both negative and positive effects on society, so this study attempts to showcase some of the best and worst examples of how the Olympics has been used by the political regimes. Sporting events can provide a new face for a nation and a beneficial tool to exercise their soft power and show off their hard power to the world, but only if they are used correctly.

There are many different reasons for governments to intervene in or promote sport for their people. There is no question that governments

around the world are engaged in sporting affairs to assist their own political purposes (Lin et al., 2009). The literature review in public diplomacy in the Olympics shows greater success in some states but at the same time, some states have failed to achieve their goals because of the incorrect ways of using the Olympics.

As mentioned earlier, the relationship between diplomacy and sport might appear obvious and even familiar, but there is a lack of study and analysis in this field. Several reasons could explain this. Firstly, two different fields of research left these themes in different categories, without seeking or combining them. Secondly, the sport has struggled, within many disciplines, to establish itself as a serious area of research. Thirdly, the sport was regarded by diplomacy scholars as low politics related area. Fourthly, no clear definition of the relationship between diplomacy and sport remains an obstacle to its proper comprehension. Finally, there has been disagreement by some scholars – both sport and politics scholars – to acknowledge that sport and politics should mix at all (Zintz, 2019).

Chapter 2. Literature Review

2.1. Public Diplomacy

2.1.1. Concept and Definition

In the 1960s, the somewhat blurred term "public diplomacy" came into the foreign policy lexicon to describe aspects of international relations. And, it has been evolved with the times. The first use of the term "public diplomacy" was coined in 1965 by Edmund Gullion, the founder of Murrow Center of Public Diplomacy. Gullion's concept of public diplomacy is concerned with the influence of public attitudes on the formation and implementation of foreign policy. It includes dimensions of international relations beyond traditional diplomacy; culture by governments of public opinion in other countries; the interaction of private groups and interests in one country with another; reporting on foreign affairs and its impact on policy; communication between those whose job is to communicate, as diplomats and foreign correspondents; and the process of intercultural communications (Gullion, 1966; Cull, 2008). It is definitely true that Gullion used this term for the first time, but He was not the last one to try to define it (Chahine, 2010). Today, despite the term's frequent use, there is a lack of in-depth research on public diplomacy.

In the 1990s, public diplomacy generally refers to “the government’s process of communicating with foreign communities in an effort to bring understanding to the ideas and ideals of its nation, its institutions and culture, as well as its national objectives and current policies” (Tuch, 1990). Tuch (1990) describes it as “daily onslaught of information, impressions, and perceptions to which foreign audiences are exposed through commercial or private channels”. In addition to that, Frederick (1993) added more specific content on Tuch’s as “activities, directed abroad in the fields of information, education and culture whose objective is to influence foreign governments by influencing their citizens.”

Traditionally, public diplomacy has been understood in terms of the relationship between one nation-state and its foreign public, the main objective of which is to nurture a favorable image of itself on the global stage. However, in a fresh and multidisciplinary area, public diplomacy is often criticized for a lack of theoretical grounding and the tools needed to attract and persuade foreign public opinion (Zhong & Lu, 2013).

This definition is pervasively used in public relations and communication studies. Scholars have defined public diplomacy according to major developments in media and communication. Signitzer and Coombs (1992) argued that PR and public diplomacy are very similar because they pursue common interests, similar objectives, and use similar tools. They defined public diplomacy as “the way in which both government and private

individuals and groups influence directly or indirectly those public attitudes and opinions which bear directly on another government's foreign policy decisions”

The USC Center on Public Diplomacy, for example, spaces itself from narrower definitions of the term “public diplomacy” and officially concedes the role of public diplomacy as a tool of "soft power." Nicholas Cull and his center view the field much more broadly. It drives on to recognize that, as the study of public diplomacy is a new and growing field, "there is not yet a single agreed definition of the term." According to Cull (2009), public diplomacy divides the practice into five elements which are listening, advocacy, cultural diplomacy, exchange diplomacy, and international broadcasting.

This definition recently has been used in many study fields as it views public diplomacy broadly with specific elements. Therefore, the researcher has taken and applied Cull (2009)'s definition of public diplomacy for this study.

Table 1

Summary of literature based on public diplomacy definition

Scholars	Public Diplomacy Theory
Gullion (1996)	The concept of his theory deals with the influence of public attitudes on the formation and implementation of foreign policy
Tuch (1990)	A daily onslaught of information, impressions and perceptions to which foreign audiences are exposed through commercial or private channels
Frederick (1993)	Activities directed abroad in the fields of information, education and culture, the objective of which is to influence their foreign governments by influencing their citizens
Signitzer and Coombs (1992)	The way in which both government and private individuals and groups directly or indirectly influence public attitudes and opinions directly related to foreign policy decisions of another government
Cull (2008; 2009)	First time to recognize the role of the PD as a soft power tool. Dividing the practice into five elements: listening, advocacy, cultural diplomacy, exchange diplomacy and international broadcasting

Table 2

Summary of public diplomacy proposed by Cull (2008)

Type of Public Diplomacy	Time Frame	Flow of Information	Source of Credibility
1. Listening	Short and long term	Inward to analysts and policy process	Validity of methods used
2. Advocacy	Short term	Outward	Proximity to government
3. Cultural Diplomacy	Long term	Outward	Proximity to cultural authorities
4. Exchange Diplomacy	Very long term	Inward and outward	Perception of mutuality
5. Int'l Broadcasting	Medium term	Outward but from a news bureaucracy	Evidence of good journalistic practice

2.1.2. Cultural Diplomacy

Cultural diplomacy has been defined as "a series of acts and institutions with the aim of increasing influence abroad, both commercially and politically" (Cummings, 1997). It plays a critical role in attracting foreign people and promoting a positive national image. According to Hurn (2016), cultural diplomacy is building awareness abroad of the cultural attributes of home culture by developing interaction through cultural activities.

Today, many states actively use cultural diplomacy to promote their national image and to attract foreign governments and their citizens. Cultural diplomacy has been used as an actor's effort to manage the international environment by making its cultural resources and achievements known abroad and by facilitating cultural transmission abroad (Cull, 2009).

Anholt (2016) developed the concept of cultural diplomacy. The image of the nation is made up of the following factors: tourism, exports, people, governance, culture and heritage. This is important to many states, as their findings are based on the belief that the way a country is viewed by others is able to make a vital difference to the success of its business, trade and tourism initiatives, as well as its diplomatic and cultural relations.

Another view of cultural diplomacy is that the use of "soft power," a form of civic encouragement – the opposite of "hard power," the use of

force and aggressive threats. Unlike hard power, soft power increases the ability to encourage and persuade through intangible sources (Nye, 2004).

Table 3

Basic information about public diplomacy

Sort	Definition
Diplomacy	Mechanisms used by an international actor to manage international relations
Traditional Diplomacy	Attempt by an international actor to manage international relations through engagement with another international actor
Public Diplomacy	Attempt by the international actor to manage international relations through engagement with the foreign public

2.1.3. Soft Power

The rise of the term "soft power" coined by Joseph Nye at the end of the Cold War was a key feature of public diplomacy as an expression of an actor's ability to achieve what it wants in the international environment because of the attractiveness of its culture rather than its military or economic leverage (Nye, 1990; Nye, 2004; Nye, 2008). The reference to soft power unavoidably raises the question of its non-inclusion as one of the fundamental concepts to be explored in the context of public diplomacy.

Without reference to soft power, there is no doubt that no conceptual assessment of public diplomacy would be successfully completed. Most of the current literature about public diplomacy mentions soft power. However, the question of how to use this "soft power" in areas such as sport has been the subject of current scholarships in a wide range of fields.

The need for proper public diplomacy boosts states to seek more efficient soft power resources. Joseph Nye suggests that the effective use of soft power can be a key to the success of the nation's foreign policy (Nye, 2008).

Table 4

Definition of Soft Power and Soft Disempowerment

Sort	Concept
Soft Power (Nye, 2004)	The ability to influence others by persuasion or attraction, rather than coercion (hard power)
Soft Disempowerment (Brannagan & Giulianotti, 2015)	The concept that refers to those occasions when a particular state may upset, offend or alienate others, leading to a loss of attractiveness or influence. Basically, this locates the other side of soft power

2.2. The Olympic Games

2.2.1. History and Features

The Olympic Games or Olympics are leading international sporting events in which thousands of athletes from all around the world participate in a variety of competitions and thousands of people in a variety of fields gather to achieve each of their own purposes. In recent years, the Olympic Games have developed into one of the most significant mega-international sporting events (Malfas et al., 2004).

The modern Olympic Games was established in 1896 by Baron Pierre de Coubertin, a visionary educator who appealed that international sport could foster individual and collective goodwill and even contribute to world peace. The modern Games, therefore, were revitalized as an expression of an ideology and philosophy, that Coubertin called Olympism. It has been claimed that Olympism grew from Coubertin's initial goal of revitalizing the youth of France through a global ideology that could embrace sport for all males (IOC, 1999).

The Olympic Charter describes Olympism as a philosophy of life, exalting, and combining the qualities of body, will and mind in a balanced way, combining sport with culture and education, seeks to create a way of life based on the joy of effort, the educational value of a good example and respect for the universal fundamental ethical principle. Consequently, the

goal of the Olympic Movement is to contribute to building a peaceful and better world by educating youth through sport practiced without discrimination of any kind and in the Olympic spirit, which requires mutual understanding with a spirit of friendship, solidarity, and fair play (Olympic Charter, 2019)

The Olympics bring states from all around the world together. Although the size of a state's amount of representatives depends on the number of qualified athletes, every state has the opportunity and incentive to participate in these games. From a sporting perspective, the prestige, pride, and nationalism that are gained from a successful event are immeasurable in capturing the hearts and minds of a state's citizens. This is a true platform for the whole global to be harmonized.

2.2.2. Olympics from the Political Perspective

The Olympic Games have long been a vehicle of direct and indirect political battles, due to its popularity across the world. This has varied from the system supremacy battle between the Soviet Union and the United States during the Cold War. As mentioned earlier, the Olympic Games as an entity has become so important internationally that states recognize the political power and continue to utilize it in certain manners.

Today, politics are almost an integral piece of the mega sporting events in general with an interactive relation, where politics affect sport and vice

versa. In recent years, the Olympic Games have become an event of economic, social and political importance. International Olympic Committee (IOC) is widely recognized as the most efficient sporting organization in the world. In many ways, the IOC took the initiative to resolve political issues in a peaceful manner and, at the same time, insisted on keeping sport and Olympism away from politics, and defended the Olympic Games against the use of States to pursue their political objectives and interests (Herguner, 2012). However, from time to time, it has been used as an instrument to solve certain political problems.

As the IOC is mainly a sport organization, its potential influence on the international system is commonly discounted by scholars of international relations; therefore, related studies are limited. As the sport, in particular, the mega sporting events are still using by the states, this study tried to find the rationale of state intervention in sport.

According to Giulianotti (2015), two points might be made on soft power and soft disempowerment. Soft disempowerment tends to be at its highest before the event and soft power tends to be realized more effectively during and after the event. One to be made here is that soft power may only be gained when the messages from the host city or nation are clearly delivered to and understood by foreign public.

2.3. Public Diplomacy in the Olympics

The use of sport certainly squares with public diplomacy because a good reputation in sport may attract foreign citizens easily but effectively. As mentioned earlier, according to Cull (2009), public diplomacy divides the practice into five elements which are listening, advocacy, cultural diplomacy, exchange diplomacy, and international broadcasting.

Mega-international sporting events, in particular the Olympic Games, can include all five distinct activities of public diplomacy. The Olympics are designed by host nations to signify their meanings, and the stars of the Olympics are usually the advocates of specific messages. Hosting the Olympic Games can raise or maintain the profile or reputation of an actor. The Olympics are a perfect platform for exchanges; the shared experience of viewing with foreign audiences is a influential tool for increasing people-to-people relationships. Broadcasting the Olympic Games – the variety of competitions, news, opening, and closing ceremonies – is a long-standing way to attract audiences (Cull, 2008).

The Communication Technologies Revolution has created two major innovations: the Internet and global news networks, such as CNN International, BBC World, Sky News, and Al-Jazeera, which are capable of broadcasting almost every major event in the world, often live, to almost every location in the world. The Internet and global networks have become

a crucial source of information on world affairs (Gilboa, 2008). It means that people access to such global events very easily wherever and whenever. The Olympics is one of the most globalized events in the world, so it gets a huge spotlight from the world. Host nations may use this opportunity to change their global image (Preuss & Alfs, 2011) or to achieve certain national or international objectives (Black & Van der Westhuizen, 2004).

However, not all host cities or nations get a branding boost by hosting the Olympics (Sanders, 2011). Host nations always need to be aware that wherever there is the attempt to accumulate soft power, there is always the possibility of soft disempowerment, the concept coined by Brannagan and Giulianotti (2015), which refers to those occasions when a particular state may upset, offend or alienate others, leading to a loss of attractiveness or influence.

2.3.1. The 1988 Seoul Olympic Games

The Seoul Olympic Games were generally believed to have had significant positive consequences for Korea and Seoul in terms of legacy benefits such as improved infrastructure, urban redevelopment, and improved international status (Yoon, 2017). South Korea has also given motivation to the promotion of its traditional culture and the strengthening of diplomatic relations with the Eastern European countries, then the Communist bloc (Black & Benzanson, 2004).

Koreans saw in the Olympics a way not only to represent their leap from the 'Third World' state to the 'First World' state in economic terms, but also to spread a new image of their nation all over the world. The slogan of the Seoul Games, which was 'The World to Seoul, Seoul to the World,' also expressed all these ideas of the Korean Government (Bridges, 2008).

The 1988 Seoul Olympic Games is a typical example of a government that used the Games for its own diplomatic purposes. By the 1980s, the Korean economy was growing quickly, and lots of Korean citizens were gaining an economic profit in political stability (Manheim, 1990). The government wanted to host the Olympics to achieve its own political purpose. As a result of the Games, South Korea achieved major political advantages, in particular, the democracy development, as a result of the negotiations between the ruling party and its opposing party (Cho, 2013).

The Seoul Olympics unquestionably brought a huge outpouring of national pride and promotion among Koreans. The 1988 Games was undoubtedly a massive implementation of public diplomacy for South Korea – no matter it was unplanned or planned – not since the Korean War occurred in 1950, had such widespread worldwide attention centered on the Korean Peninsula (Kim et al., 1989). According to a national survey conducted right after the Olympics, most Koreans believe that the Olympics played a huge role in augmenting the sense of solidarity between the Korean people and the nation branding in international terms.

After a traumatic 20th century with colonialism, division, the Korean War, and authoritarian rule, the Olympics provided an opportunity for the South Koreans not only to unite, but also to open a diplomatic window to the world (Bridges, 2008).

Although the Seoul Olympics was successful, as Manheim (1990) mentioned, the South Korean government did not predict the amount of attention it would receive from the world. The important factor that contributed to this success was the international media and other interested parties (Manheim, 1990). Some 160 nations and over 13,000 athletes participated in the Seoul Olympic Games, which was – at that time – the biggest ever Games in history. All media from over 160 nations came and broadcasted the Games, City of Seoul and South Korea and it was definitely a great platform for South Korea to make the foreign citizens know that Korea is a great and safe place to visit.

2.3.2. The 2008 Beijing Olympic Games

As cultural resources are now part of public diplomacy, the Olympics can be seen as part of a soft power plan to spread the culture and heritage of the host and showcase nations on the biggest scene. A good example of this is China, which has used the Beijing Games to improve its image on the international stage (Grix, 2013).

The 2008 Beijing Olympics showcased China's progressively open

economy and proved the extent of its readiness to be recognized as a superpower (Horton, 2008). The Beijing Olympics are just the newest wave of a sustained Chinese government campaign to persuade the world and engage foreign public opinion (Kurlantzick, 2007). The Beijing Olympics were the most expensive and luxurious summer games in the history of the Olympics. China has renovated the airport and built new facilities for 2008 Games, such as the Water Cube Center and the Olympic Stadium, also known as, The Bird's Nest, which are scarcely used after the games and are considered a white elephant (Dubinsky, 2018).

China has tried to appeal themselves to the western world and exhibit the Chinese culture through the design of the Olympic Torch, the opening ceremony and the games. Thus, as seen in both Seoul and Beijing Games, both democratic and non-democratic countries have used the Opening Ceremony of the Olympic Games as a soft power tool (Nye, 2008) to show and broadcast their culture and values (Arning, 2013).

Culture is a key field for the pursuit and exercise of 'soft power' by hosting the Olympics (Giulianotti, 2015). Chinese international relations expert Zhongying (2008) said that the Beijing Games marked a landmark in China's acceleration of soft power. For both Beijing and China, soft power influenced and exercised in a variety of ways around the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games. For example, the Olympics have demonstrated that China deserved to be positioned as a leading state within the international

community.

The Chinese government has tried to use the Olympics to educate the world about modern China, which seems to have a positive impact around the world. The goals and philosophies that the Chinese government wanted to achieve with the Olympics were transparent in their promotion video. The slogan of the Olympics was “One World, One Dream” which expresses “building a harmonious world” (Cull, 2009). This has shown that their readiness to be a leader country – new China (Cull, 2009).

For all the meanings, images, and slogans concocted by the organizers of an event such as the Olympics, the event can be used by an actor with a public diplomacy agenda of nation’s own seeking to get a grip on global news coverage (Cull, 2009). The 2008 Beijing Olympics were seen as an growth in China's soft power by successfully hosting the event; promoting messages on Chinese culture and civilization; and attracting foreign public (Zhongying, 2008).

As mentioned in Seoul’s example, hosting the Olympic Games offers the host cities and nations a superlative opportunity to induce spectators and foreign public through global television (Hong et al., 2005).

However, hosting mega-sporting events such as the Olympics has always had both positive and negative impacts on soft power. 'Soft disempowerment' may increase the risk of reputation. The Beijing Games

was no exception to this. Beijing had both positive and negative impacts before, during, and after the Olympics (Giulianotti, 2015). Beijing was at their high level of ‘soft disempowerment’ before the Olympics Games – during the event preparation – with the environmental issue, political freedom, and Chinese role in its autonomous states. These negative issues of the host nation usually spread to the world through international media because the world is always keeping its eyes on host nations since the beginning of the preparation. An important thing is that how to overcome this reputational risk during and after the Olympics. Beijing communicated with the world very effectively through cultural exchange, appealing its beautifulness and readiness, and so on.

2.3.3. The 2014 Sochi Olympic Games

As mentioned earlier, soft disempowerment tends to be at its highest point before and soft power tends to be realized more effectively during and after the event. One thing to be made here is that soft power may only be increased when the messages of the host city or nation are clearly understood by international public.

However, Putin used soft power in the wrong way. Putin and his nation, Russia, expected a soft power increase from the Sochi Olympics, but he repressed dissension and kept expressing his own message only (Nye, 2013). Soft power could not be used as a tool of public diplomacy to deliver one's

own message, but the nation as a whole.

Specifically, Sochi failed to take advantage of soft power boost for Russia by hosting the 2014 Sochi Olympics with the region's political turmoil throughout the year, Russia's subsequent actions – culminating in the secession of Crimea – and its position on the military conflict in Ukraine unquestionably seem to bear this out (Grix & Kramareva, 2017). Even as the Games proceeded, Russia launched a semi-covered military intervention in Ukraine, which, together with his talk of Russian nationalism, caused serious anxiety, particularly among ex-Soviet countries (Nye, 2014).

The Russian Government has markedly failed to bring about any essential change in the dominant international image of the country (Nye, 2014) due to a lack of coordinated effort or consistent message and the unprecedented cost of the Games (Marten, 2014; Grix & Kramareva, 2017). The Sochi Olympic Games showed the intricacies associated with the attempt to use the international-mega sporting event as tool to show off both soft and hard power. The Sochi Olympics even made the foreign public have doubts about Russia's foreign policy. The event was successful from an economic and domestic political standpoint.

However, despite the success, Sochi came at a price for Russia. Global media emphasized the poor human rights for the LGBT community in Russia, corruption, and environmental issues (Trunkos & Heere, 2017).

Moreover, any goodwill that Sochi has built up around the world through the Olympics was completely destroyed when Russia decided to invade Crimea and Russia was criticized internationally (Murray, 2018). Following the Sochi Olympic Games, evidence of systematic doping has been found in the Russian Olympic Team. Due to this scandals, the IFs have suspended Team Russia in several international competitions (Dubinsky, 2019).

The expectation that the image of a nation can be expressively affected by the Olympic Games – just a few weeks of events – is feasibly optimistic unless, of course, there are problems with the event. The 2014 Sochi Olympics tended to have a negative impact on Russia's nation image (Grix et al., 2015). As mentioned above, soft disempowerment tends to be at its highest point before and soft power prone to be realized more effectively during and after the event.

Thus, it is very important to raise the nation's image during the event and remain this afterward. But, in the case of Sochi, shortly after the closing ceremony, the world witnessed one of the biggest crises in European politics. Because it was right after the closing ceremony, it is assumed as a planned invasion. The occurrences in Crimea have led Russia to widespread criticism from the international community (Kobierecki, 2016). As far as the above facts are concerned, the Crimea invasion wasted all the possible positive effects of the Sochi Olympic Games.

As many examples of the Olympic Games, despite the predominant views on the economic impact of events, host nations are expecting for attention to be paid to the social value of the Olympic Games. In order to enable the nation's pride through hosting the Olympics, host nations should foster social interaction. Hosting such a huge international mega sporting event like the Olympic Games can be the perfect platform to make proper social interaction with the public both in and out of the nation (Chalip, 2006).

Chapter 3. Methodology

This study is being done to find features of public diplomacy success through examining the past Olympics cases, in particular, to explore the effective way of using of the Olympics in public diplomacy and also to clarify how the Olympics have influenced on host nation's image either positive or negative ways and to find constituents of effective Olympics Diplomacy. It is essential to select a research approach to the overall analysis. According to Horgan et al. (2009), a researcher must apply his or her mind before deciding which method to be used. In doing so, the qualitative research method approach is selected based on case study research was engaged. This chapter explains and defends the methodological considerations and processes were implemented in this

study.

Perry (2000) pointed out that the most important difference between the two approaches is that while quantitative research concerns ask who, what, how many and how much qualitative research addresses how and why social experiences are created and given meaning.

The strength of qualitative research is its ability to provide elaborate textual descriptions of how people experience a given research issue. As Myers (2000) said, “Qualitative studies are tools used in understanding and describing the world of human experience. Qualitative methods allow flexibility to probe initial participant responses, for example, the addition, exclusion, or wording of particular interview questions, or by asking why and how (Skinner et al., 2015).

Considering the above mentioned points, this study adopted qualitative research to explore diplomacy and sport experts’ different and common views and experiences and expectations, which highlighted gaps in the researcher’s expectations and reality.

The use of quantitative research methods was considered inappropriate in order to conduct an in-depth analysis of the past Olympics cases and perspectives of the experts from two different fields. Qualitative approaches through case studies and in-depth interview are suitable techniques to explore such phenomena (Berg, 2001; Denzin & Lincoln, 2008).

As mentioned already, it is suitable to use the qualitative research method because it helps to examine individual views and experiences in depth. The details of the research questions can be obtained from the interviewees, including their real feelings and thoughts towards issues about the using Olympics as a tool of public diplomacy (O'Boyle & Shilbury, 2018).

After analyzing the documents and understanding the structure of public diplomacy and sport diplomacy, the researcher started to conduct interviews with experts and scholars. Before the primary interviews, pilot interviews were conducted in advance. After the pilot interviews, the researcher reviewed the questions and started the primary research. The VOIP (Voice over Internet Protocol) technologies (such as Zoom and Teams) were used for conducting interviews with the interviewees due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Interviews lasted approximately 60 – 90 minutes, and the conversation been recorded to be written into a transcript for further results and findings. The interview form that was used as a guideline was in English and it was translated into Korean for Korean interviewees who wished to conduct an interview in Korean. With the collected data, generic steps were applied to analyze the data (Creswell, 2003).

3.1. Data Collection

The data for this study were collected from two sources (1) document

review and (2) in-depth interviews. These two methods are most commonly used in qualitative research.

(1) Documents

According to Creswell (2003), case studies are a strategy of inquiry in which the researcher explores in depth a program, event, activity, process, or one or more individuals. The data helped to identify how public diplomacy works and how sport can be involved in public diplomacy. Documents review, as written evidence, represents the data that is an unobtrusive source of information (Creswell, 2003). Therefore, the documents collected from sport diplomacy and public diplomacy related institute or organization.

(2) In-depth interview

For a better understanding of the participants, the researcher conducted in-depth interviews. One of the significant advantages of using an interview is that it probes deeply into the respondent's answers to obtain opinions and feelings of the informant (Gall et al., 2007). With one-on-one interviews, there is time for the interviewees to give specific explanations on the individual points of view. Without being influenced by the opinions of others, this increases the accuracy and quality of the information obtained. Therefore, the qualitative data were collected through a semi-structured in-depth interview question

set prepared and developed by the researcher which is covered the main research objectives. During the development and designing of the interview question set, the literature concerning this study area and recommendations of this study specialist were taken into account.

Pilot interviews were conducted in advance for an overall understanding of how the interviews will be carried out. After the pilot interviews, the research reviewed the question set and fixed some of the questions to the open-end. The data were audio recordings and transcripts.

3.2. Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed through the content analysis process (Creswell, 2009). For clarify purposes and a better understanding of the qualitative analysis process for the study, the qualitative content analysis process for the semi-structured interviews which is developed by Creswell is as follows:

- Recording the Data
- Transcription
- Obtaining an Overview
- The Coding Process
- Evaluation of Relevance

- List of Categories
- Identification of Thematic Patterns
- Transcription

This study used cross-cultural analysis in order to enable a comparison of two different fields' perceptions. The interviews were recorded and transcribed by researcher and it was informed before the interview. As mentioned, transcripts were analyzed through the content analysis technique (Cresswell, 2009). Quotations in Korean were translated into English by the researcher.

3.3. Research Participants

Purposive sampling was used in this study. Experts or scholars (n=2) of the diplomacy field (or public diplomacy), experts or scholars (n=3) of the sport field (or Olympics experts), and experts or scholars (n=2) from the sport diplomacy field were selected as research participants to find their perspective on the purpose of this study and find different and common features that can be used effectively.

Initially, the research planned to undertake at least eight in-depth interviews – four from each sport and diplomacy field. However, it was not appropriate to collect common features since they do not have any idea of the opposite field. Therefore, the researcher added experts for both fields. VOIP (Voice over Internet Protocol) technologies such as phone calls or

video calls were used for conducting interviews with the participants. And, to transcribe more accurately, an email interview was additionally taken.

As suggested by Creswell (2012), in order to elicit views and opinions from the research participants, open-ended, semi-structured questions were asked. However, as mentioned, knowing the context of the research, especially in an opposite field, participants were rather passive and implicit in their answers. Despite this difficulty, the researcher was able to collect the information that was valuable to this study.

Demographics of research participants

The data was collected using in-depth interviews with participants. A total of seven participants took part in this research. The ages of participants ranged from 32 to 64 years old. Two of them had been working in the diplomacy field. Three of them had been working in the sport and Olympic field. The other two had been working and researching in sport diplomacy field (please refer to table 5). The names of participants and their institutions were not mentioned in order to provide and ensure confidentiality and anonymity.

Table 5*Basic information about research participants*

Participants	Organization/field	Gender	Years of experience
Participant 1	Ministry of Foreign Affairs / Diplomacy	Male	35+ years
Participant 2	Public Diplomacy related institution / Public Diplomacy	Female	5+ years
Participant 3	Organizing Committee for the Olympic Games / Olympics	Female	5+ years
Participant 4	University / Sport	Male	30+ years
Participant 5	University, IOC / Olympics	Male	30+ years
Participant 6	University / Sport Diplomacy	Male	20+ years
Participant 7	Sport Diplomacy related institution / Sport Diplomacy	Male	25+ years

Note. The names of participants and their institutions were not mentioned in order to provide and ensure confidentiality and anonymity.

3.4. Interview Questions

As mentioned, the qualitative data were collected through a semi-structured interview. During the development and preparation of the

interview question set, the literature concerning the criticism and recommendation of the public diplomacy and the Olympics studies were taken into account. These questions may vary from one interview to the next, and the order of the questions may also vary. Interviews involve generally open-ended questions that are few in number and intended to elicit views and opinions from the participants (Creswell, 2009).

The researcher developed and prepared two interview question sets for each public diplomacy and sport/Olympics field. One of these interview question sets has chosen for the interview depending on interviewees' professional experience and background and both interview question sets were used in a proper mix for sport diplomacy experts or scholars.

Below are the semi-structured questions in order to be able to answer research questions structured for this study.

Table 6

Interview questions for experts/scholars in the field of public diplomacy

No	Interview Questions	Based on
1	What are the key features of public diplomacy?	Cull (2009) Chahine (2010)
2	What is soft power and how does it work	

	in public diplomacy?	Tuch (1990)
3	What are the most common strategic objectives when relying on soft power?	Nye (1990)
4	What kinds of approaches are used when the states try to use sport as a tool of public diplomacy?	Murray and Pigman (2014)
5	How can the host nation leverage the international sporting events (such as the Olympics) to strengthen their international relations?	Trunkos and Heere (2017) Brannagan and Giulianotti (2015)
6	Are the Olympics' strategic objectives, as a tool of public diplomacy, always achieved? List some of the successful and unsuccessful examples.	
7	What do you think are the factors that contribute to successful or unsuccessful examples you mentioned?	
8	Based on your answers, which strategic outcomes that future Olympics host	Brannagan and Giulianotti (2015)

	nations wish to achieve with the Olympic Games? What issues do they have to overcome and how do they use the Olympics effectively to achieve them?	Trunkos and Heere (2017) Shaltaev (2019)
9	Do you think the Olympics are a good means to approach public diplomacy? Why?	

Table 7

Interview questions for experts/scholars in the field of sport

No	Interview Questions	Based on
1	What are the key features of the Olympics?	Cull (2009) Chahine (2010) Tuch (1990) Nye (1990)
2	Do you know what public diplomacy is? If yes, how does it work in the Olympics?	
3	What do you think are the factors that contribute to a successful or unsuccessful Olympics?	
4	How can the host nation leverage international sporting events (such as the Olympics) to strengthen their international relations?	Murray and Pigman

5	What are the most common strategies that the host nation focuses on during the preparation of the Olympics?	(2014) Trunkos and Heere (2017) Brannagan & Giulianotti (2015)
6	Are host nations' strategic objectives always achieved? List some of the successful and unsuccessful examples.	
7	How do you think of media as a key factor of the Olympics?	
8	Based on your answers, which strategic outcomes that future Olympics host nations wish to achieve with the Olympic Games? What issues do they have to overcome and how do they use the Olympics effectively to achieve them?	Manheim (1990) Brannagan and Giulianotti (2015) Trunkos and Heere (2017) Shaltaev (2019)
9	Do you think are the Olympics an opportunity for public diplomacy? Why?	

3.5. Trustworthiness

According to Creswell (2009), one advantage of qualitative research is its high validity. Creswell defines validity as the way researchers test the accuracy of the findings by using several techniques to improve the capacity of the researcher to determine the accuracy of the findings. Creswell listed

multiple strategies in order to enhance the researcher's ability to access the accuracy of the findings. Therefore, in this study, three strategies were conducted for validating the accuracy of the findings.

(1) Triangulation

Triangulation helped the researcher to reduce bias and it crosschecks the integrity of participants' responses. It also involves using multiple and different data sources to provide the validation of the results (Creswell and Miller, 2000).

(2) Member Check

Member check is the most important data validation technique. It provides respondents the opportunities to check the collected data and result (Creswell and Miller, 2000). The purpose of doing member check was to reduce research bias when analyzing and interpreting the results.

(3) Peer Examination

Peer examination also known as Peer review is an external check of the research process. It made the researcher to be checked the findings in another person such as doctoral students or colleagues in same study field to add validity to the account (Creswell, 2003).

To sum up, the interviews were transcribed and the transcriptions were sent to each of the participants to member check and validate that the

information was correct and in accordance with what was discussed and answered during the interview. All participants positively allowed the transcriptions and what was discussed to be used for the research. Interviews were also reviewed by the researcher's peers to add validity to the account and in case of any misunderstanding while protecting the anonymity of the participants.

3.6. Research Ethics

Respect for persons requires a commitment to warranting the autonomy of research participants, and the dignity of all research participants must be respected. This principle guarantees that people will not be used merely as a means to achieve research objectives. Through the introduction email before conducting the interviews, research participants should be informed about the research purpose and the procedure of the research. All seven participants in this study were initially informed about the purpose of this study and how the results will be used before they participate (Brinkman and Kvale, 2015).

Chapter 4. Findings

Chapter 4 explains a summary of this study and shows the results and findings in relation to the research questions.

The main purposes of the study were to find features of hosting the

Olympics from the perspective of public diplomacy and to find the positive and negative aspects of using the Olympics in public diplomacy. And, with these findings for each research question, this study aimed to explore the effective way of using the Olympics for public diplomacy. Research questions were as follows:

RQ 1: What are the features of the Olympics from the public diplomacy perspective?

RQ 2: What are the beneficial and detrimental aspects of using the Olympics in public diplomacy?

Data results and findings were organized in accordance with research questions. First of all, in order to evaluate how sport diplomacy works, a total of three documents were collected and reviewed, and to explore the evaluation of some of the Olympics, a total of three Olympic Reports were collected. Secondly, the interviews were conducted with various experts and scholars from the fields of diplomacy and sport. The collected data were examined using thematic analysis as it provides flexible research to make categories across the research participants.

4.1. Features of the Olympics from the Public Diplomacy perspective

In an address to the first research question which focused on exploring the features of the Olympics from the public diplomacy

perspective, the researcher conducted in depth-interviews. The research focused on the features of the Olympics; in particular, the researcher aimed to explore the features of the Olympics from the public diplomacy perspective. Exploring the features will provide a greater understanding of the value of the Olympic Games as a tool of public diplomacy. Those features will be helpful for the future host nations for the preparation. The interviewees responded to their experiences, perspectives, and information in order to cover the research questions. Some interviewees' perspectives and thoughts even directly supported the main themes of research questions but some are not.

The findings for the first research question produced four main features: Worldwide spotlight, Media, Public Relations, and Diplomatic window. The findings are also presented with components. In order to thoroughly comprehend how features were found, a summary of keywords and features were provided below.

Table 8

Thematic analysis of RQ1 findings

Sort	Features	Components
Features of the Olympics	Worldwide Spotlight	Reputation
		Nation branding
		Image cultivation

		Harmonization
		Common value share
	International Broadcasting/Media	Social Media (SNS)
		Special TV programs
		Most televised event
	Public Relations	National PR
		International PR
		Spreading the message
	Diplomatic Window	Open the diplomatic window
		Global summit between the nations
		Reconciliation (reducing tension)
		Ideal subject of exchanges

Note. Thematic Analysis is a method for identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns within data. It is widely used method of analysis in qualitative research.

4.1.1. Worldwide Spotlight

In order to find out the answer for the first research question, interviews were aimed to identify whether interviewees had any understanding of public diplomacy and how much was important to the use the Olympics or Mega sporting events as tools of public diplomacy. Interviews revealed that research participants had enough understanding and

their own vision or message of use of the Olympics in public diplomacy.

Brannagan and Giulianotti (2015) mentioned that mega sporting events such as the Olympic Games and FIFA World Cup, a huge spotlight will be shone on the host nation. Similarly, Participant 1, 4, 5, 6, 7 mentioned that the host nation should be ready for the worldwide spotlight during the Olympic Games.

The Olympic Games are great opportunity, where the spotlight is going to be shown on the host nation. I think that is the most important feature of the Olympics which means that whether the host nation is prepared or unprepared for the level of attention that comes with events; the eyes of others will be focused on the host nation... [Skip]... I agree with you that the Olympics can be used as tool of public diplomacy both internationally and domestically (Participant 4).

Hosting the Olympics has a [profound] impact on the host nation's reputation. This is the powerful thing of the Olympics....[Skip].....a successful hosting could transform(cultivate) the nation's image but also could damage the image that cannot be reversed (Participant 6).

Nygård and Gates (2013) noted that image building can be achieved through sport as a tool of soft power. This may take the form of hosting major events such as the Olympic Games. The objective of using this kind of sporting event is for nation branding and image-building. As such, Participant 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 said that in common:

Hosting the Olympics could be used for national branding and image building. For example, Barcelona '92 is a successful example of using the Olympics as a tool of public diplomacy. They projected the city and nation to be more 'global' (Participant 6).

Such events provide host cities and nations with exceptional opportunities to construct new, authorized brand identities. I definitely believe that the Olympics are very powerful tool for nation branding. As a public diplomat, Olympics are very attractive tool for public diplomacy. (Participant 2) [Translated from Korean by the researcher].

[Skip] To be honest, hosting the Olympics is totally

different. It is not about making money; it is all about showing that the nation is stable, strong, and attractive. This is the main image that host nations are trying to create for the foreign public. (Participant 4)

Most participants shared that when hosting a sporting event, especially the Olympics, the whole country works to show a good image of it, explaining that internal political issues were not the main reason for them.

Ha and Mangan (2002) focused on the motivation behind the 1988 Seoul Olympic Games which were the result of a government plan to bring Korea into the world spotlight. In addition to this, according to Cho (2013), The 1988 Seoul Olympic Games was successfully hosted because the Soviet Union and China promised they will join the Games no matter what the political circumstances were.

The Olympic Games are special events for the harmonization of the world. Despite the tensions between some countries, all countries take part in the Olympic Games and become friends. The world could be harmonized during the 2 weeks of the Games. As time goes by, I feel that I have gradually come to understand the depth and true grandeur of the Olympics. Thinking of the previous Olympics, there was no other choice but to

go abroad to enjoy it. The Seoul Olympics, however, brought the world to Korea for the first time. Everyone has come to know about Seoul and our nation. In an international atmosphere, the national flags, anthems and nationalism created a sense of harmony between people. (Participant 1) [Translated from Korean by the researcher].

You know, the symbol of the five Olympic rings represents harmony and internationalism. We really need to think about what the Olympics are. Global citizens are celebrating, smiling, and harmonizing with the Olympics. I've been to almost every Olympic Games for the past 30 years and there were some cities that I did not even know. However, during the preparation, during the Games, and after the Games, almost all the people in the world – including me – know not only the name of the cities but also their culture, geography, size, and so on (Participant 5).

According to the interview result, the Olympic Games are a platform where nations can share their common values. Participant 1, 2, 4, 7 said in

common:

From the perspective of public diplomacy, especially from a sport diplomat perspective, many nations can share their common values. The recent decision on Tokyo 2020 postponement is a great example of this. Many global summits are actually happening during the Olympic Games, sometimes even without a specific agenda. Many global leaders are just there to celebrate, congratulate and most importantly to share their common values (Participant 7).

4.1.2. International Broadcasting/Media

The media value of the Olympics Games is undoubtedly higher than any production. It is the sporting event that is the most televised around the world and channels will provide you with a whole day of updates and recaps on what has happened that day at the Olympics. According to Manheim (1988), the international news media played the role of catalyst in both the domestic and international exchanges.

Cho (2013) noted that media is one element of society whose role significantly grows during sport mega-events. Particularly in relation to the Olympic Games, technical progress in media coverage means that their

public popularity increased and resulted in many aspects of the events change. Participant 2, 3, 6 have emphasized the importance of the media as a key feature of the Olympics.

Today especially in this pandemic situation, the importance of media is increasing. Such a huge event like Olympic Games, I can say with full of confidence that media does everything...[Skip]... I was working in several OCOG around the world and always felt that literally, media press is every corner in the venue during the games. The Olympics are bringing people from all over the world to the host nation (Participant 3).

I think using social media as a tool of PR during the Olympic Games is the best way to do public diplomacy because everyone is wondering about the host nation of the Olympic Games – for me, I always want to visit the host city during the Olympic Games or FIFA World Cup. This naturally makes people search about host cities and nations. If the host cities and nations keep spread their message and PR themselves through social media, the impact will be huge (Participant 2) [Translated from Korean by the researcher].

Horne and Manzenreiter (2006) have identified three reasons as to why the Olympics kept growing throughout the 'global era'. The first reason is that the development of technology made it possible to see events through television wherever there was a broadcast satellite.

During the Olympic Games, the host nation presents their national culture and identity symbolically through media, national identity is exposed to countries all over the world.... begins to influence people of the nation itself as well as the international public easily but quickly. The media from the world is not just there to show the competition but they have a duty to release their citizens' desire to know about the host nation (Participant 2, 3, 6).

Many international create various special TV programs and the special issue of newspapers on the Olympics host nation, so it is very important to use this platform. The host city will be in the spotlight for a few months or years and will bring lots of media and tourists, who in a way will advertise the city and help it, get some revenue from hosting the Olympic Games. The city will also make history and people will remember particular cities due to the Olympics that were hosted there.

However, as the Olympics is broadcasting everywhere in the world, it also has a negative side. The obstacles to a positive image building that the participants talked about were the media. And that the portrayed image in the media may be a negative one, that would challenge the host nation to attract participants to a certain event. Especially, the foreign media cannot be controlled.

4.1.3. Public Relations

According to Grix (2013), the Olympic Games are so prestigious and important not only for athletes and big sporting fans but also to the host cities and the viewers that are brought together for this international event. How to do public relations will bring the host nation either inevitable positive or negative outcomes.

There are many tools in international public relations.

The impact of spreading the host nation's clearer message is a huge part of public relations. If the host nation wishes to use the Olympics for public diplomacy, they need to calculate and measure the value of soft power in a long term (Participant 6, 7).

For a country like China with a controversial human rights record, hosting the Olympics could be a way to

gain greater international acceptance. They intended to release good things about solving the human rights problems through international media which is also a part of PR that shows we are solving this and that.... usually, it works (Participant 5).

The Seoul Games have a very clear message which was 'The World to the Seoul, Seoul to the World'.... [Skip]....The Seoul Olympics unquestionably brought a huge outpouring of national pride and promotion among Koreans. The 1988 Games was a massive exercise of public diplomacy for South Korea – no matter it was unplanned or planned – had such extensive worldwide attention centered on the Korean Peninsula (Participant 1) [Translated from Korean by the researcher].

4.1.4. Diplomatic Window

The Olympic Games are often used as a platform for summit meetings between the leaders of various nations. Perhaps the biggest feature of hosting the Olympics is that the host nation can establish a diplomatic environment with relatively easy exchanges with nations that have not had exchanges.

For an example of Seoul 1988 Games, in terms of diplomacy, South Korea have not had official exchanges or relations with 37 nations because of their positive relations with North Korea. This meant that there was potential for many nations to boycott the Games (Cho, 2013). Many of the participants commonly mentioned about PyeongChang 2018 Winter Olympic Games as an example:

The Olympic Games can be a great opportunity for the host nation to reduce the tension between the rivalry nations. For example, there are lots of examples of the recent Winter Olympics in PyeongChang. Two Koreas marched together in the opening ceremony which reduced the tension between the two Koreas as well as with their allies. It naturally led the global summits between North Korea, South Korea, and the United States. It was huge progress not only for those three countries but also for the whole world (Participant 3, 5, 7).

The United Nations General Assembly approved a resolution that urging all countries to stop hostilities and observe a truce during the PyeongChang Winter

Olympics. This kind of special resolution can only be approved during the Olympic Games. How special feature is that the Olympics have? (Participant 1)
[Translated from Korean by the researcher].

As mentioned earlier, the Olympic flag and Olympic rings represent all the nations and the host city will bring all these nations together under one roof. The host city will also be in the spotlight for a few months and will bring lots of media and tourists in a way that will advertise the city and help it get some revenue from hosting the Olympic Games. These features are very unique from public diplomacy perspective.

According to Nygard and Gates (2016), the Olympics sometimes used to build peace within the countries through reconciliation, integration, and anti-racism. Olympic medals offer no direct fungible transfer of power to other dimensions of international affairs. One of the diplomacy concerns is the use of the Olympics by states to boost their reputation among the foreign public and to ease tensions between the nations or to test the ground for a future policy change (Murray, 2013). Some participants pointed out that the Olympics could be the icebreaker to the political tensions.

At a certain point, the Olympics often used to break the ice between the nations and make an opportunity to step forward.

Basically, from the public diplomacy perspective, it is a great tool to bring nations together and to ease tensions. I am not saying it is a tool for diplomacy itself, but it could be a great tool to break the ice easily (Participant 1) [Translated from Korean by the researcher].

4.2. Beneficial and Detrimental Aspects of Using the Olympics in Public Diplomacy

In an address to the second research question which focused on exploring the beneficial and detrimental aspects of using the Olympics in public diplomacy, the researcher conducted in depth-interviews. The research focused to find the positive and negative aspects of using the Olympics in public diplomacy and exploring the effective way of using the Olympics for public diplomacy. Exploring the factors and aspects will provide a greater understanding of the value of the Olympic Games as a tool of public diplomacy.

Those aspects will help the future host nations for the preparation and guide how to use this effectively. The interviewees responded to their experiences, perspectives and information in order to cover the research questions. Some interviewees' perspectives, and thoughts even directly supported the main themes of research questions but some are not.

The findings for the second research question produced five beneficial aspects and five detrimental aspects. Beneficial aspects are Engagement of Local Publics, Understanding for Foreign Publics, Strong Planning and Coordination, Soft Power, and Government Communication with International Publics. And, detrimental aspects are Inevitable Risks (potential for negative publicity), Political Use, Less preparedness to host, Scandals, and Economic Instability. The findings are also presented with components. In order to thoroughly comprehend how features were found, a summary of keywords and features were provided below.

Table 9

Thematic analysis of RQ2 findings

Aspects	Components
Beneficial Aspects	Engagement of Local Publics (support)
	Understanding for Foreign Publics
	Strong Planning and Coordination (Clear message)
	Soft Power
	Government Communication with International Publics
Detrimental	Inevitable Risks (potential for negative publicity)

Aspects	Political Use
	Less preparedness to host
	Scandals (bribes)
	Economic Instability

4.2.1. Beneficial Aspects of Using the Olympics

4.2.1.1. Engagement of Local Publics

Some of the participants said that engagement of the local publics is an important aspect of using the Olympics in public diplomacy as well as for hosting the event successfully. According to Chalip (2006), local residents and the public play a huge role in hosting the Olympics. IOC also says that driving public engagement is one of the key factors.

The successful use of the Olympics as a means of public diplomacy and at the same time a successful hosting of the Olympics requires the support of its citizens. And there must be a united sense of citizenship to give a positive image to the public of other countries. During the Seoul 1988 Games, all Seoul citizens voluntarily participate in odd-even vehicle operations which reduced

a huge traffic jam during the games. By doing this small thing, local residents can give a positive image of the nation to all visitors as well to the world (Participant 1, 2) [Translated from Korean by the researcher].

We all still remember Winter Olympics multiple host city, Lake Placid. Without the engagement of the local public, this small and cold town would not host the Olympic Games successfully. There was actually no place to build the Athletes Village in town and no place to accept thousands of visitors. You know what, surprisingly, all athletes, team officials, and visitors left with smiles after the conclusion of the 1932 and 1980 Games. Local residents proudly let visitors stay in their own places full of welcome...[Skip]... fewer than 3,000 residents still carries the Olympic torch with pride (Participant 5).

4.2.1.2. Understanding for Foreign Publics

In order to maintain and develop relations with other countries on a long-term and more stable foundation, it is essential to promote cultural exchanges with those countries and deepen broad-based mutual understanding, friendship, and goodwill between their peoples (Ministry of

Foreign Affairs). Public diplomacy targets foreign publics and obviously, it is important to understand what they are seeking. Participant 4, 6, 7 mentioned during the interview:

There are many ways to communicate with foreign publics such as cultural exchanges or public information activities at home and abroad. These things have come to be increasingly important as the host nation take on greater international responsibility (Participant 6).

As with other aspects or factors, the processes surrounding a sporting event cannot always be controlled. Sport can become nationalistic, creating tension between countries than understanding (Nygard and Gates, 2013). So, it is important to understand the foreign publics in public diplomacy.

4.2.1.3. Strong Planning and Coordination

As mentioned in 4.1.1, hosting the Olympics could be used for nation branding and image building and it requires strong planning and coordination. *For example, Barcelona '92 is a successful example of using the Olympics as a tool of public diplomacy. They projected the city and nation as more 'global' (Participant 6).* According to Grix et al. (2017), the UK government clearly believes in the benefits of hosting the Olympics in

2012. With the strong and clear plans, the UK attracted lots of visitors and tourists from all over the world. London tried to urbanize East London and in doing so, create new homes, transport facilities, and business opportunities both in and out of the nations. Participants, who visited London in 2012, praised the transformation of East London.

For a city like London, which already has a very strong reputation, hosting the Olympics would be less influential. However, it was truly beneficial to host and attract foreign publics.... the readiness, clear vision, strong coordination, and so on.....everything was perfect. No one actually visited the East part of London before the 2012 Games, but now thousands of people are visiting there to see the Olympic legacies. This is true public diplomacy; I think (Participant 7).

4.2.1.4. Soft Power

Grix et al., (2015) noted that it is clear that soft power now forms part of many nation-state's foreign policy strategies and the role of sports mega-events is often used. Soft power is understood as increasingly important within the global context and culture represents a key field for the pursuit and exercise of soft power, notably through sport (Brannagan and Giulianotti, 2015). Participant 6 brought out an interesting thing during the

interview about the opening and closing ceremonies of the Olympics:

The Olympic Games, in essence, is a worldwide competitive sports event. But in reality, it is an international showcase of the national characteristics of the host country. In a sense, the Games also act as an international stage for cultural communication and exchanges as a way to bridge gaps between different cultures, enhance mutual understanding and promote friendship among all nations. Showing off the host nation's soft power during the opening and closing ceremony of the Olympic Games is a beneficial factor of using the Olympics in PD (Participant 6).

4.2.2. Detrimental Aspects of Using the Olympics

4.2.2.1. Inevitable Risks and Political Use

According to Brannagan and Giulianotti (2015), the staging of sport mega events carries inevitable reputational risks and thus may be accompanied by forms of soft disempowerment. If the host nation fails to use the Olympics for public diplomacy, the outcomes mostly are inevitable – which can be reputation, economic loss, and internal reaction.

As mentioned in the literature review, the Sochi Olympics even made the foreign public have doubts about Russia. Global media criticized the poor human rights for the LGBT community in Russia, corruption and environmental issues, and so on. In Sochi's case, shortly after the closing ceremony, the world witnessed one of the biggest crises in European politics, the Crimea invasion. It destroyed all the possible positive effects of the Sochi Olympic Games. If the host nation uses the Olympics as a showcase of their hard power or uses it as a political tool, it will bring the inevitable reputation risks. Participant 2, 3 stated:

Host nations should be cautious to communicate with the international public they do this [using the Olympics for public diplomacy]. This potential for negative publicity and loss of attraction can lead the host nation to lose credibility in the public (Participant 3).

Brazil/Rio 2016 had a lot of negative international media coverage and few truly memorable social occasions that would live in the global public. Human rights problems or facilities neglect after the Olympics were kept appeared on international media. Obviously, these problems in Brazil have remained in the minds of the public and this example shows that reputational risk

can be a huge negative factor of using the Olympics in PD (Participant 2, 6).

4.2.2.2. Less Preparedness to Host and Scandals

Chappelet and Mrkonjic (2013) noted that scandals related to corruption and doping incidents, in the Olympics or when bidding, have resulted in the detrimental aspects. As such, Participant 1, 4, 7 shared their views. During the Olympics host cities bidding, IOC members toured around the bidding cities to check their facilities, environment, public engagement, etc. In some cases, if the bidding cities are unprepared for the subsequent high levels of attention, the cities try to solve things with bribes.

The bribery scandals greatly agitated the international public. If the bribery scandals are reported on media, the whole nation is basically branded as a cheater. It is sensitive to mention but there was a huge bribery scandal in IOC with Salt Lake City. Look, we don't if IOC members really received bribes from the bidding committee or US government, but everyone believes that it is true. In this globalized world today, any kind of scandal or allegations will bring negative effects to the nation especially when the nation hosts the Olympic Games (Participant 1).

4.2.2.3. Economic Instability

The important factor that contributes to successful or unsuccessful examples was the nation's economic status. Malfas et al., (2004), noted that the most important reason behind the decision of a city, region, or country to host the Olympic Games is the potential positive impact of the event on the local economy. However, the finances must under control to host the Olympics. According to Maenning and Vierhaous (2017), the IOC prefers countries with economies that record higher medium-term GDP growth rates. If the host nation's finances are unstable, it will bring negative outcomes. Participant 1, 4, 5, 6, 7 said in common that economic instability leads to lots of negative things to happen when hosting the Olympics.

Brazil/Rio 2016 had a lot of negative international media coverage and few truly memorable social occasions that would live in the global public. Human rights problems or facilities neglect after the Olympics were kept appeared on international media. Obviously, these problems in Brazil have remained in the minds of the public and this example shows that reputational risk can be a huge negative factor of using the Olympics in PD (Participant 2, 6).

A successful public diplomacy project through the Olympics must include a readiness such as completion of all Olympics venues and facilities. And, obviously, a successful construction project must include its timely and economic completion (Patel et al., 2013). Patel et al. (2013) noted that expenses of the facilities often greatly exceed the original estimate cost and it will lead to failure of completion of the facility construction. This will bring inevitable negative effects to the host city and the nation. To avoid this economic problem, the finances must under control. Participants 1, 5, 6 mentioned the hard power could be the important factor of using soft power in public diplomacy by hosting international sporting events.

.....a prime example would be the 1976 Montreal Olympic Games. It was popularly named the “Billion dollar games”. It exceeded a lot more costs than their construction budget to build the Olympic Venues. They couldn’t finish the construction because of financial problems and the Olympics opened with unfinished stadiums for the first time in Olympic history. This example could be a good lesson for the future host cities (Participant 5).

Host cities and nations need to ensure costs are under control. Financial or economic instability can lead

the host nation to be in trouble when they prepare for the Olympic Games. No matter the nation hosts the Olympics successfully with unfinished venues, a global public won't remember that but they will only remember and say "this city wasn't ready for the Olympics, was irresponsible in preparing, and so on". Olympics are a good means to approach public diplomacy but sometimes hard power – for example, financial stability – is required for this kind of using soft power (Participant 6).

Chapter 5. Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to find features of hosting the Olympics from the perspective of public diplomacy and to find the beneficial and detrimental aspects of using the Olympics in public diplomacy and to explore the effective way of using the Olympics for public diplomacy. These findings will allow future implications and improvement for the future Olympics host nations.

In this chapter, the findings are discussed more in detail. The implications for the future host nations and key features and aspects of using the Olympics as a tool of public diplomacy will be included. The chapter

will present a more comprehensive analysis of the data to answer the research questions as well as the limitation to the study.

Sport is often used as a tool of public diplomacy. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea also strives to improve the image of Korea and strengthen its relations with other countries through sport. It has focused on sports diplomacy by hosting international sports games and working to host successful major international games, which all have a great ripple effect on the economy and improve the image of Korea (Ministry of Foreign Affairs).

Analysis from interviews has revealed, soft power relates to the ability to influence others through persuasion or attraction, rather than coercion (hard power). Based on the research done for this study, the relationships of soft power and public diplomacy are quite fuzzy, especially when one looks at particular areas in which soft power and public diplomacy may operate, for example, the hosting of sport mega-events. As Cull (2008) mentioned, hosting the Olympic Games is one of the effective ways of using sport as a tool of public diplomacy. However, the strategy of using soft power not only has positive outcomes but also has a possibility of having negative outcomes – which is defined as soft disempowerment. This concept discussed here relates to a specific aspect of Brannagan and Giulianotti (2015) – it refers to those occasions in which you may upset, offend or alienate others, leading to a loss of attractiveness or influence.

In terms of the features of the Olympics from the public diplomacy perspective, four main features presented in the findings section (please refer to table 8) and made it possible to analyze diplomatically, what attracts the nations to host the Olympics and to understand how powerful platform it is for public diplomacy. Findings have shown that the Olympics will bring a huge spotlight from the world. Both Nygard and Gates (2013) and Ha and Mangan (2002) agree that most importantly, from a public diplomacy point of view, image building can be achieved through hosting the Olympics. In this study, the research participants also highlighted an interesting aspect of hosting the Olympics which was that host nations tried to present a good image of a country with a well hosted sporting event, despite the internal clashes.

According to Manheim (1988) and Horne and Manzenreiter (2006), the media value of the Olympics is higher than any other production. It is the event that is the most televised around the world. Like studies of the Olympics and any other mega sporting events, the result of this study also indicates that the media plays a critical role as a catalyst in both the domestic and international exchange of the host nations. Also, media is one of the elements of society whose role significantly grows during the Olympics. However, as found in Chalip (2006) and Brannagan and Giulianotti (2015), the researcher confirmed in this study that not only positive things drawn by the media but also the negative image of host

nations drawn by the media, especially foreign media that cannot be controlled, and it could be a very challenging feature of hosting the Olympics. The examples mentioned in the literature review and findings section showed that the Olympics could be the easiest and most effective way to attract foreign public and as easy as it is, it is easy to lose their reputation as well.

In terms of the beneficial and detrimental aspects of using the Olympics, five aspects for each were presented in Tables 9 and 10. The findings were presented with components. Exploring the aspects will provide a greater understanding of the value of the Olympic Games as a tool of public diplomacy. These aspects will help the future host nations for the preparation and guide how to use this effectively.

The engagement of the local publics is newly found in this study as an important factor in using the Olympics in public diplomacy as well as for hosting the event successfully. One of the interviewees said that local residents and the public play a huge role in hosting the Olympics and IOC also says that driving public engagement is one of the key success factors. Also, as mentioned in Grix et al. (2017), with strong and clear plans, the host nations may attract lots of people from all over the world. In this study, the researcher confirms that host nations with strong planning and coordination took many advantages of hosting the Olympics.

As mentioned in the findings for research question 1, the Olympics have many positive features from the public diplomacy point of view. However, if the Olympics are used in the wrong way; it could possibly bring inevitable reputational risk to the host nations (Brannagan & Giulianotti, 2015; Chalip, 2006). In this study, the researcher also confirms that this perspective is something that many host nations worry about and future host nations should be prepared not to do. As shown in the study of Nye (2013), similarly, if the host nations abuse the Olympics as their political tool, the outcomes mostly are inevitable – this can be reputation, economic loss, and internal reaction.

As mentioned in the previous section and some of the participants, if the Olympics bidding or hosting cities are unprepared for the subsequent high level of attention, the cities obviously think and try to solve things with bribes. This finding is consistent with the finding of Chappelet and Mrkonjic (2013) that scandals related to corruption and doping incidents, in the Olympics or when the bidding is in process, have resulted as detrimental factors.

Lastly, an important aspect – or this can be called a factor – that contributes to successful or unsuccessful examples was the nation's economic status. As found in the study of Malfas et al. (2004), the researcher could also find in this study that the most important reason behind the decision of a city, region, or country to host the Olympic Games

is the potential positive impact of the event on the local economy. However, the finances must under control to host the Olympics. Hosting the Olympics is often much more expensive than the estimated budget of the government and it will lead to failure of completion of the facility construction. This eventually will bring inevitable negative effects to the host city and the nation. There are always good expectations are set by the global audiences to the host nations. This perspective is unique to the Olympic Games.

Many nations have devoted themselves to hosting the Olympics in recent years, the main reason being the enhance the nation's image and promote its soft power. Economic returns from hosting the Olympics are no longer expected, but in addition to tangible economic returns, soft power that can affect other people through intangible assets can only be achieved through public diplomacy. Therefore, the importance of public diplomacy is emerging more than ever, and this study has made it possible for many countries to make good use of the Olympics in public diplomacy.

Although many nations have been engaged in public diplomacy through the most powerful intangible asset of sport, there has been a lack of research in this area, and previous studies have failed or not tried to relate this part to public diplomacy. In this regard, the researcher believes that the findings highlight each other's strengths in both public diplomacy and sport and provide good implications for a complementary relationship.

5.1. Implications of the Study

Based on findings and participants' suggestions, the following implications can be suggested to explore the effective way of using the Olympics for public diplomacy. And, most importantly, this could be used as future implications and improvements for the future Olympics host nations.

The first implication of this study is monitoring. When the host nations use the Olympics for their public diplomacy, post-Olympics monitoring is recommended. The Olympics do not have to be used for one-time event or showcase for the host nation's soft power and for attracting the foreign public but public diplomacy needs to be used to achieve the global common goals and solve the issues.

Rather than just showing things like the so-called Olympic Truce during the Olympic Games, host nations should think about and monitor international issues that have been raised continuously since the Olympic Games. If that is the case, the public diplomacy effects of the host nation will be enormous and will also contribute to world peace in accordance with Olympism.

The second implication is smart power (Hard + Soft Power). In order to do public diplomacy effectively by hosting the Olympics, it is recommended to prepare enough hard power such as financial stability.

Obviously, a successful construction project must include its timely and economic completion. Expenses of the facilities often greatly exceed the original estimate cost and it will lead to failure of completion of the facility construction and eventually, it will bring inevitable negative effects to the host city and the nation. To avoid this economic problem, the finances must under control. In addition to that, it is also recommended to prepare enough soft power such as the nation's resources of culture, values, and policies.

A smart power strategy combines hard and soft power resources. Public diplomacy is an important tool in the arsenal of smart power, but smart public diplomacy requires an understanding of the roles of credibility, self-criticism, and civil society in generating soft power. If the host nation prepares to host the Olympics by properly combining hard power and soft power, it will be a great opportunity for the host nation from a public diplomacy point of view. Most public diplomacy uses soft power, but both hard power and soft power should be well prepared when preparing for the Olympics. This is also the main feature of hosting the Olympics from the point of view of public diplomacy.

The last implication of this study is strong planning and coordination for Public Diplomacy. Whether planned or unplanned by the host nation, many Olympics are often used for public diplomacy. It means that the Olympics and public diplomacy are complementary to each other. So, the researcher would recommend for future host nations to establish the

Public Diplomacy team with strong planning and coordination during the preparation of the Olympics.

Since the Olympics are often used as a tool for public diplomacy, host nations must plan and coordinate comprehensively from the point of view of public diplomacy from the very beginning of the preparations for the Olympics and it will bring a greater public diplomacy effect of the nation. If the aim of hosting the Olympics is to enhance the image of the country and promote it to the world, it is very important not only to prepare facilities for the successful hosting of the Olympics but also to plan how to use it as a means of public diplomacy from the outset.

5.2. Limitation and Future Direction

There are some limitations to this study in terms of the number of participants and previous studies, data collection, and ongoing environmental changes.

The first limitation of the study was the number of participants. The researcher was able to conduct interviews with only 7 participants because of the lack of experts or scholars in this research area. Therefore, those participants' perspectives and feedbacks might limit the extent of the impact of this research's outcome. As a phenomenon study, it needs to be evaluated on a regular basis with a higher number of samples and implementing both quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments.

In regards to the data collection, the mixed approach of interviews (online and offline) was used in relation to the current pandemic situation and respondent preference, such as Zoom or Skype for online interviews. However, there could be different results implied especially if the respondents were interviewed face to face as there are other areas that could be recorded such as the observation of body language and feelings.

Another perceived limitation to this study was the one-time data collection event. The features and aspects founded in this study may change over time. For hosting the Olympics, environmental issues or current global issues are increasingly and fully taken care of. The target for this particular study was the use of public diplomacy by hosting the Olympics, but future studies are needed to explore the sport in general as well. Additionally, future studies should be examined sport diplomacy from the perspective of more various fields or stakeholders, so it could be evaluated a higher number of participants from various and similar fields.

5.3. Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to find features of hosting the Olympics from the perspective of public diplomacy and to find the beneficial and detrimental aspects of using the Olympics in public diplomacy and to explore the effective way of using the Olympics for public diplomacy. Anholt (2007) has emphasized the importance of public

diplomacy in the construction of the reputation of a nation, region, or city. The way a nation hosts mega sporting events can be a highly effective way of communicating the warmth and depth of national character.

The findings of this research are related to the research questions and alignment with the previous literature. The findings for the first research question produced four main features: Worldwide spotlight, Media, Public Relations, and Diplomatic window. The findings are also presented with components.

The findings for the second research question produced five beneficial aspects and five detrimental aspects. Beneficial aspects are Engagement of Local Publics, Understanding for Foreign Publics, Strong Planning and Coordination, Soft power and Government Communication with International Publics. And, detrimental aspects are Inevitable Risks (potential for negative publicity), Political Use, Less Preparedness to Host, Scandals, and Economic Instability.

Based on findings and research participants' suggestions, the researcher could suggest things to explore the effective way of using the Olympic Games for public diplomacy which are Monitoring, Use of Smart Power, and Strong Planning and Coordination for Public Diplomacy.

References

- Anholt, S. (2007). What is Competitive Identity?. In *Competitive Identity* (pp. 1-23). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230627727_1
- Anholt, S. (2016). *Places: Identity, Image and Reputation*. Springer.
- Arning, C. (2013). Soft Power, Ideology and Symbolic Manipulation in Summer Olympic Games Opening Ceremonies: A Semiotic Analysis. *Social Semiotics*, 23(4), 523-544.
- Berg, B. (2001). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Black, D., & Bezanson, S. (2004). The Olympic Games, Human Rights and Democratisation: Lessons from Seoul and Implications for Beijing. *Third World Quarterly*, 25(7), 1245-1261.
- Black, D., & Van Der Westhuizen, J. (2004). The Allure of Global Games for 'Semi-Peripheral' Polities and Spaces: A Research Agenda. *Third World Quarterly*, 25(7), 1195-1214.
- Brannagan, P. M., & Giulianotti, R. (2015). Soft Power and Soft Disempowerment: Qatar, Global Sport and Football's 2022 World Cup Finals. *Leisure Studies*, 34(6), 703-719.

Bridges, B. (2008). The Seoul Olympics: Economic Miracle Meets the World. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 25(14), 1939-1952.

Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2015). *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.

Burchell, K., Ben, O. L., Gillespie, M., & Nieto McAvoy, E. (2015). Soft Power and Its Audiences: Tweeting the Olympics from London 2012 to Sochi 2014. *Participations: Journal of Audience & Reception Studies*, 12(1), 413-437.

Chahine, J. (2010). *Public Diplomacy: A conceptual Framework* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. McGill University.

Chalip, L. (2006). Toward a Distinctive Sport Management Discipline. *Journal of Sport Management*, 20, 1-21.

Chalip, L. (2006). Towards Social Leverage of Sport Events. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 11(2), 109-127.

Chappalet, J. L., & Mrkonjic, M. (2013). Basic Indicators for Better Governance in International Sport (BIBGIS): An assessment tool for international sport governing bodies, *Chair of Public Management*, 4-48.

- Cho, H. (2013). *International Sporting Events, Nationalism and Sport Diplomacy* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation], Loughborough University.
- Costa, C. (2005). The status and future of sport management: A Delphi Study. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 117-142.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches*. (3rd ed.). London: SAGE.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Boston, MA: Pearson Publication.
- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *TheoryInto Practice*, 39(3), 124-130.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Criekemans, D. (2006, May). How subnational entities try to develop their own 'paradiplomacy'. The case of Flanders (1993-2005). In *International Conference Challenges for Foreign Ministries: Managing Diplomatic Networks and Optimising Value*.

- Cull, N. J. (2008). Public diplomacy before Gullion: The evolution of a phrase. In *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy* (pp. 39-43). Routledge.
- Cull, N. J. (2008). Public Diplomacy: Taxonomies and Histories. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1), 31-54.
- Cull, N. J. (2008). The public diplomacy of the modern Olympic Games and China's soft power strategy. *Owning the Olympics: Narratives of the New China*, 117-144.
- Cull, N. J. (2009). *Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past* (pp. 18-23). Los Angeles, CA: Figueroa Press.
- Cummings Jr, M. C. (1997). *Democracy Under Pressure: An Introduction to American Political System* (8th ed.). Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 1-19.
- Dubinsky, Y. (2018). The image of Beijing and London in Israeli media coverage of the 2008 and 2012 Olympic Games. *The International Journal of Sport and Society*, 9(2), 37-50.

- Dubinsky, Y. (2019). Analyzing the Roles of Country Image, Nation Branding, and Public Diplomacy through the Evolution of the Modern Olympic Movement. *Physical Culture and Sport. Studies and Research*, 84(1), 27-40.
- Frederick, H. H. (1993). *Global Communication and International Relations*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). Collecting Research Data with Questionnaires and Interviews. *Educational Research: An Introduction*, 12(10), 227-261.
- García, C. (2012). The Use of Sports as a Tool of Public Diplomacy in Regions or "Stateless Nations": The Case of the Basque Country in Contemporary Spain. *Journal of Sports Media*, 7(2), 115-128.
- Gilboa, E. (2008). Searching for a theory of public diplomacy. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1), 55-77.
- Giulianotti, R. (2015). The Beijing 2008 Olympics: Examining the interrelations of China, globalization, and soft power. *European Review*, 23(2), 286-296.
- Grix, J. (2013). Sport politics and the Olympics. *Political Studies Review*, 11(1), 15-25.

- Grix, J., Brannagan, P. M., & Houlihan, B. (2015). Interrogating states' soft power strategies: a case study of sports mega-events in Brazil and the UK. *Global Society*, 29(3), 463-479.
- Grix, J., Brannagan, P. M., Wood, H., & Wynne, C. (2017). State strategies for leveraging sports mega-events: unpacking the concept of 'legacy'. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 9(2), 203-218.
- Grix, J., & Houlihan, B. (2014). Sports mega-events as part of a nation's soft power strategy: The cases of Germany (2006) and the UK (2012). *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 16(4), 572-596.
- Grix, J., & Kramareva, N. (2017). The Sochi Winter Olympics and Russia's unique soft power strategy. *Sport in Society*, 20(4), 461-475.
- Gullion, E. A. (1966). Definitions of public diplomacy. *The Edward R. Murrow Center of Public Diplomacy*, [http://fletcher.tufts.edu/Murrow/Diplomacy/Definitions,\(01.01.2013\).](http://fletcher.tufts.edu/Murrow/Diplomacy/Definitions,(01.01.2013).)
- Nam-Gil, H., & Mangan, J. A. (2002). Ideology, politics, power: Korean sport-transformation, 1945-92. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 19(2-3), 213-242.
- Herguner, B. (2012). The IOC as a transnational organization: Paradigm shift and its rising role in global governance. *International Area*

Studies Review, 15(2), 176-186.

Hong, F., Wu, P., & Xiong, H. (2005). Beijing ambitions: An analysis of the Chinese elite sports system and its Olympic strategy for the 2008 Olympic Games. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 22(4), 510-529.

Horne, J., & Manzenreiter, W. (2006). An introduction to the sociology of sports mega-events. *The Sociological Review*, 54(2), 1-24.

Horton, P. (2008). Sport as public diplomacy and public disquiet: Australia's ambivalent embrace of the Beijing Olympics. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 25(7), 851-875.

Hurn, B. J. (2016). The role of cultural diplomacy in nation branding. *Industrial and Commercial Training*.

International Olympic Committee. (2019). *The Olympic Charter*. In force as from 26 June 2019. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee.

Kim, J. G., Rhee, S. W., Yu, J. C., Koo, K. M., & Hong, J. D. (1989). *Impact of the Seoul Olympic Games on National Development*. Korea Development Institute.

Kobierecki, M. (2016). Russia and its international image: from Sochi Olympic Games to annexing Crimea. *International Studies*.

Interdisciplinary Political and Cultural Journal, 18(2), 165-186.

Kurlantzick, J. (2007). *Charm Offensive: How China's Soft Power is Transforming the World*. Yale University Press.

Lin, C. Y., Lee, P. C., & Nai, H. F. (2009). Theorizing the role of sport in state-politics. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Science*, 1(1), 23-32

Maennig, W., & Vierhaus, C. (2017). Winning the Olympic host city election: key success factors. *Applied Economics*, 49(31), 3086-3099.

Malfas, M., Theodoraki, E., & Houlihan, B. (2004, September). Impacts of the Olympic Games as mega-events. In *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers-Municipal Engineer* (Vol. 157, No. 3, pp. 209-220). Thomas Telford Ltd.

Manheim, J. B. (1990). Rites of passage: The 1988 Seoul Olympics as public diplomacy. *Western Political Quarterly*, 43(2), 279-295.

Marten, K. (2014). Crimea: Putin's Olympic diversion. *The Washington Post*.

Murray, S. (2013). Moving beyond the ping-pong table: sports diplomacy in the modern diplomatic environment. *Public Diplomacy Magazine*, 9, 11-16.

Murray, S. (2018). *Sports diplomacy: Origins, theory and practice*.

Routledge.

Murray, S., & Pigman, G. A. (2014). Mapping the relationship between international sport and diplomacy. *Sport in Society*, 17(9), 1098-1118.

Myers, M. (2000). Qualitative Research and the Generalizability Question: Standing Firm with Proteus. *The Qualitative Report*, 4(3). Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol4/iss3/9>

Nye Jr, J. (2008). *The powers to lead*. Oxford University Press.

Nye Jr, J. S. (2004). Soft power. In *Power in the Global Information Age* (pp. 76-88). Routledge.

Nye Jr, J. S. (2008). Public diplomacy and soft power. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1), 94-109.

Nye, J. S. (1990). Soft power. *Foreign Policy*, (80), 153-171.

Nye, J. S. (2013). What China and Russia don't get about soft power. *Foreign Policy*, 29(10).

Nye, J. S. (2014). Putin's Rules of Attraction. *Project Syndicate*.

Nygård, H. M., & Gates, S. (2013). Soft power at home and abroad: Sport diplomacy, politics and peace-building. *International Area Studies Review*, 16(3), 235-243.

O'Boyle, I., & Shilbury, D. (2018). Identifying enablers and barriers: shaping collaborative sport governance theory. *World Leisure Journal*, 60(4), 330-352.

Olympic Movement. (2004, December). *Olympic Review*.

Patel, A., Bosela, P. A., & Delatte, N. J. (2013). 1976 Montreal Olympics: Case study of project management failure. *Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities*, 27(3), 362-369.

Perry, C. (2000). A structured approach to presenting theses. *Australasian Marketing Journal (AMJ)*, 6(1), 63-85.

Preuss, H., & Alfs, C. (2011). Signaling through the 2008 Beijing Olympics—Using mega sport events to change the perception and image of the host. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 11(1), 55-71.

Sanders, B. (2011). Sport as public diplomacy. *Public Diplomacy International*, 2(6).

Shaltaev, O. (2019). *The Case of Sport as a Tool of Immigrant Integration in Sweden* [Master's thesis, Tampere University]. Trepo Digital Archive. <http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:tuni-201906172031>

Signitzer, B. H., & Coombs, T. (1992). Public relations and public diplomacy: Conceptual convergences. *Public Relations Review*, 18(2),

137-147.

Skinner, J., Edwards, A., & Corbett, B. (2015). *Research methods for sport management*. Routledge.

Trunkos, J., & Heere, B. (2017). Sport diplomacy: A review of how sports can be used to improve international relationships. *Case Studies in Sport Diplomacy*, 1-18.

Tuch, H. N. (1990). *Communicating with the World: US Public Diplomacy Overseas*. St. Martin's Press.

Xifra, J. (2009). Building sport countries' overseas identity and reputation: A case study of public paradiplomacy. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 53(4), 504-515.

Yoon, H. (2017). The legacy of the 1988 Seoul Olympic games. In *Olympic Cities: 2012 and the Remaking of London* (pp. 105-114). Routledge.

Zhong, X., & Lu, J. (2013). Public diplomacy meets social media: A study of the US Embassy's blogs and micro-blogs. *Public Relations Review*, 39(5), 542-548.

Zhongying, P. (2008). *The Beijing Olympics and China's soft power*. Brookings Institution.

Zhou, S., Shen, B., Zhang, C., & Zhong, X. (2013). Creating a competitive identity: Public diplomacy in the London Olympics and media portrayal. *Mass Communication and Society*, 16(6), 869-887.

Zintz, T. (2019). *Promoting a Strategic Approach to EU Sports Diplomacy* (Doctoral dissertation, Edge Hill University, UK).

국문초록

공공외교 수단으로서의 올림픽 활용: 올림픽 개최국을 중심으로

오 창 원

서울대학교 대학원

체육교육과 글로벌스포츠매니지먼트

오늘날 공공외교는 세계 곳곳에서 활용되고 있다. 세계 주요 국가들이 자국민과 타국 국민, 자국 정부와 타국 국민들 간의 소통을 끌어내고, 타국 국민들을 이해하고, 그들에게 영향을 미침으로써 국익을 증진하고자 공공외교를 활용하고 있다. 올림픽 대회는 더 이상 스포츠 대회에 국한되지 않고, 국가와 대중들, 국가들 간의 관계에서 무형의 자산이 지닌 매력을 통해 전 세계 국민들의 마음을 사로잡는 소프트파워를 증대시키기 위한 외교의 한 중심으로 활용되고 있다. 수년 동안 많은 나라가 올림픽을 공공외교의 도구로 활용해 왔지만, 이 분야에 대한 학술적 연구는 부족한 실정이다. 따라서, 향후 올림픽 개최를 준비하는 도시와 국가들을 위해 공공외교 전략을 어떻게 준비하고 올바르게 적용할 것인지에 관한 연구가 필요하다. 이에 따라, 본 연구에서는 이러한 필요성에 의해 공공외교의 관점에서 올림픽 개최가 갖는 특징을

알아보고, 올림픽 개최를 공공외교 도구로 활용하기 위한 촉진요인과 저해요인을 도출하고자 하였다. 또한, 본 연구는 올림픽을 공공외교 측면에서 어떻게 효과적으로 활용해야 하는지를 알아보하고자 하였다.

본 연구를 위해 질적 연구 방법을 사용하였으며, 구체적으로는 문헌 분석과 외교, 스포츠, 스포츠 외교 등 3개 분야 학자 및 전문가들과의 심층 인터뷰를 하였다. 본 연구의 결과로 우선, 공공외교의 관점에서 올림픽 개최가 갖는 특징으로는 ‘세계적인 스포트라이트’, ‘미디어 노출’, ‘공중관계’, ‘외교적 창구’ 등 네 가지의 기본 특징이 확인되었다. 또한, 올림픽 개최를 공공외교 도구로 활용하기 위한 촉진요인과 저해요인에 대한 연구 결과로는 각각 다섯 가지 요인들을 도출하였다. 촉진요인으로는 ‘지역 공공의 참여’, ‘외국 공공의 이해’, ‘강력한 계획과 운영’, ‘소프트 파워’, ‘타국 국민과의 정부 소통’이 확인되었다. 그리고, 저해요인으로는 ‘불가역적인 위험 부담(부정적 이미지 가능성)’, ‘정치적 목적으로 사용’, ‘개최 준비 부실’, ‘국가적 스캔들’, ‘경제적 불안정’이 도출되었다. 마지막으로, 연구 결과와 연구 참가자들의 제안을 바탕으로 ‘모니터링’, ‘스마트파워 활용’, ‘공공외교를 위한 강력한 계획과 운영’ 등 공공외교 측면에서 효과적인 올림픽 활용에 대한 방안을 제시할 수 있었다. 본 연구의 한계점으로는 연구를 통해 수집된 자료

들은 본 연구의 목적에 맞춰진 일회성 데이터라는 점이다. 향후 공공외교의 도구로 올림픽 개최가 활용될 때 환경문제나 여러 가지 많은 세계적인 이슈들에 의해 본 연구에서 도출된 특징들과 요인들이 현재와는 달라질 수 있다. 본 연구는 올림픽을 유치해 공공외교를 활용하는 것에 중점을 두었지만, 올림픽 유치 등 스포츠 대회 개최 이외에도 전반적인 스포츠를 통한 스포츠 외교에 대한 향후 연구도 필요하다. 본 연구는 수 많은 국가들이 올림픽 개최를 통해 자국의 소프트 파워 증진을 하려고 하는 현상을 실증적으로 규명하고자 한 초기 단계의 연구로서 의미를 가진다고 할 수 있으며, 향후 공공외교와 스포츠외교의 요소로 활용할 수 있는 이론적 배경을 확장했다는 데 기여했다고 볼 수 있다.

주요어: 공공외교, 올림픽, 소프트파워

학 번: 2019-20418