12

Curative International Marketing, Corporate and Business Diplomacy: A Triple Application for Migration

Hans Rüdiger Kaufmann, Maria Paraschaki, Evangelos Tsoukatos, Dolores Sanchez Bengoa, and Michael Czinkota

H. R. Kaufmann (✉)
University of Nicosia, Nicosia, Cyprus

University of Applied Management Studies Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany
e-mail: hans-ruediger.kaufmann@hdwm.org

M. Paraschaki
Technological Educational Institute of Crete, Crete, Greece

E. Tsoukatos
Department of Accounting and Finance, Hellenic Mediterranean University,
Heraklion, Crete, Greece
e-mail: tsoukat@staff.teicrete.gr

D. S. Bengoa
University of Applied Management Studies Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany

M. Czinkota
Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA
e-mail: M.Czinkota@kent.ac.uk

12.1   Introduction

Globalization epitomizes a total of polymorphous, heterogeneous and often contradictory economic, political, social and cultural procedures on global, regional, national and local levels (Deligianni-Dimitrakou 2008). The development of globalization and new disruptive technologies in the context of the Internet of Things (IoT) were favoured by the unlimited communication and information-sharing opportunities, offered by the ICT technological advances, and the prevalence of the neo-liberal ideologies on modern politics (Manitakis 2001; Deligianni-Dimitrakou 2008; Pamboukis 2010; Santoro et al. 2018). However, whilst globalization entails quantitative growth of the global economy with analogous enlargement of problems in the business environment, it does not necessarily lead to qualitative development (Muldoon 2005; Bolewski 2007; Asquer 2012; Jones and Thompson 2012; Makasi and Govender 2015). Whilst acknowledging improved conditions in many parts of the world regarding the delivery of products and services to a growing population, Guterres, the secretary-general of the UN, in his foreword of the UN World Economic Situation and Prospects 2018 (United Nations 2018) report, reasons possible deviations from the objectives of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in still existing "deep-rooted systemic issues and short term thinking" and calls on politicians to focus on long-term growth drivers such as "rehabilitating and protecting the environment, making economic growth more inclusive and tackling institutional obstacles to development" (https://www.un.org/development/desa/dpad/). Further discontentment with globalization relates, for example, to the disregard of local cultural idiosyncrasies due to inappropriate ethnocentric approaches, increased levels of consumer disappointment, excessive consumerism or marginalized and increasingly impoverished regions (Czinkota and Kaufmann 2015) and, last but least, still existing migration-related gaps. According to International Organization for Migration (IOM) (2018, p. 41), these gaps are, for example, reflected by: a lack of understanding of "global trends in regular migration flows, so that coverage can expand beyond the 45 or so countries for which information exists"; providing new and improving existing information on people "dying while migrating,

particularly when using clandestine channels that rely on the services of smugglers and traffickers"; "a recognized need to gather better cumulative data" on "new displacements associated with rapid onset hazards" and on displacements "due to conflict and violence" with the latter being, according to IOM (2018), "by far outnumbered" by the previous ones; and "better data on movement associated with environmental change, including the effects of climate change".

This conceptual book contribution aims to contribute to cover the literature gap on how the multifaceted issues of migration influence corporate behaviour. This gap exists as the relationship between globalization, migration and sustainability as well as the fledgling knowledge stream of corporate and business diplomacy is still under researched. In a pioneering paper, You and Saner (2017) link the achievement of the Global 2030 Development Agenda with competencies derived from business diplomacy. As an original contribution and based on a differentiation between the often synonymously regarded concepts of corporate diplomacy and business diplomacy, this book contribution concludes that corporate and business diplomacy and the recently introduced paradigm of curative international marketing form the basis for a synthesized conceptualization able to inform and guide companies to respond to global challenges such as migration.

12.2   Migration and Globalization

As reflected by migration, globalization introduces new schemes, new centres and relations of economic and political authority, new, intricate and multilevel relations, impacts and interdependences, demanding new balances and adjustments (Zhang 2005; Muldoon 2005; Bolewski 2007; Deligianni-Dimitrakou 2008; Katsaros and Tsirikas 2012). Migration, regarded as "one of the defining global issues of the early twenty-first century" (IOM Council 2003; IOM 2018) and "a complex and multifaceted phenomenon" (International Leaders Forum 2010) is used in this work to exemplify the contradictory, disruptive and often chaotic nature of interrelated globalization phenomena. Latter is best mirrored by the wave of 473,887 migrants and refugees "who reached Europe by sea in

2015 (including the first two and a half weeks of September) according to the International Organisation for Migration" (Holehouse and Weston 2015) affecting every state with one out of every 35 persons in the world being a migrant. In total, the number of international migrants increased to 243,700,236 in 2015 representing 3.3% of the world's population compared to 84,460,125 in 1970 having represented 2.3% of the world's population (IOM 2018). Migration is overshadowed by sad developments in 2015, such as 2812 migrants dying at sea, 52,200 people having been detected illegally crossing the Balkans, 572 traffickers facilitating migration, the often-disregarded Dublin rule (Holehouse and Weston 2015) making relentless research efforts necessary on a global, national, local, macro and micro level.

However, according to Hollifield (2003, in IOM Council 2003), a knowledge gap exists between the ever-increasing liberalization of capital, goods and services exchange and the knowledge stream of migration with the latter lagging as aforementioned.

The dizzily swift changes on all levels might have led to the lamentable situation that theoretical development could not keep pace with practical developments. Based on documentary sources (IOM Council 2003; the International Business Leaders Forum 2010; Juzwiak et al. 2014; DW 2015; UN Chronicle 2013; Hutton 2015) systemic macro improvements should relate to the integration of migrants or a necessary cross-sectoral dialogue. But when looking at this cross-sectoral initiative in more detail, it is worth mentioning the integration of social dialogue as suggested by the G20 as an instrument for accelerating the overall job-rich recovery. The purpose of the social dialogue is to "embrace different negotiation, consultation and exchange of information between or among representatives of employers, workers and governments on issues of common interest in the field of economic and social policy" (ILO n.a p). Especially in the field of education and integration of migrants in the labour market, the social dialogue can make remarkable contributions. Nowadays, education faces many challenges, for example, enduring budget cuts, digitalization, deteriorating working conditions for teachers who work in disadvantaged areas where many refugees are allocated, or the lack of national strategies to integrate migrants and refugees (Archick 2017). The International

Labor Organization (ILO 2018), furthermore, holds that in many countries of both, origin and destination, non-governmental actors most directly involved with the labour market are not fully recognized or incorporated in the process of migration policy development. Finally, Sparreboom and Tarvin (2017) underline the difficulty related to the refugees' skills mismatch with national curriculum.

The European Trade Union Committee for Education (ETUCE, 2019) underlines the importance to consider the impact of economic, social and demographic developments on the education sector, for example, the need for inclusive education and the integration of migrants and refugees, changing investment patterns, open and innovative education, the attractiveness of the teaching profession based on quality jobs and on an enhanced professional profile (https://www.csee-etuce.org).

In addition, corporate strategic remedies, such as including migration into corporate sustainability strategies, are provided by this book contribution. So far, an underlying holistic theory, to explain the influence of the multidisciplinary migration-related phenomena on the corporate level and vice versa is missing. Even theories and concepts of diplomacy, as overly limited to the political domain, could seemingly not sufficiently contribute to explain key international processes such as imperialism, globalization and development (Lee and Hocking 2010). To redress the balance, this conceptual book contribution suggests synthesizing conceptualizations from the fields of diplomacy, especially corporate and business diplomacy, and a recently newly introduced new paradigm, called curative international marketing.

12.3 The Concepts of Diplomacy, Corporate and Business Diplomacy

Interesting new conceptual developments in the knowledge stream of diplomacy embrace a greater diversity of state and non-state actors engaging in diplomatic practice and point to a changing character and structures of diplomatic processes (Lee and Hocking 2010). By intertwining social sciences and business studies (Sondergaard 2014), new diplomatic offsprings emerge, such as catalytic diplomacy, network diplomacy, or

multistakeholder diplomacy (Lee and Hocking 2010). After having reviewed the mainstream literature on diplomacy (Barston 1997, Berridge 2002, Hamilton and Langhorne 1995, Joensen and Hall 2005, Marshall 1997, Watson 1982, in Lee and Hocking 2010), Lee and Hocking (2010: 1222) suggest economic diplomacy "as the use of traditional diplomatic tools such as intelligence gathering, lobbying, representation, negotiation, and advocacy to further the foreign economic policies of the state".

For corporations embedded in this global economic environment, globalization resulted in an additional problem for managing corporate policy in that the design and control of relationships towards confronting sustainability problems is only feasible, if the system-company is governmental. Based on systems theory, a system is governmental if it is compliant with planning and control, that is, if it is amenable to government (Dimitriou 1987; Dekleris 1989). In turn, to be amenable to government, its behaviour needs to be predictable, that is, to be governed by laws or generally by rules (Sourlas 1995; Rhodes 1996). Globalization, though, transposes the problems to the "environment" of the system-company. This business environment is representing a wider and indeed globalized system which is less amenable to design, but mainly to control, that is, it is autopoietic and is amendable to governance but less to government. Hence, it is amenable to soft laws and diplomacy while it is less to laws and policies. As a result, facing sustainability problems in this new system requires a new kind of policy. For this purpose, the academically so far under researched concept of corporate diplomacy (Macnamara 2012) is suggested to gain more momentum (Dekleris 1989; Sourlas 1995; Rhodes 1996; Steger 2003; Katsaros an Tsirikas 2012; Henisz 2014). Specifically, in globalization circumstances, international businesses have the chance, through standard contracts, to slide over states' control and any other form of regulation, apart from self-regulation, in the frame of global governance principles (Muldoon 2005; Bolewski 2007; Deligianni-Dimitrakou 2008). The opportunities in the frame of global governance are added value vindications, like certifications or international distinctions by international organizations, that is, the Great Place to Work label (Kaufmann et al. 2015). This is also integrated in the corporate diplomacy aims (Rodriguez-Anton et al. 2012). Synoptically, corporate governance in the frame of globalization should

respond to balancing the above-described conditions, facing respective problems and developing opportunities.

This book contribution outlines the major school of thoughts, dimensions (Sarfati 2012), and definitions of corporate and business diplomacy.

In developing the body of literature, several definitions of business and/or corporate diplomacy have been introduced, either considering the two concepts as distinct or identical ones.

The following quotes mirror a contradictory notion of business diplomacy or a synonymous meaning as corporate diplomacy. First, relating to internal stakeholders and an effective organizational culture, London (1999: 185) holds that "the idea behind business diplomacy is to build effective working relationships, essentially creating a culture where people are open to dialogue about new ideas and willing to try new initiatives". He continues in that "principled, diplomatic actions, when applied and rewarded in the organization, can create an organizational culture of open and honest communication, mutual understanding, involvement, and cooperation".

On the other hand, reflecting business diplomacy's business-driven concern for external stakeholders, Saner et al. (2000: 13) note that "business diplomacy management is about: influencing economic and social actors to create and seize new business opportunities, working with rule-making international bodies whose decisions affect international business, forestalling potential conflicts with stakeholders and minimizing political risks, using multiple international fora and media channels to safeguard corporate image and reputation". A very similar explanation, albeit relating to corporate diplomacy, is provided by Steger (2003: 6–7) defining corporate diplomacy as "an attempt to manage systematically and professionally the business environment in such a way as to ensure that business is done smoothly—basically with an unquestioned license to operate and an interaction that leads to mutual adaptation between corporations and society (in a sense a co-evolution)". This conceptualization appears, according to Amann et al. (2007), to be most concrete and holistic one in comparison to others.

Saner and Yiu (2003) noticeably approach the concepts of business and corporate diplomacy distinctly, namely associating corporate diplo-

macy with internal stakeholder relationships and business diplomacy with external stakeholder relationships. Latter authors assert that

> corporate diplomacy consists of two organizational roles considered to be critical for the successful coordination of a multinational company, namely that of a country business unit extwho should be able to function in two cultures: the culture of the business unit, and the corporate culture that is usually heavily affected by the nationality of the global corporation; and that of a corporate diplomat who as a home country or other national who is impregnated with the corporate culture, multilingual, from various occupational backgrounds, and experienced in living and functioning in various foreign cultures. (Saner and Yiu 2003:15)

Business diplomacy, on the other hand, "pertains to the management of interfaces between the global company and its multiple non-business counterparts and external constituencies" (Saner and Yiu 2003: 16). According to Ruël et al. (n.y), multinational companies lack a clear and organization wide business diplomacy policy. Furthermore, the authors imply a correlation between the perceived importance of business diplomacy and the strength and/or weakness of the institutional context.

Indicating a shift from business- and reputation-driven perspectives to legitimacy-related perspectives is provided by Ordeix-Rigo and Duarte (2009: 561) supporting above-mentioned Steger's (2003) view. In this respect, corporate diplomacy is seen as caring for a symbiotic nexus with external stakeholders with congruent values as common denominators. Latter authors view corporate diplomacy through its aim that is sustainability and describe it as "a process to develop corporation's power and legitimacy within society" and stress that "corporate diplomacy is also a process by which corporations intend to be recognized as representatives of something that might be a concept or a country or its related values. In this case, it is essential to create a sincere adaptation of the corporate values to the societal values if a corporation wishes to have a symbiotic relationship with key stakeholders. Corporate diplomacy thus becomes a complex process of commitment towards society, and in particular with its public institutions, whose main added value to the corporation is a greater degree of legitimacy or license-to-operate, which in turn improves its power within a given social system" (Ordeix-Rigo and Duarte 2009: 549).

Discussing the concept of corporate diplomacy in relation to the concept of business diplomacy, Asquer (2012: 53) defines corporate diplomacy as "the behavior of organizational actors aimed at implementing favorable conditions for carrying out corporate activities" and notes that "although the two terms may be considered synonymous, business diplomacy generally refers to activities conducted between economic actors that are not necessarily corporations or that do not pursue the interest of any specific company". In this sense, he concludes that "business diplomacy may be conceived either as a particular form of corporate diplomacy, or as a type of business procurer not necessarily conducted within the corporate context" (Asquer 2012: 60).

Additionally, according to Ruël (2013: 47) "business diplomacy, a relatively new term, can be defined as an international business-driven approach to build and maintain positive relationships with foreign government representatives and non-government stakeholders". The author supports the view that "business diplomacy is considered to be similar to the concept of corporate diplomacy, but this needs to be nuanced" (Ruël 2013: 40). According to his approach, "both concepts describe the same business process and associated elements" (Ruël 2013: 39).

In addition, mixing internal and external perspectives, Monteiro and Meneses (2015) perceive the reality that most authors do not make a clear distinction between corporate diplomacy and business diplomacy, and, consequently, accepting the two concepts as equivalent. Accordingly, they state that "BD constitutes the actions (engage with multiple stakeholders, create long-term alliances, promote a triple bottom line business culture, uphold the corporate brand and reputation, increase transparency, act in international forums, etc.) undertaken by firms, when dealing with their surrounding environment (home and abroad), concerning multiple actors, market and non-market related, so as to overcome the intrinsic business constraints of doing business abroad, thus emerging as a strategic management mindset, in line with the overall strategy of the organisation, aiming for a win-win type of engagement" (Monteiro and Meneses 2015: 23–24). In the same vein, Sondergaard (2014) coins an integrated term corporate business diplomacy comprising a broad (external stakeholders) or a narrow perspective (internal stakeholders).

Synthesizing the diverse views, the authors of this contribution suggest differentiating the two concepts depending on approaches being either business/rivalry/reputation driven, or non-business/non-rivalry legitimacy driven. This view is reasoned in the following paragraph.

In line with Ordeix-Rigo and Duarte (2009) and Steger (2003), isomorphism, in the context of aligning internal and external values and relationships, is regarded key to understand corporate decision-making and behavioural patterns in a social context. Corporate behaviour in this context tends to be highly conforming with the environment relating to rational myths such as institutionalized rules, norms, procedural ceremonials (Meyer and Rowan 1977, Zucker 1977, DiMaggio and Powell 1991, Jepperson 1991, Leblebici et al. 1991, Barley and Tolbert 1997, in Czinkota et al. 2014). In doing so, the company can either present itself value congruent and non-rivalry related with other players (constituency/ audience), or as a system whose survival goals are the result of differentiation towards and competition with its competitors by a differentiated positioning of firm-specific features or resources (Deephouse and Carter 2005, Golinelli 2010, Hawley 1968, Hirsch and Andrews 1984, Parsons 1960, Tolbert and Zucker 1996, Thornton 2002, in Czinkota et al. 2014). In this respect, in terms of self-regulation, it is suggested to differentiate between legitimate, non-business or non-rivalry behaviour (business diplomacy) and business or rivalry or reputation targeted behaviour (corporate diplomacy). Whilst acknowledging, in line with Ruël (2013), Sondergaard (2014) and Monteiro and Meneses (2015), that both concepts are highly interdependent, the differentiation of legitimate and reputation-focused behaviour is relevant as it requires different mindsets of the actors.

Based on Asquer (2012), Porter (1980), Ordeix-Rigo and Duarte (2009), London (1999), Hart and Milstein (2003), Van Marrewijk (2003), Sloan et al. (2009), Kocmanova et al. (2011), Rodriguez-Anton et al. (2012), Hitt et al. (2013), Bolewski (2007), and Czinkota et al. (2014), the synthesized components of the concepts discussed so far are relating to: "Information Management", "Professionalism and Corporate Value Creation", "Systemic or Complexity Approach", "Co-Evolution and Isomorphism based on Mutual Perceptions and Mutual Development", "Culture and Values" (social responsibility,

collaborative culture and sustainability), "Grasping Opportunities", "Image, Reputation and Fame", "Influence Rules and Decisions", "Legitimacy", and "Cultivating and Transforming Multistakeholder relationships".

12.4 The Relationship Between Corporate/Business Diplomacy and Curative International Marketing

Against the background of the detrimental effects of globalization accompanied by a global trust crisis and societal discontent with marketing and its actors, Czinkota (2011) started a discourse on a marketing paradigm shift called curative international marketing. "Curative International Marketing can be defined in the following way: companies and their respective supply chains create, communicate and deliver value focusing on multilateral stakeholder groups and contextual consonance in such a way that natural, human and social capital is globally and locally restored, preserved or enhanced" (Czinkota et al. 2014, in Kaufmann et al. 2015: 70). This definition is regarded to be especially relevant for the motives of business diplomacy.

International marketing is called to take a more leading role in restoring and developing international economic health as a precondition for overall welfare driven by the salient motive to advance society across borders. With this motive in mind, curative international marketing might also inform and complement the motives of, so far, state-related economic diplomacy. Curative international marketing's contributions to corporate policy as well as corporate or business diplomacy, according to this perspective, would be the training on self-critically reflecting on the global shortcomings of the discipline, companies and their supply chains from which a "damage restitution spirit" could arise and influence the corporate vision.

Based on reflection, so far not explicitly mentioned in the discussion, this restitution spirit should complement and penetrate the more business/reputation/rival corporate diplomacy, especially, however, the non-business/non-rival/legitimacy-driven business diplomacy approaches

(according to the differentiation). Furthermore, pursuing curative international marketing perspectives could help to develop "curing" strategies and tactics driven by a corporate culture based on training internal stakeholders' authentically lived values and competences such as truthfulness and simplicity, realism, inclusiveness and proximity, providing transparency and system understanding, authenticity, communication, empathy and responsibility. Importantly, curative international marketing enhances and explains the differentiation between legitimacy (business diplomacy) and reputation (corporate diplomacy) orientated behaviour (Czinkota et al. 2014; Czinkota and Kaufmann 2015). The relevance of these values and competences becomes apparent in the case of migration, taking, for example, the need for overall welfare improvement, empathy for and inclusiveness or integration of migrants in receiving societies as well as legitimate behaviour into account (business diplomacy). Compared to the discussion of corporate and business diplomacy so far, an approach based on curative international marketing is consistent with the objectives of corporate and business diplomacy in terms of delivering value, multilevel stakeholder groups, contextual consonance and sustainability-related objectives. It reflects, in addition, a supply chain perspective and an active "restitution and more pronounced contribution spirit" going beyond reputation and legitimacy orientated corporate behaviour.

For this to engineer, curative international marketing should educate and train a multidisciplinary knowledge body consisting of management/leadership, supply chain management, marketing, jurisprudence, cultural anthropology, sociology, psychology, philosophy, history, biology and thermodynamics (Kaufmann et al. 2015). Central is the identity concept to explain social relationships and human actions both inside the corporate system—closely related to the culture and value component of the corporate diplomacy concept—and between the corporate system and its external environmental system to achieve value congruence as intended by the business diplomacy concept. Especially, the association with resilience (Kaufmann et al. 2015) makes the identity concept a promising theory explaining corporate sustainability success as well as migration topics related to both the resilience of receiving and sending countries as well as of migrants. Consequently, the concept of identity besides the other disciplines is suggested to be integrated and focused on in corporate and business diplomacy-related work.

The factor of self-regulation as an integral part of the concept of corporate and business diplomacy is consistent with the philosophy of curative international marketing (i.e. reflection). However, the explicit integration of a continuously reflexive characteristic of self-regulation is suggested to be considered in the corporate and business diplomacy concept as well as a hypothesized correlation between continuous reflexive self-regulation with co-development and co-creation of markets in a globalized system characterized by complexity.

Supporting the views of Ordeix-Rigo and Duarte (2009) as well as Steger (2003), self-reflexive regulation is reflected in sustainable social relations due to recurring social and economic actions of the various market players leading to mutual adaptation of social actors' respective activities and relational reciprocity (Kjellberg and Helgesson 2006, Anderson et al. 2008, Araujo et al. 2008, Storbacka and Nenonen 2008, Giddens 1984, Staber and Sydow 2002, Wiener 1948, Bateson 1977, Beer 1959, 1966, 1985, Yolles 1999, in Kaufmann et al. 2015). Following the objective of being homogeneously congruent with the business environment, companies often mirror social realities in their environment or even mimic other market players' behaviour as part of a continuous adaptation process (Berger and Luckmann 1967, Maturana and Varela 1980, Golinelli 2010, in Kaufmann et al. 2015). This implies to strongly suggest including legitimacy and isomorphism into the concept of business diplomacy confirming the latter's suggested system-based approach.

However, the authors of this book contribution suggest complexity theory rather than systems theory to understand and explain causes and effects during complex, dynamic and often chaotic globalization processes. Generally confirming the importance of relationships in the corporate and business diplomacy concept, complexity theory's focus is how micro and meso complex systems, based on multilevel relationships, affect emergent behaviour and order and the overall outcome at the macro-level (McElroy 2000, McKenzie and James 2004, Sherif 2006, in Amagoh 2008, p. 6, in Kaufmann et al. 2015). Figure 12.1 conceptualizes the interrelationship between globalization, sustainability, corporate/business diplomacy and curative international marketing.

Conflict Free Semi-Autonomy

↑

Integrated Components of Corporate/Business Diplomacy & Curative

International Marketing:

Reputation vs. Legitimacy Corporate Behaviour + Reflection+ Restitution

Spirit/Vision, Values & Competences, Identity

↑

Sustainability Strategies & Tactics (Opportunity Seeking; Triple Bottom

Line, including Migration)

↑

Corporate Governance Shift: From Corporate Policy to Corporate/Business

Diplomacy

↑

Self- Regulation

↑

From Corporate Planning to Corporate Governance

↑

Globalization Circumstances (i.e. Migration)

Fig. 12.1 Conceptualising the relationship between globalisation, corporate/business diplomacy and curative international marketing

12.5 Practical Suggestions Applying the Framework

In designing their corporate responses to migration, the companies should be supported by a conducive macro environment. Unnecessary government bureaucracy and a lack of transparency, for example, can lead to foregone economic opportunities, possibly emerging strains on services in the receiving countries as well as social tensions between locals and migrants. On the other hand, sending countries might suffer from brain drain (International Business Leaders Forum 2010).

The contradictorily perceived nature of migration becomes apparent with some regarding migration a "blessing" and others a "curse". Whilst the "curse" aspects have been sufficiently addressed before, the "blessing" macro aspects relate to migration being regarded a "catalyst for growth in both, sending and receiving countries (International Business Leaders Forum 2010) by the following ways:

– Filling labour market shortages in the receiving countries
– Being perceived and communicated as an economic stimulus in the receiving countries via higher levels of spending, investment and tax contributions
– Boosting competitiveness in receiving countries by reducing costs due to providing low-skilled migrants or by increasing innovation and business development due to higher levels of diversity in case of high-skilled migrants; favoured are especially the financial services, information communication technology, travel as well as food & drink sectors.
– Improving the skill portfolio and increasing levels of entrepreneurship in the sending countries by returning migrants.
– Improved social infrastructures in sending countries by migrants' remittances.

Supporting the call for complexity theory and multidisciplinary knowledge in this context, the International Business Leaders Forum (2010) regards migration "a complex and multifaceted phenomenon" requiring a concerted effort and cross-sectoral dialogue between government, civil society, trade unions and, increasingly, companies. In addition, especially, cities and local governments are called to integrate migrants into their urban development planning (IOM 2015). Latter aspects imply companies to closely cooperate with local governments on migrant topics and to engage in a cross-sectoral dialogue. In this respect, referring to migrants' integration as a multidimensional and two-way process, a research of the United Nations University (Juzwiak et al. 2014) on public-private partnerships between eight cities' governments and businesses considered five dimensions of integration: Social, Cultural and Religious, Economic, Legal and Political. The report provides good practices for making migrants and refugees an integral functional part of society and, hence also companies, applying the criteria of practicality, innovation, successfulness, transferability, sustainability and strategic fit.

In this context, the "Global Diplomacy Lab", an interesting cross-sectoral initiative comprising diplomats, political scientists, activists and NGO representatives under the patronage of the German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier, points to detrimental effects of the "winged word" refugee crisis which associates the topic with connotations

related to problems or challenges rather than with chances, opportunities or potential contributions of migrants (DW 2015). According to IOM (2018), "Germany has been the second top country of destination per UN DESA estimates since as early as 2005, with over 12 million international migrants residing in the country in 2015".

Related to educational initiatives, the University of Applied Management Studies in Mannheim, Germany, can be taken as a successful case study using the social dialogue for the integration of 32 refugees in their educational environment. Bengoa (2018) explains the way how the university designs the integration process. In the first instance, contacting the local authority, Ministry of Science, Research and Art, Baden Wuerttemberg, for the permit of refugees' admissions, and, secondly, the national organization of DAAD (The German Exchange Service): financial support for the allocation of students who could support the refugees with translations of foreign qualification is provided; thirdly, intensive communication takes place with employers, in this case, partner companies of the university. Besides financial support they give migrants the option of doing their first internships. In addition, employees from the university taught extra courses in different subjects in order to update or enlarge the body of knowledge of the refugees, conducted constant mentoring and provided psychological support. Last but surely not least, philanthropic foundations significantly supported migrants to establish their private life (clothing, driving licence, accommodation, etc.). For this engagement, the university was awarded the prestigious "The Europa" trophy. "The Europa" is conferred every year by the Adalbert Kitsche Foundation to projects and activities carried out by VET (Vocational and Educational Training) providers which have best managed to address the educational needs of disadvantaged people.

Derived from the literature review (i.e. UN Chronicle 2013; International Business Leaders Forum 2010; IOM Council 2003; IOM 2015; United Nations University 2014; DW 2015), the following summary of suggestions refers to concrete corporate socially responsible strategies of companies in the context of migration and a triple bottom line approach:

– Engage in local, national, European/international cross-sectoral and social dialogue on migration topics, that is, local town planning
– Integrating migrants in study and training programmes and upskilling the competences of migrants
– Consider the engagement in public-private partnerships
– Invest in higher levels of innovation triggered by higher levels of diversity achieved by the influx of migrants
– Avoid exploitation as well as any illegal migrant-related practices and honour human rights (legitimacy)
– Train corporate and business diplomats in differentiating legitimacy and reputation-related behaviour
– Limit the outsourcing of recruitment contracts (HR and supply chain)
– Integrate migration topics and related values into an authentic corporate culture design applying transformational leadership
– Based on corresponding or changed legislation, employ schemes for temporary contracts to both cover short-term skills and encourage migrants' return to responsible positions in sending countries, hence, achieving mutual benefits for sending and receiving countries
– Develop products and/or services for or apply for research projects related to ecological sustainability, that is, related to global warming, in sending countries
– Invest in and generate green jobs
– Support migrant entrepreneurship in both sending and receiving countries, especially for migrant women (i.e. venture capital; outsourcing)
– Support academic study opportunities for migrants
– Shifting from short-term objectives to more strategic social and ecological ones when designing business plans
– Support the setting up of centres, mainly for more unskilled migrants, to a priori assess the migrants' skills and their potential to become contributing members in the receiving countries
– Apply system, complexity and identity theory for re-designing internal corporate culture, processes or growth strategies
– Gain vindication labels by becoming a "role model" in integrating and investing in the potential of migrants

12.6 Conclusion

In a response to the international business game changing role of globalization and to currently opening sustainability gaps, reflected by current migration issues, the so far under researched concepts of corporate and/ or business diplomacy is regarded instrumental for the new paradigm of curative international marketing due to a high level of conceptual consistency. Both perspectives are based on a system (corporate/business diplomacy) respectively complexity (curative international marketing) based approach, regard self-regulation and co-development as well as co-creation a condition sine qua non for corporate governance and overall welfare and regard relationships as a central factor in the concept. A difference regarding the role of relationships might be seen in that corporate/business diplomacy regards relationships as instrumental to achieve corporate semi autonomy, whilst curative international marketing regards the quality of relationships as both instrumental, in terms of internal, meso and macro relations, but also as an end state and objective. Furthermore, the salient instrumental contribution of values, especially those of social responsibility and sustainability, is emphasized by both perspectives.

Following the system or complexity tenets, an inclusion of a supply chain perspective might be recommendable for the corporate/business diplomacy concept. In this context, the concept of corporate/business diplomacy is suggested to integrate the concept of identity to better operationalize relationship factors. In addition, regarding self-regulation, it is suggested to explicitly include the notion of continuous reflexivity, and, in addition, to differentiate between legitimate/isomorphistic and reputation-related corporate behaviour requiring differentiated mindsets in the pursuit of corporate or macro survival and growth. The marriage of the concepts does justice to the increased, but, so far, neglected corporate role for systemic change in a global context characterized by increased complexity and ambiguity, and, especially for migration.

From a practitioners' perspective, the triplet of curative international marketing and corporate and business diplomacy might be especially conducive at the nexus between marketing and other business functions. In this respect, it is able to inform: Human Resource Policy, for example,

in terms of recruitment, leadership and corporate culture; it supports strategic planning suggesting a more medium- to long-term planning horizon; it informs marketing strategies, that is, in terms of differentiating between legitimate behaviour in the PR function and reputation orientated behaviour in the promotion function. Regarding suggestions for further research, due to the high level of innovativeness of the research topic, grounded theory is suggested to further categorize the variables of this concept. On this basis, a further triangulation research approach is suggested to establish the nature of relationships between the various components (i.e. dependent & independent variables, weights and direction of individual factors, moderating or mediating effects). The authors of this chapter suggest to combine the contrasting positivism and phenomenological epistemologies by the research philosophy of critical realism.

References

Amann, W., Khan, S., Salzmann, O., Steger, U., & Ionescu-Somers, A. (2007). Managing External Pressures Through Corporate Diplomacy. *Journal of General Management, 33*(1), 33–49.

Archick, K. (2017). *The European Union: Current Challenges and Future Prospects.* Congressional Research Service. CRS Report. www.crs.gov

Asquer, A. (2012). What Is Corporate Diplomacy? and, Why Does It Matter? *Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 4*(3), 53–63.

Bengoa, S. D. (2018, October 12–13). *Social Dialogue: A Practical Case Study.* Presented at the Conference for Social Dialogue – Challenges of the Future: The Focus on Education, Moscow.

Bolewski, W. (2007). *Diplomacy and International Law in Globalized Relations.* Heidelberg: Springer.

Czinkota, M. (2011). Curative Marketing: The Next Step up for the Discipline, Marketing Management. *American Marketing Association, 21*, 12–14.

Czinkota, M., & Kaufmann, H. R. (2015). Rounding Out the Marketing Discipline's Customer Support Function with the Integration of the Curative International Marketing. In S. Bartsch & C. Bluemelhuber (Eds.), *Always Ahead in Marketing.* Wiesbaden: Springer Gabler.

Czinkota, M., Kaufmann, H. R., & Basile, G. (2014). The Relationship Between Legitimacy, Reputation, Sustainability and Branding for Companies and Their Supply Chains. *Industrial Marketing Management, 43*(1), 91–101.

Dekleris, M. (1989). *Systems Management*. Athens: Sakkoulas A.N. Publications (in Greek).

Deligianni-Dimitrakou, C. (2008). *Comparative Law and Legal Pluralism*. Athens: Sakkoulas A.N. Publications (in Greek).

Dimitriou, S. (1987). *Glossary of Government, Structuralism and the Theory of Systems*. Athens: Kastaniotis Publications (in Greek).

DW (Deutsche Welle). (2015). *The 'Global Diplomacy Lab' Tackles Migration*. Accessed at https://www.dw.com/en/the-global-diplomacy-lab-tackles-migration/a-18834238 on 15 Dec 2016.

ETUCE European Trade Union Committee for Education. https://www.csee-etuce.org/en/social-dialogue/29-european-sectoral-social-dialogue-in-education-essde. Accessed on 23 Feb 2019.

Hart, S. L., & Milstein, M. B. (2003). Creating Sustainable Value. *The Academy of Management Executive, 17*(2), 56–67.

Henisz, W. J. (2014). *Corporate Diplomacy: Building Reputations and Relationships with External Stakeholders*. Sheffield: Greenleaf Publishing.

Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., & Hoskisson, R. (2013). *Strategic Management: Competitiveness and Globalizations* (10th ed.). Mason: Cengage South-Western Publishing Co.

Holehouse, M., & Weston. (2015, September). Europe's Migration Crisis: How Many People Are on the Move? *The Telegraph*. Accessed at http://www.tele-graph.co.uk/news/uknews/immigration/11875036/Europes-migration-crisis-how-many-people-are-on-the-move.html on 23 Nov 2015.

Hutton, W. (2015). Angela Merkel's Humane Stance on Immigration Is a Lesson to Us All. *The Guardian*. Accessed at http://www.theguardian.com/commen-tisfree/2015/aug/30/immigration-asylumseekers-refugees-migrants-angela-merkel on 15 Nov 2015.

International Business Leaders Forum. (2010). *Business and Migration: From Risk to Opportunity*. Accessed at http://gbsn.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/BusinessAndMigration.pdf on 15 Mar 2016.

IOM (International Organization for Migration). (2015). *World Migration Report 2015*. Accessed at https://www.iom.int/world-migration-report-2015 on 26 Nov 2015.

IOM (International Organization for Migration). (2018). *World Migration Report 2018*. Accessed at https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/wmr_2018_en.pdf on 23 Feb 2019.

IOM (International Organization for Migration) Council. (2003). *Eighty Sixth Session, Migration in a Globalized World*. MC/Inf/268. Accessed at https://

www.iom.int/jahia/webdav/shared/shared/mainsite/about_iom/en/council/86/MCINF_268.pdf on 23 Nov 2015.

Jones, A. L., & Thompson, C. H. (2012). The Sustainability of Corporate Governance – Considerations for a Model. *Corporate Governance, 12*(3), 306–318.

Juzwiak, T., McGregor, E., & Siegel, M. (2014). *Migrant and Refugee Integration in Global Cities: The Role of Cities and Businesses*. Policy Brief Number I, 2014. United Nations University. Accessed at http://www.google.com.cy/url?url=http://www.merit.unu.edu/publications/uploads/1400742054.pdf&rct=j&frm=1&q=&esrc=s&sa=U&ved=0ahUKEwipvKephK7JAhVBYg8KHVQmBw0QFggiMAI&usg=AFQjCNFVh0oZJlN9dwZk_BJ5lNPJ6VlNRg on 26 Nov 2015.

Katsaros, K., & Tsirikas, A. (2012). Hotel Managers' Behaviour Towards Change Uncertainty in Greece. *Tourismos: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism, 7*(2), 359–379.

Kaufmann, H. R., Czinkota, M., & Zakrzewski, M. (2015). B2B and Internal Relationships and Curative International Marketing: A Polish Case Study. *Industrial Marketing Management, 51*(2015), 69–78.

Kocmanova, A., Hrebicek, J., & Docekalov, M. (2011). Corporate Governance and Sustainability. *Economics and Management, 16*, 543–550.

Lee, D., & Hocking, B. (2010). Economic Diplomacy. In R. A. Denemark (Ed.), *The International Studies Encyclopedia* (Vol. II, pp. 1216–1227). Malden: Wiley Blackwell.

London, M. (1999). Principled Leadership and Business Diplomacy: A Practical, Values-Based Direction for Management Development. *Journal of Management Development, 18*(2), 170–192.

Macnamara, J. (2012). Corporate and Organisational Diplomacy: An Alternative Paradigm to PR. *Journal of Communication Management, 16*(3), 312–325.

Makasi, A., & Govender, K. K. (2015). Globalization and Sustainable Development: A Conceptual Model. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 6*(4), 341–349.

Manitakis, A. (2001). *The Institutional Organisation of the State; State-Nation-Institution, Domination, Globalisation*. Athens: Sakkoulas A.N. Publications (in Greek).

Monteiro, R., & Meneses, R. (2015). The Relevance of Business Diplomacy in Internationalisation Processes: An Empirical Study. *International Journal of Business and Globalisation, 15*(1), 20–44.

Muldoon, J. P., Jr. (2005). The Diplomacy of Business. *Diplomacy and Statecraft, 16*(2), 341–359.

Ordeix-Rigo, E., & Duarte, J. (2009). From Public Diplomacy to Corporate Diplomacy: Increasing Corporation's Legitimacy and Influence. *American Behavioral Scientist, 53*(4), 549–564.

Pamboukis, C. (2010). *The Law of International Transactions*. Athens: Nomiki Bibliothiki (in Greek).

Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors*. New York: The Free Press.

Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996). The New Governance: Governing Without Government. *Political studies, 44*(4), 652–667.

Rodriguez-Anton, J. M., Del Mar Alonso-Almeida, M., Celemín, M. S., & Rubio, L. (2012). Use of Different Sustainability Management Systems in the Hospitality Industry. The Case of Spanish Hotels. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 22*(1), 76–84.

Ruël, H. (2013). *Diplomacy Means Business*. Windesheim reeks Kennis en Onderzoek, 46.

Ruël, H., Wolters, T., & Loohuis, R. (n.y.). *Business Diplomacy in Multinational Corporations (MNCs): An Exploratory Study.* Accessed at https://www.diis.dk/files/media/publications/import/extra/business_diplomacy_in_mncs_-an_exploratory_study_final.pdf on 10 Jan 2019.

Saner, R., & Yiu, L. (2003). International Economic Diplomacy: Mutations in Postmodern Times, Clingendael Discussion Paper. *Diplomacy*, p. 84.

Saner, R., Yiu, L., & Sondergaard, M. (2000). Business Diplomacy Management: A Core Competency for Global Companies. *The Academy of Management Executive, 14*(1), 80–92.

Santoro, G., Vrontis, D., Thrassou, A., & Dezi, L. (2018). The Internet of Things: Building a Knowledge Management System for Open Innovation and Knowledge Management Capacity. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 136*, 347–354.

Sarfati, G. (2012). Corporate Diplomats: Global Managers of 21st Century. *Revista de Economia & Relacoes Internacionais, 11*(21), 1–231. Fundação Armando Alvares Penteado, São Paulo: FEC-FAAP.

Sloan, P., Legrand, W., Tooman, H., & Fendt, J. (2009). Best Practices in Sustainability: German and Estonian Hotels. *Advances in Hospitality and Leisure, 5*, 89–107.

Sondergaard, M. (2014). Corporate Business Diplomacy: Reflections on the Interdisciplinary Nature of the Field. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy, 9*(4), 354–369.

Sourlas, P. K. (1995). *Justi Atque Injusti Scientia, an Introduction to Law Science*. Athens: Sakkoulas A.N. Publications (in Greek).

Sparreboom, T., & Tarvin, A. (2017). *Skills Mismatch of Natives and Immigrants in Europe*. http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/labour-migration/publications/WCMS_548911/lang%2D%2Den/index.htm. Accessed 23 Feb 2019.

Steger, U. (2003). *Corporate Diplomacy – The Strategy for a Volatile, Fragmented Business Environment*. Chichester: Wiley.

United Nations. (2018). *World Economic Situation and Prospects 2018*. https://www.un.org/development/desa/dpad/. Accessed 23 Feb 2019.

Van Marrewijk, M. (2003). Concepts and Definitions of CSR and Corporate Sustainability: Between Agency and Communion. *Journal of Business Ethics, 44*(2–3), 95–105.

You, L., & Saner, R. (2017). Business Diplomacy in Implementing the Global 2030 Agenda: Core Competencies Needed at the Corporate and Management Level. In H. Ruël (Ed.), *International Business Diplomacy (Advanced Series in Management)* (Vol. 18, pp. 33–58). Bingley: Emerald Publishing Limited.

Zhang, Z. J. (2005). Impacts of Globalisation on Hotel Companies' Internal Operation Environment. *Canadian Social Science, 1*(3), 68–71.