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Abstract

Despite the South Korean government’s recent policy interventions to accommodate the emerging social and classroom reality that has increasingly become multicultural, few guidelines have been provided for multicultural education practice at the local and municipal levels in South Korea (Henceforth, Korea). In particular, investigations focusing on newcomer adolescents’ linguistic and cultural identities are scarce. In this light, this doctoral inquiry investigates how multicultural students, their languages and cultures are reflected in Korean society and schools and especially, how newcomer adolescents’ linguistic and cultural identities are negotiated in terms of their own success in Korea. 8 multicultural education policies and 27 news media publications as well as the narratives of 7 students and 6 educators from two high schools are analyzed through Fairclough’s (1992, 2003) critical discourse analysis. Based on the analysis, the discourses of diversity embedded in the nation-state texts and popular media as well as in the institutional contexts are discussed in relation to five orientations to diversity,
which are derived from Ruiz’s (1984) theoretical framework of three orientations to language planning and Cummins’ (2001) empowerment framework.

The study reveals that an ideology of Korean ethnocentrism is reflected throughout the policy and news media articles as well as school administrators’ conceptualizations of diversity and multicultural education. Despite the emergent progressive orientations of viewing diversity as a right and resource, the predominant discourses of viewing diversity are that diversity is a problem/threat to society and is a problem/impediment to multicultural students’ social integration. It is evident that diversity is only appreciated once multicultural students are fully assimilated into Korean society. Thus, the notion of multicultural identity is absent or at best hidden in the Korean context. The study highlights that schools and policy makers need to make a shift in their orientations to diversity toward diversity as a right, resource and a form of empowerment through critical multicultural education in order to instill just and equitable worldviews in students. Educators’ negligence in considering these possibilities contributes to reproducing unequal power relations that disadvantage linguistic and cultural minorities and perpetuate the hegemonic status quo in Korean society.
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Chapter 1
Locating Multicultural Education in South Korea

Prologue

If someone asks me where I belong and how I identify myself in terms of my language and culture and how my identity positioning has affected my academic and social life, of course my responses will not be simple but rather convoluted. Within this limited textual space, I am not sure if I can express all of the feelings of in-between being minoritized and being enlightened. I have to leave the full description for another space and time; however, a discussion of a few critical incidents is imperative as this very question underscores the genesis of this doctoral inquiry.

I am a permanent resident in Canada, living in Toronto and also a South Korean citizen living overseas. From a linguistic standpoint, I speak Korean as my first language and English as my second language and I have a unique accent in my spoken variety of English. I have no doubt that my variety of English is a result of hybridization of my transnational living experiences. Some might notice by carefully listening to my English that I am from Gyeongsang-do, a southern province of South Korea (henceforth, Korea) if they notice that my English pronunciation includes an extra schwa between consonant clusters or in words ending with a consonant,\(^1\) and that the intonation of my English sentences fluctuates more than other Korean English speakers,\(^2\) reflecting the linguistic transfer from my Gyeongsang-do Korean dialect. Also, someone might notice that I visited Australia for a sufficient enough time as my English pronunciation of [r] in words like, ‘here’ and ‘there’ rolls less than what other typical English speakers in Canada may pronounce. Another person might say that I speak a Canadian variety of English as they will hear ‘eh’ at the end of my sentences for eliciting confirmation or affirmation. Many others might say that they do not notice any of those, but they may say that my English has some differences from what ‘mainstream’ English is like. Yes, my English may be marked from

\(^1\) This can be evidence of my first language transfer in my English since in the Korean language sound system, a vowel is always followed by a consonant. Korean English speakers show a tendency of adding a schwa after a consonant in words that have a consonant cluster or end with a consonant.

\(^2\) Gyeongsang-do Korean dialect which represents my Korean language has more rhythmic intonation than any other Korean dialects.
many others, but this fusion of different linguistic aspects represents my English and who I am. I call it my idiosyncratic English that always entails change tracing my cultural roots and journeys.

However, what has been devastating for me is when this linguistic difference is viewed as a problem by others and considered as a disqualified variety in academia and society. In fact, when I previously studied in Canada as a graduate student, I was often perceived as a non-mainstream English speaker and an English as second language (ESL) speaker with incomplete English linguistic—including all aspects of linguistic, paralinguistic and pragmatic elements of English language—and cultural knowledge by some colleagues. In particular, when I worked with a few people who thought that I could not understand challenging academic concepts and would not be able to perform as well as other English speaking colleagues due to my non-mainstream English variety, I felt very small and inferior. Also, some of my non-academic Canadian acquaintances often questioned if I could even understand what I read and doubted that I could understand what my professors said. I still receive similar questions and messages from social acquaintances from time to time. The point that I am trying to make here is that who I am has been also contingent on how people respond to me.

In addition, there have been several critical incidents since the birth of our first child in 2011. Since then my journey as a linguistic and cultural minority in Canada became more dramatic due to my engagement with our daughter in Korean. I felt very frustrated and rejected by some people when they told me not to speak or sing in Korean to our daughter. Although I did not stop and will never stop singing Korean songs to our children, the bitter memory of the situation, the rejection and inferiorized feelings that I experienced, I will never forget.

On top of myself feeling othered in Canada, our daughter was othered while we were staying in Korea for a short period when she was 10 months old. Whenever we went out with her, people came up to us and started talking to her. Some people said ‘Hi’ in English and others said ‘Annyeong’, which means ‘Hi’ in Korean. The dominant perception of our daughter’s cultural identity by most Koreans was that she was a White foreigner’s child. Our daughter is not considered as a Korean by Korean people and even by some of my Korean relatives, although she has dual citizenship, loves Korean food, sings Korean songs and plays Korean games with
her Korean friends and cousins. She is consistently perceived as a foreigner. The concept of her as a hybridized Korean has never been considered by Korean friends and relatives with whom I have interacted.

To me, it is significant that there is no such concept as Bhabha’s (1994) ‘third space’ in Koreans’ discourses of cultural identity. There are only two categories, Korean and non-Korean. The ‘othering’ is a feeling that I continuously experience(d) through how people perceive our daughter, excluding her from Korean mainstream society. Although this exclusionary feeling is uncomfortable, I am aware that this is not the same feeling that ‘foreigners’ of darker skin in Korea experience and also this is different from when I felt minoritized and inferiorized in Canada. Our daughter was not considered as a Korean but she was not necessarily discriminated against. Rather she was often viewed as privileged due to her father’s ‘White’ background. Nonetheless she will always struggle to present her Korean identity in her country of birth.

While I have had moments where my identity and language have been minoritized and devalued, I have also been fortunate to study and work in a ‘safe bubble’ meaning my current academic and professional zone at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) at the University of Toronto. In this space I feel that my diverse linguistic and cultural identities are appreciated and valued. For example, at a multilingual and multicultural poetry night in 2014 at OISE, I read two Korean poems in Korean and also read a translated version of them in English. One of the poems was related to the Sewol Shipwreck that happened in April 16, 2014 in Ansan, Korea, which is in fact one of my research sites for this doctoral research. When I read the poem in Korean, tears were streaming down my face as I felt the grief and helplessness and anger all at the same time regarding the issue in my mother tongue. Previously I could never have imagined such an open space where I could share Korean poetry and my Korean emotions in front of a predominantly non-Korean speaking group of people. As my contributions are appreciated by professors and colleagues in this space, I feel enlightened and encouraged to express who I am, what I do and how I position myself in the future.

My experiences living as a ‘visible minority’ in English Canada and also witnessing how our daughter was perceived as one of the cultural others with White privilege in Korea have served
as a powerful motivator to formulate my doctoral inquiry to investigate how cultural, linguistic and socioeconomic minority students are perceived in Korea and how they position their identities in their own terms of success.

This introductory chapter provides a contextual background of Korea’s transformation to a multicultural society. It illustrates the development of Korea’s historical, political, social and economic conditions which serve to produce and reproduce certain ideologies and discourses surrounding different languages and cultures. Then, it addresses the current state and locus of multicultural education in Korea leading to the introduction of the main inquiries of this doctoral research.

**South Korea in the Process of Becoming a Multicultural Society**

Korea’s ethnocentrism has been a long-standing ideological source for the nation’s uniformity. South Korea has been known as one of the most homogeneous nations (García, 2009). Sharing one language, one culture, and one ethnicity has been a critical source for the formation of Korea’s ethnocentrism and political propaganda in order to obtain and maintain the nation’s solidarity and security from neighboring nations such as Japan and China during their invasions seeking territory expansion. Also, ethnocentrism served as an ideological force for the nation to be resistant to Japanese colonizers and to empower Koreans to fight for independence during the Japanese colonial period in the early 20th century (G. C. Park & Watson, 2011).

While Korea’s ethnocentrism has been strengthened and maintained throughout different national and international struggles, people who have different cultural backgrounds from the majority of Koreans have been experiencing discrimination. For instance, the children who were born from Korean women and American soldiers who were stationed in Korea after the Korean War that ended in 1953 were victimized and discriminated against in Korean society due to their different skin color and the attached negative indexicality toward them for not being ‘pure’ Koreans (G. Park, 2013). Derogatory terms towards these children mushroomed since this time, to name a few, Jabjong, referring to animals’ crossbreeding, Twiggie and Ainoko, both referring
to mixed blood children (H. Jung, 1995; G. Park, 2013). In particular, the word, Jabjong, is considered as insulting and dehumanizing as it connotes these people as inferior and not pure humans.

Nonetheless, Korea’s ethnocentrism and homogeneity has been normalized through the national curriculum until very recent years (G. C. Park & Watson, 2011). In the national curriculum and textbooks at the elementary and secondary education levels prior to 2007, a mythical folklore known as the Dangoon legend describes Korea’s ethnic roots as special and unique by portraying Koreans as descendants of heaven’s son who was believed to spread the love of humanity, Hongik Ingan, literally standing for ‘to live and work for the benefit of all mankind (널리 인간을 이롭게하다)’(J.-w. Kim, 2011). This folklore recurs in teachers’ lessons and serves to reproduce the assumption that Korea is one of the few nations known as Danil Minjok (단일민족) referring to one-blood ethnic group and thus unique and special (Y. S. Lee & Shon, 2011; Moon, 2010; G. C. Park & Watson, 2011; Watson & Park, 2015).

In the contemporary era, since the late 1980s, Korea’s long-standing mythological stories and beliefs that reflect Korea’s homogeneity were confronted by the emerging demographic and societal changes brought about by an increasingly multicultural population. The increased multicultural population mainly consists of foreign workers from South Asian countries as a result of economic globalization and families formed through interracial marriage which is the nation’s response to the low birth rate (Chang, 2012; Paik, 2011).

---

3 In 1982, President Reagan’s Amerasian Immigration Law was enacted to accommodate children who were born between an American soldier and an Asian woman during the war in Asia including Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos and Thailand. Technically, the mixed blood children who were born between a Korean woman and a US soldier were eligible to immigrate into the US. However, many of them were not accepted to immigrate into the US since they could not identify their father and/or their father did not claim that they had a child. Some of these stories can be read in H. Kim (2013), G. Park (2013) and H. Jung (1995).

4 Interracial marriage refers to a marriage between a Korean citizen and his/her spouse from other countries. More often, interracial marriage is called ‘international marriage’ (국제결혼) in Korea. Recently, Korean men particularly in rural areas who could not find someone to marry arrange to marry a woman from South East Asia through private marriage brokers with some provincial support (Paik, 2011).

5 There have been disputes among scholars about when Korea started to become multicultural. Some scholars argue that Korea had close contact and interactions with different cultures during the Silla Dynasty (57 BC – AD 935) (Chang, 2012) resulting from active international trade migration at that time. Another group contends that Korea...
It is important to note that migrants to Korea who crossed cultural and linguistic borders are different from the immigrants in many Western countries such as Canada, the United States, and Australia. First, in these Western countries the majority of the population was originally constituted of immigrants. Secondly, the immigration and citizenship laws are different in that immigrants’ children who are born in these countries become citizens of the countries following *jus soli* citizenship; whereas, children of immigrants in Korea cannot be Korean citizens even though they are born in Korea due to the *jus sanguinis* citizenship law.6

The UN committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) showed concerns towards the Korean society that Korea has become increasingly multicultural in a relatively short period time; yet, continues to preserve deeply-rooted, long-standing Korean ethnic nationalism. The 2007 CERD report states that “the emphasis placed on the ethnic homogeneity of the State party [Korea] may represent an obstacle to the promotion of understanding, tolerance and friendship among the different ethnic and national groups living in its territory” (UN, 2007, p. 91). It also shows a concern about the widespread use of such terminologies as ‘pure-blood’ or ‘mixed blood’ since these terminologies entail racial superiority, marginalizing racially different people. It suggests that the nation should “adopt appropriate measures in the fields of teaching, education, culture and information, to recognize the multi-ethnic character of contemporary Korean society” (p. 91). In this light, Korea’s continuous emphasis on the ethnic homogeneity that has been understood and practiced as the source of the nation’s security and uniformity is, in fact, threatening contemporary Korea’s ability to live together with diverse ethnic people in peace. Despite the UN’s recommendations and the nation’s interventions in education to eliminate these terminologies along with the removal of ethnocentric ideas in educational artifacts in addition to including linguistic and cultural diversity through curricular reforms, changing public awareness toward multicultural individuals and their linguistic and cultural

---

6 In *jus soli* citizenship law, the newborn’s citizenship is determined by the territory of the birth; whereas in *jus sanguinis* law, one’s citizenship is determined by the nationality of their parents or ancestors.
Differences appears to be a daunting task. Divergent and at times conflicting perspectives on the increasing multicultural population co-exist leading to different interpretations of multiculturalism and multicultural education. These difficulties are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2.

Demographics of Multicultural Families and Children

The number of foreign residents and marriage migrants has rapidly increased in recent years. According to the Ministry of Public Administration and Security (MPAS, 2012), the number of foreign residents doubled from 720,000 in 2007 to 1,409,577 in 2012, representing 2.8% of the total population of 50,734,284 in Korea. As the population of migrant workers and interracially married couples grows, the number of school children who are from diverse cultural backgrounds has increased in kind. The following graphs show the significant demographic changes in the multicultural student population from 2006 to 2012.

Figure 1. Number of multicultural students from 2006-2012.

The information in Figure 1, using statistics from MEST (2012a), shows the increase of multicultural students in elementary school (Grades 1 - 6), middle school (Grades 7-9) and high school (Grades10-12) from 2006 to 2012. The total number of multicultural students was 9,389
in 2006 when the Korean government first started to account for this population. Within 6 years, the total number jumped to 46,954 in 2012, which is approximately five times more than the population in 2006.

Figure 2. Total increase of students from international marriages (IM) and foreign migrants (FM)

Figure 2 represents the total number of learners in two categories between 2006 and 2012: learners from international marriages which are dominant at more than 92% and learners from foreign immigrants reflecting an average of 8%. The population of multicultural students has consistently increased since 2006, each year showing approximately 5,000 more students registered in schools, which is noteworthy since the entire population of students across all levels in Korea has been decreasing by 50,000 students every year according to MEST (2012a).

It is interesting to note that North Korean students are not included in the statistics presented as part of the government-led multicultural education policy documents, implying North Koreans are not part of multicultural family category. However, who belongs to the category of multicultural families has been a contested issue and has been inconsistently categorized.
Defining Multicultural Families and Children

When the term ‘damunhwa-gajok’ (multicultural families) was first used by NGOs in 2002, it included the families of migrant workers and the families formed through international marriages; however, since 2005, the main focus of concern has shifted to marriage migrant women and the children born of these marriages (Chang, 2012; Paik, 2011). In academic publications, nonetheless, North Korean defectors are included as part of multicultural families (Chang, 2012). Also, within government bodies, the categorization of multicultural families and the eligibility for the financial support by the government slightly differ. For instance, as cited in Paik (2011), the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family defines multicultural families as:

The families formed by the amalgamation of Korean nationals and legally residing marriage migrant women or migrant workers via marriage, consanguinity and adoption, and the families of naturalized citizens. However, the families of permanent residents and the families formed by the marriages between two non-Korean nationals are not included among multicultural families. (p. 135)

As the Korean nationalities are determined by jus sanguine relation according to the Korean citizenship law, even though the children of two non-Korean nationals are born in Korea, they are not Korean by citizenship law.

Recently, the Gender Equality and Family Committee (GEFC, 2012) extended their scope of supporting newcomer children under the new title, Youth with Immigration Background, or Immigrant Children. GEFC conceptualizes ‘youth with immigration background’ as the children of multicultural families and the children who experience immigration. In other words, this term includes all the children who and whose parents had immigrated to Korea. This term includes: children of international marriages; North Korean defector youths; North Korean defector children who were born in a third nation; Children of foreign migrants; as well as 1.5 and 2.0
generation$$^7$$ youth immigrants (GEFC, 2012, p. 23). This term seems to be more broadly encompassing of culturally and linguistically diverse students.

The definition of multicultural families is inconsistent across the government bodies and civic organizations and the scope of support for multicultural families and students thus differs. More recently, GEFC’s revisions of their terminology and their support to immigrant children seems to be more inclusive in that they attempt to embrace all the children who immigrated to Korea. However, this definition does not include returnee children who are multicultural and multilingual due to their family’s long-term overseas stay. For instance, Korean returnees who are born overseas are Korean based on the Korean *jus sanguine* nationality law and at the same time they may be citizens of a birth country that follows *jus soli* laws such as Canada and the United States.

**Current State of Multicultural Education**

With the rapid multicultural population increase, the Korean government has become aware of social problems such as racism and discrimination throughout the country and in the education system leading to a need for multicultural policies. Particularly, 2006 is a remarkable year when the Korean government, the Ministry of Education, and local schools established a committee to investigate the needs of multicultural families and their children. Since 2006, the committee started recording the number of students from multicultural families which led to the development of support programs and revisions to the national curriculum reflecting the perceived needs of the multicultural population (D. Cho & Yoon, 2010; J. Lee, 2008; Yang, 2012). Then, two years later, in 2008, *the Support for Multicultural Families Act* was enacted in order to provide financial and systematic supports for multicultural families (Yang, 2012).

Since the first government-led multicultural education policy was developed in 2006, an increasing body of research has been conducted examining the academic and social conditions of multicultural students. While the dominant area of research remains focused on policy and

---

$$^7$$ Rumbaut (2012) uses 1.5 generation and 2.0 generation to categorize different generation cohorts in terms of their age at the time of immigration. These differing generation cohorts have different patterns and experiences of acculturation, linguistic and cultural identity negotiations.
textbooks analyses at that time, the research on multicultural education practices has been prolific in more recent years. Yet, the prevailing sector of investigation in multicultural education practices is on early childhood and primary education due to the recent increase of the multicultural student population at preschools as well as kindergartens and elementary schools (Jahng & Lee, 2013; Joo, 2007; M. O. Kang, 2011; Jonghun Kim, 2014; Y. Lee, 2013). Also a noticeable point to mention is that the dominant tendency of the research methodologies used in research articles published in Korean domestic journals is that they overwhelmingly employ survey techniques as the primary means to obtain data. This shows that the primary research paradigm in Korea leans toward quantitative research and attempts to generalize the research findings. However, the complex process of multicultural students’ transitions and identity negotiations cannot be explained and generalized within the limited choices and numeric indicators in the survey questionnaires. A survey can be an effective supplementary and/or administrative tool in larger longitudinal ethnographic studies for selecting research participants and structuring research directions and cross-checking the results from qualitative approaches. Convincing research studies that investigate cultural and linguistic minority education and interrogate issues of identity and power in the complex setting of schooling seem to orient a research approach that captures vivid evidence of narratives and social interactions in and outside of classrooms and schools (e.g., Gagné & Soto Gordon, 2009; Gérin-Lajoie, 2005, 2008). At issue is that the quantitative research findings alone tend to over-generalize multicultural students as emotionally, linguistically and culturally deficient with the potential to harm Korea’s social harmony. The research lacks individuals’ narratives surrounding their historical, cultural and socioeconomic conditions related to their upbringing and schooling. Consequently, these learners’ linguistic and cultural differences are often suggested as something to be corrected. The prior studies that examined the perceptions of multicultural students in Korea are further addressed in greater detail in the following chapter. Nonetheless, this highlights the necessity of a reexamination of educational practices in multicultural education through different research methodologies with an aim not to distort the social reality and not to further minoritize multicultural students.
The government-initiated top-down process of multicultural policy development has not been altered since 2006 and the quantitative research paradigm that is viewed as the most scientific research is still dominant in the area of multicultural education. This essentialist perspective and ethnocentric way of understanding multicultural education, relying on the numeric data of multicultural student population, has been the basis of educational and financial support as well as research focus. These biased and narrow-sighted understandings of Korea’s transition to a multicultural society and insufficient innovative efforts to shift research paradigms, policy planning and educational practice all have contributed to structuring my doctoral investigation and formulating my research inquiries.

**Research Rationale and Research Questions**

As of 2014, a large body of research with regards to multicultural education in South Korea has centered on early childhood and primary education as well as policy analysis. In particular, empirical studies focusing on newcomer adolescents and their negotiations of their linguistic and cultural identities in South Korea are scarce. In this light, this doctoral research attempts to examine how nation-state ideologies in multicultural education and the discourses surrounding multicultural students, their languages and cultures are reflected in three layers of organized public domains where discourses of multicultural education are produced and reproduced: 1) multicultural education policy documents, 2) public news media articles and 3) two high schools. In this context, the central research inquiries are the following:

1) How does the nation-state ideology reflected in the multicultural education policies influence teachers’ educational practices and students’ identity negotiations?

2) How are multicultural students, their languages and cultures perceived in Korean society in general and in different school settings?

3) How is the societal discourse surrounding multicultural students and their linguistic and cultural differences reflected in educational policies and practices?

4) How do cultural and economic minority students negotiate their multiple identities in their own terms of success?

First, the analysis of eight multicultural policy documents between 2006 and 2013 is employed to reveal the recurrent nation-state ideologies in multicultural education and discourses
surrounding multicultural students, their languages and cultures. Then, a media analysis of news articles from four dominant newspaper publications in Korea attempts to highlight the societal discourses regarding multicultural students, their languages and cultures. Lastly, a critical examination of school stakeholders’ narratives and institutional artifacts (e.g., school curriculum, lesson materials, and school website) investigates how newcomer adolescents, their languages and cultures are perceived by educators and multicultural students themselves. In this institutional investigation, the insiders’ views on linguistic and cultural diversity and multicultural education are uncovered, something that has been lacking in the field of research in Korea. These three-layered analyses make discursive and intertextual analyses possible and are intended to contribute to critical understandings of multicultural education policy and practice in the contemporary Koran society and to highlight the urgent needs of educational and societal change in order to achieve the ultimate goal of multicultural education, namely social justice.
Chapter 2
Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

The literature review in this chapter addresses the scholarly understandings of the emergent linguistic and cultural diversity in Korean society. Although this co-existence of different languages and cultures is not necessarily a new phenomenon, it is more recently recognized, given that issues of diversity have been increasingly gaining public attention. This chapter begins with discussions on how different languages and cultures have been reflected in policy and practice from various perspectives in prior empirical studies. The discussions highlight the divergent perspectives which view multicultural students and their linguistic and cultural diversity as well as multicultural education policies and practices. The review of prior research also provides insight on how the choice of a research paradigm can relate to the conceptualization of multicultural students and multicultural education. Following the review of the studies on Korean multicultural education, I discuss the conceptualization of identity and identity positioning in the literature, then address critical approaches to multicultural education which serve as theoretical and philosophical groundings. I conclude this chapter by introducing a reframed theoretical framework of five orientations of diversity by adopting Ruiz’s (1984) and Cummins’s (1986, 2001) frameworks as a key theoretical lens to guide my analyses of the multicultural education policies and practices in Korea and my understanding of the discourses of multicultural students.

Prior Research on Multicultural Education Policy and Practice in South Korea

Research focusing on multicultural education in South Korea has been burgeoning over the past decade as the Korean government attempts to actively intervene in multicultural education through the development of multicultural policies (Chang, 2012; M. O. Kang, 2015; N.-K. Kim, 2013; G. C. Park & Watson, 2011). This section reviews the prior research that examined issues relating to multicultural education policy and practice and perspectives of school stakeholders regarding their perceptions of linguistic and cultural diversity.
Studies on Multicultural Education Policy and Textbooks

One of the areas that research in Korea has extensively investigated is textual analysis of multicultural education policy documents and textbooks. Analyses of policy documents and textbooks looking at how different cultures are reflected and represented have mushroomed (Jahng & Lee, 2013; Joo, 2007; M. O. Kang, 2011; Jonghun Kim, 2014; Y. Lee, 2013). Studies of multicultural education policy documents reveal that multicultural students are often described as linguistically, culturally, physically and emotionally weak and living in socially and economically vulnerable conditions (Jahng & Lee, 2013; Joo, 2007; M. O. Kang, 2011; Jonghun Kim, 2014; Y. Lee, 2013). In a similar vein, studies investigating textbooks reveal that textbooks—mostly social studies and civic textbooks—have a tendency of presenting biased cultural attitudes and images towards multicultural families, which in turn, legitimatizes Korean beliefs and culture as the social and cultural norms as well as reproduces cultural inequality (W.-P. Hong, 2010; Joo, 2007; M. O. Kang, 2011; C. H. Park, 2007). Critical scholars taking post-colonial, poststructuralist and/or postmodernist approaches argue that these biased representations of multicultural students, and their languages and cultures embedded in policy documents and textbooks can contribute to instilling imbalanced and stereotyped cultural and world views in students, consequently dehumanizing cultural minorities, marginalizing other cultures and reproducing racial superiority and inequality (W.-P. Hong, 2010; Joo, 2007; M. O. Kang, 2011; C. H. Park, 2007).

Teachers’ Perspectives of Multicultural Education

As one of the initial studies looking at multicultural education practices in Korea, J. Lee’s (2008) doctoral research that examined teachers’ perspectives on multicultural education reveals teachers’ divergent understandings of multicultural education and perceptions of multicultural families and their children. The teachers’ conceptualizations of multicultural education have different degrees of emphasis on key concepts such as educational equity, cultural awareness, the development of positive racial and ethnic attitudes, and global citizenship education. However, their perceptions of learners are sometimes conflicting in terms of cultural identities. Some teachers perceive that students from multicultural families, particularly those who have foreign-
born mothers should be considered the same as the dominant Korean students and that it is not necessary to address the cultures and languages of the learners’ mothers in school.\textsuperscript{8} These teachers believe that the educational focus should be on naturalizing multicultural students as Koreans. In contrast, other teachers perceive that multicultural families’ different cultures and languages should be recognized and incorporated in the school curriculum. They, however, admit that their teaching practice is not about facilitating cultural diversity but is more concerned about teaching the Korean language and culture. J. Lee interprets her findings as indicative of the perception that linguistic and cultural difference is considered as a deficit rather than a benefit.

In a similar vein, Watson and Park’s (2015) study examined teachers’ awareness of cultural diversity and multicultural education through a survey of 86 in-service teachers who were completing a Master’s program in Korea. Their research investigated how teachers perceived the increasing diversity and corresponding multicultural education approaches and their readiness to teach linguistically and culturally diverse students. The study reveals that the majority of teachers are aware of Korea becoming culturally diverse. Also, an overwhelming number of participants agree that unjust treatments toward multicultural students are present, viewing cultural difference as the cause of the struggles. However, 80\% of the teachers feel either uncomfortable or undecided regarding classrooms becoming increasingly multicultural with linguistically and culturally diverse learners. In other words, the majority of the teachers are not comfortable and not ready to teach these learners. The survey also found that most teachers are aware of the importance and necessity of teacher education focusing on multicultural education although only 30 \% of the teachers “had been in a context that needed a multicultural education approach” (p. 67) and 70 \% had not been exposed to multicultural education approaches and had not experienced teaching multicultural students. However, based on the teachers’ responses, such a multicultural approach is understood as a program for special occasions, not as something that can be built into their everyday teaching practice regardless of the presence of multicultural students. Watson and Park (2015) argue that many teachers are less willing to challenge the

\textsuperscript{8} This case is only pertinent to those families formed through the arranged marriage between a rural Korean man who passed the optimal marriage time and a young woman (usually early 20s) often from South East Asia. The physical appearance of the children of these families appears to be same as children born to both Korean parents.
ideologically embedded hegemony of Danil Minjok, which stands for one ethnicity and functions as a centrifugal force of the dominant Koreans to marginalize ethnically different Others. Although the teachers in the study recognize that Korea’s ethnic homogeneity needs to be challenged, they position multicultural students as cultural ‘others’ and view cultural difference as a barrier in social activities and schooling in turn maintaining their position of Korean ethnic values as the norm.

Similar research findings are disclosed in studies that looked at teachers’ perspectives and teaching practices (Hyeyoung Cho, 2009; J. Lee, 2008; Mo & Hwang, 2007; H. Park, Cho, & Park, 2013). They reveal similar interpretations such that teachers’ multilingual and multicultural awareness was lacking and their teaching practices were not prepared and as a result, multicultural students’ linguistic and cultural strengths and values were not promoted in their teaching practices. The studies emphasize that teachers’ awareness of multicultural students’ linguistic and cultural diversity is crucial to promote inclusive multilingual and multicultural practices along with appropriate resources and guidelines to their teaching practices.

Despite the UN’s concern on the reproduction of Korean ethnic nationalism and cultural homogeneity through education, recent studies reveal that teachers’ practices have not changed much to challenge these biases. Most teachers in Korea are confused and less willing to change and challenge prejudice and inequality (G. C. Park & Watson, 2011; H. Park et al., 2013; Watson & Park, 2015). These studies highlight the immature stage of teachers’ awareness and teaching practices surrounding multicultural education.

**Parents’ Perspectives of Linguistic and Cultural Difference**

Studies that investigated parents’ perspectives are relevant in that parents are in closer proximity to the multicultural students and the studies may highlight parental influence on schooling and the connections of multicultural students’ attitudes at schools with the particularity of each individual’s domestic and social conditions. The studies the perspectives of the parents of multicultural students and parental involvement in schooling have common observations and findings. They reveal that parents tend to be more sensitive to discrimination issues among their children’s peer groups and they are inclined to guide their multicultural children to conceal their
cultural backgrounds due to persistent discriminative attitudes towards multicultural families existing in schools as well as in society in general (Y. H. Lee & Bang, 2012; C.-O. Park & Lee, 2011). Furthermore, some parents desire that their children be viewed as the same as South Korean children at school (Y. H. Lee & Bang, 2012). In Y.H. Lee and Bang’s case study, a Korean mother who married a foreign worker confessed that her child was harassed by his peers due to his darker skin color in spite of his excellent academic performance at school. In the study, parents seem to agree that different cultural and linguistic backgrounds can easily make their children a target for school bullying and group isolation. These findings coincide with some of the teachers’ viewpoints in J. Lee’s (2008) study. The school teachers believed that multicultural students should be treated the same as the Korean students. This perspective reflects color-blindness/color-muteness in response to difference (Dei, 2007; Harper, 1997; Nieto & Bode, 2011).

The color-blindness or color-muteness approach to difference rejects any kind of difference (i.e., color of skin, gender, class, religion, sexual orientation) and advocates equal treatment to everyone regardless of color, gender, and class. This ‘denying difference’ (Harper, 1997) advocates the notion of meritocracy that “success in society should be based on only individual ability, energy, and motivation” (p. 197). However, in this perspective, human identity is understood as a unified essence and thus there is no space for social, economic, cultural and historical contexts of different multicultural individuals to be considered. Nieto and Bode (2011) elaborate on the concept of color-blindness using the example of the U.S Supreme Court in the Lau decision of 1974 that highlighted that “treating everyone in the same way will not necessarily lead to equality; rather, it may end up perpetuating the inequality that already exists (p. 157).”

Without consideration of sociohistorical, socioeconomic and political conditions surrounding these multicultural learners and their schooling, equal access and opportunity is not really equal.

---

9 Parents and other advocates sued the San Francisco School Department (SFSD) as their Chinese speaking students were not provided with an ‘equal’ education. The court decision to this case was against the SFSD with the rationalization that the equal instruction and resources in English to these learners does not necessarily serve equality.
It is rather a practice of discriminating against minority students. In this regard, the notion of being equal has to be contested through a critical eye. Nonetheless, the essentialist understanding of multicultural students is not uncommon as seen in this literature review.

**Investigating Multicultural Students**

The studies directly examining multicultural students and the interpretations on the academic and social conditions of these learners and identity negotiations are particularly relevant for the purpose of this dissertation. The common findings in these studies reveal that multicultural students have academic, social and emotional difficulties reflecting low academic performance, prejudice, alienation and physical and linguistic violence at school, as well as emotional stress (D. Cho & Yoon, 2010; J. Lee, 2008; E. Oh et al., 2012; S. B. Oh, 2009; C.-O. Park & Lee, 2011; Seo, 2013). Many studies interpret that multicultural students are positioned in biased academic conditions where their learning opportunities are reduced (W.-P. Hong, 2010; Jahng & Lee, 2013; Jaegeun Kim & Cho, 2014) as they have not acquired the linguistic and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986) they need for active participation in learning and academic success in Korea.

Studies addressing multicultural students’ identities indicate that they are in a state of identity confusion or identity chaos from experiencing social and educational exclusion (D. Cho & Yoon, 2010; E. Oh et al., 2012). Some cross-cultural learners tend to have conflicting feelings toward their cultural identities being positioned between multiple cultural borders and do not position themselves in any cultural group (D. Cho & Yoon, 2010; E. Oh et al., 2012). Others show a strong rejection of their biculturality by feeling ashamed to show their multicultural family background (J. Lee, 2008; E. Oh et al., 2012). At issue is the circulation of a discourse that problematizes this identity confusion as an abnormal state of identity negotiation and as a consequence of the multicultural students’ maladjustment in schools. Moreover, this discourse blames students for their identity issues and deems them responsible for their own problems throughout policy and practice. The concept of identity is essentialized as a static and unitary entity where change and multiple forms as not desirable. Based on Norton’s conceptualization of identity, cross-cultural learners’ identities are in a process of constant change across time and space and are also at times conflicting with their multiple and complex social and educational
goals and desires (Norton, 1997; Peirce, 1995). In this light, the essentialist conceptualization of identity as static and uniform is disputable from the postmodernist perspectives that see the notion of identity as fluid, changing and multiple depending on the social, cultural and political contexts where one is situated (Norton, 1997; Peirce, 1995).

**Synthesis of Prior Research: Epistemologies toward Multicultural Education in Korea**

Prior research highlights that multicultural policies and practices that may have been well intended aiming for the advocacy of diversity have failed to challenge existing prejudices and biases toward multicultural students through the continuous distinction from and exclusion of other cultures (Jahng & Lee, 2013; M. O. Kang, 2011; S.-W. Kang, 2010; Y. Lee, 2013). In discursive practices of the nation-state and Ministry of Education as an ideological state apparatus, the intended educational goal of accommodating cultural and linguistic diversity through education has resulted in a stratification or hierarchy of people, languages and cultures wherein the notion of difference is accentuated in a negative manner, at times, as a disguised face of diversity. As a result, linguistic and cultural differences are perceived as not welcome since difference is conceptualized as “something that should be corrected and thus transformed into an acceptable condition” (Jahng & Lee, 2013, p. 310).

It is noteworthy to point out co-existing divergent and conflicting perspectives of scholars in the discussion of multicultural education and multiculturalism in Korea. Rightist intellectuals including some scholars, educators, journalists, and government representatives who seem to hold more conservative and essentialist perspectives (M. O. Kang, 2011) view the adoption of multiculturalism as a violation of Korea’s strong national identity which has historically been identified as a homogenous nation wherein its people have one shared ethnic language and culture. This perspective is often justified by the rightists through the use of statistical data implying that the small number of multicultural families and students should learn and follow the social norms of the majority (M. Kim, 2012, May; T. Lee, 2012, November; E. Oh et al., 2012). From this perspective, multicultural education is deemed as a special program only designed for multicultural students for their successful integration into the mainstream society. In other words, intensive Korean language and culture programs are provided for multicultural students with an
aim to ‘correct’ their ‘abnormal’ language and behaviors and to help them quickly adopt in school and the society. Furthermore, the notion of Korea as one ethnic nation has not been challenged and is reproduced and maintained through assimilationist approaches to multicultural education in the Rightist perspective. In this light, the power relationship between Koreans and economic, linguistic and cultural minorities is deemed as always unequal, positioning Koreans as the superior and others as the inferior. More importantly, this epistemological standpoint of understanding multicultural education fails to discuss the sociocultural and sociopolitical conditions in which economic and cultural minorities are situated to disadvantage their successful schooling due to imbued institutional discrimination and structural discrimination in the society (e.g., lack of school transition support, imbalanced employment, unfair housing conditions).

On the other hand, more critical and progressive intellectuals that represent the leftist perspectives (M.O. Kang, 2011, 2015) argue that Korea has to accept multiculturalism, support multicultural families and multicultural education and implement relevant multicultural policies while also being concerned about increasing social issues such as racism and group alienation in schools. These progressive perspectives criticize the current multicultural education policies that facilitate assimilatory approaches, and instead call for inclusive multicultural education policies that promote cultural diversity and accommodate cultural differences.

It is noticeable that more recently among the critical scholars in the Korean context (Jahng & Lee, 2013; M. O. Kang, 2011; S.-W. Kang, 2010; Y. Lee, 2013), critical approaches to analyze multicultural education policies and practices including critical discourse analysis, critical multicultural education, post-colonial approach, and poststructuralist approaches are frequently utilized for their analysis. They address embedded political and ideological practices through multicultural education and how language, culture and power interplay, noting the necessity of considering the sociopolitical context in multicultural education (Jahng & Lee, 2013; M. O. Kang, 2011, 2015; S. Lee, 2013; Y. S. Lee & Shon, 2011; G. C. Park & Watson, 2011; Watson & Park, 2015). Yet, these progressive understandings still seem to be lacking in the provision of insight on more action-oriented practices that can be implemented promptly from the very bottom level of educational interactions (i.e., classroom practice) without relying too much on
Korean bureaucratic rubrics and the government budget, which Chapter 6 in this dissertation briefly mentions (Also see Abelmann, Chung, Ham, Kang, and Lee (2014) for a discussion of bureaucratic constraints on the process of multicultural education policy development in Korea).

In recent years, Canadian multicultural education has often been referenced in the context of restructuring multicultural education in Korea as Canada is the first country in the world that adopted an official multiculturalism policy (Gérin-Lajoie, 2012; Harper, 1997; Haque, 2012). In the following section, I briefly address the official discourses of diversity in the Canadian context with a brief introduction to multiculturalism policy development.

Official discourses of diversity in the Case of Canada

Multiculturalism and the multicultural policies of Canada can be seen as a benchmark for many other countries since in 1971, Canada was the first nation to enact a multicultural policy at the federal level. In addition to recognizing the multicultural reality of Canada and its two official languages (English and French), the policy also aims to ensure the rights of Canada’s Aboriginal population (First Nations and Inuit). Canada’s multiculturalism does not necessarily require cultural assimilation for social integration at least at the policy level: however, Canada’s multiculturalism and its policies are not always consistent in practice. Gérin-Lajoie (2008) points out the vagueness of official discourse on multiculturalism and multicultural education in Canada, insofar as the notions of diversity, integration, and inclusion are not consistent from policy to practice. She further argues that the unclear notions facilitate the confusion in teaching practices at schools as the “Ministry of Education guidelines in each province are not always clear on how to work with student diversity in the mainstream classroom” (p. 9).

Cummins and Danesi’s (1990) analysis of multiculturalism and the Canadian identity highlights the contradictory public discourse on “celebratory multiculturalism”, asserting that it is “largely a superficial window-dressing exercise that serves both psychological and political functions for both the general public and policy-makers” (p. 9). They further argue that multicultural policies and the public discourse of openness to cultural differences and celebratory multiculturalism are not cohesively represented in reality. Although the discursive forms of discrimination have changed from earlier racist institutional exercises in Canada (e.g., the maltreatment of Black
communities in the Maritimes and Ontario and the discrimination against Jews and Japanese-Canadians during the second world war), there are still discriminatory assimilationist approaches evident in the recent era (e.g., discrimination against non-white applicants in employment and the persistent discrimination toward First Nations).

Furthermore, the prevailing official discourse of celebrating differences in Canadian multicultural education in the contemporary era merely remains artificial without recognition of issues of power. Critical approaches toward multicultural education such as anti-racism and anti-oppression education articulate that understanding the asymmetry of power relations in a social structure is central to understanding how the discrimination existing in any social relation is produced and treated (Cummins & Danesi, 1990; Ghosh & Abdi, 2004; Harper, 1997). Thus, celebrating difference without understanding how difference is generated in educational practice is naïve. Despite the successful shift of the dominant official discourse of diversity toward celebration from assimilation through numerous educational and policy efforts over the last half century, critical Canadian scholars criticize that the implementation of policies to include diversity is inconsistent and the emphasis on assimilating minority groups into the mainstream still remains covertly in policy and practice (Gérin-Lajoie, 2008, 2012; Cummins, Hu, Marcus, & Kristina Montero, 2015). Furthermore, it is also noteworthy that according to recent educational research (Cummins et al., 2015) when considering issues related to academic underachievement among linguistically, culturally and socioeconomically marginalized students, the investigation of how these learners’ identities are perceived and how their identity negotiations influence their academic success and failure have been absent from “mainstream” research and policy discussions. Although these gaps in policy and practice persist, in recent years researchers have highlighted the role of learners’ identity negotiations in determining patterns of learners’ academic achievement (Cummins & Early, 2011; Cummins, Hu, Marcus, & Kristina Montero, 2015; Gérin-Lajoie, 2008). In this light, my doctoral research also attempts to contribute to bridging this gap.
Theoretical Frameworks: Critical Approaches to Multicultural Education and Theoretical Concepts

This section introduces critical approaches to multicultural education as the theoretical frameworks along with significant theoretical concepts that are crucial for the analyses of multicultural education policies and practices for this study. These theoretical understandings of critical approaches to multicultural education and postmodernist theoretical concepts guide my understanding of multicultural education policies and practices and provide philosophical insights for the analysis of multicultural education in South Korea.

Banks’ (2010) Five Dimensions of Multicultural Education

Banks’ (2010) five dimensions of multicultural education provide useful guidelines for educators to reform multicultural education. Banks argues that the following five dimensions are critical constituents of multicultural education: 1) content integration, 2) knowledge construction process, 3) prejudice reduction, 4) equity pedagogy, and 5) empowering school culture and social structure. First, the dimension of content integration deals with how teachers can help to build culturally inclusive content by integrating references and examples of various cultures.

Second, the dimension of the knowledge construction process involves teachers engaging in learners’ understandings of how knowledge is constructed through implicit curricula wherein implicit cultural assumptions, stereotypes and biases are understood, interpreted and reproduced through schooling. For example, the European discovery of America can be good discussion topic to highlight the dominant perspective that is known as something celebratory; however, it can be viewed as a violent invasion into Native American lands and cultures from the perspective of Native Americans (Banks, 2010).

Third, the dimension of prejudice reduction guides teachers to use lessons and classroom activities that can be helpful for students to develop positive attitudes towards different cultures. Fourth, the equity pedagogy dimension encourages teachers to modify or develop teaching materials and practices to be not necessarily equal but equitable to all students. Banks (2010) argues that teaching styles and approaches should be modified to accommodate students of
socially, culturally, ethnically, and linguistically diverse backgrounds with “demanding but
highly personalized” lessons (p. 22). However, at issue is that often culturally and linguistically
diverse students are not expected to achieve highly demanding goals and thus these students are
educated to achieve lower goals, which is discriminatory, whether intended or not (Banks, 2010;
Cummins, 2001; Nieto & Bode, 2011).

The last dimension of an empowering school culture and social structure highlights the
importance of all the school stakeholders’ engagements in changing the school environment to
promote social, racial, gender and class equity. For instance, Banks articulates that teachers and
school administrators should create an equitable and empowering school culture and
organization by the restructuring learning and teaching environment. In the restructuring, Banks
instantiates,

[G]rouping and labeling practices, sports participation, disproportionality in achievement,
disproportionality in enrollment in gifted and special programs and the interaction of the
staff and the students across ethnic and racial lines are all important variables that need to
be examined in order to create a school culture that empowers students from diverse
racial and ethnic groups and from both gender groups. (2010, p. 22)

Banks’ multicultural education framework emphasizes school reform as fully developed with
these five dimensions to achieve social equity and justice in education. This framework has
served as significant theoretical guidance for this study to understand the institutional practices
of multicultural education in the two high schools. In particular, it has been the rubric for
understanding: 1) to what extent teachers integrate cultural and linguistic diversity when
constructing their teaching content; 2) how they reproduce or challenge pre-existing stereotypes
and prejudices surrounding multicultural students and different languages and cultures in Korea;
3) to what extent teachers and school administrators view multicultural students’ multicultural
background as positive assets; 4) how they plan and organize their multicultural education to be
equitable for multicultural students so they may achieve demanding educational goals.
Grant and Sleeter’s (2010) Multicultural Social Justice Education

Grant and Sleeter (2010) address five approaches to multicultural education. Their five approaches are: 1) teaching of the exceptional and the culturally different, 2) human relations approach, 3) single-group studies approach, 4) multicultural education approach, 5) multicultural social justice education. The first approach, the teaching of the exceptional and the culturally different, targets culturally diverse students to equip them with a cognitive foundation for social integration and adaptation. The second approach focuses on harmonious relationships among all social groups through a curriculum particularly designed for the reduction of stereotypes, prejudices and biases. The third approach, single-group studies, aims to raise learners’ awareness of social inequity by critically reflecting on how ethnic, racial and class minorities are historically oppressed through the study of a certain group of people. Fourth, the multicultural education approach has been most commonly used by educators for promoting pluralism. This approach is more comprehensive than the former three approaches and promotes school reform to accommodate diversity. The fifth approach, multicultural social justice education builds on the fourth approach in that it shares the same curriculum and instructions which promote social justice and equal opportunities for all groups. This approach advocates pervasive actions to practice multicultural education for social justice.

The central concern in multicultural social justice education is regarding “oppression and social structural inequality based on race, social class, gender and disability” (Grant & Sleeter, 2010, p. 67). Grant and Sleeter argue that multicultural social justice education aims to “prepare future citizens to take action to make society better serve the interests of all groups of people, especially those who are of color, poor, female, or have disabilities” (p. 67). This approach calls for radical actions by calling for students to actively exercise the following four practices: 1) pervasive practice of democracy; 2) analysis of social and institutional inequality existing in everyday life; 3) active engagement in social actions to challenge social inequality and injustice; and 4) collaboration across oppressed groups in various social dimensions (e.g., class, gender, race, religion, ability and sexual orientation). To elaborate, first, multicultural social justice education rejects the notion of students passively understanding democracy, for instance, through reading and listening to lectures about human rights and a nation’s Constitution. Rather, it promotes
students’ active practice of exercising politics and discussing and debating ‘dangerous discourses’ (Nieto, 2004) as well as inequality and injustice. Second, students are encouraged to analyze power relations in social reality and how structural and institutional inequality and discrimination are produced and reproduced based on students’ lived experiences as well as those of others. Third, students are to engage in social actions in order to change the unjust creation and reproduction of social prejudices and biases. As Grant and Sleeter argue, “Democracy is not a spectator sport” (2010, p. 69). Students learn to respond in order to challenge the unequal reproduction of social reality, for instance, writing a letter to local governors or the president of the nation about the unequal treatment towards minorities in hiring practices and forming a committee to take collective action to challenge biased criteria. Lastly, collaboration among various social groups under oppression is also important to develop common interests and strengthen the solidarity among minority groups to resist oppression. Despite its significance, Grant and Sleeter argue that this may be a challenging practice when different interests and different priorities between these groups conflict. With this regard, Dei (2007) asserts that through a critical examination of ‘intersecting oppressions’ and ‘interlocking systems of oppressions’, one can see the interrelatedness of all social oppressions. However complex, this interrelatedness in oppressions can serve as reinforcement for minorities to work collaboratively together and take a collective action to resist against social injustice.

Grant and Sleeter’s (2010) social justice multicultural education highlights that the focus of attention should be on issues of oppression and inequality existing in society and institutions. This particular aspect has been a lens in understanding the multicultural students’ experiences in and outside of school regarding their difference in languages and cultures. In particular, the way that multicultural students’ languages and cultures are treated has revealed how institutional discrimination is inherent in schools. Also, the emphasis on social action and visible strategies to resist oppression are relevant to guide and analyze local schools’ practices of multicultural education.

10 The distinction between ‘intersection oppressions’ and ‘interlocking oppressions’ is crucial in emphasizing the situational and contextual nature of oppressions and political practice. Please see Dei (2007, p. 193) for more discussions regarding intersection oppressions (e.g., black criminality) and interlocking oppressions (e.g., labor workforce and workplace harassment).
This multicultural social justice education approach reflects Freire’s critical pedagogy (1970, 2000) and promotes the concept of praxis that is addressed as a central force to change school and society toward social justice and is also echoed in Nieto’s critical multicultural education.

**Nieto’s Critical Multicultural Education (2011)**

Sonia Nieto’s conceptualization of multicultural education provides significant insights into the field of multicultural education. She addresses seven characteristics that multicultural education should constitute. First, multicultural education is antiracist education. This antiracist education should not be a superficial practice to accommodate cultural and linguistic diversity (e.g., tokenism, and food and festival approaches). Rather it should be conscious of educational inequalities and biases embedded in schooling wherein certain cultural and linguistic knowledge and perspectives are respected and learners of certain cultural groups are advantaged more than others through educational policies and curricula (2011, p. 43). Nieto argues that inclusive, balanced and multicultural teaching and curriculum should create a space that allows students to explore a wide variety of perspectives (p. 43). She also criticizes the fact that many schools do not attempt to confront negative aspects of history, arts and science and she argues that schools and educators should make “antiracism and antidiscrimination explicit parts of the curriculum and teaching young people skills in confronting racism” (p. 44). In this regards, antiracist education is *de facto* the central element of multicultural education.

Second, multicultural education is basic education. Nieto argues for curriculum change from the traditional yet prevailing model that represents a monocultural curriculum favoring the knowledge of the dominant culture (i.e., European American and male centered in the U.S.) to a radical curriculum that challenges dominance in knowledge (re)production. She contends that multicultural education should be organized as part of a core curriculum, not “peripheral to the core curriculum” (2011, p. 46) and not as “irrelevant to basic education” (p. 46). She further argues that “a monocultural education deprives all students of the diversity that is part of our world. What is needed is a true multicultural literacy” (p. 46).

Third, multicultural education is important for all students. Nieto argues that multicultural education is for everyone regardless of race, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, language,
religion, ability and other differences. She critiques commonly circulating misconceptions of which groups are the focus of multicultural education:

Although it is true that the primary victims of biased education are those who are invisible in the curriculum and whose schooling experiences are inequitable, everyone loses when education is biased. Teachers in primarily White schools might think that multicultural education is not meant for their students. They could not be more wrong. White students too receive only a partial education, which helps to legitimize their cultural blindness. Seeing only themselves, they may believe that they are the norm and thus most important and everyone else is secondary and less important. (2011, p. 49)

Nieto’s view is also applicable in the South Korean mainstream schools where the prevailing understanding of multicultural education is that the Korean students have nothing to do with multicultural education. In most Korean mainstream schools, the majority of the students are homogenous Korean students and the core curriculum is based on monocultural and monolingual perspectives. The perspectives and knowledge of minorities in different social categories—to name a few, race, ethnicity, language, sexual orientations, social class, age, and language—are considered as peripheral, not the norm and at times even viewed as abnormal. These schools then perpetuate the status quo of inequalities in the process of knowledge construction through continuous exclusionary practices by delivering only a partial view of the world. In this regard, it is important that all schools take responsibility to provide multicultural education for all students; otherwise, inequalities and injustice will be continuously reproduced and reinforced.

Fourth, multicultural education is pervasive. Nieto argues that a true multicultural approach should be pervasive in every dimension of schooling including curriculum, physical environment, the school climate, and relationships among teachers and students and community. She emphasizes that “Multicultural education is a philosophy, a way of looking at the world, not simply a program or a class or a teacher” (Italics in original, 2011, p. 50). In this regard, curricula are developed to accommodate diverse histories, perspectives and beliefs of different cultures, genders, and ethnic groups, and topics considered “dangerous” can be addressed in lessons to improve learners’ critical thinking skills.
Fifth, multicultural education is education for social justice. Multicultural education for social justice “means learning to question power structures and the status quo” (2011, p. 52). Nieto argues that although people may feel uncomfortable to deal with contradictions between democratic ideals and the reality of the society in which inequality is reproduced, it is still crucial to teach students about these social contradictions and biases since society represents a crucial focus of the curriculum. She firmly contends that “Ethics and the distribution of power, status, and rewards are basic societal concerns; education must address them” (p. 52, Italics in original).

Sixth, multicultural education is a process. Nieto argues that it is always ongoing as becoming a multicultural person and building knowledge is always an incomplete process. Also, this implies that multicultural education promotes students’ continuous learning rather than a one time or limited exposure to superficial information on different ethnic and cultural groups. She explains that this meaning of multicultural education as a process is often relegated to a peripheral position as it is not easy and does not bring prompt outcomes. For instance, eliminating tracking and developing higher expectations for all students take a long time as they involve “changing perceptions, behavior, and knowledge” (2011, p. 53). As a consequence, she further argues that “the processes of multicultural education are generally more complex, more politically volatile, and even more threatening to vested interests than introducing ‘controversial’ content” (p. 53).

Seventh, multicultural education is critical pedagogy. Critical pedagogy is education for social change through praxis which consists of a continuous critical reflection on social reality and an analysis of inequity and critical action to challenge the inequity (Freire, 2000). Multicultural education with a critical pedagogy perspective creates an environment where “students are empowered both individually and collectively to become active learners” (p. 54). In critical pedagogy, critical literacy is central to students’ understanding and questioning about power, inequality, social prejudices and encourages them to take actions. This emphasis on critical pedagogy in multicultural education derives from Freire (1970, 2000) and Nieto provides an insightful linkage between multicultural education and sociopolitical considerations in schooling such as issues with power and (in)equality. Thus, Nieto’s multicultural education is in essence critical multicultural education. This framework guides my understanding of the current
multicultural education policy and practice as well as my analysis of how multicultural learners, languages and cultures are reflected and treated in the Korean schooling.

Also rooted in critical pedagogy, Cummins’ framework that focuses on empowerment and minority students provides another significant foundation for understanding the sociopolitical conditions wherein culturally and linguistically diverse learners are situated in oppressed learning circumstances. In particular, it is relevant to highlight how an educators’ role definition can influence learners’ identity negotiations and how identity affirmation is related to how power can be mobilized either coercively or collaboratively.

Cummins’ Empowerment Framework (1986, 2001)

In Cummins’ empowerment framework, defining educators’ roles is critical in that, as Cummins put it, “students from ‘dominated’ societal groups are ‘empowered’ or ‘disabled’ as a direct result of their interactions with educators in the schools” (Cummins, 1986, p. 21). This framework highlights that minority students are empowered when an educator’s role is defined in these conditions: 1) cultural and linguistic identities are additively incorporated; 2) community participation is collaborative rather than exclusionary; 3) pedagogy is interaction-oriented rather than transmission-oriented; and 4) assessment is advocacy-oriented rather than disabling students (p. 25). He articulates that

… widespread school failure does not occur in minority groups that are positively oriented toward both their [minority students] own and the dominant culture, that do not perceive themselves as inferior to the dominant group, and that are not alienated from their own cultural values. (Cummins, 1986, p. 22)

To debunk the crucial underpinnings and to elaborate pedagogical insights from this framework, Cummins (1986, 2001) first, stresses educators’ choices in their role definition. Cummins argues that as one of the main agents in the educational system, educators are fundamentally involved in unequal processes of knowledge (re)construction and (re)distribution by structuring the syllabus, lessons and all aspects of classroom interactions wherein certain knowledge and ideas are constructed and mobilized to benefit certain social groups. In this sense, educators are never
politically and ideologically in a neutral position (2001). Acknowledging inherent institutional discrimination and unequal interpersonal power relations in the educational system, Cummins’ empowerment framework provides two focal lenses on the interaction between educators and students. The first lens of the teaching-learning relationship focuses on educators’ choices of their pedagogical strategies and techniques to scaffold and facilitate learners’ development of literacies, content knowledge and cognitive skills. The second lens of identity negotiation examines “the messages communicated to students regarding their identities—who they are in the teacher’s eyes and who they are capable of becoming” (Cummins, 2001, p. 21). This lens implies that how culturally and linguistically diverse learners sense who they are and how they position and invest themselves is inevitably connected to how educators view who these learners are and how educators help these learners’ invest in their identities for success in and beyond the given educational system (Cummins, 1986; Cummins, 2001; Norton, 1997).

In this light, through this empowerment framework, Cummins argues for a shift of power relations in interpersonal space from coercive to collaborative, which serves as the centrifugal force to contribute to school reform and social change. Coercive relations of power inevitably lead to marginalization of culturally and linguistically diverse students in various school experiences; whereas, collaborative relations of power contribute to developing an additive pedagogical environment by resulting in increased learner participation in lessons which in turn leads them to invest their identities in positive academic ways (Cummins 1986, 2001). As a result, “students who are empowered by their school experiences develop their ability, confidence and motivation” (1986, p. 23) to invest their identities in ways that promote academic success. In contrast, “students who are disempowered or ‘disabled’ by their school experiences do not develop this type of cognitive/academic and social/emotional foundation” (p. 23).

Cummins’ argument for altering power relations from coercive to collaborative through critical examinations of teaching-learning relationship and learners’ and educators’ identity negotiations reflects Freire’s (1970, 2000) concept of critical ‘praxis’ which is also echoed in the abovementioned critical approaches to multicultural education.

The understanding of the interrelatedness of power, identity and success in schooling in Cummins’ empowerment framework has been particularly useful in examining how some
linguistically and culturally diverse students in two Korean high schools in my study become silenced and disabled in schooling and minoritized in society and how other students become empowered and invest their plural identities to succeed in Korean society.

The following section speculates how the notion of identity is conceptualized and empirically examined in prior literature and outlines my adopted notion of identity.

**Conceptualization of Identity**

As my study examines how multicultural students are reflected in policy and popular media texts and how they are perceived by different school stakeholders, unpacking how the literature addresses the notions of identity and identity positioning is a necessary step in order to understand and interpret how my participants are perceived in school and society and how they position themselves in their social practice.

Hall (1996) theorizes the notion of identity in three forms of subjects: the Enlightenment subject, the sociological subject, and the postmodern subject. The Enlightenment subject reflects an essentialist view of understanding identity as unified, consistent, and identical throughout the individuals’ lives which reflects an essentialist perspective. The sociological subject sees that identity is formed through individuals’ interaction with society. In this notion, identity and identity positioning is dependent on social interaction, and identity is viewed as relational as it is co-constructed by the self and others. Hall introduces the last concept of identity as the postmodern subject which is in direct contrast to the essentialist perspective. In this conceptualization, “The fully unified, completed, secure, and coherent identity is a fantasy” (p. 598). The identity of the postmodern subject is understood as something historically defined, constantly changing, multiple, and influenced by power relations in social interactions. This view is increasingly echoed by critical scholars who orient their work in non-essentialist and postmodernist perspectives of identity (Cummins, 2001; Gérin-Lajoie, 2011; Morgan, 2004; Nieto and Bode, 2011; Norton, 1997; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). The notion of identity that I adopt for understanding my participants and the messages related to identity embedded in policy texts and educators’ discourses derives from this non-essentialist and postmodernist perspective. In particular, I concur with Gérin-Lajoie’s and Cummins’ conceptualization of
identity. For them, the issues of power, language, and culture are central to understand individuals’ positioning and negotiating of their identities with others.

As mentioned above, Cummins’ empowerment framework posits that identity negotiation is intrinsic to students’ interactions with teachers, parents and community. In other words, whether students are minoritized/disabled or emancipated/empowered is a function of how various social actors in schools and society view and treat the students. Instruction that enables students to create ‘identity texts’ reflects an emancipatory and empowerment pedagogy that challenges oppressive educational conditions by affirming the identities of the students who author these texts.

The evidence-based research related to identity texts directs educators to pay attention to how educators perceive students in terms of identity, language and culture (Cummins and Early, 2011; Cummins, 2015; Cummins et al., 2016). Specifically, students’ interactions with teachers and the engagement opportunities that teachers create will determine the extent to which students’ identities are affirmed or devalued in the context of their school work. As such, educators’ perceptions of identity and operation of identity negotiations with students are highly ideological as they can lead to the oppressive or emancipatory pedagogy which then contributes to the creation of educational patterns of reproducing or challenging unequal power relations.

In a similar vein, Gérin-Lajoie (2008, 2011) also manifested through her ethnographic studies how linguistic and cultural minority youth makes sense of who they are, where they belong, and how they perform their identity by examining their rapport to identity, language and culture. The concept of rapport to identity refers to “the positioning of an individual in regard to identity, language, culture, race and ethnicity” (Gérin-Lajoie, 2011, p. 1). Her earlier and recent ethnographic studies (2008, 2011) reveal that Francophone youth in English Canada, Anglophone youth in French Canada, and allophone youth across Canada show bicultural/trilingual identities that do not necessarily reject or attempt a full assimilation to the majority language and culture of their social contexts. Their rapport to identity, language and culture is in a constant state of change and is contingent on their unique social practices and contexts. Based on this longitudinal research on identity, the notion of identity is not defined as
something uniform, static and monolithic but is fluid, relational, multiple and contingent on social context and practice.

I will show how this conceptualization of identity is prominent in how my participants negotiate their identity, position themselves in school and society, and exercise their identities. The negotiation of my participants’ identities is reflected in the relationship with close friends, families and teachers as well as the society and the world where they are situated. They construct their identities through their interpretation of interactions with others and the world and their constructed identities contribute to a new form of interaction and a new construction of identity. The central elements of this ongoing negotiation of identity or positioning of identity, or using Gérin-Lajoie’s term, rapport to identity, are language and culture. Language, in particular, is a primary point of concern for all my student participants with respect to how they see themselves and how they perceive they are viewed by others.

**Ruiz’s (1984) Three Orientations to Language Planning**

Ruiz (1984) proposed three orientations to language planning. Orientation, according to Ruiz, refers to “a complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society” (p. 16). In this light, orientations can also be viewed as “language attitudes in that they constitute the framework in which attitudes are formed: they help to delimit the range of acceptable attitudes toward language, and to make certain attitudes legitimate” (p. 16). The three orientations are: language-as-problem, language-as-right, and language-as-resource.

The language-as-problem orientation prevailed explicitly in the 1960s (and previously) in the US under the assumption that “non-English language groups have a handicap to be overcome” (Ruiz, 1984, p. 19), which served as justification for the enactment of the 1968 Bilingual Education Act (BEA). Within this perspective, languages other than the dominant standard language are considered as a problem that impedes students’ abilities to learn the dominant standard language as well as the potential for successful socialization and integration into mainstream society. An assimilationist language policy approach is viewed as a solution to the problem that diverse languages pose. This assimilationist approach was also apparent in Canada up to the 1960s and beyond. The Canadian Indian residential school system established in the 1800s to educate
children of First Nations and Inuit communities, the education system for Francophones living outside of Québec, and the assimilationist orientation to the education of immigrant-background students are typical examples of this approach (Cummins & Danesi, 1990; Gérin-Lajoie, 2008, 2012; Harper, 1997).

The language-as-problem orientation echoes the response of ‘suppressing difference’ that Harper (1997) discusses in her historical analysis of the policy response to diversity in Canada. According to Harper, the central response to difference in the 1950s and 1960s involved suppressing diversity through aggressive assimilationist approaches that attempted to “…eliminate diversity among students, ensuring conformity to a standard identity, narrowly and rigidly defined” (Harper, 1997, p. 194). Within this confined form of viewing difference, linguistically and culturally diverse individuals are forced to be the same as the majority, depriving them of opportunities to maintain their heritage language and cultural identities. Despite the continuous revisions and reforms of education policies since the 1960s designed to promote cultural inclusion, overt or covert assimilationist perspectives still persist and are manifested in societal structures ranging from employment qualifications to professional standards in teacher education (Gagné, Chassels, & McIntosh, 2015; Gérin-Lajoie, 2012). Korean multicultural education is no exception to this pattern.

Ruiz’s language-as-right orientation highlights the rights of individuals who speak languages or varieties of language different from the dominant standard language. In some cases, language rights are enshrined in the legal system (e.g., the educational and social rights of Canadian official language speakers who are in minority contexts, such as Anglophones in Québec and Francophones outside of Québec). However, the language-as-right orientation extends beyond legal rights to include ethical considerations associated with language diversity. For example, to what extent does the suppression of minority languages within mainstream schools violate the human rights of children to an equitable education? Thus, notions of language rights extend beyond a narrow perspective on language alone. As Ruíz states:

> Since language touches many aspects of social life, any comprehensive statement about language rights cannot confine itself to merely linguistic considerations. By extension,
this means that discrimination as to language has important effects in many other areas. 
(1984, p. 22)

Ruiz highlights numerous examples of language-as-right such as the right to have access to formal educational, social, legal, and medical systems (p. 22). Struggles for language rights are contested in many societies due to conflicting interests between different social, economic, and ethnic groups. However, Ruiz argues that the importance of the language-as-right orientation will only become greater as a society grows more linguistically and culturally heterogeneous (p. 23).

This perspective is highly relevant to the situation in South Korea where attention to issues of linguistic diversity is very recent and, as documented in Chapter 4, discussions related to minority language rights are scarce in policy documents and prior studies of multicultural education. Some news articles have called attention to the insufficient social infrastructure that prevents newcomers from gaining access to important public services and exams such as civil documents and driver’s license exams (H. Lee, March 21, 2010) but this perspective is very much overshadowed by the language-as-problem orientation.

In Ruiz’s language-as-resource orientation, languages are considered as beneficial, useful, and valuable; they are individual and societal resources that expand the educational, employment, and social possibilities of individuals and society as a whole. They benefit the national interest by advancing political and economic competitiveness and a nation’s status in the global market. However, this language-as-resource orientation does not necessarily challenge social, cultural and economic inequalities as the status of minority languages within particular societies varies enormously. For example, as documented in subsequent chapters, English occupies an extremely high status as a minority language in Korea but Chinese is typically viewed in negative terms. Thus, policy-makers and educators are much more likely to view English as a resource compared to Chinese with very different messages communicated to speakers of these languages regarding their status and legitimacy. In short, we need to go beyond the language-as-resource orientation to address issues of power, status, and equality in the society.
Reframing Theoretical Orientations in the Korean Context

Ruiz’s three perspectives on language planning are pertinent for understanding how different languages and cultures have been perceived and treated in Korean education. However, for purposes of framing the current investigation, I adopt Ruiz’s framework by extending the problem-oriented view into two categories and adding an empowerment-oriented category that incorporates Cummins’ (2001) analysis of societal power relations. The following five categories provide a series of lenses to view and analyze the discourse of multicultural education in Korea as well as the attitudes of educators and the experiences of students. These categories allow us to incorporate the unique social, cultural, historical and political contexts that influence current Korean educational and social policies and practices. The five overlapping orientations are:

- Diversity-as-problem/threat for the society;
- Diversity-as problem/impediment to assimilation/integration;
- Diversity-as-right, incorporating a focus on ethical dimensions of policy and practice;
- Diversity-as-resource whereby the languages and cultures of diverse groups can increase opportunities for individuals and society as a whole;
- Diversity-as-power/empowerment whereby educators and policy-makers acknowledge the contested nature of language and culture within society and attempt to implement critical pedagogical approaches that render visible how these power relations operate.

**Diversity-as-problem/threat.** The rationale for dividing Ruiz’s language-as-problem category into two sub-categories is that there are significant differences between societal discourses that are xenophobic and frequently racist in orientation and those that are more benign insofar as they focus on how best to integrate newcomers into the society for the good of both newcomers themselves and the society as a whole. Within the former orientation, society is fearful of the presence of others and the different languages, cultures, and religions that they bring into society. As a result, societal discourses highlight the likelihood of social disharmony, cultural rupture, identity dilution, and violence associated with diversity. As illustrated in the previous chapter, Korea has been in a constant state of diplomatic and political disputes with
Japan and North Korea. Having been surrounded by these convoluted issues and tensions with neighboring nations historically, Koreans have been indoctrinated with the notion of homogeneity as a means to maintain the nation’s social unity. Government propaganda has highlighted homogeneity as an essential attribute to secure the nation and solidify national identity. This perspective has been reinforced through formal education from Korea’s first national curriculum through the most recent curriculum. In this sense, it is not surprising that this perspective is prominent among the majority of Koreans, and in particular the generation that was more directly involved in the Korean war and Japanese colonization and their immediate descendants who would likely have heard horrible stories of war and colonial experiences. These Koreans may still view the world in terms of a dichotomy comprised of compatriots versus enemies; those who are different are categorized as an enemy who may potentially dilute the homogeneity of Korea and undermine national unity and identity.

**Diversity-as-problem/impediment to assimilation/integration.** This orientation is similar to the diversity-as-problem/threat orientation insofar as its intent is to make the perceived problem posed by diversity disappear. However, it is not overtly xenophobic; instead, it aspires to solve the problem through rational means by creating infrastructure that would assist newcomers in learning the societal language and integrating into the society. Virtually all societies that have received significant numbers of immigrants during the past 50 years have engaged with this type of problem-solving process. For example, Canadian schools have provided specialized teachers to help newcomers learn English or French and free language programs for adult newcomers are also widely available across the country funded largely by the federal government.

The fact that the surface structure of this diversity-as-problem orientation is focused on rational problem-solving does not, however, mean that implementation is, in fact, rational or evidence-
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11 The issues and tensions with Japan are related to territorial ownership over Dokkdo, an island located between Korea and Japan, the Japanese distortion of history during Japanese colonization and act of dehumanization of comfort women—sex slaves—during the Japanese territorial expansion, and the current Japanese government’s response to the history of colonization of Korea, to name a few. Also, within the Korean peninsula, South Korea is technically in a state of war with North Korea since the Korean war was not resolved with a peace treaty but rather through an armistice, which means that another war could break out at any time.
based. Ideological considerations infuse debates concerning appropriate provision to support newcomer integration. This is clearly evident in the debate in the US (and elsewhere) about the relative merits of bilingual education versus English-as-a-second-language (ESL) programs. Despite strong supportive evidence (e.g., Cummins, 2001, 2015; Cummins & Early, 2011; Hélot & Ó Laoire, 2011), bilingual programs have been vehemently rejected by many policy-makers, educators, and media commentators in the US on the grounds that they reduce exposure to English in school, thereby encouraging L1 maintenance and a lack of commitment to learn English.

In the Korean context, as documented in subsequent chapters, both of the diversity-as-problem orientations predominate in societal discourses and educational policies and practices. Early policy reports and media articles (2006-2011) reveal strong ethnocentric and even xenophobic tendencies but this orientation gives way to a more pragmatic problem-solving approach in more recent documents.

**Diversity-as-right.** The third orientation advocates not only preserving basic human rights for social, cultural and racial minorities but also promoting rights for minorities to settle, be educated, have equal access to all civil services, examinations and certificates, and have opportunities for employment. This perspective is rarely reflected in public discussions of Korean multicultural education but as Ruiz emphasizes, its importance only becomes greater as a society becomes more multicultural. When there is no recognition of the rights of minorities in society, the operation of discrimination becomes justified whether intended or not. In fact, numerous forms of discrimination have characterized and are still present in Korean society as reported in prior studies (see Chapter 2). Thus, the diversity-as-right orientation is a much needed perspective at this moment in Korea.

**Diversity-as-resource.** In this approach, cultural and linguistic diversity is considered as useful societal resources and is viewed as worthy of support and nurturing within society. In various countries, researchers have pointed out that the linguistic intelligence of a society (reflected in linguistic diversity) opens up greater opportunities for trade and economic exchange, national influence, military surveillance, diplomatic influence, as well as cultural enrichment.
The focus is on what newcomers and minority groups can do for their adopted country as a result of the resources they bring. This represents an emergent discourse that can be identified in recent Korean multicultural education policies. However, this approach does not necessarily interrogate the operation of power relations between minority and majority groups nor does it consider issues of social justice, equality and empowerment.

**Diversity-as-power/empowerment.** The last perspective that I propose as a lens to examine Korean multicultural education is diversity-as-power/empowerment, which highlights the power relations that exist in classroom interactions between teachers and students as well as public discussions of diversity at the societal level. For this orientation, I adopt Cummins’ (1986; Cummins, 2001) empowerment framework, discussed previously. Within this orientation, power and identity become central focal points in relation to understanding how diversity is negotiated with particular societies. Cummins argues that: “These micro-interactions between educators, students and communities are never neutral; in varying degrees, they either reinforce coercive relations of power or promote collaborative relations of power” (2001, p. 19). Cummins (1986, 2001) asserts that the pattern of interactions between students and teachers and between schools and communities reflects a process of negotiating identities. Within the interpersonal space that is formed through these interactions, the linguistic and cultural capital of students and their communities is either affirmed or rejected by the school. Cummins stresses the importance of the choices that educators exercise, which can challenge unequal educational and societal structures through pursuing interactions that promote empowerment, defined as the collaborative creation of power. The alternative set of choices involves educators remaining compliant and complicit with dominant societal discourses that reinforce the inferior status of minority groups within the society.

This empowerment lens allows me to interrogate how individuals—students, educators, parents, and policy-makers—position themselves in relation to diversity. For example, to what extent do teachers assume that maximum exposure to Korean in school is necessary for successful learning of the language and integration into Korean society? To what extent have policy-makers examined research that might position students’ home language as a cognitive and learning tool rather than as an impediment to adjustment and school success? How do students react to the
pressures to hide their cultural identities and multilingual accomplishments? The focus on the
closest to the operation of power relations within my adaptation of the Ruíz (1984) framework allows me to
incorporate the critical multicultural education perspectives elaborated by theorists such as
Cummins (1986, 2001), Banks (2010) and Nieto and Bode (2011) within the language planning
orientations proposed by Ruíz (1984).
Chapter 3
Methodological Framework

This doctoral research attempts to reveal the discourses and perspectives regarding multicultural students, their languages and cultures as reflected in three different social dimensions, namely, the nation-state level, societal level and local institutional level. In order to achieve this goal, a critical discourse analysis (henceforth, CDA) and a case study approach are used. CDA in this study helps to uncover how power and ideologies embedded in the perceptions of multicultural students and their linguistic and cultural differences are circulating and reproduced. Furthermore, CDA is used to uncover how the status quo of inequalities is reinforced in authoritative texts, namely, policy documents and news media articles that are produced by the government and the dominant newspaper publishing companies. Additionally, a case study approach is chosen to reveal the multicultural education conditions in two different high schools through examining school stakeholders’ views on multicultural students and their languages and cultures. Two case studies are described in the study as each school forms a unique unit since they have their own unique curricula and hold differing educational goals.

The significance of employing CDA in this doctoral inquiry is to interrogate the relationship between education policy and practice and between government ideology and societal discourses and to demystify how the multicultural ideologies and discourses embedded in the documents are reproduced in educational practice and how the reproduced cultural biases and stereotypes can further minoritize multicultural students’ linguistic and cultural identities in Korea. The deployment of a case study is to make connections between the findings from the analysis with the specific institutions and the multicultural individuals’ lives. This is done in order to highlight how these circulating ideologies and perceptions relate to educators’ and multicultural students’ definitions of multicultural individuals and themselves, different languages and cultures in Korea and reveal whether the circulating ideologies and perceptions reinforce or resist the status quo of inequality.
Critical Discourse Analysis as an Analytic Lens

CDA views language as a social practice and interrogates the relationship between language, power and ideology by examining how textual representations in different social dimensions reflect power and ideology and how hegemony is reinforced (Fairclough, 2003). In this study, CDA is used to analyze multicultural education policy documents and newspaper articles in Korea in order to examine discourses surrounding multicultural students and their languages and cultures. In the process of examining the discourses, power relations existing between different individuals, languages and cultures as well as hidden ideologies embedded in the texts are revealed by analyzing the language used in the texts. The deployment of CDA is an attempt to show “how discourse is shaped by relations of power and ideologies, and the constructive effects discourse has upon social identities, social relations and systems of knowledge and belief, neither of which is normally apparent to discourse participants” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 12).

Background and Underpinnings of CDA

CDA was initiated in the field of critical linguistics that was influenced by the Frankfurt School and Jürgen Habermas and has been theorized and largely explored by Norman Fairclough, Teun van Dijk and Ruth Wodak (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000; van Dijk, 2001; Wodak, 2006). Fairclough argues that CDA helps to construe how semiotic events (i.e., written, spoken and multimodal texts in a given context) interrelate with semiotic structures mediated by discursive practice (Fairclough, 2012). In a similar vein, van Dijk asserts that CDA functions to reveal how social inequality, power abuse and dominance are legitimized and reproduced in written and spoken texts in social and political contexts (van Dijk, 2001). What is salient and emphasized in van Dijk’s CDA is the recognition of socio-cognition to mediate the relationship between discourse and structure emphasizing the interrelatedness between social cognition and personal attitudes. For van Dijk (1995), ideologies are “abstract mental systems” that represent socially shared beliefs and attitudes and that influence personal cognitions in understanding and
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12 Fairclough’s more recent work on CDA expands the notion of texts by including multimodal texts that are not only conventional forms of written and spoken texts but also visual and other alternative forms. His use of words such as ‘semiotic’ or ‘semiosis’ in his recent works seem to reflect his recent expansions.
interacting with other people and the world (p. 18). Similarly, maintaining the core characteristics of CDA and reinforcing Fairclough’s notion of CDA, Wodak’s CDA emphasizes the historical conditions of oppression (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000).

The central tenets of CDA which are conceptualized by different critical linguists can be synthesized as follows: first, CDA is problem-oriented. It deals with social problems and thus its ultimate goal is to resist social inequality and ‘wrongs’ (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; van Dijk, 2001). Second, the link between texts/events and society/structure is mediated through discursive practice and CDA attempts to demystify the interconnection between the micro and macro contexts of social practices through an examination of language (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; van Dijk, 1995, 2001). Third, CDA is an interpretive and explanatory approach moving beyond simply describing data and towards making connections between the social, historical and political conditions of society with given social events. Fourth, CDA is a multi-disciplinary, inter-disciplinary and trans-disciplinary approach as the topics of discrimination and oppressions which CDA attempts to interrogate intersect with each other across multiple social dimensions (e.g., race, gender, class, ethnicity, language, ability and religion) (Fairclough, 2003, 2012; van Dijk, 2001; Wodak, 2006).

**Fairclough’s CDA**

Based on Halliday’s Systematic Functional Linguistics and grounded on the theoretical and philosophical foundations of Foucault’s (1972) theories of “power, language and ideology”, Gramsci’s (1971) concept of hegemony, and Althusser’s (1971) notions of ideological State Apparatuses (e.g., educational institutions), Fairclough has been developing CDA (Fairclough, 1995, 2003) as an analytic lens to interrogate and interrelate three dimensions of discourse that include analysis of language texts, discourse practices, and sociocultural practices. Fairclough’s three dimensions of discourse analysis are tabulated in Table 1 below.

---

13 Hallidayan SFL sees language as a multifunctional semiotic system and emphasizes socially constructed meanings embedded in the given text. Hence, the connection of ‘social’ in CDA that views language as a social practice derived from Halliday’s SFL.
Table 1. Fairclough's Three Dimensions of Discourse Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of discourse analysis</th>
<th>Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic analysis</td>
<td>Description: Analyzing language use (e.g., syntax, grammar, vocabulary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive practice</td>
<td>Interpretation: Analyzing the production of texts (e.g., analysis of intertextuality and interdiscursivity, focusing on the circulation of the texts across space and time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocultural practice</td>
<td>Explanation: Analyzing the ideological connotations with the given texts (e.g., power relations, hegemonic practices, political attitudes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of language texts pertains to analyzing textual forms such as vocabulary, grammar, genres and metaphors, metonymys, and juxtapositions. The underlying assumption in this level of textual analysis is that the choices of the linguistic representations and any other semiotic representation in a given text are not arbitrary but always ideological and political. Then, it implies that these ideological and political choices of linguistic and non-linguistic elements are discursive practices that contribute to the legitimizing, reproducing and reinforcing of social and cultural dominance and inequality as embedded in linguistic and other multimodal forms of texts.

The analysis of discourse practices focuses on the intertextuality of how discourses or meanings of texts are reproduced throughout different texts and different genres. Using Bakhtin’s concept of intertextuality (Bakhtin, 1981; Kristeva, 1986), Fairclough reifies the interrelatedness of existing texts and new texts and recalls the historicity of texts in terms of production from Bakhtin, accentuating the structuring and restructuring of orders of discourse in his framework of CDA. Intertextuality refers to relations of utterances that are linked in “the chain of speech communication” (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 94) and “how texts draw upon, incorporate, recontextualize and dialogue with other texts” (Fairclough, 2003, p. 17). Intertextuality reveals the
interconnectedness of preexisting texts and new texts. For Fairclough (1992), the relationship between intertextuality and hegemony is significant.

The concept of intertextuality points to the productivity of texts, to how texts can transform prior texts and restructure existing conventions (genres, discourses) to generate new ones. But this productivity is not in practice available to people as a limitless space for textual innovation and play: it is socially limited and constrained, and conditional upon relations of power. The theory of intertextuality cannot itself account for these social limitations, so it needs to be combined with a theory of power relations and how they shape (and are shaped by) social structures and practices. (1992, pp.102-103)

Combining the concepts of intertextuality and hegemony, the analysis of discursive practices is significant in that it involves both micro-analysis and macro-analysis by connecting the descriptions of texts and the macro processes of shaping texts as Fairclough (1992) argues that micro-analysis “provides evidence for macro-analysis. Micro- and macro-analysis are therefore mutual requisites” (p. 86).

The third dimension, the analysis of discourse as social practice interrogates texts in relation with ideology and hegemony. According to Fairclough (1992, 2003), ideologies are representations that are naturalized by norms and conventions and continues naturalizing social subjects in the discursive events by contributing to “establishing, maintaining and changing social relations of power, domination and exploitation” (Fairclough, 1992, p.89). He further argues that “ideological representations can be identified in texts” (p. 9) and that the analysis of social practice should focus on the influence of ideologies on the social relations of power and domination in the examination of texts. Drawing upon Gramsci’s (1971) concept of hegemony, Fairclough (1992) echoes:

Hegemony is the power over society as a whole of one of the fundamental economically-defined classes in alliance with other social forces…Hegemony is a focus of constant struggle around points of greatest instability between classes and blocs, to construct or sustain or fracture alliances and relations of domination/subordination, which takes economic, political and ideological forms. (p. 92)
Fairclough (1992, 2003) pays attention to the process of how ideologies are structured and strengthened in order to maintain a group or nation’s dominance and hegemony. In this study, the analysis of discourse as a social practice focuses on the effect of ideology and hegemony in multicultural education policy texts and news media articles. Thus, by relating ideology, hegemony and identity, the analysis attempts to connect the ways that multicultural students and their different languages and cultures are perceived in Korean society with the ways that multicultural students negotiate their identities which involve assimilating, resisting, naturalizing and transforming their languages and cultures.

**Research Design: CDA and Case Studies**

Following Fairclough’s three analytic dimensions, this doctoral inquiry employs CDA to investigate eight multicultural education policy (MEP) documents produced by the Korean government from 2006 to 2013 and news media published online between 2006 and 2013. CDA is used as a critical lens to demystify the ideologies embedded in these texts by linking the linguistic choices in these various texts (the micro analysis) with an understanding of social structures (the macro analysis). In other words, CDA helps to uncover how the nation state controls social structures by legitimizing the status quo of social and cultural minority students and their linguistic and cultural characteristics through the production and reproduction of authoritative texts and through discursive practices in the public news media articles that cite the government’s multicultural education policies.

**Data Sources, Data Collection and Analysis Procedures**

This study consists of three types of data sources: 1) multicultural education policy documents between 2006 and 2013; 2) multimedia newspaper articles written between 2006 and 2013 and; 3) data from case studies of two high schools. The analyses of three different layers of data together attempt to uncover the perceived attitudes towards multicultural students as well as their cultures and languages and uncover how the discourses surrounding different languages, cultures and identities are disclosed at the institutional and societal level and how the nation-state’s power and ideologies are reproduced to reinforce the status quo of socioeconomic, cultural and linguistic minority students.
The analysis of multicultural education policy documents is intended to demystify the representations of the Korean government’s ideology as the documents are written and published by the South Korean Ministry of Education. The analysis of social news media leads to an understanding of how Korean society perceives multicultural students, different languages and cultures and how the nation-state ideology is reflected in the news media articles. The institutional discourse analysis reveals the perspectives of cross-cultural learners, teachers, and school administrators and also uncovers how these perspectives are interrelated to the nation-state ideology and circulating societal discourses regarding multicultural students and their languages and cultures. Figure 3 below shows these three layers of data and how they are related to each other. It is important to note that the discourses of multicultural students and different cultures and languages from different dimensions are not necessarily independent from each other. In other words, policy document representations, institutional perspectives, and societal discourses are interconnected, being influenced by and influencing/reinforcing each other.

![Figure 3. Three layers of data sources.](image)

The following table is an outline of the research design which includes information about the data sources, data collection and analysis procedures, research methodological approaches as well as the research questions that the data sources and methodological approaches help answer.
### Table 2. Research Design Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data Collection Procedure</th>
<th>Data Analysis Procedure</th>
<th>Research methodological approach</th>
<th>Research questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Multicultural Education Policy [MEP] documents</td>
<td>8 MEP documents between 2006 and 2013 were collected through the government websites.</td>
<td>Fairclough’s CDA: 1) Describing specific texts for multicultural students, different languages and cultures 2) Interpreting textual data 3) Explaining data</td>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>How is the societal discourse surrounding multicultural students and their linguistic and cultural differences reflected in educational policies and practices? How does the nation-state ideology reflected in the multicultural education policies influence teachers’ educational practices and students’ identity negotiations? How are multicultural students, their languages and cultures perceived in Korean society in general and in different school settings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 News Media Articles</td>
<td>News articles were selected using the Naver newspaper search engine</td>
<td></td>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>How does the nation-state ideology reflected in the multicultural education policies influence teachers’ educational practices and students’ identity negotiations? How are multicultural students, their languages and cultures perceived in Korean society in general and in different school settings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Participants’ narratives</td>
<td>Semi-structured and stimulated recall interviews</td>
<td>Thematic Analysis: analyzing emerged themes from transcribed and translated interview data and from other supplementary data</td>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>How does the nation-state ideology reflected in the multicultural education policies influence teachers’ educational practices and students’ identity negotiations? How are multicultural students, their languages and cultures perceived in Korean society in general and in different school settings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations</td>
<td>Taking field notes</td>
<td></td>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>How does the nation-state ideology reflected in the multicultural education policies influence teachers’ educational practices and students’ identity negotiations? How are multicultural students, their languages and cultures perceived in Korean society in general and in different school settings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal identity texts</td>
<td>Though picture illustration, bilingual texts, digital texts (e.g., personal blog)</td>
<td>CDA to decode the thematic data</td>
<td></td>
<td>How do cultural and economic minority students negotiate their multiple identities in their own terms of success?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School curriculum and educational materials and flyers circulating in the school as supplementary data</td>
<td>Supplementary data available through school websites and school bulletin boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

14 I was not able to have as many classroom observations as I hoped since some teacher-participants did not want me to be in their regular classrooms. I was only able to observe two different sessions of music class and after-school English class which my student-participants attended.
Research Methodological Approaches and Techniques

CDA of Multicultural Education Policy Documents and News Articles

CDA was applied to both multicultural education policy documents and news articles for the analysis. Please see Appendix A for a list of the selected multicultural policy documents published by Ministry of Education in Korea from 2006 through 2013. For the selection of news articles, first, I conducted a keyword search on Naver\(^\text{15}\) using the Korean word, 다문화 [Damunhwa, ‘multi-culture’] meaning ‘multi-culture’ to find news articles. The Korean word, 다문화, multi-culture, is a common denominator or at least the most commonly used adjective for multicultural students. It is a seemingly must-have word to discuss issues surrounding multicultural students, multicultural education and multiculturalism in South Korea\(^\text{16}\). News articles about ‘multi-culture’ were selected from the opinion columns of the four newspapers wherein experts such as university professors, researchers and company directors often opine or debate contested issues. The publication date of the articles was within the period between 2006 and 2013 to be consistent with the policy document analysis. With this protocol, 592 articles were first shown. Then, by scanning the articles based on topic relevance, 27 articles that focused on multicultural students were finally selected from four different newspapers: 6 articles from Chosun (CS); 8 articles from Dong-A (DA); 4 articles from Hangeore (HG); and 9 articles from Kyeonghyang (KH). The details of chosen news articles are in Appendix B.

Application of Fairclough’s CDA to Policy Documents and News Media Articles

In the MEP and multimedia news analyses, this study first examines language use for labeling multicultural students and perceptions and treatments of their language and culture in the written documents and investigates the intertextuality of those words throughout the documents and across different genres (i.e., policy documents and news reports). Lastly, these analyses

\(^{15}\) Naver is one of the most popular search engines in Korea and also provides internet news and e-mail services. For this study, I used the internet news service through Naver and the news articles are available at http://news.naver.com/.

\(^{16}\) Multicultural students are referred to through many different words in the Korean language thus using multicultural students as the key search term seemed to be too simplistic or deterministic to find important articles.
contribute to revealing the nation-state ideologies embedded in those words. The analysis of those words through CDA helps to uncover institutional discourses on multicultural students’ language, culture and identities through school stakeholders’ narratives that were gathered as part of the case study approach.

The following figure describes how Fairclough’s CDA is used to analyze MEP and the news media.

Figure 4. Application of Fairclough’s CDA.

As the first step, the linguistic analysis is employed by looking at words and phrases specifically that directly and indirectly label multicultural students (mostly nouns) and refer to the perception and treatment of the students’ heritage languages and cultures (adjectives, verbs and phrases). Then, the linguistic analysis is interpreted to analyze the intertextuality and interdiscursivity of the different labels of multicultural students as well as the treatment of heritage languages and cultures, which is a discursive practice. Lastly, ideologies of the nation-state and hegemony that strengthen the unequal power relations existing between different languages, cultures and identities are demystified. The 8 policy documents and 26 news media articles except one were written in Korean and I translated them into English for the analysis. One news media article was available in both Korean and English.
Two Case Studies of Local Educational Practices

The case studies were conducted at two high school settings: A multicultural alternative high school in Seoul and a mainstream general high school in Ansan which is approximately a one-hour drive south of Seoul. Each school embodies its own unique sociocultural, socioeconomic and sociopolitical characteristics with different ideological and philosophical stances and pedagogical approaches to multicultural education. The unique conditions of each school have differing influences on how school stakeholders conceptualize multicultural education. Also, the different schools as different institutional structures are reflective of how school stakeholders perceive multicultural students and their different languages and cultures. To understand how multicultural education is conceptualized in the two schools and how cultural differences and cross-cultural learners are understood, it is important to look at diverse perspectives from the different school stakeholders who are involved in multicultural education. Thus, my research aims to investigate cross-cultural learners, teachers, and administrators in terms of their perspectives of multicultural education, multicultural students and different languages and cultures in two distinctive high schools.

Daham Multicultural Alternative High School. Daham multicultural alternative high school, located in Seoul, first opened in March 2012 and is one of the first multicultural alternative schools approved by the Korean Ministry of Education in Korea. The school was established to accommodate socioeconomic and cultural minority students who gave up on their education midway through their transition from their previous school outside of Korea to a Korean school. As of 2013 when this research started and interview data were collected, the school had 80 students, 17 teachers and 8 bilingual instructors. In terms of students’ ethnicity, students with a Chinese background were dominant representing 60 out of 80 students (75%), followed by 11 Vietnamese (13.8%), 5 Mongolian (6.3%), 2 Japanese (2.5%), 1 Filipino (1.2%) and 1 American (1.2%). Most students were newcomers to Korea, arriving fewer than 3 years

---

17 Seoul is the capital of South Korea where one fourth of the total population resides, which makes the city the center of culture, economy and politics. In this sense, Seoul is considered as the most suitable venue for my research since it consists of the most diverse multicultural population with differing socioeconomic and sociocultural circumstances. Ansan is known as a city that has one of the largest communities for immigrants and foreign residents in recent years.
prior to the start of this research on average with some students having been in Korea for less than one year.

The school is reflective of linguistic and cultural diversity with at least seven different languages spoken by students and many of the students and their family members are multicultural and multilingual. The majority of the students are recent newcomers to Korea who were born outside Korea and moved to Korea often due to one or both of their parents’ employment or marriage. Considering the students’ unique situations, the school emphasizes education for social integration into Korean society. Supportive of smooth and swift social integration, the school is designed to foster vocational education, providing classes to teach useful skills for students to benefit their future employment in Korea. In addition, the school has bilingual teachers who are hired to support students’ understanding of subject matters in classes where highly academic and Korean words are used.

The school specifically focuses on two vocational areas: tourism and computer media. These two focal areas and accompanying curricula were advised and approved by the ministry of education. The school consists of six home classrooms based on their specialization of tourism and computer media for Grades 10 through 12 and each class is limited to 20 students. The following table is a brief description of my participants’ profiles.18

---

18 The school names and participant names are all pseudonyms. Note that all of my multicultural student-participants used Korean names and thus I assigned them with Korean pseudonyms.
Table 3. Daham Multicultural High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Mimi (G11, 20 yrs.)</th>
<th>Jinu (G11, 19 yrs.)</th>
<th>Chung (G11, 21 yrs.)</th>
<th>Han (G11, 18 yrs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ls:</td>
<td>Korean &amp; Chinese</td>
<td>Ls: Tagalog,</td>
<td>Ls: Chinese &amp;</td>
<td>Ls: Chinese &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English &amp; Korean</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Korea [YK]:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>YK: 3</td>
<td>YK: 2</td>
<td>YK: 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Ms. Kang (45 yrs.)</th>
<th>Mr. Jung (34 yrs.)</th>
<th>Mr. Lim (53 yrs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub:</td>
<td>Music teacher</td>
<td>Korean arts</td>
<td>Vice-principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ls:</td>
<td>Korean &amp; Chinese</td>
<td>Ls: Korean &amp; a</td>
<td>Ls: Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>little Chinese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Teaching [YT]:</td>
<td>21yrs</td>
<td>YT:5yrs</td>
<td>YT: 27yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sindo General High School.** Sindo General High School is a mainstream general high school that is located in Ansan, an industrial area adjacent to Seoul, and is attended by approximately 1000 students (340 in Grade 10; 310 in Grade 11; and 350 in Grade 12) and 75 educators including administrators and classroom teachers. The multicultural students who attend this school are representative of middle or lower socio-economic classes according to one of the teacher participants. As many other mainstream general high schools, the school curriculum is based around the needs of the dominant group of Korean students with the Korean language as the main medium of instruction except for foreign language subjects. In 2013, the school participated in a multicultural education project sponsored by the city of Ansan. Targeted for their 10 multicultural students, the school started running various programs such as cultural events, a foreign language contest and extra foreign language classes. The following table shows a brief description of my participants' profiles.
Table 4. Sindo General High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sindo General High School Participants</th>
<th>Inha (G10, 18 yrs.)</th>
<th>Suji (G11, 19 yrs.)</th>
<th>Bori (G11, 18 yrs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Ls: Korean &amp; Indonesian</td>
<td>Ls: Korean &amp; Chinese</td>
<td>Ls: Korean &amp; Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Korea</td>
<td>YK: 10 yrs.</td>
<td>YK: 5 yrs.</td>
<td>YK: 13 yrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educators</th>
<th>Mr. Ha (44 yrs.)</th>
<th>Ms. Lee (22 yrs.)</th>
<th>Mr. Yu (60 yrs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub: Social studies</td>
<td>Sub: English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ls: Korean</td>
<td>Ls: Korean &amp; English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ls: Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Teaching</td>
<td>YT: 15 yrs.</td>
<td>YT: 1 yr.</td>
<td>YT: 30 yrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case study approach, multiple tools were used to collect the data. All the participants were interviewed following a semi-structured interview format. This format provided the flexibility to have a guided interview yet also allowed space for elaboration and discussion of unexpected yet significant issues that came up during the interviews. The two schools’ educators were interviewed only once due to their busy schedules. Thus, for the educators, all the questions were asked during the one interview session; however, I was able to ask follow-up and additional questions informally for instance, prior to the classroom observations.

I was able to interview the students three times. The first interview was based on their background information. This provided me with their prior educational and lived experiences in Korea and elsewhere. This background information helps to reveal how the participants perceive their past and current positions. After obtaining their personal histories, the participants were interviewed again in order to obtain more focused information related to their perceptions of multicultural students, their linguistic and cultural negotiations inside and outside the schools,
and the school’s approach to multicultural education. The last interview with the students was based on my analysis of the previous interviews and classroom observations in order to obtain an in-depth understanding of students’ perceptions of their schooling and linguistic and cultural negotiations as well as the self-generated multimodal identity texts in which student participants expressed themselves.

The use of multiple sources of data for the case studies is needed since limiting data collection to only one type of data is not sufficient to fully understand cross-cultural learners’ perspectives on who they are, what educational conditions they are in, and how their social surroundings and sociopolitical conditions influence their identity negotiations in their learning. Although the interview data was the primary data source for the analysis, other sources of data such as self-generated multimodal identity texts, fieldnotes of classroom observations, and the school curriculum as well as other available educational materials circulating in the school including lesson plans and written assessment tools were collected and analyzed.

For the concept of multimodal identity texts, during the first interview session, I asked student participants to reflect on their own experiences through the use of multimodal tools such as online blogs, drawings, paintings, or by creating a cartoon series to express their reflections of their school life including learning and interacting with their peers and teachers. These alternative modes of expressions are another significant channel to understand the learners since they encourage learners to show their unique personalities and identities that may not be fully expressed in traditional linguistic based modes (Cummins and Early, 2011).

The interview data that were mostly in Korean were transcribed and translated into English. The only exception was Jinu’s case where the interview data were mixed with Korean and English as such the Korean utterances were translated and the English was kept verbatim. The interview data were coded according to recurrent themes. The thematic coding helped to summarize individual narratives and locate commonalities and differences in the individuals’ experiences. The thematic analysis was reexamined to cross-check with policy and new media analyses.
Chapter 4

CDA of Multicultural Education Policy Documents and News Media Articles

This chapter focuses on how multicultural students are positioned and how their multiple languages and cultures are reflected in the Korean government’s multicultural education policy documents and in news articles from Korea’s dominant newspapers. CDA is used as an analytic lens to investigate how multicultural students, their languages and cultures are defined and positioned in the rhetoric of the South Korean authoritative public texts, that is, eight multicultural education policy documents and 27 news media articles that were published between 2006 and 2013 in Korea. The analysis of language use and its interpretations throughout the policy documents and news media articles first focuses on: 1) lexicon for labeling and categorizing multicultural students; 2) lexicon and phrases for the perception of multicultural students and their languages and cultures; 3) lexicon and phrases for visions and expectations. Deciphering words and phrases specific to multicultural students, their language and culture as well as texts indicating and inferring perceptions, visions and expectations leads to revealing the nation-state’s beliefs and societal perspectives towards different languages, cultures and identities.

The intertextual analyses of the multicultural education policy documents and news articles play a significant role to highlight consistent and inconsistent attitudes and beliefs regarding linguistic and cultural diversity. The linguistic analysis regarding the choices of certain words and phrases and the relation between words throughout different texts helps to reveal discursive practices regarding the predominant perceptions of multicultural students. This analysis of discursive practices then contributes to highlighting how the public textual space of authoritative force (i.e. the government led policy documents and the dominant social media) is utilized to either empower or suppress the socioeconomic, cultural and linguistic minority students.

In order to uncover how the discourses surrounding multicultural students and their linguistic and cultural differences are reflected at the educational policy and societal level through the multicultural education policy [MEP] and news article analyses, this study first examines language use for labeling multicultural students and perceptions and treatments towards different
languages and cultures in the written texts. It then investigates the intertextuality of discourses surrounding multicultural students throughout the texts within and between policy documents and news articles. Lastly, these analyses attempt to uncover the nation-state ideologies embedded in these documents. The analyses through the use of CDA help to explain the perceptions of school stakeholders in the case studies which together lead to contributing to a deeper understandings of current multicultural education in Korea. In light of this, through CDA, the eight MEP documents and 27 news articles between 2006 and 2013 are analyzed with the following guiding questions:

a. How are multicultural students linguistically named/labelled?

b. What characteristics and qualities are attributed/described/ascribed to these individuals, their cultures and languages and how are they perceived?

c. What kind of visions and expectations are imagined for multicultural students?

In order to capture the changes of the categorizing of multicultural students, perceived characteristics and imagined possibilities for them over the eight years (2006-2013), I analyzed two time phases representative of the earlier documents between 2006 and 2009 and the recent documents between 2010 and 2013.

**Linguistic Analysis in MEP**

Multicultural students are defined based on the definition of multicultural families. In the very first 2006 MEP document, multicultural families are defined by a divisive yet obscure term and the definition is used extensively in various social and institutional sectors. Multicultural families “refer to families that are constituted of persons whose ethnic and cultural backgrounds are different from *ours*” (MEHR, 2006, p.1, my emphasis in the italics). This definition invokes a few subsequent questions. What characteristics does the Korean culture refer to as ‘*ours*’ in the above text have in order to distinguish it from ‘*others*’? Are all Korean families ethnically, culturally and linguistically homogenous? As discussed earlier about the myth of Korea’s ethnic homogeneity in Chapter 2, Korea is no longer ethnically and culturally

---

19 All policy documents and news articles in this study were written in Korean. The presented excerpts and words from the original documents were translated into English by the author unless otherwise specified.
homogenous in the contemporary era. In this sense, the definition of multicultural families being ethnically and culturally different from ‘ours’ is unclear; however, this definition has been widely applied in the practice of categorizing and characterizing multicultural families and multicultural students and imagining visions for them at the policy level since the very first multicultural education policy of 2006.

Numerous labels are used to categorize multicultural students throughout the eight multicultural education policy documents. As the policy is revised each year, the labels for multicultural students have seemingly progressed to be seen as more ‘politically correct’. For instance, in the earlier documents of 2006 and 2007 labels tend to have more biased words such as illegal residents(불법체류자), mixed blood (혼혈) and Kosian(코시안); however, those terms do not appear in the relatively recent documents of 2012 and 2013 where the words, ‘multicultural students’ (다문화학생) seem to be the representative label. In terms of describing the status and characteristics of multicultural students in the policy documents, multicultural students are consistently portrayed as legally, socio-economically, culturally, and educationally marginalized more overtly in earlier documents (2006-2009) than recent documents (2010-2013) as may be seen in the following section. In terms of describing multicultural students’ expected visions and imagined social positions, the choice of vocabulary seems to change from being narrowly-determined in the earlier documents to being more inclusive in more recent documents. Yet, the notion of inclusiveness fails to connect to practical implementations of the policies. More detailed descriptions follow below.

Earlier policy documents (2006-2009)

Defining and labelling multicultural students. The very first multicultural policy document from 2006 which contains various yet conflicting concepts and terms to explain multicultural students starts with convoluted policy title, ‘Educational Support Countermeasures for Children from Multicultural Families’. In this title, the selected words such as ‘countermeasures’ and ‘children from multicultural families’ imply that children from the multicultural families are viewed as sources of emergent social problems that have to be corrected through effective ‘countermeasures’. To support this, in the 2006 document, some of
the words used for multicultural students index derogatory meanings through racist and exclusionary terms such as children of illegal residents (불법체류자), mixed blood children (혼혈아동), minority (소수자), and Kosian (코시안). The labels used for categorizing and characterizing multicultural students throughout the eight MEP documents are shown in Appendix C. These terms imply that multicultural individuals are socially considered as outsiders and social minorities in Korea. In particular, the terms such as mixed blood children and KOSIAN do not have negative literal meanings; however, the words are all used in negative contexts where they describe students who are raised in socioeconomically, culturally and linguistically vulnerable situations that may hinder their successful schooling due to teachers’ stereotyping and subsequently setting low academic expectations for these students (Banks, 2010; Cummins, 2001; Nieto & Bode, 2011; Steele & Aronson, 1995). Furthermore, in some cases where these words are used, the use of these terms contributes to reproducing the existing discourse of multicultural students as these terms are not problematized and not challenged in a way to raise critical awareness of linguistic use. For instance, the following text from the 2006 policy document uses the word, ‘mixed-blood children’ in a way that problematizes them for discontinuing school and justifying them as a target for countermeasures.

There needs to be countermeasures to prevent mixed-blood children from dropping out of school and at the same time, in the event of dropping-out, there needs to be the implementation of support programs such as re-enrolling, a licensing examination and university students’ mentoring.

(혼혈아동이 학업을 중도하차하지 않도록 예방 대책을 강구하는 동시에, 하차 사례가 발생했을 경우 복학 유도, 검정고시 지원, 대학생 멘토링 프로그램 적용 등이 필요함.) (MEHR, 2006, p. 10)

In particular, the use of the word, mixed blood is a racist term indexing the terrible historical memories from the Korean War that broke out in 1950 as the term was applied to the children of color born between Korean women and Black American soldiers during and after the war. Acknowledging the negative connotation of certain labels towards multicultural students in Korea, the UN suggested the elimination of the use of the word ‘mixed-blood’ particularly in all
institutional settings as it entails the concept of racial superiority which is discussed in Chapter 2; however, these labels are still circulating in society indexing derogatory and discriminatory meanings, which is also discussed later in this chapter through the news article analysis.

Many of the derogatory terms have disappeared since 2008. One noticeable change in the 2008 policy document is that multicultural students are called ‘students from multicultural families’ instead of ‘children from multicultural families’.

**Characteristics of multicultural students.** Multicultural students are depicted as a new social category of social and educational problems that Korean society needs to pay more attention to in order to resolve. The following texts can be seen mostly in the introductory sections of policy documents between 2006 and 2009 where the rationale of the policy and the reasoning of the policy implementation act are specified to be informative, logical and persuasive to the readers who are educators and administrators, students and parents. However, the choice of the terms in the following excerpts seems to be highly biased to describe the characteristics of multicultural students.

1) [The policy is] to understand the current state of education for children from international marriage and children of foreign workers who have newly emerged as an educationally marginalized class in our society and to report comprehensive countermeasures from the perspective of multiculturalism.

(우리사회에 새로운 교육 소외계층으로 대두되고 있는 국제 결혼 가정 자녀, 외국인 근로자 자녀의 교육 현황을 파악하고 다문화주의적 관점에서의 종합지원 대책을 보고하고자함.) (MEHR, 2006, p. 1)

2) The majority of children from multicultural families who are legally, economically, and socially in vulnerable conditions experience identity confusion due to poor academic achievement and social prejudice which derives from insufficient Korean language ability and maladjustment into Korean culture.

(법률적 경제적 사회적 기반이 취약한 다문화 가정의 자녀의 상당수가 한국어 능력 부족 및 한국문화 부적응으로 인해 학습 부진과 사회적 편견에 따른 정체성 혼란 경험.) (MEHR, 2006, p. 1)
3) [In the case of children from international marriage family,] due to their **language development delay** and **cultural maladjustment**, their understanding in classes is poor and they show **emotional disorders such as ADHD and exhibit excessively passive and aggressive behaviors.**

(언어 발달 지체 및 문화 부적응으로 인해 학교수업에 대한 이해도가 낮으며, 지나치게 소극적이거나 반대로 폭력성 또는 과잉행동장애 (ADHD)를 보이는 등 정서장애도 나타남.) (MEHR, 2006, p. 5)

4) In the case of children whose mother is a marriage immigrant, their **Korean language development is delayed** because the children were brought up by a mother who was **poor in the Korean language** during their early childhood.

(여성결혼이민자 자녀의 경우 유아기에 한국어가 미숙한 외국인 어머니와 함께 생활하므로 언어발달 지체.) (MEHR, 2006, p. 5)

5) **Emotionally sensitive** students of international marriage families who are now in elementary schools …may **not overcome prejudice and discrimination and give up schooling** when they enter secondary schools, which may lead to **social problems.**

(현재 초등학교에 재학 중인 국제 결혼 가정 자녀들이 …정서적으로 민감한 학생들이 편견과 차별을 겪지 못하고 학교를 포기하는 사례가 늘어나 사회문제가 될 우려.) (MEHR, 2006, p. 5)

6) Children from multicultural families are viewed as a **culturally marginalized class** and thus Korean language and Korean culture education …should be implemented.

(다문화가정 자녀들을 ‘문화소외계층’으로 보아 문화예술교육 프로그램 지원 및 한국어 한국문화 교육 실시.) (MEHR, 2006, p. 17)

7) Children from multicultural families need to establish their identity **in order to be a member of Korean society.**

(다문화가정 자녀의 경우 한국사회를 구성하는 일원으로서의 자아정체감 (Identity) 확립.) (MEHR, 2007, p. 7)
For multicultural families who are socioeconomically vulnerable, the support is to resolve the educational gap and academic underachievement through the education of understanding Korean culture – Simultaneously, the support to minimize identity confusion due to social prejudice should be provided. (경제 사회적 기반이 취약한 다문화가정을 대상으로 한 한국어 문화 이해교육 등을 통해 학습 부진 및 교육격차 해소 – 사회적 편견에 따른 정체성 혼란을 최소화하기 위한 지원 병행.) (MEST, 2008, p. 1)

Multicultural students are portrayed as linguistically and culturally deficient and also depicted as emotionally and mentally weak in the policy texts. They have a tendency of “passiveness” that derives from “their language development delay and cultural maladjustment” and they encounter “identity confusion” and “emotional disorders such as ADHD and excessively passive and aggressive behaviors”. In other words, insufficient Korean linguistic and cultural knowledge is linked to their emotional and mental weaknesses and blamed for school failure and low achievement.

**Imagined identities for multicultural students.** In 2006, multicultural students are expected as ‘future interpreters in South-East Asia’, reflecting the background of the majority of
multicultural students in Korea. In this imagined vision, multicultural students’ linguistic diversity is recognized as opening up the possibility that they might become future bilingual interpreters. However, this imagined goal for multicultural students seems to be limited as it did not highlight the value of these multilingual global human resources beyond South East Asia at that time. Then, in 2009, multicultural students are expected to become ‘international leaders’ without any geographic indicator and their multicultural resources are imagined to contribute to students’ achievement of excellence and success at the international level.

Recent Policy Documents (2010-2013)

Defining and labelling multicultural students. In 2010, a new categorization of multicultural students appears. Prior to 2010, there are largely two groups that constitute multicultural students: Students from international marriage families and students from foreign families. In 2010, this simple dichotomous categorization was revised to further classify the category of students from international marriage families into two; Korean-born children from international marriage families and newcomer children from international marriage families. The latter group, newcomer children from international marriage families, is a new addition in 2010 and the majority of my student participants are categorized in this group. The naming of multicultural students has stabilized with seemingly less-biased lexicons since 2012 with ‘multicultural students’ as an official title. However, the label does not mean that it finally obtains a politically neutral meaning as various discourses surrounding this lexical use have been circulated in several social contexts as can be seen in the analysis of newspaper articles below.

It is interesting to note that in this categorizing and labeling practice there is an attempt to distinguish students whose mothers are foreigners by labeling them as students of foreign mothers. This implies that the mother has an impact on education. However, foreign mothers are often blamed for their children’s failure in schooling. The MEP documents imply that foreign mothers’ insufficient Korean language abilities results in their children’s deficient Korean abilities as seen in the following text, “As multicultural students are brought up by a mother who is poor in Korean language, their [students’] Korean proficiency and academic foundations are weak and experience difficulties in getting accustomed to school life” (MEST
2010, p. 5; MEST, 2011, p. 2). It is interesting to note the absence of father’s roles in their children’s schooling in any discussions of contextualizing multicultural students.

**Characterization of multicultural students.** The 2010 multicultural education policy introduces a new category of multicultural students and implies that this group is a newly emergent problem that schools, provincial ministries of education and local communities should pay attention to. The description of this new group is also repeated in 2011. The characteristics of this group of multicultural students are described in the following excerpt.

9) (Characteristics) Born and raised overseas, [newcomer students] have little understanding and experience of Korean language and culture. The students who missed a chance to enter their age-appropriate grade have difficulty continuing their schooling due to experiences of family deconstruction and a gap from schooling.

((특성) 외국에서 출생, 성장하여 한국어, 문화에 대한 이해와 경험이 거의 없고, 학령을 넘긴 자녀는 가족 해체, 학습 공백등으로 학교생활, 상급학교 진학이 어려운 설정.) (MEST, 2010, p. 18; 2011, p. 10)

Based on the document, the recent newcomer students do not have prior knowledge about Korean language and culture in general. In particular, those who did not enter school at the ‘right’ time are generalized as having domestic problems and an educational gap, which leads to them dropping out of school.20

However, the general understanding of multicultural students including all categories of multicultural students seems to be persistent from the earlier policy documents as seen in the following excerpts.

10) As multicultural students are brought up by **a mother who is poor in the Korean language**, their Korean proficiency and **academic foundations are weak** and they experience difficulties in getting accustomed to school life.

(한국어가 미숙한 모의 양육으로 한국어능력 부족, 기초학습이 부족하거나 학교생활 적응 등에 어려움경험.) (MEST, 2010, p. 5; 2011, p. 2)

---

20 Note that in the Korean education system high school education is free but not compulsory. Thus one can argue that students can drop out from schooling more easily since schools cannot force students to continue schooling.
11) The ministry of education considers that multicultural students’ school attendance is still relatively low and that they still experience difficulty in adjusting in school due to language …

(MEST, 2013, p. 2)

Such phrases, ‘brought up by a mother who is poor in Korean language’, ‘academic foundations are weak’, ‘difficulties in getting accustomed to school life’, ‘difficulties in adjusting in school due to language’ shown in the above excerpts from 2010, 2011 and 2013 policy documents indicate that multicultural students are still viewed as socially and academically ‘vulnerable’. In this argument, their immigrant mothers whose Korean is not proficient enough are problematized and directly blamed for multicultural students’ underachievement and maladjustment in school, which reflects the consistent view of multicultural students since 2006.

**Imagined identities for multicultural students.** More recently in 2012, they are envisioned to become ‘creative global human resources’; however, in the document, this vision is not limited to only multicultural students as written in the following, “… to help all students to grow as creative global human resources who understand diversity” (MEST, 2012, p. 1). It is related to the change of policy direction in terms of the main subject of multicultural education. Until the 2012 policy revision, multicultural education policy documents focused on providing programs for multicultural students. However, in 2012, the prepositional phrases such as ‘for all the students’ and ‘of all the students’ appear from the first page of the introductory section that rationalizes the purpose of the policy to the last page of the body section that describes specific plans.

**Analysis of Discursive Practice in MEP**

Although multicultural students are described through various labels from socially and culturally derogatory labels in the earlier documents to less biased forms in recent documents, the discursive practice and recurring discourses of characterizing multicultural students have been
associated with a mostly negative understanding of the group. The only exception where multicultural students are described positively in the policy documents is in the section where the policy proposes the goals and visions of multicultural education for multicultural students. In the very short—and sweet—lines, multicultural students are envisioned or imagined as ‘future interpreters in South-East Asia’ in 2006, ‘international leaders’ in 2009, ‘global human resources’ in 2010, and ‘creative global human resources’ in 2012. This kind of imagining discontinues in 2013 as the policy declares multicultural education for all. Thus, thereafter proposing visions for multicultural students only in the multicultural education policy can be interpreted as treating multicultural students differently from the majority Korean students, which, in turn, can be understood as discriminatory. What follows is my interpretation of what has been described in terms of multicultural students, their languages and cultures in the previous section of linguistic practice of MEP.

**Earlier Policy Documents (2006-2009)**

**Discursive practices of categorization and characterization of multicultural students.**

The two earliest policy documents contain insulting terms such as children of ‘illegal residents’ and ‘mixed blood’. Those terms disappear in the 2008 document. Despite the elimination of derogatory terms in the policy documents, in most cases, these students are repetitively described in stereotyped and biased ways across different sections and different documents as seen above in excerpts 1) to 11). This, in turn, can lead to a stigmatization of minority students and the reinforcement of their status quo as social, economic and cultural minorities. For instance, the use of a medical term such as ‘ADHD’ that stands for Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder in the 2006 policy document to describe multicultural students’ academic and emotional conditions is marked and discursive as this use of the term provides medical grounds for multicultural students’ being deficient which functions to be more persuasive for the government’s intervention to ‘correct’ multicultural students’ problems. In other words, at the policy level, in particular through the earlier policy documents, multicultural students’ schooling issues such as underachievement and maladjustments are all considered as individual problems rather than systemic problems that the society as a whole has a responsibility for. Also, in terms of the description of multicultural students’ identities, multicultural students are treated as not
having an identity that is accepted in Korean society. They are suggested—but really required—to have a Korean cultural identity in order to be accepted in society. The recurrent practice of describing multicultural students in these negative terms in the authoritative texts then contributes to legitimize the minority status of multicultural students and reinforces the social inequality and unequal power relations that exist in Korean society.

**Perception of multicultural students, language and culture.** Based on the description of multicultural students in the earlier policy documents, the dominant understanding of multicultural students and their languages and cultures is that they show linguistic and academic delays as well as being physically and emotionally weak. These perceived characteristics are used as justification for policy change to accommodate multicultural students’ needs of learning the Korean language and culture. In this reasoning, the differences that multicultural students show in comparison to their Korean counterparts is considered as ‘weaknesses’ and their individual ‘problems’ to ‘fix’. In turn, the policies propose that the mastery of Korean language and culture is the only way for multicultural students to overcome ‘weaknesses’ and ‘problems’ and succeed in school and society. This is the logical basis that the policies take as the policy provides support programs exclusively for multicultural students in the earlier documents. Moreover, as part of the multicultural education support plan, bilingual education has been addressed since 2006. However, there is no specific strategy for bilingual education mentioned in the 2006, 2007 and 2008 policy documents. It is not until the 2009 MEP that bilingual education is mentioned again but it is for foreign parents of multicultural students to develop their bilingual skills through specific training so they may contribute to teaching in bilingual education. However, the bilingual teacher education programs are designed specifically to help the understanding of the Korean language and culture rather than fostering additive bilingual teacher education since the curriculum example shown in the document consists mostly of courses for understanding the Korean language, literature and culture as seen in Appendix D. In other words, bilingual education in the policy documents has been advocating subtractive bilingual education wherein it aims to help multicultural students to smoothly integrate into the society through promptly learning Korean language and culture using bilingual texts and bilingual lessons as transitional resources for better academic achievement.
In fact, this is in line with bilingual teachers’ teaching practice in Daham High School as discussed in Chapter 5.

As such, in the earlier multicultural policy documents, multicultural students’ heritage languages and cultures are ignored as the policy documents greatly focus on the learning of the Korean language and culture for multicultural students’ integration education. This implies that the early policies take assimilationist approaches. In particular, the very first policy document for multicultural education uses conflicting metaphors such as a ‘cultural melting pot’ approach for democratic integration. The meaning of ‘melting pot’ refers to being assimilated into a new form by melting away one’s original form. In other words, a melting pot approach is to ignore one’s original language, culture and identity and to ‘civilize’ oneself to become a citizen of the host country and thus, the metaphor is often used for an aggressive assimilationist approach (Harper, 1997) and in the language-as-problem orientation (Ruiz, 1984). In this context, the way that a melting pot approach is practiced cannot be democratic; rather, it is autocratic and suppressive. This confusing expression quickly disappears in the following year’s revision in 2007.

From the point of critical multicultural education, this multicultural education policy then, reflects a biased practice, an assimilationist approach that focuses on correcting multicultural students’ differences by providing ‘special programs’ in the learning Korean language and culture in order for multicultural students to conform to an accepted identity in Korean society. This biased conceptualization of multicultural education leads to legitimizing the existing prejudice and social inequality. In other words, as Nieto and Bode (2011) argue, the dominant social and cultural group internalizes that their culture and language are the norm and desirable and others are peripheral and as not valuable as theirs. Furthermore, the biased textual descriptions referring to multicultural students and their languages and cultures in the earlier policy documents fail to consider the sociopolitical conditions of their schooling such as issues with access to appropriate school options, tracking, high-stakes tests, and transition support for these multicultural students all which influence either their success or failure in schooling (Banks, 2010; Cummins, 2001; Nieto & Bode, 2011).

**Recent Policy Documents (2010-2013)**
Discursive practices of categorization and characterization of multicultural students.

As noted earlier, multicultural students are more consistently labelled as ‘multicultural students’ in the policy documents since 2010. However, it is interesting to note that the discursive practice of continuous categorization and the distinction between the category of ‘multicultural’ and ‘general’ is persistent. The distinction between ‘multicultural’ students and ‘general’ students referring to Korean students, and between ‘multicultural’ students’ parents and ‘general’ students’ parents is still present in the recent policy documents. Although multicultural education is for all students according to the policy texts, the practice of demarcation between ‘multicultural’ as marginalized and ‘general’ as the norm is continuously made by repeatedly distinguishing the groups in noun and prepositional phrases as seen in the following: “all the students including general students and multicultural students…” (MEST, 2012, p. 1), “bilingual education that multicultural students and general students learn together…” (p. 1), “the Minister of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology shared opinions with not only general students’ parents but also multicultural students’ parents…” (p. 1), and “A club where multicultural students’ parents and general students’ parents participate together will increase the interaction with the parents of general students” (p. 6). The repetitive pattern such as ‘multicultural’ students and ‘general’ students throughout different sections reinforces the status of multicultural students as socially marked and the use of word ‘general’ implies that Korean students are socially unmarked and thus the social norm.

In particular, the position of the parents of multicultural students and the parents of general students in the above texts is unequally distributed. In this text, “the Minister of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology [MEST] shared opinions with not only general students’ parents but also multicultural students’ parents…” (MEST, 2012, p. 1), the action of the Minister’s sharing opinions with general students’ parents is interpreted as common and unmarked; however, sharing with multicultural students’ parents is uncommon and marked. This implies that the Minister made an extra effort to communicate with multicultural students’ parents. In this sense, multicultural students’ parents are considered as the recipients of special attention and care from the authoritative figure such as the Minister of MEST. Also, in this text “A club where multicultural students’ parents and general students’ parents can participate
together can activate the interaction with general students’ parents” (p. 6) which is part of the section for suggesting strategies to strengthen education for multicultural students’ parents, the activation or invigoration of the interaction with general students’ parents is written as a much appreciated and invaluable process for educating multicultural students’ parents. In this context, general students’ parents as the dominant social group are positioned as mercy-providers and their knowledge is considered as much more valuable and appreciated. This passage that is produced by the authoritative power reproduces the unequal power relations existing in the society between the dominant and the dominated. This discursive practice embedded in group categorization and distinction positions multicultural families as marginalized and suppressed subjects and ‘general’ Korean families as the dominant group whose social power is further strengthened through the policy intervention.

Perceptions of multicultural students, language and culture. Despite the use of such terms as ‘global’ and ‘international’ which are set as proposed imagined characteristics or identities for multicultural students by the policies, multicultural students are expected to be beneficial human resources for the nation as seen in the following text:

In order to help multicultural students to grow as a valuable human resource of our society, ‘school’ should play a central role to strengthen their talents and support their weakness…

(다문화학생이 우리 사회의 소중한 인재로 성장 할 수 있도록 ‘학교’가 중심이 되어 재능을 살리고 부족한 부분은 지원하며…) (MEST 2012, p. 7)

In other words, these students are imagined as global and international human resources but they are expected to invest themselves and their linguistic and cultural identities in order to meet the nation’s needs and benefits which imply both a nationalistic and a neoliberal approach to development of human resources.

In particular, the 2012 policy stresses the swift assimilation for multicultural students to be ‘acceptable’ members of Korean society and emphasizes economically useful human resources and attempts to link private business sectors to support multicultural students and to deregulate policy around mentoring programs for which university students are encouraged to volunteer to
be mentors for multicultural students without getting paid—instead, academic incentives as a
form of payment—and at the same time without receiving any professional training. This
neoliberal approach is also shown in the emphasis on multicultural alternative schools
specializing in vocational education specifically designed for multicultural students in the 2010,
2011 and 2012 MEP documents. However, no alternative forms of schooling specifically those
that may prepare multicultural students for post-secondary education are suggested. This implies
that multicultural students are encouraged to develop socially and economically useful skills to
find a job with only high school credentials and are expected to contribute to the nation’s
economic system. In this light, the ‘global’ and ‘international’ human resources as the imagined
identities for multicultural students connote ‘economic’ human resources for the nation-state in
the globalized era.

Regarding the division between multicultural students and Korean students that is clearer in the
earlier policy documents as discussed above, the more recent policy documents attempt to blur
the boundary between ‘multicultural’ and ‘Korean’. For instance, the ministry of education
introduced a welcoming diversity policy in 2012, articulating that multicultural education is for
all students by emphasizing an understanding of cultural diversity as a society. Yet, the power
inequality still exists between multicultural students as the ‘recipient of special care’ and Korean
students as the ‘provider of care and resources’. This unequal treatment in the policy documents
contributes to institutionalizing this inequality in schooling. For instance, Korean students can
be mentors to multicultural students and get academic incentives but not vice versa. In this
educational structure, multicultural students’ knowledge in language and culture is not
considered as valuable. Rather, multicultural students’ linguistic and cultural identities are
treated as incomplete and incompetent.

Linguistic Analysis & Analysis of Discursive Practices in News Media Articles

In the analysis of news media articles, the linguistic choices in labelling multicultural students
and the descriptions of multicultural students and their language and cultures are delineated and
interpreted simultaneously since it is difficult to separate the social agents from their context in
the story as often news media articles contain a specific event or story of the main subjects. This
feature of news articles is different from the MEP documents where information of the social agents is not necessarily connected in a coherent story. Rather, in fact, in the MEP texts, the information regarding multicultural students is delineated in bullet point form in a straightforward manner which often constitutes rationale/background, goals, strategies, and expectation. In this style of framing, the MEP’s group categorization based on the definition and rigid—yet, stereotyped at times—characterization of multicultural students seems to be a significant policy strategy to administer and control the production and reproduction of knowledge, power and ideology. In contrast, news articles tend to deliver the arguments using significant events and stories that range from individuals’ anecdotes to national and international public figures’ narratives. Thus, it seems to be natural to describe, interpret and explain all at the same time regarding the perception of multicultural students, their languages and cultures in the genre of news articles. Also, where relevant, the analysis of discursive practices in the news media articles attempts to make interconnections with the MEP analysis which makes this part of the analysis inherently intertextual. However, the further interconnection between MEP documents and news articles is discussed in the analysis of discourse as sociocultural practice (Fairclough, 1992, 2003).

In terms of organizing ideas and presenting analyses of news articles, this section also attempts to examine the perspectives of diversity across time as presented in the earlier section. Then, the analysis is redressed in terms of ideological orientations, right-wing versus left-wing perspectives that enable the analysis of the somewhat invisible historical events to make them more visible. Thus, the following section addresses the linguistic analysis and the analysis of discursive practices in terms of time and ideology. Note that Chosun (CS) and Don-A (DA) newspapers are historically known as the right-wing-oriented and Hangyeore (HG) & Kyeonghyang (KH) newspapers are historically considered as the left-wing-oriented (M.O. Kang, 2011, 2015).

**Earlier News Articles (2006-2009)**
Labelling multicultural students. Multicultural students are called either children of multicultural families or students of multicultural families throughout the 27 news articles that were selected from 2006 until 2013. Based on the descriptions, typical multicultural students in the news media are children of a Korean father and a non-Korean mother, which is the most common constituent of multicultural families based on the statistics (MPAS, 2012; MEST, 2012a). Prior to 2010, the labels used for multicultural students in the news media, other than ‘children or students of multicultural families’ are ‘mixed blood’, ‘Multiculture’, ‘Subjects for social care’, ‘New Citizens’, and ‘guards to protect our agricultural villages’. The following short excerpts show how these terms are used in the news articles.

12) [The press was] busy finding successful cases for mixed blood like Hines Ward and Daniel Henry.


13) If we think of our future when these children become ‘guards’ to protect our agricultural villages and become ‘youth who are responsible of our nation’s territorial security, then their problem is our problem.

(이들이 장차 우리 농촌을 지킬 ‘지킴이’이고, 또 우리 국토방위를 담당할 ‘청년들’이라는 것을 생각하면, 이들의 문제는 곧 우리의 문제다.) (Kim, J., May 19, 2008, CS)

14) They are discriminated as being academically deficient at school. And in case of boys, they cannot go and serve military service for being a mixed-blood child.

(학교에서는 학습부진아라고 차별받습니다. 그리고 남자 아이들의 경우에는 혼혈아라 해서 군대에도 가지 못합니다.) (Kim S., June 21, 2009, KH)

15) These are cultural carriers and the people who can play a role of bridging countries in the future. In my personal opinion, these are ‘new citizens’. They are new citizens.

(이들은 문화 운반자들이며 향후 국가간 가교역할을 할 수 있는 사람들입니다. 제 개인적으로는 이들을 ‘new citizen’으로 봅니다. 새로운 시민들이요.) (Do, J. & Lim, A., June 21, 2009, KH)
16) One time, huge criticism was aroused in society because of the expression “multiculturals, stay” said by a homeroom teacher asking students from multicultural families to stay after school. (담임선생님이 다문화가정 학생들을 방과후 남으라고 하면서 “다문화 남아”라고 말한 것이 물의를 일으킨 적이 있었다.) (Lee, M., October 21, 2009, HG)

17) I urge this term [subjects for social care] to be changed or revised so that these people, the subjects for social care, study peacefully without feeling discriminated against. (따라서 ‘사회적 배려 대상자’인 그들이 차별을 느끼지 않고 마음 편하게 공부할 수 있도록 용어 개정을 촉구한다.) (Lee, M., October 21, 2009, HG)

Most instances where these biased terms are used illustrate that multicultural students have been associated with negative images and/or situated in an oppressed and discriminated conditions except for one case where multicultural students are conceptualized as the concept of ‘new citizen’ who can play a beneficial role for the nation as in excerpt 15. Some terms are highly racist and derogatory such as ‘mixed-blood’ (혼혈, Honhyeol) as the lexicon is overtly straightforward to intend othering, which is also seen in the early MEP documents. The term, ‘mixed-blood’, along with ‘mixed-race’ or ‘mixed-breed’ (잡종, Jabjong), is used often to distinguish multicultural students from Koreans. The word, Honhyeol, or Jabjong is used in the context where multicultural students are excluded from social duties and treated as inferior due to the difference of blood from pure-blood (순혈, Sunhyeol) Koreans. This dichotomy between pure-blood (순혈, Sunhyeol) and mixed-blood (혼혈, Honhyeol/Jabjong), however, is discriminatory as used in the way that pure-blood Koreans are the norm and superior whereas mixed-blood Koreans are the problem and inferior. Even in the article that has the positive intention of welcoming ‘mixed-blood’ Koreans described in excerpt 12, the report admits that there had been a scarcity of positive stories about ‘mixed-blood’ Koreans. This article attempts to create a counter-image regarding ‘mixed-blood’ Korean only after Hines Ward21 and Daniel

---

21 Hines Ward was an American football player and serves as an NBC studio analyst of football games. He was born to a Korean mother and an African American father.
Henney\(^{22}\) started to gain media attention in Korea as successful ‘mixed-blood’ figures who are related to Korean ethnicity in Sports and Movies. Despite its intended positive tone towards ‘mixed-blood’ Koreans, the article connotes that the societal perception toward these individuals had been negative around that time.

Other terms, such as ‘multiculture/multiculturals’, ‘subjects for social care’, ‘guards to protect our agricultural villages’, are also discriminatory as they are presented in the creation of unequal power relations between multicultural students and the majority of Korean students. In most articles prior to 2010, these biased terms are used without challenging prejudiced connotations of the words except for one case presented in excerpt 17. The reporter of the article attempts to raise linguistic awareness of public texts by criticizing the use of the term in the multicultural education policy documents stating that it has a discriminatory function in society and calling for the revision of the term at the policy level. Furthermore, the word, ‘multiculture’ as in excerpt 16, is used in a context where multicultural students may feel discriminated against or at least made to feel uncomfortable as their differences are perceived and treated as a problem and thus they are in need of special attention and care by teachers and schools. These treatments serve to reproduce inequity and injustice existing between Koreans and multicultural students as these terms situate multicultural students in socially, economically and academically deficient conditions.

**Perceptions of multicultural students, languages and cultures.** Multicultural students are described as linguistically, culturally, socioeconomically and mentally deficient and can cause social problems as seen throughout the news articles prior to 2010. The following excerpts reflect these views.

18) Students from multicultural families number approximately 25,000. Although half of these students are still in elementary school, if we neglect these students, they can become social problems and barriers to social integration.

(학령기 다문화가정 자녀는 2만 5000여 명에 이른다. 이 중 절반은 아직

---

\(^{22}\) Daniel Henny is a model and actor in the US and Korea. He was born to a Korean American mother and an Irish American father. He became famous in Korea after he appeared in a Korean TV soap opera called My Lovely Samsun.
초등학생이지만 이들을 방치할 경우 사회적 문제가 되고 사회 통합에도 걸림돌이 될 수 있다. (Kim, H., October 25, 2008, DA)

19) If the students became juvenile delinquents because they were not absorbed into our culture and their self-esteem is not affirmed, the cost and the damage that our society may receive will be huge. Think of the violence that happened in France.

(우리 문화에 흡수되지 않고, 자긍심을 느끼지 못해 비행 청소년이 되면, 나중에 우리 사회가 안게 되는 피해나 비용은 굉장히 큽니다. 프랑스에서 일어났던 유혈 폭력사태를 보세요.) (Kang, H., January 10, 2009, DA)

20) [Migrant women] from underdeveloped nations are portrayed as struggling from poverty, possessing little education, not proficient in the Korean language, incompetent in other skills, passive, and incapable. So, policies and a bill are being enacted based on the merciful perspective that [we have to] help these women to play an appropriate role as mothers and wives. These views derive from deeply rooted Korean ethnocentrism.

(저개발·빈곤 국가에서 온, 학력이 낮은, 한국어도 못하는, 다른 능력도 낮으며 수동적이고 무력하다는 이미지죠. 그래서 이들이 엄마로, 부인으로 제대로 된 역할을 하도록 하기 위해선 도와줘야 한다는 온정주의, 시혜적 입장에서 범안·정책의 틀이 만들어졌고, 만들어지고 있다는 겁니다. 한국 자민족 우월주의가 깊이 갈려있는 것이죠.) (Do & Lim, June 21, 2009, KH)

21) Migrant women mothers are in agony because their children are treated differently in early child care centers, schools and after-school centers with the reason that they are children of multicultural families. What’s important for them is that they do not want to be considered as different or exotic beings from others.

(이주여성 엄마들은 자녀들이 어린이집이나 학교, 방과후 생활에서 다문화가정의 자녀란 이유로 달리 대접받는 것을 고통스러워합니다. 이질적이고 다른 존재로 보지 않으려고 하는 것이 중요하다는 것이죠.) (Lee, S., June 21, 2009, KH)

The above excerpts describe how multicultural students, their languages and cultures are perceived at the societal level in the late 2000s. The dominant message is that multicultural students are considered as potential harm to society if they are not assimilated successfully into
the mainstream society as seen in Excerpts 18 and 19.\textsuperscript{23} Thus, their deficient linguistic and cultural knowledge and maladjustment in schooling should be ‘fixed’ for their successful integration into Korea by having a uniformed identity as a Korean.

The role of mothers is described as extremely important for their children’s education particularly in Korea in Excerpts 20 and 21. Both excerpts indicate that assimilation can be a panacea to the existing problems that the multicultural families have. Nonetheless, it is interesting to note that the spokesperson in Excerpt 20 criticizes Korea’s racist orientations and perceptions of ethnic superiority over economically underdeveloped nations where most migrant mothers are from. She argues that this ethnic superiority in turn has created the social discourse where ‘We’ as the superior group should help these ‘inferior’ mothers to function ‘appropriately’ as a mother and wife in Korea by educating them ‘appropriately’. She asserts that this discourse leads to the assimilation-oriented policy reforms related to multicultural families.

Excerpt 21 highlights the migrant mothers’ feelings regarding their children’s experience due to difference. Based on the report, migrant mothers suffer from the discriminatory responses that their children receive in public institutions indicating that difference is considered as a source of discrimination as if they were the seed of the problem. This implies the existing societal discourse that migrant mothers are a source of problems related to multicultural students. This discourse of blaming the mothers for multicultural students’ failure in school adjustment and academic achievement is also shown in the policy reports that fault mothers’ responsibilities of their children’s failures in schooling which in turn became one of the rationales to support education for multicultural children’s mothers.

The earlier news reports predominantly reveal that multicultural students’ linguistic and cultural differences are forms of social harm and are problems that have to be resolved whether through individual efforts or collective efforts as society. In this view, multicultural students’ cultural

and linguistic assimilation is considered as solution, which reflects the perspectives of the earlier multicultural policy reports.

Recent News Media Articles (2010-2013)

Labelling multicultural students. In more recent news articles, although more positive titles for multicultural students appear in some cases, still many news articles report that derogatory terms are persistently used to dehumanize cultural minorities in Korea. The following excerpts exhibit the mixed messages co-existing in the naming of multicultural students.

22) Not only do they work very hard but they also have intelligent brains and great abilities to assimilate into Korean culture. These ‘New Koreans’ are the advanced human resources that developed countries such as German, France, and Japan desire to have. (공부를 열심히 할 뿐만 아니라 두뇌가 아주 명석하고 한국문화에 대한 동화력이 대단하다. 바로 이런 ‘뉴 코리안’이 지금 독일 프랑스 일본 등 선진국들이 탐내는 고급인력이다.) (An, December 2, 2011, DA)

23) Most of all, we should create a social atmosphere where children of multicultural families are free from discriminations and prejudices. The word ‘Kosian (Korean + Asian)’ also seems to be biased expression. (무엇보다 다문화가정의 어린이들이 차별과 편견에서 자유로울 수 있는 사회풍토가 조성되어야 한다. 코시안 (Korean+Asian)이라는 말도 불평등 의식이 담긴 표현 같다.) (Yu, I., December 9, 2012, KH)

24) Hwang has been loved among the world netizens as he became famous for his dance in the music video ‘Gangnam style’ and is being called ‘Little Psy’. However, recently some netizens are harassing him, calling him ‘inferior mixed race’ after the fact that his mother is Vietnamese was revealed. (황군은 인터넷 조회 수 15억건을 넘긴 ‘강남스타일’로 세계 네티즌 사이에서 ‘리틀 싸이’로 불리며 사랑받고 있다. 그러나 어머니가 베트남 사람이라는 사실이
As long as the situation where multicultural children themselves are suffering from the fact that they are children of parents from other nations and other ethnicities and that they are not pure-blood Korean.

(다문화 아이들 스스로가 자신이 다른 국가 다른 민족 출신 부모의 자식이고 순혈 한국인이 아니라는 사실에 괴로워하는 상황이 계속되는 한, 다문화 문제는 결코 해결 될 수 없다.) (Lee J., August 21, 2013, HG)

Although ‘new Koreans’ in Excerpt 22 referring to assimilated multicultural individuals are described as beneficial human resources for the nation, who can be entitled as ‘new Koreans’ is determined by their individual efforts to successfully assimilate into Korean culture and speak fluent Korean. In other words, they are required to eliminate their foreignness and Koreanize themselves to be considered as ‘new Koreans’.

Based on the labeling practice presented in most recent articles, multicultural students are still labelled as the racially and culturally discriminated terms such as ‘Kosian’, ‘not pure-blood’ and ‘inferior mixed-blood race’ as seen in the above Excerpts 23, 24, and 25, which reflects the societal discourse surrounding these individuals and are continuously persistent in the recent news media. More evidence of these persistent perceptions is shown in the following section.

**Perceptions of multicultural students, languages and cultures.** Multicultural students’ linguistic and cultural differences are blamed for their school maladjustment and their failure or withdrawal from schooling. The following excerpts vividly uncover these perceptions.

26) These people who dropped out from school cannot find a job, become a failure in life and harbor complaints and enmity against Korean society.

(학업을 중도에서 포기한 이들은 제대로 된 일자리를 찾지도 못한 채 낙오자가 되 우리 사회에 대한 불만과 적개심을 키워 갈 수밖에 없다). (“Think of the children from multicultural families in 10 years,” March 8, 2010, CS)

27) According to one U.S. study, highly educated parents used 2000 words with their children per hour, but blue-collar parents used just 1300. The difference in the range of vocabulary
had a tremendous impact on the mental development of their children. The poor level of Korean spoken by a foreign father or mother and their lack of diversity in vocabulary inevitably has a negative impact on the children's language skill and mental development. Some 17 percent of migrant mothers are ethnic Koreans from China, and they only speak poor Korean. About 53 percent of multicultural families make the minimum wage, so they cannot afford expensive private cram schools or kindergarten education.

(미국의 한 연구에 따르면 전문직 부모는 자녀에게 시간당 2000 개의 단어를 사용하지만 노동자 계층의 부모는 1300 개의 단어를 쓴다고 한다. 두 계층 부모들의 이런 어휘 사용량 차이가 자녀의 지능 발달에 큰 영향을 미친다는 것이다. 외국인 엄마의 서툴 우리말과 비타한 어휘 사용량이 자녀의 우리말 습득 수준과 지능 발달에 부정적 영향을 줄 수밖에 없다. 외국인 엄마중 서툴게나마 우리말을 할 줄 아는 중국 조선족 출신은 전체의 17%뿐이다. 다문화 가정은 53%가 소득이 최저생계비 이하로서 특기 과외는 물론이고 유치원 교육도 제대로 못 시킨다.)

(“Think of the children from multicultural families in 10 years,” March 8, 2010, CS, English texts available on the online Chosun English version) 24

28) The children who accompany foreign migrant women for re-marriage with Korean men are called ‘midway-arrived children’. These children have created a new problem of multicultural families since last year

(한국인과 재혼(再婚)해 이주해온 외국 여성들이 데려온 자녀를 ‘중간 입국 자녀’라고 부른다. 이들은 지난해부터 다문화 가정의 새로운 문제로 등장했다). (Lee, J. March 9, 2010, CS)

29) We are against the idea of specialized education for the children of multicultural families. This is the act of racism. It is because this kind of education, in the name of multiculturalism which should be a space of [knowledge] exchange and sharing, forces the children to become like Korean children … I think that this time, Korean children need to

---

24 This particular news article is available both in English and in Korean. This English excerpt is not translated by me as it is the English version that the online newspaper provides. However, I noticed that the English version is mistranslated in one part, that is, the word ‘mothers’ in Korean is translated as ‘parents’. For my analysis, I will take the standpoint embedded in the Korean version of the article, to point out the emphasis on mothers’ role in their children’s education.
우리는 다문화가정 자녀 특수 교육에 반대합니다. 이는 인종차별적인 행위입니다. 다문화라는 이름 아래 교육과 공유가 되어야 할 교육을 한국 아이들과 똑같이 되도록 강요하는 것이기 때문이죠...저는 이 기회에 한국 아이들이 ‘특수한 교육’을 받을 필요가 있다고 생각합니다(웃음).) (Ko, G., March 3, 2011, HG)

30) It can be shameless that we expect innovations and visions from migrants while not protecting their basic human rights. … We have to break down the double and triple layered barriers of [deeply rooted] pure-blood ideology. (이주자들의 기본 인권도 지켜주지 못하면서 그들이 가져다 줄 도전과 혁신의 에너지를 기대하는 건 염치없는 일인지 모르겠다. …이중삼중으로 둘러친 순혈주의의 벽을 깨야 한다). (Gu, J., July 3, 2011 KH)

31) Elena Stikova (pseudonym). She came to Korea after graduating from a university in the Ukraine and now she works at one of the conglomerate companies after she got married to a Korean man with whom she fell in love with while studying in Korea. Tran Chu (pseudonym). She graduated from a prestigious university in Ho Chi Minh, received an MA in Seoul with a scholarship from POSCO, got married with a department head in a bank and currently is working in the bank with her husband. You can find something in common among these people when you teach them. Not only do they work very hard but they also have intelligent brains and great abilities to assimilate into Korean culture. These ‘New Koreans’ are advanced human resources that developed countries such as Germany, France, and Japan desire to have. (엘레나 스티코바(가명). 우크라이나에서 대학을 졸업하고 우리나라에 와 공부하다 한국 남자와 사랑에 빠져 결혼한 곤 대기업에서 근무하고 있다. 트란 추(가명). 베트남 호찌민의 명문대학을 졸업하고 포스코 청암장학금으로 서울에 와 석사학위를 받고 모 은행과장과 짝을 맺어 같은 은행에서 일하고 있다. 이들을 가르쳐 보면 몇 가지 공통점이 있다. 공부를 열심히 할 뿐만 아니라 두뇌가 아주 명석하고 한국문화에 대한 통화력이 대단하다. 바로 이런 ‘뉴 코리안’이 지금 독일 프랑스 일본 등 선진국들이 탐내는 고급인력이다.) (An, 2011 Dec, DA)
32) The victims of school bullying are the children who are slow in many ways, for instance, mentally and physically immature, not linguistically proficient, and are slow behavior-wise. Children from multicultural families can easily be the target [of school bullying]. It is a characteristic of youth development that children tend to isolate others who are different.


33) Multicultural families are situated in socioeconomically vulnerable conditions as well as being culturally different. Their difficulties in social adjustment lead to negatively influencing their children who are closely attached to their mother. They have difficulties adjusting in Korean schools in the beginning school years as their language development is slow. As a result, there are various problems for instance, a high drop-out rate and low rate of continuing education in high school and university. ...Until now, it appears to emphasize ‘integration’ into Korean society as the basic theme of the policies, however, [I believe] that there is a need for an assimilationist policy that incorporates the characteristics of ‘multiculture’.... Being bicultural by embodying their mother’s culture and their own culture can lead to establishing a healthy personality by accepting their roots positively and developing their individual capability in more great deal.

(문화적 차이뿐 아니라 다문화가족은 특성상 사회경제적으로 취약한 상태에 있다. 결혼이주 여성의 적응상의 어려움은 어머니와 가장 밀착된 자녀에게 부정적인 영향을 주게 된다. 어려서는 언어 발달이 늦어 학교생활에 적응하는 데 어려움을 겪게 된다. 이에 따라 학교 중퇴율이 높고 상급학교 진학률이 낮아지는 등 여러 측면에서 문제를 안고 있다. ...지금까지는 다양한 정책의 기조가 한국사회에의 ‘통합’을 강조하고 있는 것처럼 보이는데, 다문화의 특성을 살린 동화정책도 필요하다고 본다. ...어머니 문화와 본국 문화를 동시에 수용하는
There are needs for more remedial education for language and school subjects for children from multicultural families to be integrated in the relations with friends. Also, one-on-one mentoring programs should be broadened by connecting these students with teachers, university students, retired teachers and volunteers as these children are in need of someone to converse.

(“Provide mentor support to the children from multicultural families who suffer from school bullying,” January 9, 2012, CS).

If we do not work hard to embrace these people, in the near future, ‘midway-arrived children’ can become a serious social problem.

(“이들을 적극 끌어안는 노력이 없다면 가까운 미래에 중도 입국 자녀는 심각한 사회문제가 될지도 모른다.” (Hong, G., February 2, 2012, CS)

Only 85% of children from multicultural families attend elementary school, only 60% attend middle school and only 30% attend high school. The major cause is incompetent Korean language and cultural differences.

(“Multicultural education that brings dream and confidence,” December 26, 2012, KH)

Most excerpts in the above focus on multicultural students as a problem for Korean society and the potential consequences of this problem except for Excerpts 29 and 30. Namely, multicultural students have linguistic and cultural difficulties in schooling and as a result, they tend to have low academic achievements and have fewer opportunities for employment and become ‘a failure in life’. They are perceived to have the potential to cause serious social problems in the future.
In Excerpt 27, parents of multicultural families are positioned as blue-collar workers and poor speakers of Korean. The texts attempt to explain why multicultural students whose mothers are not Korean experience difficulty in school. However, this depiction is problematic in that this socioeconomic class dichotomy between privileged and underprivileged ignores the sociolinguistic and sociocultural complexity in understanding the dominant Korean ethnic group and non-Korean ethnic group and lacks empirical evidence regarding the sociolinguistic and sociocultural factors influencing language learning and schooling.

First, although Korean parents may use more words in Korean while non-Korean parents may use fewer Korean words, non-Korean parents may use more words in languages other than Korean, which is clearly not harmful to their language development. Studies in bilingual child-rearing show no evidence of any long-term delay associated with exposure to two languages in the home (Cummins, 2001). Moreover, research on bilingual learners show cognitive benefits such as increased executive function, metalinguistic awareness, and socioemotional skill development (Bialystok, 2001; Kovács & Mehler, 2009). Second, most students in Korea spend more time at school and private institutions rather than at home; however, this pathological aspect of Korean children from Korean families is not mentioned as a problem but is implied as the norm and as a symbol of economic status (i.e., being able to economically afford private education). Third, the news reporter from excerpt 27 overlooks or avoids mentioning why multicultural families only make minimum wage, although the reporter credits expensive private education and kindergarten education as important criteria for the development of language skills and mental development. In other words, there is lack of sociopolitical consideration of multicultural families’ situated conditions in Korea in relation to their children’s education.

‘Midway-arrived’ students, referring to newcomer multicultural students, have been considered as a new social problem in more recent years. As seen in Excerpts 28 and 35, they are described as having little knowledge of the Korean language and culture when they transfer to a Korean school. However, these articles tend to focus on simplistic cause and effect relationships in understanding the students’ academic failure by blaming multicultural students’ lack of knowledge in Korean language and culture. What is unsaid regarding multicultural students’ academic failure is that the students do not have full access to the Korean education system and
Korean society has structural barriers which in turn contribute to students’ failure. Without discussing these societal and institutional conditions, this line of thought is a practice of stereotyping and stigmatizing multicultural students and legitimizing the status quo of inequality.

Moreover, multicultural students are perceived as disabled persons in many areas, for instance, physically, mentally, linguistically, and behavior-wise as written in Excerpts 32 and 36. The text stereotypes multicultural students as abnormal and deficient beings. This stereotyping is used to explain why multicultural students easily become targets for school bullying. In this sense, the perception of multicultural students’ problems related to bullying and harassment is that the social problems that they face are reflective of ‘their’ mistakes, not ‘our’ structural and systemic contradictions, which echoes Kang, M.’s (2015) observation in her media analysis on migrant Others in Korea. This perspective further contributes to reproducing stereotypes toward multicultural students. Also, problematizing multicultural students’ social attitudes and language reflects bias by faulting multicultural students’ behaviors only and not examining Korea’s social and institutional structures and the sociopolitical conditions where these students are situated to be disabled and silenced.

Furthermore, some texts above show a simplistic assumption that being fully assimilated into Korean culture indicates success as seen in excerpt 31 and not being able to assimilate means failure, as seen in Excerpts 26 and 35. In particular, the view of multicultural students who are not assimilated into society as detrimental reflects the diversity-as-problem/threat for the society orientation. Multicultural students who are not able to assimilate into the mainstream society are described as a potential harm to society. In contrast, those who are successful to integrate into society are depicted as positive individuals. For instance, Excerpt 31 uses examples of foreign women who are famous for their assimilationist endeavours which represent success. The examples and suggestions mentioned above are all in line with the perspective that multicultural students are the ones that have to be changed through an assimilation process for successful social integration.

However, some articles seem to show progressive perspectives of multicultural students, their cultures and languages as seen in Excerpts 29, 30 and 33. Excerpt 29 is a quote directly cited by
Michelle who is known as a transgender Filipino woman migrant worker in Korea and works for labor workers’ workplace conditions in Korea. She criticizes the specialized education program that is designed for assimilating multicultural students and separate schools for multicultural students in Korea, arguing that the specialized education should be given to Korean students as they need to learn more about diversity. She contends that the given specialized education program only for multicultural students is racial discrimination in that this special education under the title of ‘Damunhwa’ (multi-culture) forces multicultural students to be like Korean students and that it is not for mutual knowledge exchange or sharing. In other words, based on Michelle’s understanding, this specialized education is unidirectional, requiring only multicultural students to understand Korean language and culture and to be normalized as Koreans having a uniformed Korean identity since these students are considered as ‘abnormal’. This perception of multicultural education in Korea reinforces the analysis of discursive practices in particular in relation to the mentoring program that is suggested in the 2012 MEP document wherein the relations of power between multicultural students and Korean students are consequently unequally distributed in the institutional structure as the Korean students are positioned as the mentors and multicultural students are mentees.

In Excerpt 30, the reporter criticizes the deeply rooted Korean ethnocentrism and existing social discrimination against multicultural students, arguing for the protection of these members’ basic human rights and rejection of Korean ethnocentrism. Reflecting on a similar perspective of multicultural students and their languages and cultures with this, the source article, in which Excerpt 33 is a part of, advocates for additive bilingual and bicultural education for multicultural students. This perspective values bi/multiple linguistic and cultural knowledge of the learners as an important asset rather than as viewing it as a ‘problem’.

It is interesting to note that more right-wing oriented press such as CS and DA shows a tendency toward assimilationist approaches as a response to the currently emerging diversity as seen in Excerpts 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35. In contrast, more left-wing oriented press such as HG and KH tend to show diversity-as-right orientations by criticizing existing racism and the lack of public awareness of human rights for cultural minorities in society as seen in Excerpts 29 and 30.
Analysis of Sociocultural Practices in MEP and Newspaper Articles

Korean Ethnocentrism and Pure-blood Ideology

The government’s conflicting language ideologies and beliefs towards linguistic and cultural diversity are imbued in the practice of naming/labelling, defining and categorizing multicultural students in the MEP documents and are reflected in the social perceptions of multicultural students, their languages and cultures. The language ideology that deems language and culture as problems (Ruiz, 1984) has been predominantly circulated throughout the MEP documents and news articles, legitimizing an assimilationist approach. This assimilationist approach is blatantly explicit in the beginning policy documents overtly suggesting that Korean society should become a “cultural melting pot” (MEHR, 2006, p. 6). This view of multicultural students’ languages and cultures as deficient emphasizes that multicultural students establish Korean social identity positions and encourages them to be active in the social process of Koreanization. In other words, this language ideology viewing different languages and cultures as a problem as well as the support programs reinforcing linguistic and cultural assimilationist approaches in turn functions to legitimize Korean ethnocentrism where linguistic and cultural differences are problematized and should be corrected.

Although this ideological practice in the reproduction of Korean ethnocentrism is invisible in the recent policy reports, it is still exercised through the discursive practices of the authoritative ideas through policy interventions. For instance, in the 2012 MEP under the title of ‘2012 Educational Advancement Plan for Multicultural Students’ (MEST, 2012b), the mentoring program between multicultural students and Korean students and the recommended program for strengthening multicultural students’ parents’ education appear to be effective plans to maximize the interaction between the social minority and majority that is needed for multicultural students’ smooth naturalization into Korea. However, these proposals validate only the Korean language and culture and ignore the importance of heritage languages and cultural repertories in schooling.

This practice of Korean ethnocentrism is more apparent in the news articles from diverse press organizations (i.e., left and right media press) at various times. For instance, the discriminatory and divisive words in labeling multicultural students such as Honhyeol [mixed blood] and
Sunhyeol [pure blood] are ideologically loaded terms which are used to define and distinguish multicultural students in the news articles across time. The use of these terms whether actively or passively reflects Korean ethnocentric supremacy that views pure-blood Koreans as the purist ethnic group, and views mixed-blood Koreans as an ‘inferior mixed race’ (“Blind pure-blood ideology that will ruin the nation's future”, May 2, 2013). Most articles from CS known as the most conservative right-wing press and some articles from DA which is also considered as right-wing press still reproduce this ideology by using the term without consciousness and criticism, thereby further minoritizing multicultural students and legitimizing social inequality and unequal power relations situating the minority at further marginal and peripheral positions. It is, however, worthwhile to note that some articles from HG and KH known as the progressive left-wing press tend to criticize this pure-blood ideology.

Nonetheless, the rigid distinction between Koreans and non-Koreans in terms of the purity of blood does not reflect the reality of actual Koreans. Pai (2000), an expert in Korean historiography, argues that it is a myth that Koreans are a pure-blood ethnic group. He argues that at the time of Goryeo dynasty (918-1392) in Korean history, interracial marriage was not uncommon. Pai contends that this pure-blood theory is ideologically and politically used as propaganda to control people in order to form social unity and secure the nation from others. For instance, in particular, after 1950s’ Korean War, the Korean government attempted to eliminate mixed-blood children, viewing them as a national shame and made appropriate legal conditions for mixed-blood children to be easily adopted by other nations (H. Kim, 2013). By doing this, the nation was believed to have been secured with one blood and one national identity. In light of this historiographic and Korean genealogical understanding, the pure-blood theory to distinguish multicultural students from the general Korean population is hypocritical and discriminatory as present Koreans themselves may not necessarily be the purest ethnic group and distinguishing between others and treating them as a problem based on biological differences is irrational, unethical and discriminatory.

The use of these terms is then an explicit practice of Korean ethnocentrism that considers Koreans as a pure racial group and superior to mixed-blood groups. These assumptions create a social discourse that positions multicultural students as a contaminated race in society. As this
discriminatory practice of Korean ethnocentrism has been constantly practiced, the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination [CERD] (UN, 2007) pointed out the persistence of discrimination existing toward foreigners, migrant workers and their children in South Korea and noted that the widespread institutional use of such terms as ‘pure blood’ and ‘mixed blood’ can lead to policies based on notions of racial superiority. They suggest removing these terms from the school textbooks and all the teaching and learning materials by the government; however, the use of these terms in the news media still remains as shown above.

Discourses of Diversity

Throughout the authoritarian policy documents and news media reports between 2006 and 2013, the notion of diversity is continuously defined against what constitutes ‘Koreanness’. In other words, diversity is consistently understood as something that multicultural students have and that is different from the social norm. This conceptualization is more overtly seen in the earlier multicultural education policy documents and in more conservative news articles. Yet, in recent policy reports, this idea is more covertly embedded and fused with another perspective of diversity that is ‘diversity-as-resource’. As the 2012 multicultural education policy written by the ministry of education declares that multicultural education is for all and that difference should be understood as a ‘talent’, the diversity that multicultural students bring in to school and society is conceptualized as a resource. The plan that the policy includes, however, is mostly related to multicultural students’ educational ‘advancement’ through more intensive Korean language and culture programs.

Often, this discourse of ‘diversity as resource’ or ‘difference as talent’ seems to contribute to recreation of unequal power relations existing between the minority and the dominant Korean groups due to the imbalanced practice of mobilizing resources and knowledge that multicultural families and children have within the education system. For instance, Korean students have more opportunities to receive extra points from helping multicultural students through a mentoring program; however, a structured system wherein multicultural students obtain points for example through teaching foreign languages or helping Korean students is lacking. This systematic inequality can contribute to broadening the academic gaps between multicultural
students and Korean students. Also, Korean parents are positioned as the ones to teach the parents of multicultural students on how to educate their children; however, there is no space created for multicultural parents to equally contribute to guiding Korean children’s education. As a result, the unequal power relationship between Korean families and non-Korea families seems to be maintained through the educational system by positioning multicultural students and their parents as the ‘recipient of special care’ while projecting the idea of Korean students and their parents as the ‘provider of care and resources’. In this biased educational structure, knowledge of different languages and cultures is not considered valuable. Rather, different linguistic and cultural identities are treated as incomplete and incompetent.

The discriminatory practices behind this welcoming discourse of diversity is also exercised in the recent news media articles where only successfully assimilated multicultural individuals are described as resourceful and beneficial and others as detrimental. Thus, within the superficial expression of diversity/difference as resources, diversity is continuously interpreted and practiced as a problem in the MEP documents as well as in the social media space.

**Chapter Summary**

Multicultural students are portrayed as linguistically and culturally deficient and also depicted as emotionally and mentally weak in the MEP documents and news media articles. These perceptions were shown not only through the labeling and categorizing of multicultural students but also through characterization of these learners in a certain way in the MEP texts. In particular, more explicit othering and marginalizing practices are exercised in the earlier MEP documents (e.g., 2006 and 2007), through the reproduction of derogatory terms without challenging them; while the recent MEP documents do not use these terms, they still perpetuate the unequal power relations existing between culturally diverse but minority students and their Korean counterparts. While the positive attempt of the recent MEP documents (e.g., 2012 and 2013) to accommodate diversity as a resource, the policies are likely to fail to achieve their educational goal, that is, ‘multicultural education for all’ regardless of difference. Also, the desired visions of ‘international leader’ or ‘creative global human resource’ for multicultural students may not be reached, due to a failure to provide challenging academic opportunities
through an equitable educational system for multicultural students so they may mobilize their linguistic and cultural knowledge as scaffolding resources for their learning and affirmative identity negotiations.

Although the discourse of diversity-as-problem is prevailing whether explicitly or implicitly across time at the national policy and societal levels, the understanding of diversity seems to be making a shift toward more ‘softer’ assimilationist perspectives or toward the orientation of diversity-as-problem/impediment to assimilation/integration at the more individual level. In other words, the public and societal rhetoric of diversity in Korea prior to 2010 is that the diversity or difference is considered as threat to the society reflecting the strong Korean ethnocentric and pure-blood ideology which in turn leads to forcing multicultural students to conform to the united Korean identity. However, this suppressive and racist perspective seems to have softened as diversity is understood as not so much as threat to the society although it is instead considered as individual problems to social integration. However, within this softened assimilationist response to diversity, a new social discourse regarding multicultural students and families appears both in the recent MEP and news reports. That is, multicultural individuals are considered as the ones to be taken care of by their social dominant counterparts. As a result, the unequal power relationship between Korean families and non-Korean families seems to be maintained through the unequally structured social and educational systems.

Although this social inequality has been recurrent and reinforced, based on the analysis of MEP documents and news media, a counter-discourse that challenges this unequal power relationship between Koreans and multicultural students and families is not entirely absent in the news media. For instance, the Filipino social activist who has been fighting in Korea for foreign workers’ human rights suggested an alternative multicultural education for Korean students who are monolingual and monocultural. In short, the analysis of discourses surrounding multicultural students and their languages and cultures at the governmental and societal level highlights that although problem-oriented responses to diversity in Korea are dominant with deeply rooted Korean ethnocentrism in the earlier stages of multicultural education, divergent orientations of responses to diversity are emerging. However, the discourses of challenging social inequalities and unequal power relations are absent. Accordingly, scarce are policy efforts or suggestions to
create interpersonal spaces (e.g., between students, between students and teachers, between parents, between schools and communities) to alter the relations of power from coercive to collaborative by acknowledging the linguistic and cultural knowledge of minority learners (Cummins, 2001).
Chapter 5

A Case Study of Daham High School’s Multicultural Education

This chapter depicts how culturally and linguistically diverse students in Daham High School are perceived and how their multiple cultural and linguistic identities and knowledge are positioned by teachers, administrators and the students themselves through a case study approach. Daham High School is a vocational alternative high school specifically designed for multicultural students. Daham High School’s approach to multicultural education has a noticeable tendency of assimilationist educational practices. The analysis highlights how the stakeholders in Daham High School perceive their local institution’s multicultural education approaches and multicultural practices as well as details the multicultural students’ reflections of their cross-cultural journey in terms of schooling and their identity negotiations to adapt or resist the social norms of the new society.

Context: Daham High School

Daham high school opened in 2012 as a multicultural alternative vocational high school located in Seoul. Unlike the mainstream general high schools that are required to follow the national curriculum, Daham high school has its own curriculum tailored to the perceived needs of their students all of whom are multicultural. The curriculum is based around three educational themes: Korean language education; cultural adaptation education; and vocational education.

The role of Korean language education and culture adaptation education is to prepare students ultimately for their employment after graduation. The school has a policy that students must take a Korean proficiency test called the TOPIK (Test of Proficiency in Korean) and that they must reach a designated level by the end of the school year in order to move to the next grade and be permitted to graduate. More specifically, students in Grade 10 must reach at least Level 2, students in Grade 11 must reach at least Level 3 and students in Grade 12 should attain Level 4. In order to support this much emphasis on improving learners’ Korean language proficiency, the school has designed Korean language classes within the curriculum and developed extracurricular Korean classes as after-school programs for students who are in need. The rationale of this school policy is to help students prepare for employment, believing that students
may find it easier to find employment when their Korean proficiency is at Level 4. Level 4 indicates a competent Korean speaker who can communicate in common workplaces in Korea. Regarding the cultural adaptation education, cultural elements are added in the syllabus of certain subjects such as social studies and Korean language arts. Also, the school organizes culture trips as part of learning the Korean culture for students. The culture trips include Korean traditional sports events (e.g., Taekgyun which is a Korean traditional martial art) and visiting Korean heritage sites (e.g., Gyeongbokgung which is the main royal palace of the Chosun dynasty which was built in 1935). Through the culture trips, the school attempts to help students familiarize themselves with Korean culture and history, which is considered to be beneficial for swift integration into the Korean society and their future employment.

According to Mr. Lim, the vice-principal in Daham high school, prior to the school’s establishment, a survey among multicultural students had been conducted in order to decide the focus of vocational education for the school. The survey asked participants to list their preferred areas for work. The survey revealed that the first two preferences were tourism and computer related areas. The survey results then contributed to the development of Daham High School’s very first curriculum. As a result, the school’s curriculum for vocational education is designed to support two major areas: Computer media and tourism. The computer media course focuses on equipping student with useful computer skills for future employment in the field. The tourism course also aims to develop interpersonal and communicative skills for multicultural students to succeed in the field of tourism. To further support students in these two areas, the school also provides after-school programs to help students get various certificates related to tourism and computer media such as computer programing certificates like C++ and Microsoft Excel programs and a Barista certificate program.

Furthermore, the school has eight bilingual instructors who speak Korean and their home language (i.e., Mandarin Chinese (henceforth, Chinese), Taiwanese, Vietnamese, Japanese and Mongolian). They can assist students with Korean language issues as well as help them understand course content. The school curriculum states, “[bilingual teachers] are to help multicultural students who have communication difficulties through team-teaching and by teaching students Korean (의사소통이 어려운 다문화가정학생 협력 수업 및 한국어지도를
The team-teaching with bilingual teachers is designed to support “multicultural students who need social care with Korean language education and identity establishment (사회적 배려가 필요한 다문화가정 학생들의 한국어교육과 정체성을 확립한다)” (p. 36). Although the intended role of the bilingual teachers is to help students with translation in all subjects, there are not enough instructors for all of the classes. Therefore, bilingual instructors are only available in the main subjects such as math, science and history. Despite the limited bilingual personnel, it is a distinctive feature of this multicultural high school compared to the mainstream schools.

**Multicultural Students’ Perspectives in Daham High School**

**Mimi**

Mimi was born from Korean-Chinese parents in Yanbian, China. Mimi’s parents were divorced when she was very young and she did not see her father afterwards, thus she does not have many memories of her father. When she was young, her mother often had to travel for employment and as such, Mimi spent a great deal of time living with her maternal aunt in Harbin. As Mimi lived in Korean-speaking communities in Yanbian and Harbin, she spoke Korean as her first language. When Mimi was in Grade 9, her mother moved to Korea. Shortly after, her mother asked Mimi if she would like to move to Korea and Mimi decided to join her mother.

Mimi moved to Korea in the summer of 2010 when she was 17 years old. She was very happy when her mother asked her to come to Korea. Not only could she live with her mother, but she also was longing to live in Korea. She had watched Korean television programs and liked Korean food, fashion and goods even when living in China. When she moved to Korea, she did not feel very strange and it did not seem totally new or uncomfortable to her because she had already known so much about Korea. Soon after moving to Korea she obtained her Korean citizenship and had a strong desire to live in Korea permanently.

While Mimi was happy to live in Korea, she faced and continues to face numerous hurdles. She is struggling in school and is constantly negotiating her identities between linguistic, cultural and social boundaries. Although Mimi’s Korean is good, she seems to lack self-confidence and
motivation to learn. Mimi’s narrative below illustrates her experiences regarding linguistic and cultural differences and depicts how she negotiates her linguistic and cultural identities from her struggles within and outside school.

Mimi’s language and literacies practices. Mimi’s first language is Korean. In her hometown, Yanbian, most people speaks Yanbian-accented Korean although the official languages are both Korean and Mandarin. When she lived in Yanbian, Mimi used Korean predominately with her mother, relatives, and friends. She only used Chinese with the teachers at her school and in Chinese classes. Also, she likes reading Korean novels and comic books and watching Korean TV shows more than Chinese program. Since Mimi’s speech community and her literacy practice in China was Korean, she feels that her Korean was always better than her Chinese.

Mimi’s everyday linguistic practices drastically changed after she moved to Korea. Particularly, after she started school in Korea, oddly enough, Mimi heard and used more Chinese than Korean at school. Although Mimi knew that her school teachers wanted all of the students to use Korean at all times, she was reluctant to follow the Korean-only monolingual policy. In order to maintain her relationships with friends, she had to use Chinese, which is the linguistic symbol of friendship, since most of her friends were from China and were not yet good at Korean and thus used Chinese. In turn, she felt that her Chinese skills were getting better. However, her friends said to Mimi one day not to use Chinese because Mimi’s Chinese was strange in terms of pronunciation and colloquial usage, which made her a little confused about her language use as she said

I have a friend who speaks Chinese well but only talks to me in Korean. She said to me not to use Chinese. She thinks that my Chinese is strange.

(중국말 잘 하는 애 인데 저랑 할 때는 한국말만 씀. 저보고 중국말 하지 말래요. 제가 중국말하면 이상하네요.) (Mimi, 2013, April 30).

Mimi’s literacies investment changed slightly since she moved to Korea. Although she was not spending as much time reading Korean novels and comic books as she used to, she liked the
variety of Korean TV programs since she had greater access to Korean TV channels. Also she liked writing her journal logs in Korean. She mentioned that she won an outstanding award in a school-wide writing contest in Daham high school.

**Perceptions of linguistic and cultural difference.** Mimi retold an interesting story about her and her friends speaking in Chinese. One day when she was chatting with her friends while walking out of school, they were approached by two elderly Korean men who asked them about Chinese culture. The men asked about how Chinese people live. Mimi thought that some people are curious about other cultures and people as she said:

> Because we speak Chinese… some elderly people look at us in a curious way. One day when I and my friends were walking by the school, the elderly men suddenly came to us and asked us about how Chinese people live. I felt neither good nor bad. I thought that they were just curious [about China and Chinese].

(우리는 중국말하니까, …어떤 할아버지 할머니들은 우리가 신기하잖아요. 학교 앞을 지나가는데 갑자기 물어봤어요. 중국은 뭐 어떨까요… 나쁘지도 않고 좋지도 않아요. 그냥 궁금해서 물어본거구나.) (Mimi, 2013, April 30)

This experience was, as she recalls, nothing but amusing as her different culture and language stimulated people’s curiosity.

She also remembered one hostile incident that left her with hurtful memories. In this instance, Mimi was speaking on the phone with a potential Korean employer in Seoul and his reaction to her Yanbian-accented Korean may be seen in the excerpt below.

One time, I made a phone call to apply for a part-time job. The receiver (the employer) listened to my voice [Yanbian-accented Korean] and noticed right away that I was a foreigner. You know… [the kind of feeling] that he started looking down on me?

> Because I was a foreigner, [he was thinking] I was not able to do anything… So, at that time, I felt a little bad.

(그리고 제가 알아차리고 전화를 걸었어요. 근데 거기 사람이 막 제 목소리를 듣고, 제가 외국 사람이 아는 거에요. 약간 무시하는 거 있잖아요?)
Mimi said that the employer noticed that she was not a Korean who spoke the standard variety of Korean as illustrated above. Mimi was then considered unsuitable for the job because she was deemed a foreigner. She may have been considered as a foreigner who did not know enough about Korean culture to work in the clothing store. Mimi felt that the employer disqualified her from even being interviewed in person due to her Yanbian-accented Korean and her foreign background. At the time of her first interview, Mimi mentioned that her Yanbian-accented Korean was more neutralized as she was spending more time in Korea. However, she did emphasize that being able to speak standard Korean would be more beneficial to her future in Korea. As she experienced linguistic discrimination against her idiosyncratic Yanbian-accented Korean which also exhibits distinctive morphological differences from ‘standard’ Korean, her linguistic identity negotiations may have resulted in her developing a more naturalized Korean accent which is closer to the Korean that Seoul residents use. She admits that she still has a local variety in her Korean language which is noticed by teachers as she said that “Teachers think that I am like a local person who is learning Seoul language (선생님들은 제가 지방에서 올라와서 서울말 배우는 사람같더라고요)” (Mimi, 2013, April 30).

Mimi also experienced cultural differences related to age when she once attempted to go to a regular school. She was discouraged to enter the regular school on the grounds that she may not be a good fit for the school due to her age which was three years older than her expected classmates at that time. The following excerpt illustrates a Korean institutional perception on age differences and how Mimi felt about that:

I didn’t think of going to a regular school because I am older [than my expected classmates]. Actually, I asked about school admission at one regular school on the phone. The school [teacher] said that I would not adjust well into the school life due to my age.
문의를 한 적이 있거든요. 그쪽 학교에서도 나이때문에 학교생활을 잘 못할거라고 말했어요.) (Mimi, 2013, May 21)

Mimi phoned the school asking questions regarding admission. After the phone conversation, as she confessed, she was afraid to attend a regular school, having heard that she could be isolated by her peers due to the age difference. Furthermore, the school gave her the impression that they did not want to have anything to do with her. This implies that the school does not want to challenge the existing Korean school culture that can be considered as biased against students of varying ages. Also, the school does not appear willing to create a space for addressing dangerous discourses such as discrimination against age or other languages and cultures. In this sense, Mimi’s linguistic and cultural differences are viewed as a hindrance in schooling and are considered as her own problems that she has to take care of.

Having more negative experiences regarding linguistic and cultural differences, Mimi also seems to negotiate her linguistic and cultural identities according to the expectations of Korean society. For instance, Mimi explained that she quickly learned that talking with her friends in Chinese in public such as in the subway or bus was not a good idea as she experienced uncomfortable looks towards her and her friends.

Well, on the subway, my friends are all Chinese, they speak so loudly. Elderly people who sit across from us stare at us. My Chinese friends’ voices are so loud. You know it’s like the tone of someone in an argument. The looks that we get [from people] are not that good. It is not positive but it is that these guys are noisy. Chinese people are like this.

(M 좀 지하철이나 타면, 중국애들이잖아, 중국말을 엄청 크게 말해요. 앞에 어른들이 쳐다봐요… 한국말을 목소리가 엄청 커요. 약간 싸우는 톤이잖아… 시선이 좋기만 하지 않잖아? 좋은 시선으로 보는게 아니라 아니라 애는 시끄럽다. 중국애들이 이런 애들이구나…) (Mimi, 2013, April 30)

She said that even though they were only talking about daily topics such as what happened in school or their preference of fashions or food, just like any other teens’ talk, it might be
perceived as though they were arguing in public. From her point of view as a bilingual speaker in Korean and Chinese, she thought that the way her friends spoke Chinese was could be viewed by Korean people as arguing in comparison to Korean which she believes is a ‘soft’ and ‘cheesy’ language as she said “the way Korean people speak is a little cheesy and the tone is soft (한국사람들 말하는거 좀 느껴해야요. 톤이 나긋나긋해요)” (Mimi, 2013, April 30). Since then, she avoids talking in Chinese and tries to talk in a softer tone in Korean in public. As such, Mimi’s negotiation in public language interactions leads to minimizing her use of Chinese and by doing so, her Chinese cultural background is silenced in public.

Mimi’s perception of her school’s approach to multicultural education. Mimi’s reflections of school field trips illustrate a few characteristics of her school’s multicultural education approaches. Mimi participated in several school field trips but she lost interest in them later on. She felt that most places were representative of old Korean heritage sites and culture that she was unable to connect with her daily life or her near future. Mimi said:

It was all about [Korean] tradition and heritage. We go check out bowls and clothes [used thousand years ago]. All the things that we saw were that kind of things…I don’t even know what all those things mean… (전통밖에 없잖아요. 가서 그냥 그릇같은거 보고… 전통, 옛날 사람들이 입던 옷이라든지… 그런거 밖에 없으니까… 왜도 모르니까…)(Mimi, 2013, April 30)

Mimi’s school culture trip program is designed to facilitate students’ understanding of Korean culture and to develop their manners when in public spaces. The school curriculum states that “this program is to provide students with opportunity to experience various cultures and arts (다양한 문화 예술 체험 활동의 기회를 제공한다)” and “…to help students understand Korean cultural background (한국의 문화적 배경을 이해할 수 있다)” and “…learn how to use public transportation and appropriate manners in public spaces including at the theater (대중교통기관 활용, 공공건물에서의 지켜야할 예절, 공연 관람 예절을 배운다)” (Daham, p. 44). However, the notion of Korean culture that the program promotes is rather static, fixed and representative mostly of the past. Nieto (2004) argues that in critical multicultural education practice, the conventional notion of culture should be re-conceptualized since the concept of
culture is changing, fluid, and at times hybrid. In this sense, the school’s multicultural education practices seem to foster a limited notion of culture. This is also a biased practice that indoctrinates Korean ethnocentrism in that the cultural representations from the field trips tends to show the pride of Korean culture and Korean historical figures such as kings and intellectuals based on the itinerary of the culture trip program. As such it is no doubt that Mimi does not feel connected to this imbalanced culture trip program of Daham School.

**Mimi’s challenges in schooling.**  Mimi shows her concerns in schooling which highlight her family’s insecure socioeconomic conditions which leads to uncertainty in her future plans. Mimi was not sure what she wanted to do in the future. At the time of the first interview, she said “I just want to work in a company that gives me [economic and social] security (그냥 평범한 회사에서 일하고 싶어요. 안정적인 직업)” (Mimi, 2013, April 30). She does not have a specific future plan about what she wants to do and become but she has a desire to have any kind of job that can keep her life secure, which seems to reflect her current insecure socioeconomic status. She likes drawing but she did not feel that it is a special skill that could be an asset when applying for a job. She emphasizes that she needs to be a proficient English speaker to get employed in a company while she seems to be regretful about not having English linguistic capital as she said in following:

[I’m] at the bottom [of social ladder]. I am not good at anything. I think I need English more [than anything else]. Even in my study of computer media, everything is based on English words. Really difficult, I need English but I cannot attend a private English language institute …

(완전 밑바닥, 아무것도 할 줄 모르고, 영어가 더 필요한 거 같아요. 영어는 제 컴퓨터하는데도 다 영어가든요. 진짜 영어 어려워요. 영어가 필요한데 영어학원을 다닐 수도 없고…) (Mimi, 2013, April 30)

She mentioned that due to her current economic situation she cannot afford private English education which most Korean students attend after school. She is pessimistic about her future and feels that she is not getting support from her mother in planning and investing for her future. This is seen in the following excerpt.
If I got support from my mom for even one area, I would focus on studying in that area. My mom is not interested in my studies. Although she said that it is all because our living conditions are difficult, I still can’t help feeling bad.

Mimi feels that her mother is not interested in her education and her schooling. She regrets that her mother did not participate in school meetings or come to see her school and teachers. She says that she rarely speaks with her mother about her academic conditions or opportunities either to go to university or enter a job market. During the first and second interviews with Mimi, she expressed a lack of educational support from her mother, which she felt led to her perception of herself as incompetent.

Furthermore, Mimi imagines her future pessimistically rather than positively as she said, “After graduating from high school, as I go out into society, [I am] at the bottom of the ladder. I don’t know what I can do (여기 학교를 졸업하고 사회에 나가면 [난] 밑바닥이잖아요. 뭐 할 수 있을 지도 모르겠어요)” (Mimi, 2013, May 21). Although Mimi is the most competent in Korean language and culture among my student participants at Daham high school, she feels that her academic capacity is not competitive enough for her to find employment in Korea and she further shows feelings of helplessness.

Mimi’s comments relating to her socioeconomic and academic conditions highlight the vicious capitalistic cycle of education in Korea which can be explained in the relationship between receiving private English education and developing academic competitiveness for future employment. In other words, those who are in socioeconomically affluent conditions can afford expensive private English education and improve their English skills. As a result, they may have a better chance of being hired in a higher-paying job with secure employment so that they can maintain their higher socioeconomic conditions. This neoliberal characteristic of private educational practice, in particular with English learning, seems to make Mimi feel further marginalized in Korean society as she cannot afford private English education. Also, she does
not feel that she learns enough from the English classes in her school either as Daham School focuses on students’ Korean language learning and their major subjects that is computer media for Mimi.

Commentary. Mimi’s stories illuminate a few resonant characteristics of multicultural education generally in Korea and at Daham. First, Mimi’s experiences of linguistic and cultural discrimination against her Yanbian-accented Korean and her Chinese cultural background indicate that linguistic and cultural differences are not appreciated and are considered as disadvantageous in the eyes of Korean employers. However, perceiving that ‘standard’ language has no accent is a myth (Lippi-Green, 1997). Having the Korean ‘standard’ language as a norm for multicultural students in Korea so that they do not have accent—or, American English as a norm for English learners in the world—is a socially and politically constructed and ideologically manipulated construct (Lippi-Green, 1997). Lippi-Green (1997) argues that the attempt to have no accent or removing individuals’ original accent is illusionary. Second, Mimi’s experience surrounding age differences in schooling reflects Korea’s institutional characteristics where younger or older students are likely to be marked in the school system and alienated from their peers. Mimi’s story implies that this institutional condition needs to be changed in order to accommodate multicultural students who may not meet the optimal school age in Korea at the appropriate time due to the different school systems in their home country, administrative issues related to transfer and transition, and issues related to immigration processing. This indicates that mainstream general schools are not ready to embrace these multicultural learners and thus it is not fair to blame these students for academic failure without making an effort to change educational system. This blaming is then institutional discrimination against minority students. Third, Mimi’s story related to academic challenges and her observation of the interrelatedness between socioeconomic conditions and employability in Korea also points out an important message regarding Daham School’s institutional conditions. Although Daham High School emphasizes Korean language and culture learning and preparing students for employment in the fields of tourism and computer media, the school does not appear to prepare students for higher-paying jobs since they do not provide enough opportunities for students to acquire the necessary English skills. By not providing the socially perceived cultural capital including linguistic
capital that is deemed as valuable in a given society (i.e., English) minorities can be further marginalized by making them less competitive in the society (Nieto & Bode, 2011). In this sense, although the school’s emphasis on the Korean language and culture and their academic focus on two majoring subjects, computer media and tourism, are intended to help multicultural students integrate in the mainstream society quickly and may contribute to their survival in Korean society, this multicultural education practice does not challenge the social status quo of inequality. The school’s approach is designed to support students to get a low-income job but not a high-income job, which then reinforces the pre-existing social inequality. It seems that Mimi internalizes these messages embedded in the school’s multicultural education as she envisions herself getting an ‘average’ job that can give her security regardless of her interest and desire. In her envisioning of her future, she does not position her bilingual or bicultural identity as an asset but rather as burden. She desires to become a full social participant in Korean economic activities and thus her interest lies in eliminating her Yeonbian accented Korean and acquiring the mainstream Korean language and culture.

**Jinu**

Jinu was born in 1995 in the Philippines from a Korean father and a Filipino mother. He also has two younger brothers and when Jinu turned 15, his family moved to Korea to live with his grandparents in Seoul. The family had decided to move to Korea for Jinu’s and his brothers’ education. Shortly after they moved to Korea, his father went back to the Philippines to work for a Korean company, but his father makes frequent trips between the two countries. Jinu often talks to his father through Skype, online communication software that allows free Internet video calls between Skype users on a computer. His mother works at a sewing factory in Seoul where many foreign female workers tend to be hired with a low wage in spite of the intensive labor work. To connect with their Filipino culture, Jinu and his brothers go to church on Sundays. They like going to church not only because it is an important part of their routine to maintain their Christianity, which is big part of their Filipino culture, but also because they can meet many Filipino friends, eat Filipino food and buy Filipino goods at the Sunday church market. Although Jinu has multiple linguistic and cultural identities as a Filipino Korean as well as an English, Tagalog and Korean language user, he encounters challenges to maintain them. The
following stories illustrate how he negotiates his multiple linguistic and cultural identities in complex institutional and domestic conditions.

**Jinu’s language and literacies practices.** Jinu speaks three languages: Tagalog, English and Korean. He is proud of knowing three languages. He is the only one among the participants who specified that these three languages are their first languages even though he has varying degrees of competencies in these languages. His most proficient language, according to him, is Tagalog, which is not surprising given that he lived in the Philippines for about 15 years and spoke Tagalog with all of his friends and family except his father. English is his second most proficient language and reflects the fact that he went to a private international elementary school where English was the main medium of instruction and he consistently speaks English with his father. It is interesting to note that his father prioritized English language learning over Korean by believing that Jinu’s acquiring high English proficiency will consequently result in profitable rewards in Jinu’s future, which in fact, reflects the political and ideological status of English language in the world (Heller, 2006; J. S.-Y. Park, 2009; S. J. Park & Abelmann, 2004). Although he is the least proficient in Korean since he only started learning and using Korean in high school in Korea, he notes that his Korean drastically improved as he had to use Korean at school every day. He said that in Korea, he tries to write in Korean but when he cannot think of some words, he tends to switch to English. This language switching pattern is also seen in his journal log in the following Figure 5.
In terms of language use at home, he speaks Tagalog with his mother and his brothers, which has been a consistent practice both when they were living in the Philippines and in Korea. He speaks English with his father and he uses Korean with his grandparents and his school friends. It is interesting to note that his father speaks Korean as a first language and English as a second language but that he has intentionally only spoken English with his three children since they were born. Jinu’s mother speaks Tagalog as her first language and English as a second language and she started learn Korean after moving to Korea. His father and mother communicate with each other mainly in English. Jinu’s Korean grandparents want him and his brothers as well as his mother to use only Korean at home. Although they do not want them to use Tagalog at home, Jinu, however, mentioned that he, his brothers and mother continuously speak to each other Tagalog.

Although Jinu was exposed to Tagalog and English from birth, he only started to learn Korean when he began schooling in Korea. At Daham multicultural high school, the majority of his friends are from China and speak standard Mandarin Chinese. In the beginning, he found it difficult to interact with his peer group wherein Mandarin is the language of communication because he did not know much Chinese and very few of the students were fluent in Korean at that time. As time went by, his and his friends’ Korean improved. It appears that his engagement with the music band at school led to him being more sociable and helped to build friendships with the students in the band as he said “I look at it [involvement in music and the band] as best time with friends hanging out with my friends. I like to have something to do with my friends. [Otherwise] I really don’t know what to do with them together [if there is no music]” (Jinu, 2013, May 29). He became close with a few friends in the band. They were from China and spoke Chinese with Chinese-speaking friends but they try to speak Korean when Jinu was present. For Jinu, Chinese is not an entirely new language. When he was in a junior high school in the Philippines, he took Chinese classes. Now that he has more Chinese friends in school, he notes that he is motivated to learn Chinese to get to know his friends better.
Jinu seems to be active in maintaining his social relationships with different cultural groups in different languages through social media using computers and smartphones. He chats with his friends usually using KakaoTalk, a free instant messaging application for smartphone users. Also, he often goes online to check his personal blog or watch YouTube video clips using his smartphone or his computer.

In his personal blog, he posted various pictures and videos, some of which have a short description and others have none. From his posts and replies I could see that he uses three languages with each language being used for different topics. For instance, most postings that relate to school activities such as music band performances are written in Korean and the replies, written by his friends from his music band, are also in Korean. Jinu also posted videos of his band practicing and performing at a concert. His friends replied to the videos commenting on the quality of the videos and the performances. He uses his three languages to varying degrees depending on the contexts of the videos and written messages. Particularly, in the replies, Jinu replies in Korean to Korean users and Tagalog to Tagalog users and English to English users.

**Jinu’s linguistic and cultural diversity, acknowledgements and challenges.** Jinu was exposed to four different languages. He was exposed to Tagalog and English when he was born in the Philippines and he started to learn Korean and Chinese in Korea. Korean is the language of instruction at school and domestic interaction with his Korean grandparents. Chinese serves social functions for Jinu to maintain friendships with his Chinese friends at Daham. Jinu’s English use with his father is motivated by the fact that his father wants him and his brothers to learn English and he emphasizes that English will help his future. As such, Jinu’s father always uses English with Jinu and his brothers. Moreover, Jinu feels more comfortable using English than Korean with his father. Jinu’s acquisition of English is also positively acknowledged by his friends and teachers as Jinu often hears his friends and teachers praising him for being able to speak fluent English.

Although Jinu is proud of his multicultural background, his multilingual and multicultural identities are not always perceived as welcome. Jinu experiences cultural exclusion at home from his grandparents. The previous Christmas holiday, he wanted to celebrate with his family
as he used to do in the Philippines; however, his grandparents did not allow them to celebrate any Christmas rituals except for going to church. Jinu was also forced to adapt to Korean culture and rituals such as ancestral ceremonies on Korean Thanksgiving Day and New Years’ Day but he was not permitted to conserve his Filipino culture. In other words, his diverse cultural identities are not valued and are discouraged by his grandparents; however, Jinu struggles and negotiates to maintain his Filipino linguistic and cultural identities by resisting his grandparents and by continuously using Tagalog and staying actively involved in the Church.

**Jinu’s institutional choices and reflection.** Jinu did not have many high school options to choose from. When he arrived in Korea, he did not go to school right away. He went to a multicultural center where he learned basic Korean language and culture. The next year, he entered Grade 9 which is the last grade in middle school in Korea and is the year where students have to choose a high school based on their educational goals. Successful admission, however, is typically based on students’ achievement scores throughout their middle school years. In the case of Jinu, he did not have high enough scores on the middle school exams to be admitted to a general high school. He blamed his low Korean proficiency for his failure to enter a general high school.

He mentioned that he was not good at Korean and that he did not understand the language in the exams in the beginning, which limited his options for high schools. Jinu mentioned that an international high school could have been an option but his family could not afford the tuition. Jinu’s father thought that the multicultural school would be a good place for Jinu since his Korean language proficiency was not high enough to compete and succeed in a mainstream school. As such Jinu decided to go to Daham multicultural alternative school. However, the school’s educational direction is not quite in alignment with Jinu’s academic and career goal to be an international lawyer. It appears that the school’s focus on vocational education is distracting from Jinu’s preparation to go to university and study law.

After Jinu struggled from the educational mismatch between his desire and the school’s characteristics, he decided to take Scholastic Assessment Tests (SAT) which required strong skills in English and Mathematics. For his SAT preparation, he studied at home through
Nunnopi home schooling program and at church with a volunteer teacher. This reveals that Korea’s educational options for some newcomer secondary school students are limited at the moment. Although Daham multicultural high school is an alternative for multicultural students, it is not sufficient to fulfill the needs of multicultural students who have educational and career desires outside of tourism and computer media.

**Commentary.** Jinu’s use of languages is contingent on the social spaces where he is located and the people with whom he communicates. For example, he uses Tagalog with his mother, two brothers and Filipino friends, English with his father, and Korean with his Korean friends and teachers. However, this seemingly simplistic linguistic practice with distinctive linguistic borders gets complicated when he is with different language users who have different perspectives on language use. For instance, Jinu’s English is admired by his peers and teachers; however, languages other than Korean are not permitted at home by his grandparents. Although he negotiates his positions to maintain his multilingual and multicultural identity by resisting the domestic Korean-only speaking rule and by communicating in Tagalog with his brothers and mother and in English with his father, he did not have an option to negotiate his identity within the dominant institutional system. He was considered as an incomplete Korean learner. Jinu was penalized for his less-competent Korean proficiency which effectively limited his high school choices.

Nonetheless, Jinu’s schooling experience related to linguistic skills highlights the socioeconomic context that is closely connected to schooling. As he has English linguistic capital which is a great advantage for admission to many international schools, he could have had more options for high school. However, due to his economic conditions, he cannot afford the tuition at a private high school and therefore he could only consider public high schools. Additionally, to enter high schools that are specialized in foreign languages and science, he must have Korean proficiency at the mastery level. Jinu’s case can be interpreted as highlighting the role of socioeconomic status. If his parents had more economic means, he could have fit in very well at an international high school. However, his Korean skills are not sufficiently developed for him to be accepted in most

---

25 Nunnopi program is run by a private education company and provides learning materials. For Jinu’s case, twice a week, a coordinator teacher visits Jinu’s home to check his learning progress with the learning materials.
general/mainstream high schools despite the fact that his strong English skills would be a major advantage in these schools.

Jinu’s experiences with institutional options indicate the lack of inclusive multicultural education in the Korean education system, which echoes Mimi’s perceptions of multicultural education practices. This reflects the fact that the Korean educational system is not yet well-prepared for multicultural students and highlights the lack of coherence between policy and practice. For instance, the concept of cultural diversity is advocated and multicultural elements are suggested to be incorporated in school curricula through the multicultural education policy on the one hand, as seen in the multicultural education policy analysis; on the other hand, assessment tools are still designed to advantage Korean students by virtue of the fact that they exclude students with non-Korean cultural and linguistic competences.

Chung

Chung was born in China in 1993 from a Korean-Chinese mother and Chinese father. Her parents were divorced when she was young. When Chung was in elementary school, her mother was re-married to a Korean man and moved to Korea; however, her mother’s economic conditions were not good enough to bring Chung with her. After living away from her mother for 10 years, Chung moved to Korea in May 2011. Chung’s economic conditions were not good when she moved to Korea and she started working in a factory with her cousin after arriving. Although she did not feel lonely working in the factory because there were many recent immigrants working together, many workers including her and her cousin were always assigned to work the night shift and they often worked overtime. When her mother brought Chung an information letter about the multicultural school and suggested that she attend, Chung thought it would be better than working at a factory at night and she soon after enrolled in the school. Chung holds Chinese citizenship and is not planning on applying for Korean citizenship at the expense of forfeiting her Chinese citizenship. Although she seems to hold a strong cultural sense of belonging to China, her feelings about where she belongs are in a state of constant change. Chung’s story highlights her struggles as a foreigner in the Korean education system and describes how she negotiates her linguistic and cultural identities accordingly.
Chung’s linguistic struggles and linguistic negotiations. Chung speaks Chinese as her first language and is learning Korean as her second language. Although Chung’s mother can speak Korean and Chinese, she only spoke Chinese with Chung when they were in China. Chung started to learn Korean only after she moved to Korea. In the beginning, she learned the Korean language and culture at a local multicultural community center. Chung still uses Chinese with her mother in Korea although her mother speaks Korean to her. She notices that her Korean step-father does not like them conversing in Chinese as depicted in the following excerpt below.

My mother always speaks to me in Korean. I understand her, but if I use Korean at home, not good... It’s not comfortable, [so, I use Chinese] When my step-father is at home, if I use Chinese, he thinks that I am swearing at him, so I just use Korean when he’s at home. I sometimes use Chinese a lot even in front of him, [but] he sometimes gets angry. (어머니는 저한테 항상 한국말을 써요. 제가 다 알아들었는데, 그냥, 집에서 한국말 쓰면 별로, 별로 생각해요. 별로 편하지 않아요. 새 아빠가 있을 때는, 새 아빠가 있을 때는, 제가 중국말하면 또 제가 욕하는 줄 알고, 그냥 좀, 새 아버지 있을때, 그냥 한국말 써요. 가끔 중국말을 많이 써요. 새 아빠 앞에서도, 좀 그, 저중날때 있어요.) (Chung, 2013, May 2)

As a result, to avoid potential domestic conflicts, Chung uses Korean at home when her step-father is close by.

Like Mimi’s experience related to using Chinese in public, Chung also experiences ‘uncomfortable stares’ from people on the subway and on the street. The following excerpt from the interview with Chung illustrates how she felt about her use of Chinese in public spaces and her linguistic negotiations afterwards.

When I talk to friends in Chinese, people look at us and it is not good. I try to speak Korean if possible when other people are present nearby... I know, when I use Chinese, people look at me. So I don’t use Chinese. I just use Korean. (친구들이랑 지하철에서 통화할때도 중국말로 쓰면 엎에 사람들도 주의하고그냥 별로 좋지 않아요. 그냥 최대한 통화할 때 다른 사람있으면 최대한 한국말로 하고,
Chung said that Korean people look at her and her friends uncomfortably when they use Chinese on the subway and on the street. She also mentioned that when she sees some people using English, Chung feels jealous of them:

One day, I saw a foreigner and a Korean person sitting next to each other on the subway, an English person and a Korean person [who spoke in English] I just envied them.

Chung thinks that when people use English, they do not get ‘uncomfortable stares’ from Koreans in public. So, she learned that speaking Chinese in public usually does not get positive attention unlike English, which leads her to avoid using Chinese in public. Even when she has to talk on the phone in public, she tries to use Korean.

Chung’s comparison of people’s responses between English conversations and Chinese conversations in public is indicative of the differing attitudes towards Chinese and English in Korea. This reinforces the existence of divergent yet hierarchical attitudes towards different languages that is illustrated in Jinu’s story where he receives positive response towards his English by his peers and teachers, while people do not comment on his Tagalog.

Chung also noted the school’s language policy that restricts the use of students’ heritage languages and requires that students only use Korean at school. However, Chung said that the Chinese students still speak Chinese during break time and even during classes. This can lead to the teachers giving penalty points which are subtracted from students’ total academic scores at the end of the year. Although many students resist this language policy, teachers seem to insist on this rule as depicted in the teachers’ perspectives in this chapter. As a response to this policy, Chung said that she found herself being silent in a particular few classes whose teachers are more insistent about the policy than others. However, between classes, according to Chung, most
Chinese students including Chung speak in Chinese and even non-Chinese friends, like Jinu for example, try to learn and speak in Chinese.

**Chung’s transition into Korean school.** Chung reflected that her resumption of schooling in Korea was challenging in particular due to language. Reflecting on her experiences during the past year, she said that she did not have a good understanding of the lessons at school. Although there were bilingual teachers who could help her with the Korean language, she did not know what to ask and the teachers were not always available in every class. For her, the first semester was very difficult in terms of adjusting to the Korean school and learning the subject matter in Korean. She mentioned that she relied on her close Chinese friends as they shared similar linguistic and cultural concerns. As her Korean improved, she started paying more attention in classes and studying harder than before. She also became closer to friends from different cultural backgrounds. Also, she became interested in the Korean language and found herself highly engaged in some classes such as the digital photography class.

Although she is majoring in computer media, she does not like computer related subjects. She told me that she did not apply to computer media as her first area of specialization rather she applied to major in tourism; however, her application was not successful and she had to enroll in the computer media program because of the restriction on the number of students in each course. This implies the inflexibility of institutional rules such that the classes have to have the same number of students in the two major courses. This inflexible rule may make class administration easier for teachers and administrators but some students may lose their direction in planning their future goals by giving up on their desired area of specialization.

**Chung’s experiences of linguistic and cultural discrimination.** For Chung, linguistic difference seems to play a big role for socialization. Her frustrations were depicted in the following excerpt from her interview:

If I speak good Korean, I can attend a regular school. If I can’t speak Korean and went to a regular school, the Korea students might be a little annoyed by me… If you went to a regular Korean school and couldn’t speak Korean, you would face group alienation… I’d like to have Korean friends but there’s no one [who wants to be a friend with me]
Chung blames her incompetent Korean language skills for the fact that she cannot go to a regular school and does not have Korean friends. After listening to her experiences of linguistic and cultural discrimination, I asked her opinion on how to improve the situation or to give a message to Koreans. She seemed to be a little cynical about improving Koreans’ perceptions of linguistic and cultural differences. She said:

I don’t think Korean people can change... If I point out Koreans’ discriminatory behavior, they will criticize me and Chinese people. What’s the use of me saying that alone? (한국 사람들 변할 수 없을 것 같아요... 제가 차별 나서서 말하면 사람들이 나더라 욕할 것에요. 또 중국 사람들을 욕할 거에요. 제가 혼자 나가서 그렇게 말하면 무슨 소용이 있겠어요?)” (Chung, 2013, May 2).

She seems to feel powerless to change the reality of deeply-rooted discrimination regarding difference in Korea. Moreover Chung told me an anecdote about her facing cultural isolation and discrimination. Chung attended a science invention competition that was held in another school. She met students from regular schools and heard that some of the students made negative comments about multicultural students attending the activity together as a group. The following excerpt from my interview with Chung encapsulated her experience of cultural isolation and her feelings afterwards.

I am participating in school activities… it’s the science invention class, where I meet Korean students. One day, two of the Korean students in my group stopped coming. I heard that they did not like participating in the activities because multicultural students were in the same group. The teachers in charge of the class decided to cancel their registration in the class. [I learned] that Korean students do not like us. (제가 요즘 학교행사하는 거 있는 테요... 과학 발명교실이라고 있는데, 그거 가면...
After this experience, as Chung said, she felt deeply offended and thought that it would be very hard to become friends with Korean students.

Chung’s different cultural background was also an impediment for Chung to obtain scholarship opportunities in and outside of school. She often found that she was not eligible to apply for many scholarships and was disadvantaged to take the school’s complementary overseas trips because she held a foreign nationality. She confessed that not being able to obtain scholarships made her feel discouraged in schooling. It is rather surprising that although the Daham multicultural high school consists of multicultural students whose cultural backgrounds and nationalities are diverse, the school nevertheless primarily serves the interests of multicultural students who hold Korean citizenship.

Commentary. Chung positions herself linguistically as Chinese; however, the longer she stays in Korea, the boundary of her cultural belonging becomes more blurred as she said “I miss Korea when I am in China, and I miss China when I am in Korea (중국에 있으면 한국이 그립고 한국에서는 중국이 그립고)” (Chung, 2013, May 29). She mentioned that she realizes that she is developing her cultural identity as Korean-Chinese the more time she spends in Korea with her mother who is Korean-Chinese and she is feeling more culturally connected to Korea. However, experiencing some of the Korean students’ negative attitudes towards multicultural students leads her to feeling isolated from mainstream society. This discriminatory response is likely not only a response to multicultural students’ perceived language limitations but also a reflection of societal discourses that position multicultural families as occupying a lower socioeconomic and sociocultural status within the society.

Furthermore, Chung’s experience of negatively biased attitudes against the Chinese language and positively biased attitudes toward English highlights the language hierarchy that exists within
Korean society. In this case, Chinese is viewed as an inappropriate language in public, hence explaining the ‘uncomfortable stare’; in contrast, English is associated with the language of aspiration and opportunity as also seen in Jinu’s case. After perceiving these differentiated connotations associated with different languages, Chung decreased her use of Chinese in public as a result. Chung’s story relating to Koreans’ perceptions of different languages implies Koreans’ hierarchical and hegemonic attitudes towards English as dominant and other non-English foreign languages as subordinate, which is also articulated in Jinu’s and Suji’s cases.

Han

Han was born in Harbin, China in 1996 from a Korean Chinese mother and Chinese father and lived there until he moved to Korea in 2010. Although his mother could speak Korean and Chinese, Han did not have a chance to acquire Korean since he lived away from his parents for a long time due to the location of his parents’ workplaces. He lived with his relatives in China all of whom only spoke Chinese. Also, he went to a mainstream Chinese school where the language of instruction was Chinese. When he moved to Korea, he said that at first, he was afraid of leaving his home because he could not speak any Korean and his parents were too busy to help him. He found that his first 3 months in Korea were very painful and he was resistant to the new culture although he liked the fact that he could finally live with his parents. He started learning Korean through a migrant community center and a church where he found information about Daham. At the same time that he started school in Korea, he obtained his Korean citizenship, believing that his life would be more convenient holding it. Han shows drastic changes over time in his attitudes towards living in Korea and his perceptions regarding others’ perspectives of different languages and cultures. Initially, he was pessimistic about living in Korea as a culturally and linguistically different person; however, over time his attitudes become more positive seeing hope and the possibilities for his future.

Han’s language use. Although Han had an opportunity to acquire Chinese and Korean as his mother is Korean-Chinese, he was predominately exposed to Chinese and he only started learning Korean after he moved to Korea. He says that he tries to speak Korean with his mother but communicates with his father in Chinese since he never previously spoke Korean with him
even though his father also speaks Korean and Chinese. At school, he uses Chinese with his friends; however, he notes that teachers do not like students to use Chinese at school. The following interview excerpt reveals how he feels about the Korean-only language policy:

I want to use Korean but it’s not easy. I hate when teachers tell us to use only Korean in school. If I use Korean [only], I can’t continue the conversation because I don’t know certain words in Korean although I know them in Chinese. Then, the situation gets awkward and I will be laughed at…. I understand that teachers use Korean in class, but [I’m not convinced of using Korean only] among students… This year, the atmosphere is actually better. I think teachers gave up [pushing the Korean-only policy] on us because we didn’t listen… I got a penalty point only once because I used Chinese.

Han said that he received a penalty point for class performance due to his use of Chinese once. According to Han, he uses Chinese most of the time but sometimes code-switches between Chinese and Korean. As he expresses above, he really does not like the school’s language policy that forces students to speak Korean-only. In fact, when I was observing two of Han’s music classes and his performance in music band activities, I witnessed that Han was one of the students who were confident enough to ask the teachers questions in Korean, but at the same time he was also one of the students who was talking to his Chinese-speaking peers in Chinese.

**Han’s experiences related to linguistic and cultural difference.** Han shared his work experiences in Korea where he felt discriminated against due to being culturally and linguistically different. He tends to attribute his negative experiences to his own incompetent Korean proficiency:
When I worked at a part time job, I was only paid half of what the Korean workers earned there. Because I didn’t know much of the Korean language… It was just four months after I came to Korea. I heard so many swearing words. I probably learned swearing words the most at that time. He was a man in his 40s. He probably had children too. It was a courier company. I was responsible for loading boxes. The man assigned our group with more boxes and scolded us for not being fast. He swore at us a lot and gave us only half of the wage. Thinking of that time, I get so mad.

Han also shared another story. One day, he went to a cellphone store to buy a new cell phone. When Han was looking at different phones, a salesperson came to him and told him to leave if he was not going to buy anything. Han did not even have an opportunity to look at the different phones. Han thought that the salesperson’s treatment was unfair in that Han had rights to know more details about the different cell phones and to choose a phone as a customer. Yet, the salesperson did not explain anything to him and ignored him. Han felt that he was discriminated against because he was a foreigner and did not speak good Korean. These two experiences highlight how Han perceives that he was discriminated against because he is a foreigner and also show that Han felt resentful because he was unable to speak up for himself due to the lack of Korean communicative skills at those times.

Han also told another story related to linguistic discrimination. He was speaking Chinese to his school friends on the subway. One Korean man approached him and told him not to use Chinese. Han got upset and told him that it was none of his business. Then, the man grabbed Han’s lips. He said that he was almost in serious fight on the subway if his friends did not stop him. He said that he could not forget that incident since he was very humiliated in public. He also said that he
often receives strange looks from people on the subway. Although Han said that all these negative experiences are related to his lack of Korean proficiency, the reiterated subway stories from Mimi, Chung and Han seem to reflect the intolerance of Korean people to the public use of different languages, in this case, Chinese.

One of the most shocking cultural experiences, according to Han, is Koreans’ attitudes towards relationships between people of different ages. Han learned that age plays a very important role in Korea in social relationships.

In Korea, people concern about the age too much. The relationship between Sunbae (those who are older and experienced) and Hoobae (those who are younger and less experienced)—I really don’t like it. In China, teenagers can be friends with someone in their 30’s… when something happens, how old are you? People yell like this. I don’t understand why they do that. I don’t even want to understand, if they have to find out my age. One time, I wanted to be a friend to this person. He asked me my age and he rejected me saying that we did not fit in the same age group…

This perception of Koreans’ judgments regarding social relationships based on age is also mentioned by Mimi and Suji. In Korean culture, age is closely related to the pragmatics of language use. Often, Korean people ask others for their age at the initial stage of building a social relationship as they have to decide whether to use the honorific form of Korean or the non-honorific form. The appropriate usage of these forms is considered very important in social relationships in Korea and if used incorrectly can lead to disharmony and harm the relationship. In particular, if someone uses a non-honorific form when speaking to an older person, the older person may get upset as they feel that they are being treated disrespectfully. In this sense, people who do not know this close relationship between age and language use may experience some
confusion and conflict in building social relationships. However, newcomers’ struggle to understand the role of age in social relationships and communication is just one factor that contributes to explaining why the participants felt and feel isolated from mainstream society. From these struggles of negative cross-cultural experiences and conflicts, Han learned that Chinese people in particular should master the Korean language in order to live successfully in Korea. After acquiring the language, they should say that they are Korean rather than saying they are Chinese to live without discrimination in Korea. He expressed this idea as follows: “You can live without a trouble in Korea if you say you’re Korean, not a foreigner, if possible, rather than a foreigner. In particular, the images about Chinese people are negative in Korea. (한국에서 외국사람이라고 보다 당연히 한국사람이라고 얘기해야 잘 살 수 있죠. 중국사람 한국에 와서도 나쁜 이미지가 있잖아요.)” (Han, 2013, May 7). Regarding this particular view of his, I asked him if he could tell people that he is Korean as he also obtained his Korean citizenship. He said, “I can’t say that I am a Korean citizen even though I have a Korean passport. I have to explain so many things. Why I am not speaking Korean well? (한국 여권이 있어도 한국 사람이라 말 할 수 없어요. 한국사람이라고 하면 설명해야할게 많잖아요? 왜 한국말 못하는지?)” (Han, 2013, May 7). For Han, fluent Korean language proficiency is the prerequisite to be a Korean citizen in the society. In this belief, he does not consider himself as a Korean citizen although he is legally a Korean citizen.

**Han’s institutional experiences.** For Han, the primary motivation for going to school was to socialize with his school friends. He said that he was not interested in studying. Even when he was in China, he missed many classes. In his current high school in Korea, too, he often missed school particularly at the beginning of the previous year when he started high school. However, since the second semester last year, he has started attending school more often as he became interested in his music band activities. He is participating in the band as a vocalist as one of two vocalists in the band. Although he thinks that he can sing Chinese songs much better than Korean, he has still managed to learn many Korean songs which he thinks also help him to learn Korean. He also notes that when he is singing and playing guitar, he feels relief from stress.
Han feels that Korean schools tend to be student-centered compared to the schools in China. Based on his experience, schools in China are mostly concerned about the schools’ reputation. They do not care so much about their students. In contrast, the multicultural alternative high school seems to care about students more. For example, the school provides students with practical extracurricular programs such as computer programming and Korean language programs while waiving all of the class fees. The teachers in his school are also worried about students and they are strict to the extent that they want students to quickly adapt to the Korean education system and society. Also, he shares his impressions about students in a regular school based on conversations with his friends whom he met through a local multicultural community center. He thinks that most students in a regular school are working hard to go to university. He expresses that there are too many people studying just to go to university and that he does not like an extremely competitive atmosphere. At the moment, he is not interested in going to university. He believes that it is more important to have special and useful skills than earning a university degree. Related to this, when I asked about his plan after high school graduation, he said that he wants to have his own trading business where he can travel around America.

Commentary. Han’s case adds depth to my understanding of newcomer youth identity negotiations as he exhibits rather unusual traits compared to my other student participants and most multicultural students. Many of my student participants seem to be influenced by their social actors’ responses and position themselves to perform according to their perceptions of societal expectations as seen in Mimi and Chung. Although acknowledging the social and educational pressures of assimilation, Han overtly expressed anger and resistance against linguistic and cultural discrimination in and outside of school. Han’s negotiation of his linguistic and cultural identities shows that individual’s agency can play an influential role in one’s positioning of identity, language and culture. However, it should be noted that Han’s overt expressions about his agency is not without taking academic risks. He was well-known for being a student like a ‘basketball’ which is a metaphor for those whose behaviors are unpredictable and often considered as problematic.

During the interview, Han often compared the different ways discrimination operates in Korea and China. Reflecting on his experiences of being discriminated against in Korea, he tends to
compare the situation with China. Han thinks that discrimination exists everywhere but in different forms. He concludes that his experience as a foreigner in Korea could be better than being a foreigner in China. His continuous comparing and interpreting of the two cultures became his strategy to negotiate his position in the new culture. He tries to see the positive part of his new culture which contrasts with his initial views of living in Korea when he would only see the negative parts of Korean culture. In the interview, he mentions that although the images of Chinese people in Korea are not good, everything can be up to him, so he says that he changed his pessimistic attitudes to be more “positive” in order to adjust in the new environment “to live comfortably”. He adds that Korea was a foreign country to him and he had better accept the Korean way of living rather than resist in order “to live comfortably”.

Often, in these intercultural negotiations by comparing and interpreting his two different cultures, Han concludes that he is the one that needs to change in order to successfully settle in Korea as a foreigner by improving his Korean language proficiency and accepting Korean culture. By doing so, he positions himself as an illegitimate resident as if he is invading the dominant Korean culture, even though he obtained Korean citizenship, saying that he should follow the Korean way of living. Although he highlights the importance of one’s agency and his own power to change, which is lacking in Mimi’s case, he takes a pragmatic attitude while being fully conscious of the inherent systemic and structural biases towards different cultures and languages in Korea. His reflection of his experiences and his negotiations clearly highlight the unequal power relations existing between Koreans and Chinese foreigners in particular.

Educators’ Perspectives in Daham

Vice-principal, Mr. Lim

Mr. Lim, 52 years old at the time of interview, is a vice-principal at Daham High School. He had 27 years of experience teaching electronic engineering before he became a school administrator in 2012. Most of the schools that he had worked at were located in rural areas and they tended to have students who were from families in socio-economically challenging conditions. With his prior experiences at those schools, he felt that he could do a great job in
Daham. He states that his passion to help learners in need and his adventurous personality greatly influenced his decision to become involved in Daham Multicultural High School.

Mr. Lim’s diverse cultural experiences through teacher training programs which took him to different countries for educational site visits motivated his close engagement in the process of establishing Daham high school as a multicultural alternative school. Before the school started accepting students, Mr. Lim was involved not only in ‘hardware’ dimensions such as assigning the number of classrooms and remodeling classrooms, the teacher’s office, and other spaces but also in ‘software’ dimensions such as designing the school curriculum. Although the ministry of education assigned two major areas to the school to focus on, that is, computer media and tourism, the school had to create their own curriculum from the ground up with a greater focus on vocation and adaptation to life in Korea. Reflecting on his involvement in establishing Daham multicultural high school and planning the school curriculum, Mr. Lim illustrates his educational commitment to teach multicultural students in Daham multicultural high school as well as his perception of multicultural students.

**Mr. Lim’s perception of multicultural students.** Mr. Lim thinks that many multicultural families are still not accepted as Korean citizens although the general perceptions of multicultural families are improving. As he said, “It [the perception toward multicultural students] is better than before. But still, how can I say… still they are not completely accepted as Koreans (전에보다는 많이 나아졌죠. 그래도 아직까지는 뭐라 표현해야할지… 아직까지는 한국인으로 완전히 수용하지 못하는 것 같고)” (Mr. Lim, 2013, May 7). He further added that multicultural students have difficulties with social and economic insecurity. He then explained the characteristics of the economic conditions of the multicultural students in Daham High School by comparing them to multicultural students elsewhere:

> Particularly, our [multicultural] students have various difficulties. For example their economic conditions are not good. Those multicultural students or children of foreigners whose economic conditions are good go to international schools or foreigner schools. [The two groups] are clearly separated.

(특히 우리학생들같은 경우 여러가지 어려움이 있어요. 경제적인 부분도 그렇고.
Mr. Lim contends that there is a clear distinction in the choice of education between learners of lower socioeconomic classes and those of middle or upper classes within the group of multicultural families. He points out that the students in Daham High School are from multicultural families, most of whom are socioeconomically underprivileged. In contrast, he said that students from middle or upper socioeconomic classes would go to international schools or foreigner schools.

**Mr. Lim’s approaches to multicultural education.** Mr. Lim emphasizes the need for his multicultural students to learn the Korean language and culture. He says that so long as the students are in Korean classrooms, they should learn the Korean way of interacting particularly in their relationships with teachers. The following excerpt depicts this perspective:

> There is clear cultural difference in multicultural students [from Korean students]. In class, they are different in many aspects in terms of students’ attitudes and the way they interact with teachers. I think that teaching a Korean way of interacting with teachers and classroom manners is a good way to help students adjust to Korean society.

(학생들의 문화적인 차이는 분명히 있죠. 교실에서도 학생들의 자세라든지, 선생님을 대하는 방법, 여러가지 달라요. 한국사회에서 선생님을 대하는 방법이라든지 수업시간 테도라든지 그걸 가르치는 것이 적응할 수 있는 방법이라고 생각해요.) (Mr. Lim, 2013, May 7)

Mr. Lim said that some students do not know how to show respect to their teachers. For instance, he mentioned that students should listen to teachers, not talk to other students and not challenge teachers, at least in class. He contends that the students should learn the Korean way to be

---

26 International schools accept students of foreigners and Korean students. However, the number of Korean students cannot exceed 30% of the total number of students in the school. Foreigners’ schools accept students of foreigners and Korean students who have a residency experience living abroad more than three years. These schools are notorious for costly tuition but are also known as elite schools.
respectful toward teachers and their elders since it is an important part of Korean culture that they need to adapt to in order to have a good relationship with Koreans.

Mr. Lim shows ambivalent attitudes towards bilingual language practices. On the one hand, Mr. Lim likes that his students perform well in external competitions such as bilingual speaking or writing contests; however, he does not advocate for bilingual education for his students within the school. He clearly positions his beliefs and approaches to teach the multicultural students in Daham Multicultural High School as seen in the following:

I don’t think that our school is the place to do multicultural education. [We] teach multicultural students but not through multicultural education. Multicultural students need education to understand Korean students. (우리학교는 사실 다문화교육을 하는 테가 아니라고 생각해요. 다문화가정학생을 교육하는테지 다문화교육을 하는 테는 아니에요. 다문화 학생들은 한국학생들을 이해할 수 있도록 교육이 필요하다.) (Mr. Lee, 2013, May 7)

Mr. Lee does not position Daham School as an institution for multicultural education although Daham School is referred to as one of the multicultural alternative schools in Korea in the 2012 multicultural education policy document. Mr. Lee mentions that his students are already good at their first languages and that they need to spend more time learning Korean in an immersion setting and need to understand Korean culture including understanding how Korean students interact with peers and teachers in classes. For the immersion language learning environment, Mr. Lim mentions that the school has Korean-only language policy in the school. In fact, the school curriculum states the detailed specifications regarding the use of Korean. For instance, the curriculum states that “students are encouraged to use Korean for questions and answers in class (수업시간에서의 질문과 답변이 한국어로 이루어질 수 있도록한다) and that “teachers should ensure that students are using Korean at all times including during lunch and break times (쉬는 시간, 점심시간 동 교내 생활 중 언어활동이 한국어를 통해 이루어질 수 있도록 지도)” (p. 63). As such, the school curriculum emphasizes the maximum exposure to the Korean language. Nonetheless, there is not any empirical evidence to support the curriculum statement and Mr. Lim’s argument that Korean-only practices result in effective Korean language learning.
In fact, studies related to second language learning show that the use of learners’ first language is not harmful in second language learning. Students are much more likely to learn the target language if their first languages are incorporated as scaffolding tools (Cummins, 2001; Cummins & Early, 2011).

Furthermore, Mr. Lim emphasizes vocational education for his students to equip them for good employability in Korea. To develop the students’ employability, Mr. Lim believes that the mastery of the Korean language and culture is a pre-requisite skill to acquire. He further mentioned that the cultural knowledge, language and other skills and certificates that students learn and acquire from Daham High School will be useful for their future wherever they decide to work. However, his argument regarding the transferability of students’ new language, culture and vocational skills into different contexts seems to reflect his Korean nationalistic attitude as he said that “There will be students who will return to their home country. Then, we should also teach them to become a great human resource to advertise Korea as a great nation. (본국으로 돌아가는 학생들도 상당히 있을 거예요. 그런 학생들도 또 열심히 가르쳐서 가서 훌륭한 한국을 잘 광고해주 줄 수 있는 그런 인재를 만들어서 보낼겁니다)” (Mr. Lee, 2013, May 7). He then expects students to play an important role to advertise Korea’s excellence.

**Commentary.** Mr. Lim’s multicultural education approach is supportive of linguistic and cultural assimilation by emphasizing Korean language and culture learning and not leaving space for the inclusion of linguistic and cultural diversity. Although he mentioned that his students are already proficient in their first language(s) and thus it is not the point of concern for him, his cultural attitudes towards educating multicultural students seem to have a tendency toward Korean ethnocentricity by arguing that students should learn the Korean way of interacting in their relationships with teachers and students and also by expecting students to become a good ethnocentric resources on the global stage for Korea. This assimilationist approach is reiterated by the other teacher participants as well.
Music teacher, Ms. Kang

Ms. Kang is a music teacher and was positioned as a head teacher in Daham High School and is in charge of the school curriculum development. She has approximately 20 years of teaching experience in Korea. When she first saw the posting for the teaching position at Daham High School, she thought that this school needed a teacher who could speak Chinese and that she would be a good fit as she had basic Chinese language skills which she learned while living in China for a year. Her Chinese language skills play an important role to interview new multicultural students as part of the school admission process and to administer school events including organizing meetings with parents. Her story addresses teachers’ struggles to deal with multicultural students and the students’ linguistic and cultural issues and how she and other teachers respond to the struggles.

Unexpected multicultural students. Ms. Kang confessed that there was a discrepancy between what had been planned and what actually happened when the school was accepting students. Based on the hiring posting that she had read, the school was designed to accommodate multicultural learners who had withdrawn from a regular high school or who gave up entering a high school. However, Ms. Kang noted that the school encountered several administrative problems. First, the school did not expect to have students who were recent immigrants and transferring from their school in their home country to a Korean school. The school did not know how to process the transfer since there was little information, if any, to deal with mostly newcomer students, which was a fairly recent phenomenon in Korea. Second, the school did not expect such a high number of students who did not speak any Korean. The school needed help to translate Korean instructions into various languages right away. Third, the teachers were not prepared to teach these students. Some teachers were invited and other teachers were appointed to Daham as their first teaching position when they had no option to refuse the appointment. The lack of accurate information about the expected students and insufficient numbers of professionally trained teachers with multicultural education experience seems to have led to the educators to quickly modify their initially planned curriculum and teaching practices. Ms. Kang is one of those who promptly responded to these challenges.
**Music band as a multicultural pedagogical tool.** Ms. Kang’s organization of a music band seems to have increased the students’ active participation in school events. She said that the music band project was not planned as part of the school curriculum and not even as an extracurricular activity. One day, the CJ culture foundation, which is affiliated with Cheil Jedang (CJ) Corporation, a South Korean conglomerate, contacted a vice-principal right after the school opened in 2012 and expressed their desire to support students by offering music lessons. The school promptly created a school music band and the CJ cultural foundation donated musical instruments and some musicians from the organization volunteered to teach students how to play various musical instruments such as piano, acoustic and electric guitar, bass and drums. That was how the school music band was formed and soon after, the band activities were incorporated as part of school curriculum.

Ms. Kang mentioned how passionately the musicians as well as the students became involved in the music band. In the beginning, 10 classes were planned for the band activities with the professional musicians after school. Almost half of the students in the school participated in these activities. They expressed positive feelings about the band and a desire for continuing the band the following year.

The professional musicians invited the students to perform at their concert at the end of the year. When the plan of participating in the concert with the musicians was decided and announced to students, the students started arduously practicing for the concert. The students voluntarily practiced during lunch breaks and after school as much as possible. The school also encouraged them to practice any time except during class time. After their first experience at the concert which was held in the summer of 2012, the students did not stop practicing and often they were practicing with their favorite popular songs. As the students became more enthusiastic about practicing, Ms. Kang organized two music concerts within the school year which were not planned initially. Ms. Kang said that the students in the beginning did not know even how to read basic music notes. The musician teachers had to teach them the very basics of reading music which supplemented what they were learning in her music class where she also taught them how to read music. Ms. Kang admits that she was amazed to watch her students learning music skills so quickly within a short period of time.
Ms. Kang recognizes music as powerful means to connect people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, saying that “Music is a common language, isn’t it? Even though the vocalists sing Korean songs, music makes everyone connected, right? (음악이라는 것은 만국 공통어잖아요? 가사는 한국어로 물론 보컬은 부르지만 음악으로 다 통하잖아요?)” (Ms. Kang, 2013, May 14). She continues to emphasize the benefits of music for her students by commenting that music helps students to open their minds and connect with each other by working together in order to make a harmonious sound regardless of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. It also helps students to understand each other and builds a sense of community.

According to Ms. Kang, music serves a therapeutic function. She said that some students were too stressed about studying and music helped them to reduce stress and express their feelings. There are others who are just not interested in studying but became interested in music and finally found something that they could dedicate themselves to. She also mentions that they feel that they are learning something from the music band and that they feel gratified and experience a sense of satisfaction, which in turn leads the students increasing their self-esteem.

**Monolingual approach through music band.** Despite her recognition of music as a form of therapy, it is noticeable that she rejects a bilingual approach to teach music to multicultural students. She rationalizes the monolingual approach to her teaching practices in the following.

The songs that students are practicing now are all Korean songs. The reason why we did not choose songs from other countries … first, although it is not appropriate to say that our school promotes an assimilationist paradigm, our students need to learn Korean urgently. Because they are midway-arrived [newcomer] students, they cannot afford to do this and that. They cannot afford bilingual practices. Because they are in an urgent situation where they must be employed right after graduation and get adjusted in Korean society as soon as possible, Korean education is considered as very important.

(지금 연습하고 있는 곡들은 다 한국곡이에요. 특정한 다른 나라의 노래를 고르지 않았던 이유는… 일단 저희 학교자체는 동화주의라고 하기에는 딱 그렇지만,
According to Ms. Kang, the purpose of introducing Korean songs to the music band is to promote Korean language learning through music. From her perspective, the school’s urgent task is to help students quickly learn the Korean language and prepare them for future employment and quickly adjust in the Korean society as depicted above. She added that:

An assimilationist approach or melting pot approach, whatever it is, it does not matter. Our school has a policy that only focuses on Korean language learning. One class group set their homeroom motto as ‘let’s talk in Korean’ because students’ Korean language ability is so behind.

The above comments reinforce the school’s assimilationist approach to educating multicultural students, which also supports Mr. Lim’s perspectives on multicultural education, believing that the Korean-only language policy at school is the best practice for their students.

Commentary. It is interesting that Ms. Kang advocates incorporating alternative teaching approaches by acknowledging multiple intelligence theory (Gardner, 1993); however, she strongly positions herself in promoting a monolingual approach, rejecting a bilingual approach to teach Daham’s multicultural students. Ms. Kang believes that bilingual education is not an option for the multicultural students in Daham as their urgent task is to improve their Korean communication skills and using students’ first language is barrier for the development of Korean language proficiency. Nonetheless, she believes that music can be a great resource for students to learn Korean language and develop their talent as well as positive self-esteem.
However, it appears that she neglects heritage language and culture as a resource to actually help students to learn KSL and develop positive self-esteem by affirming their multiple linguistic and cultural identities as prior research in bilingual education supports (Cummins, 2001; Leoni et al., 2011)

**Korean language teacher, Mr. Jung**

Mr. Jung was born in Seoul and majored in Korean language and literature at a university in Korea. He has taught Korean language and literature in secondary schools for more than 5 years in Korea and he also taught Korean language arts in China for 5 years. He is one of three Korean language teachers at Daham and teaches Grade 10 Korean language arts and Korean as second language (KSL). Like Ms. Kang, he saw the job posting for Daham high school and was interested in teaching multicultural students.

Mr. Jung is also a homeroom teacher of Grade 10 students majoring in Computer Media. Fifteen of 18 students in his homeroom class are from a Chinese cultural background. The remaining three students are from the Philippines, Vietnam and Mongolia. Mr. Jung is able to speak basic Chinese that he learned when living in China. He said that having knowledge of Chinese language and culture was definitely helpful in his teaching practice with Chinese speaking learners; however, he said that he tries to use Korean as much as possible. Mr. Jung’s story illustrates how he perceives Korea’s emerging multicultural society and multicultural members of Korean society, and how he interacts with his multicultural students in his teaching.

**Mr. Jung’s perceptions of Korea’s multiculturalism and multicultural people in Korea.** Mr. Jung perceives that Korea is becoming more multicultural and the societal perceptions towards multicultural members of society are mixed with both negative and positive responses. Mr. Jung argues that the characteristics of multicultural families in recent times are distinctive from those formed due to the Korean War.

He thinks that the types of multicultural families and society’s perceptions of them changed over time. For instance, he said that after the Korean War, many multicultural families were formed between Korean women and American soldiers and the attitudes towards them were very
negative and they experienced overt discrimination. In comparison, in more recent times, multicultural families seem to be understood as families formed due to globalization and the perceptions of them are not always negative. However, he notes the society’s reproduction of stereotyped images of multicultural students and the sometimes negative usage of words towards multicultural students.

Mr. Jung also points out the lack of support from the government and lack of sufficient social services to embrace these multicultural families. He found that many of his students are in socioeconomically challenging conditions and thus they often work at part-time jobs after school. He adds that those who are able to find a job are fortunate since some students are unable to obtain employment due to linguistic and cultural discrimination. He said that if these students were to receive governmental funding, they could focus more on schooling.

Mr. Jung’s understandings of how multicultural families are formed in Korea highlight the importance of understanding the social, historical, and economic contexts where these multicultural families are formed and situated. Although Mr. Jung acknowledges the complexity of understanding multicultural families and societal biases against multicultural students, he did not mention how these biases can be challenged in his teaching practice and at the school level.

**Approach to language teaching and the use of L1.** Mr. Jung’s KSL class focuses on two areas: one for basic Korean language skills and the other for academic language skills. Students use Korean language textbooks that are published by Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation (KICE). Mr. Jung mentions that he mostly relies on these textbooks for his Korean language class. When I asked about the cultural components in the textbooks, he responded that the Korean culture was dominant and there were only a few areas dealing with other cultures.

Mr. Jung seems to be more flexible in terms of his students’ use of their first language (L1). However, he seems to be obedient to the school’s policy surrounding the monolingual approach in Korean language teaching. In terms of the use of students’ L1 at school, he said:
Of course they feel comfortable to use their first language when talking among the same ethnic group of students, so I often see students speaking their first language in the hallway during breaks and lunch. But, it is a natural phenomenon. Of course, our school recommends that students should only use Korean in school but it is not a compulsory rule. I think it is true that students’ using L1 do not have good effect for students from other countries such as Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam. When Chinese students speak only Chinese, non-Chinese students feel isolated, so regarding this, teachers are often warning students.

Mr. Jung’s comment above echoes Ms. Kang and Mr. Lim saying that learners’ L1 use is a contested issue in the school. In particular, Chinese students’ excessive use of Chinese among Chinese students was a common source of tension between students and teachers. However, Mr. Jung’s attitude towards learners’ use of L1 is rather ambivalent compared to Mr. Lim and Ms. Kang who hold stronger positions toward banning the L1 at school. Mr. Jung mentions that learners’ use of Korean should not be forced although learners should avoid excessive use of their L1 at school. Mr. Jung’s perspective towards learners’ L1 use is shown in the following instructions for the evaluation of writing in his class:
Figure 6. Writing evaluation instruction

The last instruction in Figure 6 states “you should write in Korean; however, you are allowed to write in your first language (with minus points) (한국어로 작성하는 것을 원칙으로 하되 모국어로 쓰는 것 (약간의 감점 있음)을 허용)”. The instruction is for the students’ writing contest, which is also considered as performative test in Mr. Jung’s KSL class. It reflects his conflicting attitudes towards the use of students’ heritage languages. The above text indicates that the exclusive use of Korean is encouraged. The fact that students’ L1 is allowed at the expense of negative points communicates that the use of L1 is disadvantageous to their school achievement after all. By inserting the prepositional phrase “with minus points” in brackets, Mr. Jung legitimates the school’s monolingual approach through the form of the school’s evaluation instrument, an authoritative and legitimate tool.

Commentary. Mr. Jung acknowledges that society and classrooms are increasingly becoming multicultural. He seems to be more flexible to accept linguistic and cultural differences based on the interview. While he is skeptical about the school’s assimilationist approach at times, he does not necessarily challenge its unequal educational practice of Korean-only policy in his teaching. Rather, by restricting the use of newcomer students’ first languages in the writing contest, his teaching practice seems to reproduce the dominant discourse which is circulating in Daham High School that views diversity as a problem to students’ successful assimilation and integration.

Chapter Summary: Linguistic and Cultural Difference in Daham High School

Multicultural students’ linguistic and cultural differences in Daham High School seem to signify a form of negative baggage in the school settings and are perceived as a disturbance to the society. The students from Daham fear attending a mainstream high school due to the potential
for social isolation, which may be partly derived from their perceived incompetent Korean language proficiency. Outside the school, the students also had uncomfortable and negative experiences regarding their different backgrounds and as a result, they do not feel accepted by Korean society. The newcomer multicultural students in Daham High School feel that they do not have any educational choices except for Daham and that Daham is the only ‘safe’ place for their education where they will not have to worry about social isolation and bullying.

Multicultural students’ experiences that are subject to linguistic and cultural biases in and outside of school seem to negatively influence their ability to negotiate positive multilingual and multicultural identities. For instance, Mimi, Chung, Jinu and Han from Daham High School all seem to fear being isolated because their Korean language proficiency is perceived as not fully developed and their cultural differences in most cases—except for Jinu’s case exhibiting both positive and negative experiences due to linguistic difference—is not viewed as valuable. In Mimi’s case, she has a different Korean accent and her age is different from her peers in the same grade. These differences except for the English language are perceived as barriers to successful integration into society. How the students perceive their knowledge of languages and cultures and how they negotiate their identities accordingly are greatly linked to how educators see the diversity of their students and respond to their perceptions and understandings of diversity in their practice.

The prevailing perception of school teachers and administrators of multicultural students and multicultural education in Daham High School is that multicultural students are academic underachievers and unsuccessful in employment due to deficient linguistic and cultural abilities. This deficit perspective seems to be predominant in their understanding of multicultural students and their linguistic and cultural repertories. For academic success, learners are then required to have mastery of the Korean language and knowledge of Korean culture and there is no space for their linguistic and cultural diversity to be incorporated to benefit their learning. Therefore, from this deficit perspective, learners should be assimilated into Korean monolingual and monocultural instructional settings. This deficit perspective is heavily reflected in Daham high school’s approach to multicultural education and the educators’ teaching practices. The school vice-principal, Mr. Lim, the music teacher, Ms. Kang, and the Korean Arts teacher, Mr. Jung
from Daham high school all reiterated the importance of acquiring the Korean language and
culture as pre-requisite to employment and for students’ success in Korean society in general.
They viewed any use of students’ heritage languages and cultures as an impediment to this
process. Such Korean monolingual and monocultural approaches are overtly exercised and
reinforced in Ms. Kang’s and Mr. Jung’s teaching practices by intentionally teaching only
Korean songs and disadvantaging bilingual use in the writing contest. It seems to be ironic that
the school for multicultural students which is also stated as a “multicultural vocational
alternative school” (MEST, 2012b, p. 14) in the policy document is actually immersing students
in Korean monolingualism and monoculturalism, whether these practices are overt or not.

In short, the deficit perspective, or the orientation of diversity-as-problem that sees diversity as
an impediment to social integration embedded in Daham High School’s education practice seems
to affect how students perceive themselves and how they interact with people in and outside of
school. This orientation does not see the diverse characteristics of multicultural students that are
different from the mainstream Korean students necessarily as a social harm. Yet, it does not
view the diversity as a social value, either. The stories from the participants illustrated the
school’s efforts to help students adjust to Korean society as quickly as possible. The school does
not appear to recognize linguistic and cultural diversity as a benefit in students’ learning
processes and thus teachers do not create a space for incorporating cultural and linguistic
diversity in their practice which could have been an opportunity for teachers and students to
positively affirm the diverse linguistic and cultural identities that could have been a mediating
tool to their academic success (Cummins, 2001).
Chapter 6
A Case Study of Sindo General High School’s Multicultural Education

This chapter addresses three multicultural students’ perceptions, challenges, and negotiations surrounding linguistic and cultural differences as well as the perspectives of three educators who play an important role in the school’s multicultural education projects at Sindo High School. This case study of Sindo High School highlights the specific conditions of the school’s multicultural education that are distinctive from Daham High School and the characteristics of the multicultural students in the relationship with teachers and peers through these school stakeholders’ narratives. Although the school administrators and teachers attempt to employ customized educational practices toward multicultural students through their newly added ‘multicultural education projects’, the multicultural students face various challenges in schooling and receive mixed messages of diversity from the educational practice and in the very intimate interpersonal space with their teachers and peers.

Context: Sindo High School

Sindo High School is one of the mainstream high schools located in Ansan city close to Seoul in Korea. As I noted in Chapter 3, Ansan recently became well-known as one of the most multicultural cities in Korea due to the increasing influx of multicultural families and migrant workers in the city. When I was searching for a mainstream high school to recruit for the research, I noticed from my search of school websites that Sindo High School was distinctive from other mainstream schools in Ansan as the school was designated as a model school for multicultural education starting in March, 2013. The school follows the national curriculum and fosters students’ development in order to pursue post-secondary education after graduation like most mainstream high schools in Korea. However, as a multicultural model high school for 2013, the school newly added a multicultural education department which allows the teachers to organize and administer multicultural education projects for the year. This new addition was distinctive from other mainstream high schools as most high schools did not have the multicultural education department to conduct multicultural education planning and implement practices more systematically. Nonetheless, the school’s implementation of multicultural
education led to various challenges which influenced teachers’ understandings of multicultural education as well as students’ perceptions of diversity projected by the school and teachers’ teaching practices.

**Multicultural Students’ Perspectives in Sindo High School**

**Inha**

Inha moved to Korea from Indonesia with his parents and older sister in 2003 when he was 7 years old as a result of his parents’ employment. After arriving in Korea, Inha spent a year learning the Korean language and culture at *Kosian’s House*. *Kosian’s House* is a multicultural community centre that was established in 2000 in Ansan with the aim of supporting foreigners’ adaptation to life in Korea. After Inha learned basic Korean, he enrolled in Grade 1 at an elementary school, a year later than the majority of Korean students enter. Although Inha did not share much information about his initial experiences in elementary school, it can be assumed that it was not always a pleasant time as he mentioned that his foreign name was often a target for harassment during the elementary and middle school years.

Although Inha desires to stay in Korea, he may have to go back to Indonesia as he said that his parents had a temporary visa that did not allow them to legally work in Korea any more. Due to his unstable visa status, Inha plans to go back to Indonesia and study graphic design since he feels that it is not going to be easy for him to enter a Korean university as a foreigner.

Inha’s story addresses how he perceives the social and institutional attitudes towards linguistic and cultural difference and how he positions himself on the borderlines between *us* as Koreans and *others* as foreigners and between legal and illegal status of residence in Korea.

**Inha’s language skills.** Inha is a bilingual speaker of Indonesian and Korean. He speaks Indonesian with his parents and speaks both Indonesian and Korean with his sister. Although Inha’s first language is Indonesian, he said that his Korean is much better than Indonesian commenting, “I feel more comfortable in Korean, I think and work in Korean language.
It seems that Inha has more balanced Korean language skills with both cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) and basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) developed (Cummins, 1979) since he is immersed in the Korean academic and social settings. He also feels more comfortable using Korean for his school work and other voluntary computer graphic work that he does in collaboration with a social group outside of school.

**Inha’s experiences of learning Korean language and culture.** Inha recalls his initial experience learning the Korean language and culture once enrolled in school. Inha’s middle school had a special class for multicultural students to learn the Korean language and culture. Inha liked learning Korean; however, he did not like to go on the school field trips for multicultural students. He feels that going on the school trips that are specifically planned for multicultural students are not fun anymore since he had already been to the same places multiple times in elementary school and he found that the trips only focused on Korean traditions and Korean history. They involved visiting heritage sites, palaces, and museums where Korean traditional and cultural artifacts were displayed. Moreover, he did not like teachers’ arguments that he must go because his school was paying all the travel expenses including food, transportation and site admission fees for him. In the end, he felt that he was forced to join the trips with teachers. On the surface, it appears that his school tries to support multicultural students since multicultural families cannot always afford the trips by themselves. However, he then felt that he was covertly discriminated against by the teachers’ way of forcing and rationalizing the school trips for multicultural students. He perceived that his teachers indirectly said that he should accept the school’s offer without a second thought as his family was economically challenged.

**Discrimination related to his foreign name and immigration status.** Inha has always been labeled as a foreigner instead of as a friend or student. In the beginning, people showed excessive attention toward him as he was from a different country. As time went by, after being asked too frequently “Why did you come here?” (Inha, 2013, May 22), the excessive attention
annoyed him because he realized that he was continuously considered as one of the ‘others’. He said that over time to some extent he learned to ignore the Korean people’s way of categorizing him as a foreigner and an object for alienation.

He revealed his feelings from being othered with his Indonesian name. He said,

I received attention from people due to my name Ttik. In the beginning I thought people are curious but later I felt being isolated … Later, I felt bad because I was treated as an alien (‘틱’라는 이름때문에 많이 시선을 받았고, 처음에는 호기심이었지만 나중에는 소외시키는 느낌을 받았고, …나중에는 이방인 취급하는 것이 기분나빴죠)” (Inha, 2013, May 22).27

He said that after the long period of time being harassed by peers and teachers due to his unique Indonesian name, he decided to take on a Korean name to use in high school. He said that since he started using his Korean name, he does not get as much attention and he feels more comfortable living in Korea.

Moreover, Inha is interested in computer-related skills but his status as a foreigner in Korea will likely hinder his future opportunities. Inha learned and is able to use various computer programs through the Internet. He is also able to use numerous computer graphic programs such as Photoshop, CAD design and 3-D design. Yet, due to his status as a foreigner in Korea he was unable obtain certificates accrediting his computer skills. As such, he feels that he will be in a disadvantaged position for tertiary education or employment in Korea since he does not have the certificates that can prove that he is adept at his many computer skills. As a result, Inha imagines his future in Korea as challenging so long as his status as a foreigner does not change. Although he desires to at least finish high school in Korea and then go back to Indonesia to continue education at the tertiary level, he is not sure if this may occur due to his family’s illegal immigration status.

27 Ttik is also a pseudonym for Inha’s Indonesian name.
**Multiliterate identity.** Inha seems to have trouble identifying his linguistic and cultural belonging. He states that he does not remember much about Indonesia. Although Indonesia is his birth country and Indonesian is his first language, he feels foreign to his home country. He said that “I don’t remember much [about Indonesia]. I was too young. I may feel strange. It’s still my home because I have relatives there (잘 기억이 안 나죠. 너무 어렸을 때 니깐. 낯설겠죠. 그래도 집이죠. 거기 친척들이 있으니깐)” (Inha, 2013, May 22). On the contrary, although Korea is a temporary space for him, he feels more comfortable living in Korea since he speaks Korean and knows the Korean way of living. He said that, “Korea is another world and another pathway (한국은 또다른 세상, 또다른 길…)” (Inha, 2013, May 22). Nevertheless, he makes it clear that he may always be treated as a foreigner in Korea and thus he cannot call Korea another home.

Among the participants, Inha is the most literate in many domains. Adopting the notion of multiliteracies (The New London Group, 1996) Inha may be viewed as a multiliterate person with strong digital literacies. On top of his bilingual abilities in Indonesian and Korean, he is able to use various computer graphic and music editing programs. He learned them on his own and through online communities since he was interested in computer programs. He notes that he feels more engaged in his online work and community activities and he is also more active online than offline. Also, he likes chatting online and feels more comfortable talking online than talking offline since he feels that he can express himself better online. Inha is also interested in drawing which he integrates with his graphic design work such as homepage and game designing. Whenever he is designing something online, he always sketches out his ideas with a pen or pencil first. For instance, he likes to draw the main characters when he is designing a computer game. The following drawings in Figure 7 are some examples of Inha’s characters that he plans to include in a computer game:
Figure 7. Characters in a computer game

Figure 8 below shows how he plans to design his online community homepage and how they will appear on the homepage as a final product as seen in Figure 9.

Figure 8. Sketch of online community homepage

The following images are all from Inha’s completed project and are on the website and his blog. Figure 9 shows the main screen of Inha’s computer game project. Figure 10 illustrates one of his game characters. Figure 11 is a music concert ticket that he designed as a group project to be evaluated for a school performance test. Figure 12 shows the main page of a site introducing a computer game which is designed to attract people in the area of graphic design. The page also
includes Korean thanksgiving holiday greetings. It is interesting to note that although Inha does not feel that he has good English skills, in the presentations of his graphic design projects, he often use English words—sometimes spelled in Korean—for instance, for introducing key items of the website as seen in Figure 9 and for describing the key content as seen in Figure 11. The English language seems to serve as an exhibitory function. This can be said that these multilingual expressions are his way of expressing his multilingual identity. However, the absence of his Indonesian language in any of his projects implies that his Indonesian linguistic and cultural background is not something that he desires to show to Koreans.

Figure 9. Homepage

Figure 10. Game character
Commentary. Although Inha has been in Korea for over 10 years and he feels more comfortable with the Korean way of eating, living and communicating and he is a competent multiliterate person, he was consistently othered and discriminated against due to his foreign name and his family’s residency status. Having had negative experiences in obtaining certificates because he is a foreigner, he envisions a limited future in Korea and is thus planning to return to Indonesia, his legal country of birth. However, it may not be easy for Inha to transfer to a regular high school in Indonesia since he has been away from Indonesia for too long and he may be not be qualified to directly transfer. In fact, when I spoke to him 8 months after his last interview, he had already returned to Indonesia and was having a difficult time finding a school. Inha is fluent in two languages, knowledgeable in two cultures, and multiliterate through his autonomous learning of computer and digital skills. Yet, somehow he is not situated in an advantaged position in either of his two countries, Korea and Indonesia.
Suji

Suji was born from a Korean-Chinese mother and a Chinese father. She uses Korean and Chinese (Mandarin) with her mother since her mother can speak both Korean and Chinese and Suji only speaks Chinese with her father since her father only speaks Mandarin. Her mother moved to Korea first after she got divorced from Suji’s father when Suji was in elementary school. Suji then lived with her father and step-mother and then moved to Korea in 2008. At the time of the interview, Suji was living with her mother and Korean step-father and her step-father’s parents in Ansan, Korea. Suji is interested in learning languages and she desires to become a hotelier. She expresses her desire to go to the United States not only because she can learn English quickly but she also wants to pursue her dream to enter the hospitality business there. Suji’s story reveals how her linguistic and cultural differences are perceived by others and how she herself perceives linguistic and cultural diversity.

Stereotypes and discrimination against Chinese people and culture. Suji had a hard time adjusting to the Korean school and society mainly because she often heard Korean people stereotyping Chinese people and Chinese culture. She felt very offended and isolated since her Korean friends showed negative responses towards her different accent due to her Korean and Chinese cultural background. As she experienced more negative responses, she became reluctant to show her multicultural background. Her frustration and discouraging experiences and hurt feelings are vividly revealed in the following excerpt:

Some people are curious about me, but I feel that there are more people that don’t like me… because I am Chinese. …One day in Society and Culture class, we talked about different cultures. When it comes to Chinese culture, I found that my peers have negative comments about Chinese culture. For example, when we talked about Chinese food, the first response from my classmates was that Chinese food is dirty. I felt terrible. …It’s a common perception among friends that when something like crimes or bad news happens, people say ‘isn’t it by Chinese again?’ And some people say that they want to physically hurt Chinese although it was an informal talk among friends.

(저에게 관심이 있긴한데 저를 싫어하는 사람이 더 많은 것 같아요.)
The above excerpt shows how her friends perceive Chinese people and culture at school and how the perception is reinforced in the society and culture class as stereotyped perceptions are repeated by classmates without being problematized or challenged. Suji also felt very hurt when someone said to her “If you are going to act like that, go back to your country” (그렇게 할꺼면 너 다시 중국가라) (Suji, 2013, May14). Having experienced negative responses more and more from classmates and other school friends, she became less and less confident about having a Chinese background. “In the beginning, I had been proud of myself, but [as time went by,] I found myself hiding [my background]. I felt that there’s nothing to be gained by revealing my background…(처음엔 당당했었는데 점점 숨기게 되더라고요. 말하면 좋을게 없는것 같고…)” (Suji, 2013, May 14). As a result, her bilingual and bicultural background becomes invisible and if possible, she wants to avoid attention from people as the attention she received in the past had a negative effect on her self-esteem and confidence.

School transition: Problems in the Korean education system. Suji’s transition into a mainstream Korean middle school was challenging. Although she completed Grade 8 in China, in Korea, Suji started in Grade 7 which is the first year of secondary education. Her mother thought that Suji may not be able to keep up with the core educational elements in Korea and that it would be better for Suji to start over from Grade 7. Regarding this, Suji actually felt discouraged and ashamed as she was going to study with a younger age group. Nonetheless, she worked hard and her middle school achievement scores were quite good overall.

Although Suji did well in middle school, she heard from her teacher that her good grades would not be accepted in the Korean education system to enter high school because she was a foreigner at that time. That was the most discouraging moment for Suji. She said that she was very upset
and felt discouraged and demotivated to continue studying. In fact she stopped studying at the end of the first semester in Grade 9. Then in the following semester, her teacher told her that her school records were accepted. After she learned that her grades were accepted, she was happy but it was difficult for her to get back to studying intensively in the same way as before. Lost in direction, she did not want to go to high school but her parents persuaded her to go. Suji said that her parents thought that she had to finish high school at least. Mostly due to her parents’ desire, she decided to go to high school and entered her current school, Sindo High School which was the only general high school that she could be accepted with her school record in the city.

**Suji’s dream language: English.** When I asked Suji about her long term plans and dreams, she said that she wanted to go to the United States and become a hotelier. As Suji desired to become a hotelier, she felt that she must learn English since according to her, English is the world’s common language and thus an important skill for her as a hotelier in the future. She also mentioned that she may be able to learn English quickly if she goes to the US. She expressed her perceptions on learning English and living in the US in the following way:

People think that the US is much better place to live than Korea. You can make a lot of money by running even a laundry business in the US. You can live in a house, not in an apartment building…Guys are handsome, beautiful and white…If you say that you’ve been to America, everyone will be jealous of you. Also, you have to use English there. You will learn more quickly if you are in America as I learned Korean quickly in Korea. When I heard that one of my relatives has been to America, I envied her. Since I set my dream to become a hotelier, I felt more serious about going to the US. (미국이라고 하면 사람들은 여기보다 좋고, 미국가서 세탁소 열어도 돈 많이 벌겠다고. 미국에는 아파트가 아니라 그런 집에서 살고…남자도 잘 생겼고, 맘 피부도 좋고 하얗고, 제가 한국에 와서 한국어를 더 빨리 배웠잖아요. 그래서 미국가면 영어를 더 빨리 배울것 같고…어떤 친척은 미국갔다고, 그렇게 보기 좋게 보였는데, 호텔리어라는 꿈을 갖고부터 더 가고싶어졌어요.) (Suji, 2013, May, 14)

For Suji, the US is perceived as economically stable and linguistically prestigious and provides an advanced environment for living and learning English. However, she has a tendency of
culturally stereotyping American people as she says “you can live in a house…” and “guys are handsome, beautiful and white”. For Suji, Americans are white Americans and live in houses, a conceptualization which does not reflect the reality of the US. However, her perceptions regarding the American people and culture may not be a coincidence as English textbooks predominantly represent the Anglo American middle class group as the normative cultural group (Song, 2013; Yim, 2007).

Cultural conflicts in relationships with friends and family members. Suji also experienced difficult times with some of her friends due to her age as she learned that age is a very important aspect of relationships in Korea. When she first started middle school she found that her classmates were uncomfortable with her and did not know how to speak to her. The likely cause of this discomfort was that Suji who was in Grade 10 was in the same age group as the students in Grade 11. Thus, she was one year older than her classmates in Grade 10. As already discussed in Han’s story, being different in terms of age requires different social practices. However, someone who is in a lower grade than others is also assumed to follow the hierarchal rule of using honorific forms in Korean. She recalls that one time she got into an argument with some students who were in grade 11 when she was in grade 10 because Suji did not use honorific forms when talking to them in Korean. The students then became furious and told her to go back to China if she was not going to follow Korean rules. Then, not only was Suji confused by the Korean school culture that she could not be a friend with either students in the same grade or the same age group but she was also hurt by her friends’ discriminatory response of not accepting her as a member of the Korean community and isolating her as an “other”.

Suji also had conflicting experiences with family members, specifically, with her step-grandparents. One day, Suji witnessed her mother kneeling in front of Suji’s step-father’s parents. She later learned that her step-grandparents blamed her mother for her not eating food at home, which in turn led to a furious argument between her step-father and his parents. Suji said that her step-grandparents often blamed Suji and Suji’s mother for all of the domestic problems. Suji also admitted that she experienced feelings of rejection from her step-
grandmother because her step-grandmother ignored Suji on the street when Suji said hi to her. Since then, Suji says that she wants to avoid talking to her step-grandmother even at home.

**Commentary.** Having experienced negative responses and social conflicts from friends and family members due to her different culture and language and not being in the age group, Suji tried to avoid these conflicts by being quiet, ignoring people’s malicious comments and by not revealing her cultural background as well as by not confronting her step-grandparents. As a result, her linguistic and cultural diversity becomes invisible as she feels that being invisible is the best strategy for her not to get hurt from people’s biases, stereotypes and blatant discrimination. When I was observing the after-school English class which Suji was attending, she was very quiet and did not say a word when other students talking. The English language teacher, Ms. Lee confirmed that Suji is one of the quieter students in class. Then, this leads one to wonder if this silence is an outcome of her internalization of the inferiorization of her language, culture and identity.

**Bora**

Bora is 18 years old and in Grade 10. Her father is Korean and her mother is Korean-Chinese. Bora was born in Korea and moved to China when she was very young and lived there for 5 years. She moved back to Korea with her family before she went to elementary school. Her first languages are Korean and Chinese. Although she is more fluent in Korean than in Chinese, she is proud of her Chinese background and tries to improve her Chinese communication skills. She lives with her parents and during school vacations she often visits her Chinese relatives in China. In the future, Bora would like to go to a university in China where her aunt is a professor and become a flight attendant. Among my participants, Bora is the most confident person in regard to her multicultural and multilingual background and has had more positive than negative experiences regarding her multicultural background and bilingual skills.

**Bora’s linguistic practices.** To maintain her Chinese language skills, Bora tries to talk to her mother in Chinese as often as possible. She thinks that it is important to check her Chinese pronunciation with her mother.
Once a week, I speak Chinese with my mom. My mom initiates a conversation in Chinese. Then, naturally, we continue the conversation in Chinese… If there are parts that I can’t [say in Chinese], I switch to Korean and then switch back to Chinese… Sometimes, English springs up in the middle of the conversation.

(일주일에 한번 정도는 집에서 엄마랑 중국말을 해요. 자연스럽게 엄마가 먼저 중국말을 해요 그레서 대화가 이어가고… 제가 못하는 부분은 한국말을 하고 그리고 또 중국말로 이어가고… 어떤 때는 말이 막힐때 영어가 튀어나오기도 해요.)

(Bora, 2013, May 21)

The above excerpt shows how she practices Chinese with her mother. She adds that Chinese is fun to speak and it is a secret language between her mother and her. She also expressed that she feels proud of herself when she speaks Chinese and she desires to become a fluent Chinese speaker. She also thinks that she has to be good at Chinese language since her mother is Chinese and must also receive a good score on the Chinese language exam. When she had two questions wrong on the school’s Chinese language mid-term exam and her score was lower than someone whose mother is not Chinese, she said that she felt bad. In light of this, Bora’s ability to speak Chinese and being good at Chinese language subject seems to be a source of pride and confidence.

**Cultural identities: Being in-between.** Bora has plural and at times hybrid cultural identities; however, her bicultural identities as being Korean and Chinese at times face challenges due to disrespectful responses from people. She says that she feels bad when she hears Korean people complaining about Chinese products and Chinese people in Korea. She says that she often hears Korean people overgeneralizing and complaining that Chinese products are cheap but of a low quality and defective. Particularly, she is hurt when she hears Chinese people called *Jiangke* (쟝께) indexing Chinese people as being poor and unclean, which is also mentioned during the interviews with Suji and Ms. Lee, English teacher. Conversely, Bora feels uncomfortable when she hears Chinese people complaining about Korean people in China. When she visited her relatives in China during the Beijing Olympics she felt bad when her
relatives complained about the Korean athletes in a short-track skating. Her relatives claimed that the Koreans were cheating and were cunning and did not play fairly.

Bora’s anecdotes highlight how a certain culture is stereotyped. The stereotyping is through overgeneralizing the characteristics of individuals and a small part of society as the features of the whole ethnic group and culture. Having part of Bora’s culture stereotyped, Bora sometimes feels that she has multiple cultural identities isolated from the dominant cultural group both in Korea and in China and at times wants to resist the attitudes of the dominant group. She said, “When I am in Korea, I’m on the side of China. When I am in China, I am on the side of Korea” (Bora, 2013, May 21).

Nonetheless, Bora is perceived by her peers and teachers as a typical Korean female high school student who is hanging out with Korean female friends, follows Korean celebrity and baseball and soccer players. In fact, she is a big fan of Ki Sungyong, famous Korean soccer player and an active member of his fan club attending fan club meetings and receives his signature on his posters that she bought. It is interesting to note that Bora is the only one among my student participants who is perceived as a Korean student rather than ‘multicultural’ student by others but who desires to be seen as ‘multicultural’.

**Bora’s Koreaness and multicultural striving.** Bora is proud of her cultural background and her mother being Chinese. She says that people do not recognize her as being multicultural if she does not mention it, but she likes to tell people about her cultural background. She often asks people if she looks ‘multicultural’. She says that people often respond to her that she does not look like a person who has Chinese mother. Then she says,

Don’t I look like a Chinese person? I think that my facial features may look a little different from Korean people, but [Korean] people say that I completely look like a Korean.

(중국사람처럼 생기지 않았냐고… 여던가 이목구비가 틀려보일것 같은데 근데 사람들은 완전 한국사람 같다고..) (Bora, 2013, May 21).
Bora expresses that she wants to look multicultural because she is very proud of her Chinese culture as captured in the following excerpt:

If I don’t say anything, nobody knows. I am really proud of my mom being Chinese so I say to people... Don’t I look multicultural? But people say ‘no, you don’t’... my mom is Chinese. But people don’t think that I have Chinese mom but I really look like a Korean... I just wanted to be standing out as a multicultural person. I am really proud of myself speaking Chinese.

(Bora, 2013, May 21)

Even though Bora is not perceived as linguistically and culturally different in Korea, she shows a strong desire to reveal her linguistic and cultural backgrounds since she is proud of them. However, she adds that another factor makes her feel proud of her diverse cultural backgrounds. She links her pride in being multicultural with the fact that her maternal aunt’s family in China is socioeconomically privileged:

When I talk about China, I am so proud. Because my aunt’s family is not poor in China...They are well-off in China. I am very proud of them. When I tell my friends about my aunt’s family, my friends are jealous of me. There are people that hide their cultural background. I don’t think that’s good. I think it is good to tell people that you’re multicultural.

(Bora, 2013, May 21)
Although she expresses that it is not good to hide one’s multicultural background, she does not explore why some people who are socioeconomically underprivileged remain silent about their backgrounds. According to Nieto and Bode (2011), it is naïve to assume and judge someone’s struggles and negotiations without considering the sociopolitical and socioeconomic contexts where individual multicultural members are situated. Based on Bora’s reasoning of why she feels proud of being multicultural, the multicultural aspirations seem to be only possible when one has Korean cultural and linguistic features and when one’s additional cultural background is connected to privileged socioeconomic conditions.

**Commentary.** Bora’s positioning of her identity, language and culture as bilingual and bicultural can be said to be her attempt to normalize what is considered as ‘abnormal’ in Korea and make her positioning something ‘cool’. It seems that she has been making efforts to ‘advertise’ her Chinese linguistic and cultural competence as she is not perceived as ‘multicultural’ but as a monolithic typical Korean by others. She continuously attempts to practice crossing the Korean and Chinese linguistic and cultural borders with her mother whenever and wherever possible to show her multicultural value. Through these multicultural practices she strives to create a counter-discourse of diversity as something ‘cool’ that one can be proud of in contrast to the dominant Korean discourse of diversity.

Bora’s experiences and perceptions of Koreanness and multiculturalness are reflective of the societal discourses on being multicultural in South Korea. She seems to be well aware of the lower status of multicultural families in Korea and she tries to position herself as exempt from the stigmatization that multicultural families are linguistically, culturally and economically deficient by arguing that her family and extended families have economic capital and she is not deficient in languages or cultures. However, based on Bora’s perceptions, one has to possess economic, social and cultural/linguistic capital to be proud of being multicultural in Korea, which still does not challenge the pre-existing discriminatory perception of multicultural families.
Educators’ Perspectives in Sindo High School

Principal, Mr. Yu

Mr. Yu, 60 years old, is a school principal at Sindo High School. He has about 30 years of experience teaching Korean Language Arts in secondary schools and about 5 years of experience as a school administrator. Surrounding his experience of multicultural education implementation, he says that his former school organized a multicultural event where the local residents who were from other countries came to the school and introduced their culture although his former school did not have multicultural students.

He has other experiences where he was in contact with different cultures. He has been to countries in Asia and Europe as part of in-service teacher training programs. However, the programs were very short and based on tourist attractions, not realistic living experiences. At the time of the interview, he had been principal for two years at Sindo High School and he had been involved in large school projects such as ‘Innovative School’ (혁신학교) and ‘Multicultural School’ (다문화학교). With the two major school projects, Mr. Yu says that he emphasized a creative and autonomous curriculum incorporating cultural diversity.

While negotiating the budget for the school’s multicultural education project, Mr. Yu encountered unexpected issues with the Ansan municipal government that allocated the budgets for the multicultural projects at schools located in Ansan. The biggest issue was related to the stakeholders’ differing perspectives on multicultural education. According to Mr. Yu, the municipal government argued that they can only support the schools’ multicultural projects that are dedicated to assimilating multicultural students by focusing on Korean language and culture learning. In contrast, Sindo School’s multicultural project proposed multicultural education for all students and planned various multicultural events and programs for all students. Mr. Yu’s initiatives with the multicultural education project despite the conflicts of interests with the government, highlights his perceptions of multicultural individuals, different cultures and languages in Korea and his approaches to multicultural education.
Mr. Yu’s multicultural education approach. Mr. Yu emphasizes an experience-based practice for multicultural education. He believes that students will learn best by directly experiencing different cultures. His beliefs and approaches to multicultural education are further illustrated in the following excerpt:

Teaching should not be just repeating theories. I believe that the best teaching practice is to provide students with plenty of opportunities to learn through living. I believe that the tendency that children from multicultural families tend to hide their multicultural background connotes that there is something wrong. Why do they try to hide? We have to help them not to hide their background.

(이론으로 자꾸 가르칠 것이 아니고요. 자꾸 생활 속에서 깨닫게 해주면 그게 최고의 교육이라고 봐요. 그러니까 다문화가정 출신을 감춘다는 것 자체가 잘 못되어있다는 거죠. 왜 감출려고 했을까. 감추려고 하지 않게 해야하는데.) (Mr. Yu, 2013, June 10)

Along with this comment, Mr. Yu shared his experiences of teacher training programs related to multicultural education. He found that the most useful experience from his prior training sessions related to multicultural education was visiting the multicultural street in Ansan which is known as a hub for the multicultural population and tasting the various ethnic foods. Having the experienced tasting different foods and seeing how other ethnic people interact, Mr. Yu thinks that it is important for learners to have hand-on experiences and direct interactions with other cultures.

Advocating Separation Education for Newcomer Multicultural Students. Another significant aspect in his perspectives of multicultural education is that Mr. Yu advocates for separate education for newcomer multicultural students in particular due to their incompetent Korean language skills. Mr. Yu believes that newcomer multicultural students should acquire a certain level of Korean communication skills first before entering a mainstream school.

He suggests that multicultural students first go to a school which has supporting programs such as Korean language and culture programs. Mr. Yu expresses that it is rather dangerous for the
students who are newcomers and have difficulties in communicating in Korean to attend a mainstream high school like Sindo High School.

It is dangerous to send those children separately because they cannot communicate. Our school does not have a proper system to accept and teach those students. There are schools like bridging schools in some areas. They accept those students [and teach them the Korean language separately]. There should be separate education for those children. (그런아이들을 학교에 따로 보내는 것은 위험해요. 언어가 안되는데. 그게 우리는 시스템적으로 확실히 되어있지 못하기 때문에. 지금 일부지역에서는 거점학교라고 있어요. 그런 사람들을 모아놓고 [ 언어를 가르치요], 그런 아이들을 위한 교육은 따로 모아놓고 하는 것이구요.) (Mr. Yu, 2013, June 10)

He further argues that the students should have separate education for their social safety in order to avoid some social problems such as group alienation and bullying. For him, multicultural students are viewed as a potential for school problems and he responds by avoiding these potential problems by not accepting multicultural students who are not competent in the Korean language.

Like Mr. Lim, Mr. Yu also shows a nationalistic perspective of multicultural education. He expressed that one of the important reasons to actively implement multicultural education is for instilling Korean nationalistic mind in multicultural students so that the students are trained to protect the nation of Korea in the event of war. He emphasized this view at a teachers’ meeting in order to persuade teachers to actively participate in the school’s multicultural education project as he said:

The statistics said that multicultural students’ drop-out rate is seven times higher than regular students. I thought that it is a serious problem and that we may encounter a big problem in the future. They [multicultural students] may aim their weapons at South Korea while serving in the military service in the demilitarized zone (DMZ). In the event of an outbreak of war, we may all be killed. I told all teachers about this and suggested to them to participate in the project all together.
Based on Mr. Yu’s opinions, to be able to protect Korea from an attack by another nation, the school needs to foster multicultural education that indoctrinates multicultural students in Korean nationalism. However, this is unjust and not realistic and it is not part of multicultural education. Rather it ignores multicultural students’ multiple cultural roots. In particular, students who were originally from North Korea may have serious conflicts in the negotiations of their identities and social positions. In this sense, it is rather ironic that like Mr. Lim, the vice-principal in Daham high school, Mr. Yu’s nationalistic attitude is also reflected as a way of rationalizing the multicultural education plans for their schools by emphasizing a nationalistic mindset in multicultural education. Mr. Yu’s nationalistic viewpoint in relation to multicultural education may be reflective of South Korea’s geopolitical conditions wherein South Korea is situated in a temporal break of war with North Korea which has differing ideological and governing systems from South Korea. The meaning of temporal break from war is that the war can resume at any time although it may not happen that easily due to diplomatic, domestic, economic and political reasons relating to the geopolitical situation of the Korean peninsula. Nonetheless, educating learners with Korean nationalistic mindset indicates indoctrinating them to be patriotic to the host nation by inculcating the host nation’s cultural values, beliefs, and history.

**Mr. Yu’s perceptions of cultural differences.** Mr. Yu expresses his perceptions of cultural differences, arguing that different cultures are not easily accepted in Korea. He argues that

There are not many people who are willing to permit their children to marry a Black person unless they are really aware [of multicultural values].

(당신의 자녀가 검둥이와 결혼을 한다고 한다면, 사실 왜 만큼 깨어있는 사람아니면 결혼 못하게 할 걸요.) (Mr. Yu, 2013, June 10).
He mentions that people of color, in particular, people of darker color may have more difficulties getting accepted in the Korean society.

In addition, Mr. Yu shares his perceptions of foreigners in Ansan where he works and lives. He says that foreigners in Ansan are considered as unethical persons who often disobey public rules such as traffic rules and often create social problems, commenting that

The foreign workers here should start to obey the Korean rules before they are treated like that [perceived like unethical persons], whether they obey the rules in their countries well or not.

(여기 와 있는 노동자 이런 사람들이 자기네 나라에서는 얼마나 잘 하는지 모르지만 그런 대접을 받기 전에 잘 해야하는 데.) (Mr. Yu, 2013, June 10).

His argument, however, seems to stereotype foreign workers in Ansan as unethical people who ignore public rules, overgeneralizing all the foreign workers as social problem-makers.

Interestingly, Mr. Yu thinks that the multicultural students in his school do not belong to the same category of foreigners as ‘unethical persons’ or ‘trouble makers’. On the contrary, he comments that the students obey school regulations well. For instance,

Multicultural students in our school are normal. They do not throw garbage out elsewhere and do not swear. They are docile. They are okay.

(학교에 있는 다문화가정 학생들은 말장난해요. 쓰레기를 바리지 않고요. 욕을 하는 것도 아니고요. 오히려 압정해요. 펜참아요.) (Mr. Yu, 2013, June 10).

The fact that the multicultural students in the school only throw away garbage in garbage bins and do not swear at least makes Mr. Yu perceive these students are ‘normal’ and not like the foreigners that he exemplifies above. He further compliments them as ‘quieter’ than Korean students.

Commentary. Mr. Yu’s perceptions of the multicultural students in Sindo high school as being ‘normal’ and ‘quieter’ than Korean students seem to ignore the multicultural students’
personal histories and their adaptation processes. Most of the multicultural students in Sindo high school are *de facto* either born in Korea or are long-term residents in Korea. They have already acquired the Korean language and culture close to the same level as the majority of Koreans. The multicultural students in Sindo High School can then be viewed as Koreans because they have Korean linguistic and cultural features; however, they are still categorized as multicultural students by Mr. Yu and the school as well as by the nation based on the nationality law—except for the Bora’s case. Furthermore, perceiving these students positively due to them being quieter than Korean students is problematic since being quieter or silent may be the consequences of negative experiences from being stereotyped and discriminated against in the past due to cultural or linguistic differences, as depicted in Suji’s and Inha’s cases. Mr. Yu’s response may then serve to reinforce the silencing of multicultural students’ unique cultural characteristics namely, being multilingual and multicultural.

**Social studies teacher, Mr. Ha**

Mr. Ha, 41 years old, teaches social studies for students in Grade 11 at Sindo High School. He has been a social studies teacher for 14 years in Korea. As far as international and cultural experiences, he had a short overseas experience visiting China as part of an in-service teacher training program. In Sindo, as part of his administrative duties, he was a director in charge of the school’s multicultural education project. My interview with him, thus, focused greatly on his involvement in the school’s multicultural education as well as his perceptions of multicultural students at Sindo high school.

**Mr. Ha’s perspectives of multicultural education.** Mr. Ha expresses a few concerns about the school’s multicultural education. First, he feels that his school started the multicultural education project impulsively without any long-term plans. He argues that the school joined the popular educational trend that is multicultural education in order to reshape the school’s positive image through the advocacy of multicultural education. He says that recently many schools started incorporating multicultural education polices and running multicultural education programs. Second, Mr. Ha is concerned that the school’s multicultural education approach is not consistent and inclusive enough. The school’s multicultural education approach is only
concerned with supporting multicultural students due to a reduced budget and the municipal government’s regulations that funding should be used for multicultural education to serve multicultural students’ interests. The limited budget and the bureaucratic restrictions allow the school to create multicultural awareness education only for the classes that multicultural students attend although the school principal emphasizes cultural diversity and multicultural education for all. Having conflicting perspectives regarding multicultural education with different stakeholders, Mr. Ha realizes that multicultural education may not be a long term practice as the school is relying on funding from the city. Third, Mr. Ha points out the lack of teachers’ conscious awareness of the necessity of multicultural education in school. He mentions that the school failed to get teachers’ attention to implement multicultural education. He contends that teachers should realize the importance and necessity of multicultural education in school and create an atmosphere where they can voluntarily consent to implement multicultural education as part of their everyday practice. In his school, he finds that teachers consider multicultural education as an extra administrative burden as he argues:

To be honest, teachers don’t recognize the absolute necessity of multicultural education in school. It is just a burden for them. In our school, there are only six teachers in our department that are concerned with multicultural education…We, teachers, need to ask ourselves why we need multicultural education.

(Mr. Ha, 2013, June 4)

Mr. Ha suggests that there is a need for differentiated multicultural education approaches in terms of institutional conditions. Even the school that does not have any students from multicultural backgrounds should consider providing multicultural awareness education. In particular, Mr. Ha is conscious of human rights issues related to multicultural education. He argues for the necessity of laws and legislated policies to support the human rights of
multicultural families and students, which he adds may lead to more public attention to multicultural families and make multicultural education more legitimate and powerful.

Mr. Ha’s perceptions of multicultural students. Mr. Ha said that the societal perceptions of learners from multicultural families in Korea are generally negative, arguing that in particular, people with a darker skin color are more likely to be isolated than others. He mentions that Korean people are scared of foreigners in Ansan and scared of going to Multicultural Street (다문화거리). Multicultural Street is a street in Ansan City where there are multicultural markets and various ethnic restaurants and is also an area where many multicultural families and foreign workers live. He argues that one reason Koreans are scared of these people and the street is that foreigners and multicultural individuals have strong images associated with social crimes. In particular, several serious crimes such as individuals being seriously physically harmed happened on Multicultural Street. Mr. Ha notes that these issues are often reported in the local newspaper and television. Thus, Mr. Ha clearly understands the societal perceptions of multicultural students and foreigners, which are greatly influenced by local multimedia sources.

Although, according to Mr. Ha, the general perceptions of multicultural families and foreigners are not positive, he argues that there are no overt biases or stereotypes existing at least in Sindo High School. Part of the reason is that based on his observations, the multicultural students in the school do not seem to reveal their cultural backgrounds. Thus, most teachers and students do not even know who has a multicultural background and as such the silent multicultural students are perceived as not isolated or bullied due to their different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Mr. Ha contends that although people have the perception that multicultural students tend to have poor academic achievements, which he attributed to news media reports, there are students who do not fall into that stereotype at Sindo high school. Rather, some multicultural students are performing better than the majority of students in his school. Nonetheless, Mr. Ha makes an interesting comment on the academic achievement of multicultural students in another mainstream high school.

WK High School nearby Sindo is a distinguished elite school. [The multicultural students] in that school do not show [their backgrounds]. They tend to be more stubborn
and more sensitive to academic achievements. There are certainly multicultural students in that school, but they don’t show. Multicultural students who have higher grades all went to that school… they don’t show their background at all.

He argues that the students of multicultural families in WK High School which is located nearby Sindo and is known as one of the elite schools in the province have higher grades in school performances than those in Sindo and have a greater tendency not to reveal their cultural backgrounds.

**Commentary.** Mr. Ha’s perception that multicultural students hide their cultural and linguistic backgrounds then leads to further discussions such as: whether the school sees different linguistic and cultural repertories as a potential or burden for success in schooling and thus whether the school creates a space where cultural and linguistic diversity flourishes or is prohibited. When students are inclined to hide their linguistic and cultural diversity, it can be said that they did not see the benefit of revealing it, feeling forced to be like one of the Koreans to be successful in their schools. This in turn suggests that the multicultural students’ linguistic and cultural diversity is understood as a burden for academic success in a mainstream high school and more so in the elite high schools.

**English teacher, Ms. Lee**

Ms. Lee, 27 years old, was teaching English as a foreign language at Sindo High School and it was her first year teaching when I interviewed her. She majored in English education at a university in Seoul where she had completed pre-service teacher education and she also received an English teacher certificate. Before she graduated from university, she went to the US for a year as an international student through the school’s international exchange program. After
graduating from university and successfully passing the national teachers’ examination in 2013, she was appointed to Sindo High School in Ansan for her first teaching assignment.

Ms. Lee speaks Korean as her first language and English as a foreign language. Among the teacher participants, Ms. Lee is the only bilingual, having English as her second language. Given her background as a novice teacher and as a language teacher, Ms. Lee’s perspectives of multicultural education as well as of the linguistic and cultural diversity of the multicultural students provide insights in the areas of teacher education and culturally sensitive multicultural educational practices.

**Ms. Lee’s teacher education related to multicultural education.** Ms. Lee recalled that there were few experiences or courses or content related to multiculturalism and multicultural education from her teacher education at her university in Korea. However, there were activities related to multiculturalism in one course in which she enrolled in the US as an exchange student. In that course, students were asked to present different ethnic foods. Various ethnic groups were represented and the students cooked, presented and shared their culture’s food with their classmates. Ms. Lee and two other Korean classmates made *Bulgogi*, a popular traditional Korean dish made from marinated beef in sweetened soy source. Another event was to show different countries’ traditional cultures. Her group showcased how to bow in the Korean traditional way.

She compared her experience at the university in the U.S. with her Korean university. At the Korean university, although she did not have any hands-on projects for learning different cultures, she remembered that one professor mentioned about the concept of World Englishes in class. Although that was the only time to talk about different varieties of Englishes, Ms. Lee said that it was a powerful lesson for her to learn about different perspectives regarding English language learning and teaching. Nevertheless, Ms. Lee’s limited pre-service teacher education in Korea highlights the current state of Korea’s university level teacher education which does not address professional development in the area of multicultural education.

Regarding in-service training programs, Ms. Lee mentions that recently an information letter from the provincial ministry of education was circulated for teachers to apply for an in-service
training program related to multicultural education. It was one of the many optional teacher training programs. She thought that only the teachers in the department of multicultural education were concerned with multicultural issues and that they tended to take teacher training programs related to multicultural education. Ms. Lee feels that the other teachers are not interested and do not consider multicultural education as part of their work. Most teachers do not spend extra time and effort to link the multicultural issues with their subjects. In her school, it seems to be clear that dealing with multicultural education is a departmental responsibility. This is echoed by Mr. Ha as he said that the planning of educational practices related to multicultural education is mostly done within the department. Ms. Lee’s perceptions of how the school’s multicultural education is organized and perceived highlights the lack of teachers’ awareness of multicultural education that can be incorporated in their subject matter and also the lack of in-service professional development related to these issues.

**Cultural stereotypes and biases.** Ms. Lee often observes students stereotyping certain cultures. She feels that students are not sensitive to multicultural families and surrounding issues as many of her students are not used to meeting multicultural families and people from other cultures. Thus, she thinks that her students’ way of dealing with multicultural issues and their sensitivity to different cultures is not well developed.

Ms. Lee mentions that some students use stereotyped words towards certain cultures for example, Jjangke (짱깨) or Jjangkola (짱꼴라) for Chinese people. Jjangke is derived from Chinese word for ‘Zhanggui’ which means Chinese shopkeeper but associated with the word, ‘JJajangmyeon’ (짜장면, one of the most popular Chinese dishes in Chinese restaurants in Korea) (Cha, 1999 June 5). Jiangkola is derived from the Chinese word for slaves (Shin, 2009 June 25). Although the literal meanings are not derogatory, the words are insulting and discriminatory since the use of the words serves to denigrate and insult Chinese people in Korea. Ms. Lee realized that her students were not just ignorant but discriminatory towards other cultures when she heard her students calling Chinese people Jjangke and even some students saying that they wanted Chinese people to go back to China. Ms. Lee says that she gets quite puzzled and does not know how to respond to that at times.
In terms of students’ responses towards different cultures, Ms. Lee says that some students show positive attitudes towards white foreigners whereas they tend to show negative attitudes towards foreigners of color. She observes that students have a tendency to view physical appearance close to that of white people in favorable terms. For instance, she observed a case when a female student’s facial expression brightened and was cheerful when she heard from her classmates that she looked like a white foreign girl with pale skin. However, she also observed another case when a male student’s peers told him that he looked like one of many South Asian foreigners who are often seen working as laborers at construction sites. In this case, the student became angry and showed offence to the comments.

Ms. Lee provides another interesting example of students’ unbalanced perceptions toward different cultures based on their responses to criminal issues with foreigners in Korea. She notes that students have a tendency to problematize issues of one culture much more than those of other cultures. For example, her students often expressed negative responses to any issues related to the Chinese cultural group. However, they seemed to problematize much less a criminal act by a French resident in the French village in Seoul.

These responses are contrary and biased. Students tend to consider the Chinese cultural groups as regular criminals and tend to think that the Chinese presence is harmful in Korean society; by contrast, the criminal act committed by a French resident was a one-time occurrence and the person suffered from psychological problems. In other words, Korean students have a discriminatory attitude toward Chinese people. According to Ms. Lee, when there is a criminal act involving a Chinese person, students tend to blame the whole Chinese community. In contrast, students show different attitudes toward a French person by considering the incident as a one-time individual mistake.

In responding to her students’ cultural stereotypes and biases toward different cultures, Ms. Lee follows intercultural strategies that encourages students to reflect on their own culture and compare it with different cultures. This involves encouraging students to put themselves in the shoes of the other group as illustrated in the following excerpt:
Students judge the whole cultural community with one problem. Then, I tell them that we behave as if American people blamed the whole Korean people for one incident occurred by just one Korean individual.

(그거 하나만 보고 아이들은 무리지어서 그 사람 전부를 판단하잖아요. 제가 우리가 그러면 미국에서는 한국사람들이 잘못하면 한인 모두를 탓하는 것과 같은 행동을 하고 있다고 말해요.) (Ms. Lee, 2013, June 10)

Ms. Lee says that this practice can help students to develop a more rational understanding toward people from foreign countries. This practice can also help students to become more sympathetic towards different cultures. She comments that her teaching practices use this strategy of comparing cultures to deal with the cultural elements in English textbooks. She says that one chapter addressed multiculturalism in London and that London was illustrated as a multicultural society representative of a melting pot. The chapter also described various people from different cultures and introduced cultural differences, for example, by presenting different ways of eating different foods in different cultures. Ms. Lee mentioned that, when dealing with the chapter, she compared Korean food and Korean way of eating with other cultures. In fact, her emphasis on intercultural engagement was also seen in her teaching. Intercultural engagement includes critically reflecting on one’s own culture by comparing different cultures and relating one’s own to other cultures (Byram, 1997; Corbett, 2003). When I observed her after-school English class, she elicited students’ contributions to sharing and constructing cultural knowledge by asking students about the similarities and differences in other cultures’ culinary manners as described in the texts.

Ms. Lee articulates the importance of introducing cultural activities and various materials to teach cultural diversity as illustrated in the following excerpt:

So, I feel that students have biased responses towards different cultures because they do not have the knowledge of diverse cultures. Thus, I feel the necessity of changing the perception by introducing cultural activities and showing movies related to multiculturalism, such as ‘Banga Banga’.

(… 아이들이 다양한 문화를 잘 몰라서 그렇게 반응하는 것일 수 있는 것 같아서)
She suggests watching a movie with students such as ‘Banga Banga’ which reflects the current state of Korea’s multiculturalism from the viewpoint of multicultural families and foreign workers. She argues that this activity can help students challenge stereotyped perceptions and raise multicultural awareness as an initiating stage toward multicultural education.

Although there are increasing volumes of educational materials related to multicultural education, there is still a scarce amount of resources to be used as pedagogical practice and at times, materials tend to be biased. Ms. Lee mentions that her English textbook introduces different English varieties but American English is dominant. Nonetheless, Ms. Lee adds that the parents of multicultural families can be good resources to introduce different cultures. More powerfully, hands-on experiences such as making different cultural foods and tasting different dishes could also be a good practice to introduce different cultures, as Ms. Lee experienced at the American university.

**Commentary.** Ms. Lee tends to have more concrete examples of pedagogical practices related to multicultural education than Mr. Yu and Mr. Ha. She mentions that her experiences living as a foreigner in a foreign country and having hands-on practical cultural experiences helped her to develop cultural awareness and sensitivity. In fact, her teaching practice included activities that raised linguistic and cultural/intercultural awareness as exemplified above. As such, her approach to multicultural education reflects linguistic and cultural awareness where students’ linguistic and cultural diversity is understood as a resource for knowledge construction. Also, Ms. Lee’s story highlights the lack of teachers’ awareness of multicultural education and the significance of developing teachers’ training programs focusing on multicultural education, including pedagogical suggestions to incorporate cultural diversity into the different disciplines.
Chapter Summary: Linguistic and Cultural Diversity in Sindo High School

The experiences that multicultural students in Sindo High School add to the depth of understanding of how multicultural students perceive linguistic and cultural diversity in Korea through their interactions with teachers and peers in the past and currently. They do not face serious social isolation due to linguistic issues that are more evident from the multicultural students from Daham high school, although they feel culturally insulted at times by their peers and teachers, for instance, due to different names and different ages. However, it does not mean that they did not experience marginalization and discrimination due to linguistic issues. In fact, the stories from Inha and Suji illuminate their painful and uneasy time in the beginning of their settlement in Korea due to their linguistic differences. Even though the students acquire Korean language proficiency, the students are still isolated and discriminated against to some extent due to cultural difference in schools. In particular, Inha and Suji chose to hide their multicultural attributes such as using different languages and showing different cultural characteristics. For them, their cultural and linguistic differences were a burden in the past and thus they did not want their cultural backgrounds to be revealed. However, the exception to these cases is Bora.

Unlike most multicultural students, Bora likes to show her multicultural background as she had more positive experiences associated with her background. Her affirmative experiences regarding her multiple linguistic and cultural identities have a great influence on increasing her motivation to learn and invest in her future as multicultural and multilingual people, which is also similarly seen in Jinu’s case in Daham High School. Bora positions her identities differently from the other multicultural students as she had had more positive responses towards her multiple linguistic and cultural repertories. Bora through the Chinese language club showed her excellence in Chinese language which is approved by her Chinese teacher and her friends and relatives. However, she admitted that she intentionally announces her different background to others showing her pride of her multicultural background, which most multicultural students do not dare to show, and that she is exceptional.

Most multicultural students seem to have internalized that their bilingual and bicultural abilities are not useful since they do not have opportunities to further develop their bicultural and
bilingual skills in school, which is illustrated by Suji and Inha. Suji does not identify her bilingual abilities and bicultural background as being beneficial in high school. Her comments also indicate that she is becoming increasingly monolingual as her Chinese language is in the process of attrition. For Inha as well, there do not seem to be any opportunities for him to improve his bicultural and bilingual abilities. Rather he feels that he is being assimilated into Korean culture by being forced to go to on school field trips. Inha strongly feels that he should speak and act like a Korean in order to be treated as other Koreans in school. Consequently, in order not to show his different cultural background, he changed his name into a Korean name. In this sense, these students’ stories along with those from Daham High School highlight the fact that some multicultural students often feel forced to acquire the social, cultural and linguistic norms that are considered valuable in the Korean education system as well as being forced to assimilate into the Korean society as quickly as possible at the cost of the attrition of their heritage language and having their ethnic names forgotten.

One noticeable distinctiveness that the three multicultural students in Sindo High School exhibit is that they seem to be firm regarding their future plans and be on the right track by working hard to develop the necessary skills for their dream jobs (i.e., computer graphic designer for Inha, hotelier for Suji, and flight attendant for Bora), which was not seen in those students in Daham High School except for Jinu. It can be said that the multicultural students in Sindo seem to have more educational opportunities to develop their necessary skills through school. Suji is taking an after-school program for learning English, Bora is participating in the Chinese language club and Inha is taking part in a photography club. These students are investing their time and efforts towards their dream.

The educators’ perspectives of diversity in Sindo High School also seem to reinforce this perception that multicultural students’ diverse languages and cultures do not have a space in Korean schooling. According to the educators in Sindo High School, their multicultural students tend to hide their cultural backgrounds. Most teachers and students do not know who has different cultural backgrounds. The multicultural students are all fluent in Korean and they do not show any specific cultural features that may reveal that they have different cultural backgrounds. Ms. Lee and Mr. Ha mention that the students prefer not to show their cultural
backgrounds due to fear of discrimination. Moreover, the educators seem to agree that although the school’s multicultural education should focus on multicultural education for all students, their current multicultural education practices do not support that aim. Mr. Ha and Ms. Lee note the lack of teachers’ awareness regarding the necessity of multicultural education in school. According to them, only the teachers in the multicultural education department consider the school’s various multicultural education projects seriously since they are part of their administrative duties. However, other teachers feel rather burdened to be involved in the different multicultural education projects. Also, based on Mr. Yu’s and Mr. Ha’s explanations, the school’s multicultural education was not planned as a long-term project but instead relies heavily on the city’s budget, which influences how the school organizes its multicultural education.

The delineated tensions above regarding the school’s multicultural education practices highlight inconsistencies between beliefs about multicultural education and the implementation of multicultural education. The school advocates, according to Mr. Yu, multicultural education for all, but the specific action plans had to change to be in line with the city’s multicultural education purposes in order to obtain financial support. The city’s suggestion of supporting multicultural students by focusing exclusively on Korean language and culture learning is in fact then a political act to naturalize these learners as Koreans while ignoring their heritage language and culture. Also, it seems to be short-sighted as it does not advocate multicultural education for all which is crucial and essential for equitable and inclusive education (See Nieto and Bode’s argument on this, 2011, pp 48-50). It seems that the educational practices are influenced too much by the economic conditions set by Ansan municipal administrators. Nonetheless, this highlights that the school’s implementation of multicultural education is closely interrelated with sociopolitical conditions where the school has to consider the interests of Ansan city, which provides all the money for multicultural education. This, in turn, implies that multicultural awareness education should not be limited to the school level but should be extended to civic organizations, broader communities, and ultimately to all levels of the society regardless of age, gender, class, ethnicity and ability.
Chapter 7
Discussion and Conclusion

This doctoral inquiry has investigated how multicultural students, their languages and cultures are perceived by stakeholders in two high schools as well as how discourses surrounding multicultural students, their languages and cultures are reflected in multicultural education policy documents and the news media articles. In this final chapter, I synthesize my analysis of the case studies of newcomer adolescents in the two high schools by comparing the schools’ distinctive multicultural education practices and highlighting the similarities and differences in the student participants’ identity negotiations of their schooling and socialization. Then I discuss the findings of the textual analysis and case studies through the lens of the five orientations to diversity as discussed in Chapter 2 which are based largely on Ruíz’ language planning orientations. The chapter concludes with the limitations of the research and suggestions for future research.

Discourses of Newcomer Youth Language, Culture and Identity: Comparison between Daham and Sindo

The two high schools have fundamental differences in how they view diversity and in their approaches to multicultural education. The discrepancy derives from the differing school conditions, differing conceptualization of diversity, and the characteristics of their multicultural students. The multicultural students from the two schools show some similar patterns yet they differ in their identity positionings in response to the messages they receive from the society and their schools through hidden and implicit curricula (Cornbleth, 1984).

Daham High School as one of the first multicultural alternative high schools in South Korea attempts to accommodate the needs of multicultural students to support them in successfully integrating into South Korean society. The school’s curriculum places a strong emphasis on Korean language and culture as well as on the specialized areas of study, namely, tourism and computer media. Although there are bilingual teachers in the school, they assist students’ understanding of subject matter in particular for the subjects where more advanced academic concepts are taught such as in social studies, history and science. They are not there to promote
additive bilingualism. Their orientation is towards subtractive bilingualism wherein students’ linguistic differences are considered as an academic burden. In alignment with the curricular messages, the educators’ beliefs and their teaching practices in Daham’s multicultural education reflect monolingual and monocultural approaches. Rejecting the possibility of a multicultural identity, the school fosters one Korean national identity in order to help students successfully assimilate into Korean society. Somewhat similar but more divergent understandings of diversity and multicultural students emerge from the educators at Sindo High School.

As depicted in the previous chapter, the main message embedded in Sindo High School’s multicultural education program indicates that multicultural education is for everyone, not limited to only multicultural students and families. The principal, Mr. Yu also emphasizes the importance of raising multicultural awareness and multicultural sensitivity for Korean students. However, he also articulates a differentiated orientation to educating multicultural students which reflects a patriotic perspective. Thus it can be said that he holds dualistic/ambivalent understandings of multicultural education. On the one hand, multicultural education for multicultural students is associated with learning Korean nationalistic values and is necessary for national security and peace. On the other hand, multicultural education for Korean students is connected with appreciating multicultural values in order for them to become global leaders who have multicultural sensitivity. In other words, Mr. Yu has somewhat limited expectations for multicultural students while in a broader sense he expects world citizenship from Korean students. Nonetheless, in terms of the implementation of the multicultural education program in Sindo High School, the other two teacher participants Mr. Ha and Ms. Lee who are closely associated to multicultural education projects show different orientations to multicultural education. Mr. Ha emphasizes a human rights oriented education while Ms. Lee underscores the importance of intercultural education which compares different cultures and decenters one’s own culture in order to achieve a better understanding of cultural others. I observed that she put this orientation into practice during her extra-curricular English class.

As such, multicultural education in Sindo connotes mixed yet at times conflicting messages, which is different from the educators at Daham High School who have consistency in viewing multicultural education through an assimilationist approach. This can also be due to the different
characteristics of the multicultural students in the two schools. For instance, multicultural students in Sindo High School do not have concerns regarding Korean language learning as they had to come close to the level of native-speaker mastery to be accepted into one of the Korean mainstream high schools. However this is not the case for students in Daham. Most students in Daham are newly arrived, having been in Korea for approximately two years and are not proficient in Korean. Thus the educators in Daham focus on the students’ acquisition of Korean and socialization into Korean culture as an urgent task particularly for employment after their high school graduation. By contrast, students in Sindo are old timers—in fact, Bora in Sindo High School was born and raised in Korea except for a couple years when her family stayed in China.

It is evident that the school’s emphasis on assimilation and the educators’ teaching practices that coincide with the Korean-only monolingual policy at Daham High School have an impact on students’ understandings of themselves and how they negotiate their identities, cultures and languages in school and society. For Han and also for Mimi and Chung, their linguistic and cultural differences are interpreted by acquaintences and teachers as an impediment to their social integration and success in Korea. As a result, it is not surprising that Mimi and Chung became silent about their linguistic diversity outside of school and that Mimi attempts to naturalize her Korean accent in order to sound more like a ‘standard’ Korean speaking person. Han also seems to internalize the school’s linguistic assimilationist message as he thinks that only those who can speak native-like Korean can become a citizen of Korea and will not be discriminated against and treated unequally. On this note, he does not perceive himself as a Korean citizen despite holding Korean citizenship. Nonetheless, Han’s identity negotiations and positioning should not be understood as a linear pattern, as he exhibits multiple feelings—at times, anger, reluctance, and resistance while at other times he opts for compromise and reconciliation.

It is also noteworthy to point out the influence of peer group pressure on the identity positioning of multicultural students in Daham High School. Most of the Chinese speaking students use Chinese with their peers in Daham High School during recess even though it is not welcomed in the eyes of teachers. In other words, the school’s language policy conflicts with their peer relationship negotiation. Students resist the school’s policy to maintain their peer group
membership and friendship. Even Mimi and Jinu started to learn Chinese in order to be part of the peer group. However, this affective aspect of multicultural youth positioning in relation to identity is absent in Sindo.

Although similar experiences are shared by the multicultural students in Sindo, their experiences and identity positionings are distinctive from each other and from those in Daham High School. Inha and Suji in Sindo High School are more assimilated into the Korean school and society than anyone else except Bora, showing somewhat typical characteristics of Korean youth at the present time (e.g., peer communication through KakaoTalk with their smart phone and enjoying Korean pop music). In the public space, they do not exhibit any other linguistic and cultural affiliations other than Korean, for instance, during classroom interactions and in their personal blog that is open to public. However, it is not that they reject their feelings of Indonesian and Chinese culture and language. It seems that they are accustomed to showing what Korean society and their school and peers expect to see from them, in other words a fully assimilated Korean identity. In contrast, Bora’s identity positioning is a reversal as illustrated earlier. Bora prefers to look ‘multicultural’ and consequently performs her biculturality by often crossing different linguistic borders when communicating with her mother at home and outside and by showing her willingness to be a language interpreter as needed any time in and outside of school. She rejects having a monolingual and monocultural identity, rather positioning herself to be seen as bicultural and bilingual. It is interesting that Bora’s Chinese is not as proficient as my other multicultural students who have Chinese linguistic backgrounds. However, it is evident that she has a stronger sense of belonging to her bicultural and bilingual space where her Korean and Chinese cultures coexist than any of my other participants. Jinu who also perceives himself as having a multicultural identity does not actively or vigorously ‘perform’ or ‘advertise’ his multicultural and multilingual identity like Bora although he does negotiate his identity positions to obtain multicultural and multilingual legitimacy in his own way at home. One thing that these learners’ experiences relating to their languages and cultures implies is that the notion of multicultural identity is absent or at best hidden in Korean society. Some students attempt to assimilate into Korean society and culture to eradicate their ‘abnormality’ as a response (i.e.,
cases of Mimi, Chung, Suji, Han, and Inha) and others resist and perform their ‘abnormality’ as an attempt to normalize what is considered as abnormal (i.e., cases of Jinu and Bora).

Diversity-as-Problem/Threat

This orientation is very evident in some of the early policy documents and media articles that reflect a conservative political perspective. It is less evident in later policy documents, media articles reflecting a more left-of-center political perspective, and in the views of educators. However, some of the comments of educators also reveal concerns that newcomers could threaten national security if they are not educated effectively to acquire the Korean language and identify with the Korean nation.

The ethnocentric orientation to diversity is reflected in the way newcomer students are labeled in the 2006 multicultural policy document. Among other terms, the label mixed-blood is used as a descriptor. This term feeds into the historical discourse of racial superiority and the stigmatization of children born to Korean women and African American soldiers during and after the Korean War in the 1950s. Despite criticism from the United Nations about the use of this term, it is still used in the popular press and media commentary.

A deficit perspective permeates the earlier Ministry documents on multicultural students. The goal of policy initiatives is to control and ‘correct’ the linguistic and cultural ‘defects’ of multicultural students. These documents explicitly suggest cultural assimilation and heavily emphasize Korean language and culture learning for multicultural students. No consideration is given to creating a space for the development of multiple linguistic and cultural identities. Their linguistic and cultural differences are considered as major points of concern and tension by the Ministry of Education as they are problematized and framed as problems that the development and improvement of multicultural education policies must resolve. Multicultural students’ diverse languages and cultures are considered as disturbances and burdens to success in schooling and social integration. This hidden message suggests that students’ multicultural and multilingual identities should be eradicated and replaced by a Korean identity so that students may be accepted as members of Korean society.
A highly nationalistic and ethnocentric orientation to diversity is also reflected in news articles published by the more conservative newspapers Chosun and Donga. Racially derogatory terms referring to multicultural students such as *mixed-blood* and *Jabjong* are used without being problematized and challenged. Multicultural students are described as socioeconomically, culturally, mentally and physically challenged individuals and these characteristics are cited as a reason why they are subjected to bullying at school. These articles also speculate that a lack of assimilation into society may result in social violence. It seems as if these conservative news media do not see the option of a peaceful co-existence between Korean and multicultural identities in Korean society. Multicultural identities must ‘disappear’ for the good of both the Korean society and the newcomers themselves.

Strong Korean ethnocentric ideas are reproduced by the two school administrators who show nationalistic attitudes in multicultural education. For instance, Mr. Yu rationalized his initiative to implement multicultural education in Sindo High School in terms of the nation’s security and the need for social conformity to a unified national identity. As documented in the previous chapter, Mr. Yu expressed the existential threat posed by unassimilated and potentially non-loyal newcomer youth by saying that “in the event of the outbreak of war, we may all be killed”. Mr. Lim, vice-principal of Daham high school, also advocated linguistic and cultural assimilationist approaches to accelerate students’ quick adaptation into Korean society. These nationalistic perspectives of school administrators contribute to the school’s pedagogical approach, policy and curriculum. Particularly, Mr. Lim, emphasized that learners’ swift adaptation into Korean society through acculturation required the school to maximize classes focused on Korean language and culture.

In summary, while much of the discourse surrounding diversity in the Korean context can be characterized as ‘ethnocentric’, in some cases this discourse went further in warning that newcomers posed a threat to Korean identity and the security of the nation. It is interesting to note that the recent (2015/2016) discourse in Europe and North America surrounding Syrian refugees similarly highlights the potential threat newcomers pose to the security and identity of receiving countries.
Diversity-as-Problem/Impediment to Assimilation/Integration

This orientation to diversity is the most common one in both Korea and in countries around the world that are experiencing a planned or unplanned influx of newcomers. The focus is on creating social structures and educational provisions that promote rapid language learning and cultural assimilation. This orientation does not share the overt racism and ethnocentrism characteristic of the previous diversity-as-problem/threat orientation but ethnocentrism is implicit in the fact that assimilation is viewed as a one-way process and newcomers are seen as having little to contribute to the broader society with respect to economic, cultural, or linguistic capital.

Although the Ministry of Education’s recent multicultural education policy documents in 2012 and 2013 make some attempt to incorporate a positive orientation to cultural and linguistic diversity, the documents still legitimize the strong boundary between Korean students and multicultural students. They reinforce linguistic and cultural inequality by validating Korean students’ and parents’ abilities and resources as cultural capital (e.g., Korean language and culture) but largely ignoring multicultural students’ and parents’ resources as cultural capital. For instance, according to the 2012 multicultural education policy document (MEST, 2012b), only the Korean way of raising children is encouraged in the proposed exchanges between Korean parents and multicultural parents. Despite the increased opportunities for multicultural students and families to interact with Korean students and families in the recent multicultural education policy, unequal relationships between the families are reproduced through an unequal knowledge exchange which serves to strengthening the boundary between them and legitimizes the superiority of Korean culture and knowledge.

Although Sindo high school appears to have a more accommodating perspectives and approaches regarding multicultural education based on the school’s multicultural education program, the school administrator, Mr. Yu, has conflicting and divisive attitudes towards multicultural students and Korean students. As noted above, he shows a strong ethnocentric attitude by invoking national security as a rationale for educating multicultural students and he promotes a nationalistic orientation to curriculum for these students. At the same time, he advocates a focus
on linguistic and cultural diversity for educating Korean students. However, despite the nationalistic tone to some of his comments, his views appear to be pragmatic rather than racist in orientation. A strong emphasis on learning and incorporating Korean culture is a core element in his educational philosophy in regard to multicultural students. Mr. Lim’s orientation in Daham School is very similar.

As reflected in the administrators’ perspectives, nationalistic concerns are also evident in planning the school curriculum and in teachers’ teaching practices. Daham school’s Saturday culture trips are all related to learning about Korea’s history, heritage and traditions. Similarly, Sindo’s school field trip that is specifically designed as part of the multicultural program focuses on Korea’s past and present by visiting Korean palaces and the Blue House. 28 Ms. Kang’s practice of teaching only Korean songs and intentionally excluding songs of other nations similarly reflects an ethnocentric orientation. Mr. Jung, the Korean language arts and KSL teacher, commented that students are more likely to learn Korean culture and the Korean way of interacting and behaving by virtue of the fact that the textbooks focus on Korean culture and rarely introduce other cultures.

Although these institutional and pedagogical practices are implemented with the best interests of students in mind, it is worth noting that institutional structures limit their effectiveness in some instances. For instance, multicultural students who do not hold Korean nationality are considered ineligible to apply for scholarships and obtain certificates as reflected in the experiences of Chung and Inha. Thus, the pragmatic focus on rapid assimilation that underlies much policy and educational practice in Korea is contradicted by societal structures that exclude highly assimilated students such as Inha from membership in the society.

Diversity-as-Right

As noted above, this orientation was virtually absent from the discourse analysis of policy and media documents and also from the perspectives of educators in the two high schools except for Mr. Ha. Only one media article (excerpt 30) mentioned the need to protect migrants’ basic

28 Blue House refers to the office of Korean president and his official residence. The Korean word for Blue House is Cheongwadae [청와대] which means pavilion of blue tiles.
human rights and Mr. Ha, the social studies teacher in Sindo is the only one who argued for the need of enacting laws to protect multicultural families’ human rights in Korea. Clearly, there are no legally recognized minority groups in Korea. However, there was also minimal acknowledgement that newcomer students and their families might have ethical rights that should be considered both in schools and the wider society. Examples of these rights might include the right of all children to an effective education, the right to maintain and develop competence in the family language, and the right to retain affiliation to one’s original cultural background. Public funding of heritage or international languages programs in several Canadian provinces and an official national policy of multiculturalism represent examples of a society acknowledging both the legitimacy of these rights and the broader benefit to the society as a whole associated with these policies.

Although the diversity-as-right perspective did not characterize public discourse or educational policies and practices in Korea, there was ample evidence from the students’ perspectives of their rights being violated. The exclusion of Inha from Korean citizenship and the opportunity to apply for scholarships despite long-term residence in the country is one example. The prohibition on students using their home languages in most school contexts is another. The strong negative feedback that students received when they used Chinese on the subway also illustrates the restriction of students’ rights imposed formally or informally.

**Diversity-as-Resource**

This orientation emerges in the Ministry of Education policy documents, particularly the more recent documents, albeit in a limited way. For example, there was acknowledgement in the 2006 document that multicultural students could become ‘future interpreters in South-East Asia’. This imagined identity expanded in the 2009 document to include the possibility that multicultural students could become ‘international leaders’. Then in 2012, their possibilities expanded once again to become ‘creative global human resources’. Furthermore, multicultural education was envisioned as relevant to all Korean students to help them “grow as creative global human resources who understand diversity” (MEST, 2012b, p. 1).
These lofty goals were reflected in the aspirations of educators at Sindo high school to extend multicultural education to the entire school. However, when funding was not forthcoming to pursue this objective, it was simply dropped and, as noted above, the pedagogical focus for all students remained ethnocentric.

Within Daham high school, the institutional focus on preparing multicultural students to become involved in either the tourist or computer fields represented a very narrow diversity-as-resource focus, not far removed from a deficit focus. Students’ knowledge of at least one other language and culture represented a potential resource to promote and support tourism from other countries while computer work did not depend on advanced knowledge of Korean and thus multicultural students might be capable of succeeding in this field. This limited acknowledgement of very limited ‘resources’ is simultaneously an affirmation of students’ broader linguistic, cultural, and academic deficits.

In short, there was limited discourse that acknowledged the resources that multicultural students could potentially contribute to Korean society but this discourse stayed at the level of rhetoric with very few institutional structures put in place to implement policies based on this perspective.

**Diversity-as-Power/Empowerment**

Although this orientation to diversity has been prominent in the academic literature related to multicultural education and critical pedagogy, as reflected in the writings of Banks (2010), Cummins (2001), and Nieto (2004), and many classroom examples have been documented (e.g., Cummins & Early, 2011), it is fair to say that it is by no means a dominant perspective in European or North American education. Most education is still rooted in the transmission of the curriculum with little, if any, critical analysis of societal power structures. Korea is obviously no exception to this trend. The Korean-only language policies of the two high schools legitimizes unequal power relations and reflects the broader discourse about diversity in the wider society.

Some news articles did criticize the existing societal and institutional discrimination against multicultural students as illustrated in excerpts 29, 20 and 33 from articles published by *Hangyeore, Kyeonghyang* and *Dong-A*. These articles challenged dominant perspectives and
‘pure blood’ ideologies by suggesting that Korean students need a specialized education provision to become more multiculturally aware. The news article, from which excerpt 29 is taken and which is based on an interview with Michelle, a foreign worker, criticizes the fact that Korean students are not equally considered as deficient as a result of the fact they have a serious lack of abilities to understand cultural diversity. These perspectives on the need to challenge coercive power relations and reverse inequalities seem to be absent both in planning multicultural education policy as well as in the schools’ educational practices.

However, in the reflections of teachers and students, we see the potential for a more critical orientation to teaching content and developing critical thinking among both ‘mainstream Korean’ and multicultural students. For example, Ms. Kang’s music program generated high levels of engagement among multicultural students, despite the fact that only Korean songs could be sung. This enthusiastic engagement appears to reflect the fact that students could excel at creating music despite their limited Korean language skills. Their identities were affirmed and expanded as a result of gaining a skill that was highly valued by their teachers in school, by their families, and by their peers.

Although the music program does not directly challenge the societal and educational pattern of coercive power relations, it does so indirectly by enabling students to emerge from the ‘deficit’ and low status/low ability identity implicitly projected on them by virtue of their designation as ‘multicultural students’. It also suggests that similar levels of engagement might be generated if the curriculum and instruction actively connected with their lives and integrated issues of status and power into their learning. These students were faced with the challenge of negotiating their identities within Korean society on a daily basis, ranging from being bullied in Sindo School to being repudiated for speaking other languages both in school and outside the school.

Teachers in Sindo High School showed an openness to a more critical orientation to educating multicultural students but this does not appear to have been translated to any extent into classroom practice. The principal expressed nationalistic Korean attitudes which underlie his orientation to educate multicultural students while at the same time arguing that Korean students need to have multicultural understanding and an awareness of cultural diversity. The teachers in
Sindo similarly argue for anti-racist education, human rights education and intercultural teaching practices for all students as part of multicultural education and they problematize mainstream Korean students’ discriminatory attitudes regarding different cultures. In particular, they highlight the fact that people from China and South Asian countries, where the majority of foreign workers in Korea originate, are particularly subject to discrimination. However, this awareness does not appear to significantly influence their pedagogical orientation in the classroom.

Because of the lack of affirmation within the school of any cultural identity other than the mainstream Korean identity, multicultural students struggle to reconcile competing experiences and influences regarding their different languages and cultures in and outside of school. However, despite the complexity of this struggle to negotiate their identity, they demonstrate considerable agency in pursuing a productive direction for their lives. Mimi, Chung, Han, Inha and Suji desire to be part of the dominant Korean group. They all show their attempts to assimilate linguistically and culturally into the mainstream Korean society. They attempt to acquire the standard Korean language and mainstream Korean youth culture by listening to and performing Korean pop music and watching Korean talent shows. They perceive that acquiring Korean cultural capital including Korean standard language and not revealing their linguistic and cultural differences is necessary to get good grades in school and get a ‘stable’ job in the future.

Bora and Jinu, however, also show more affirmative attitudes regarding their multiple linguistic and cultural identities. They appreciate and desire to maintain their multiple linguistic and cultural identities as a result of having experienced more positive responses towards their multiple linguistic and cultural repertoires from their parents, teachers and friends. Bora is willing to show her Chinese language abilities and share her Chinese cultural background with her friends. In Jinu’s case, despite his grandparents’ negative reaction to the use of other languages, he resists their influence and continues to use his multiple languages. However, these languages exist in a dynamic and shifting hierarchical relationship with each other. He is very much aware that strong Korean language skills are essential for academic success and establishing social relationships. However, since he is not able to speak Korean well, he at times feels deficient. However, he is not as discouraged at school compared to other multicultural
students because his competent English abilities offset the anxiety about his still developing Korean skills. By contrast, his Tagalog skills do not seem to play any role in his schooling and socialization in Korea and it is not welcomed at home by his grandparents. But because it is his ‘comfort language’, he continues using it with his mother and brothers.

The messages that students receive in and out of school regarding the legitimacy of their cultural backgrounds and linguistic repertoire seem likely to play a significant role in their school adjustment and achievement. When schools emphasize the academic weakness of multicultural students and focus on ‘fixing the problems’, students are likely to feel that they are at ‘the bottom of the ladder’ in society as Mimi felt. Conversely, a positive orientation to students’ cultural knowledge and linguistic accomplishments would communicate that students can become competent social agents in Korea.

The effects of negative messages can be illustrated in the experiences of several students. Mimi and Suji, for example, expressed stressful feelings due to the reaction by others to their Chinese-Korean accent. Mimi felt that her linguistic differences limited her chances for employment and she consequently tried to naturalize her accent to sound like the dominant Korean group. Initially, Suji became silent and was afraid to make friends because of her idiosyncratic accent. Like Mimi, Suji attempted to quickly acquire the Standard Korean accent to be socially included despite the fact that this involved suppressing her heritage linguistic characteristics.

Daham school’s monolingual practices aimed at ‘correcting errors’ of multicultural students were designed to help them integrate into Korean society more smoothly. However, in the absence of positive messages about students’ abilities and accomplishments, this corrective orientation risks causing students to internalize a sense of inferiority. Also, the perspective of Mr. Yu of Sindo School that the multicultural students in his school are ‘normal’ and ‘quieter’ probably reflects the fact that students are trying to hide their multicultural realities.

It is interesting to note that Sindo School felt they were unable to pursue multicultural education for all students when the funding agency required that the funds be spend on helping only the multicultural students. The change in pedagogical orientation that is implied by a focus on empowerment is not an add-on component that requires special funding. Rather, it infuses
teachers’ instruction so that they communicate affirmative messages to students regarding their diverse talents and abilities and draw students’ attention to the ways in which power relations operate in schools and society.

**Educational Implications**

**Implications for Policy**

**Clarify the status and regulations related to ‘multicultural students’.** As discussed in Chapters 1 and 4, different definitions of ‘multicultural students’ exist in different government bodies and these differences cause confusion in school practices. For instance, according to my interviews with Mr. Lim and Chung, Daham School used the definition of multicultural families and children used by the Ministry of Gender Equity and Family (MEHR, 2006). Based on their definition, students of the families formed through international marriages, of a mother or father who is a naturalized Korean, are considered as multicultural students and eligible for governmental scholarships and bursaries as well as funding from the private sector. However, the rights of students who do not have a Korean parent (e.g., children of foreign workers) to have access to special programs or funding are ignored. In both Daham and Sindo schools, students whose mothers are migrant women from South Asia and hold Korean citizenship had opportunities to receive scholarships and access to various public certificates. However, students whose parents are both foreigners or do not have Korean citizenship did not have these opportunities and they were, in turn, further marginalized from settling and integrating into mainstream society, which is illustrated in Chung and Inha’s cases.

Thus, despite more enlightened consideration of multicultural issues in recent government documents, there appears to be minimal acknowledgement of the educational needs of children of migrant parents who do not have Korean nationality. This is not directly problematic when parents are wealthy because they have the funds to send their children to international or private schools. However, at the other end of the socioeconomic spectrum there is a major gap in provision, which the national educational policy has not addressed. Thus, schools such as Sindo high school will not accept students whose Korean is limited and these students appear to have difficulty finding a general school that will accept them. This situation is
rationalized by the schools in terms of protecting newcomer students from bullying but it is also self-serving insofar as it reflects and reinforces the schools’ unwillingness to make adjustments to welcome and educate newcomer students. This denial of access to an appropriate education for many newcomer students without Korean nationality is perpetuated by the policy vacuum at the national level in relation to these students.

Create an infrastructure that supports and ‘normalizes’ the educational integration of newcomer students. As noted in the preceding section, there is minimal infrastructure in the Korean context to support newcomer students’ educational development. Schools such as Daham High School represent only a very small first step to create a safe and supportive learning environment. However, only a small fraction of newcomer students have access to such schools and there is confusion about the scope of the mandate within these schools (focus on ‘multicultural students’ defined narrowly or on all newcomer students who are learning Korean). The kind of infrastructure required can be seen in contexts around the world that have much longer experience in integrating immigrant students into the educational system (e.g., Australia, Canada, Norway, Sweden, the United States, etc.). Minimally, a system for assessing newcomer students’ Korean language and literacy skills and their previous educational experiences and accomplishments should be in place. Also, there needs to be legislation that either (a) mandates that all publicly funded schools accept newcomer students and provide a safe and supportive learning environment for these students or (b) designates an appropriate number of schools in each jurisdiction that will provide these services.

Implement an evidence-based approach to educational policy-making related to diversity. It is clearly in the interests of individual students, their families, and the society as a whole to ensure that newcomer and/or multicultural students receive an effective education that permits them to graduate from high school and play productive roles in their new society. In order to design and implement this kind of educational provision, it is important for government agencies to consult the research that has been carried out in both Korean and international contexts. There is a knowledge base that can inform policy decisions and directions (e.g., Baker, 2000; Banks, 2010; Cummins, 2001; Hélot & Ó Laoire, 2011; M. O. Kang, 2015; Schmidt & Gagné, 2015). For example, the research evidence clearly shows that students’ home language
abilities provide a foundation for developing academic skills in their second language and thus should be supported within the school rather than prohibited (Baker, 2000; Cummins, 2001). Similarly, there is considerable evidence supporting the efficacy of culturally relevant and critical anti-racist approaches to pedagogy for diverse students (e.g., Sleeter, 2011) and thus pre-service and professional development for teachers should be to incorporate these perspectives. These initiatives clearly require leadership at the national level, which thus far has been limited in its scope.

Revisit the structure and content of pre-service and professional development for teachers. This implication follows directly from those outlined previously. Although some multicultural education training programs are available for school administrators, few opportunities for in-service professional development are available to teachers. The teachers’ interviews in Sindo High School pointed to serious gaps in teachers’ multicultural awareness. According to Ms. Lee and Mr. Ha, teachers perceive getting involved in multicultural practices as an extra burden on top of their own teaching and administrative responsibilities at school. They highlight a lack of cooperative effort to practice multicultural education across departments and across the disciplines in the school. Ms. Lee points out that even if teachers are interested, they may not know how to incorporate aspects of multicultural education in their subject matter teaching. Again, the international literature on these issues could provide some guidance for Korean policy-makers in addressing the reality of diversity in schools and ways of transforming this perceived ‘problem’ into educational opportunities for all students (e.g., de Mejia & Hélot, 2011; Schmidt & Gagné, 2015).

Pedagogical Implications

Schools should shift their pedagogical orientation from problem-oriented to empowerment-oriented. The basis for this implication is the proposition that educators individually and collectively exercise choice with respect to the forms of instruction they implement in their classrooms and the ways in which they interact with students and parents (Cummins, 2001). Although different contexts impose different forms of constraints on educator choices, there is always scope for teacher agency with respect to the goals and means of
education. Thus, changes in the ways in which multicultural and newcomer students are positioned and educated within schools do not have to wait for broader policy-changes at the national or municipal level.

This reality can be illustrated with respect to the two case studies of Daham and Sindo schools. Although the educators interviewed in both schools showed awareness of issues facing multicultural students and commitment to assist students, it is clear that their instructional choices did not fully examine all the alternatives. For example, despite the provision of intensive KSL classes in Daham multicultural school, the school does not acknowledge diversity as a resource for learning. In Sindo high school, although the school provides a few multicultural events such as a multicultural festival, a bilingual contest, and a Chinese language club, multicultural education is not incorporated as part of learning in each subject. It is rather designed as ‘added-on’ (Apple, 2001), which implies that this multicultural education is superficial, temporal, peripheral, extra and optional. Multicultural education is not a major instructional focus, which, in turn, means that students’ plural identities are minimally validated.

However, these two schools have progressed further than most Korean high schools in acknowledging diversity as an issue to be addressed. In most schools, there is no systemic support to accommodate diversity. As Mr. Yu, the principal of Sindo high school mentioned, many high school principals do not accept the admission of multicultural students as they are considered as a potential problem as a result of being subject to bullying and alienation from the mainstream of the school. Most regular schools in Korea neither have bridging programs for newcomer students who need extra support to understand instructions nor heritage language or cultural programs.

Thus, it is not surprising that the Daham multicultural students felt that they did not have any other choices for high school. In other words, these students did not find any other ‘safe’ schools options in which the curriculum would be organized in a way that multicultural students are not alienated and problematized. The international research suggests that this type of curriculum should advocate cultural diversity as a resource and focus on antiracist education, social justice education, and equity pedagogy where issues related to socioeconomic and cultural
minority students are included as part of the main topics for learning, as suggested by critical multicultural pedagogues (Banks, 2010; Grant & Sleeter, 2010; Nieto & Bode, 2011). In Daham School, multicultural students felt ‘safer’ than in any other schools; however, the curriculum is still organized in a way that positions their multicultural characteristics as peripheral by focusing exclusively on Korean linguistic and cultural elements as the central part of learning.

Although most teachers acknowledge the emerging diversity as current reality in Korea, they are not prepared (in either sense of the term) to accommodate diversity in their teaching. For example, they are not prepared to challenge ‘dangerous discourses’ when the issues of discrimination, social inequality, and cultural biases and stereotypes emerge during classroom teaching. As noted previously, effective practice requires critical approaches to teaching. The interrogation of power relations that exist in the interactions between different groups of students, between students and teachers, between schools and local communities should be a central part of teaching practice in order to challenge social inequality if the goal of education is social justice and empowerment.

The point here is that these instructional configurations in both schools are the result of choices made by administrators and individual teachers. As such, they can be modified through reflection, discussion, and a willingness to innovate. An empowerment-oriented pedagogy focuses on pursuing instructional conditions for the collaborative creation of power (Cummins, 2001). This is clearly a complex and long-term project but once again there are numerous international examples that can stimulate productive dialogue among educators interested in maximizing educational opportunities for all students (e.g., Cummins & Early, 2011; Hélot & Young, 2006).

**Use critical autobiographies as a pedagogical and action research tool.** This represents just one example of the kind of instructional initiative that teachers might undertake to shift from a problem-oriented to empowerment-oriented pedagogy. Erickson (2010) outlines the rationale for this form of pedagogy as follows:

Critically reflective autobiographies by students and oral histories of their families – a form of community action research – can become important parts of a multicultural
curriculum. Even in a classroom with a student population highly segregated by race or by social class, students’ reflective investigation of their own lives and of family and local community histories will reveal diversity as well as similarity. (p. 44)

Through a critical autobiography, students can reflect on their lives, their immediate and extended family’s experiences in different cultural contexts, and their interaction with teachers and friends. The critical autobiography can be done as a form of student collaborative action research where students who have diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds can collaboratively work and share their life experiences of crossing borders and intercultural communications (e.g., Cummins & Early, 2011; Gagné & Gordon, 2009). When they share their own research with their peers and teachers at school, their knowledge in various languages and cultures as well as their advanced research skills developed through conducting research will be validated by the school community. Teachers and other students will get to know the newcomer and/or multicultural students better and also learn new knowledge that is produced by the students.

Limitations of the Research

Although I attempted to minimize researcher biases by trying not to project my own ideas during the interviews, I was often in a situation where I felt the need to be empathetic to my participants—for example, when they were sharing dramatic stories that were often related to their painful past memories. I felt that it was natural to respond in an empathetic way to participants and that my responses were a means of creating a comfortable atmosphere for communication with them. Nonetheless, it was my subjective judgment whether my responses as a researcher to my participants were appropriate or not.

Moreover, I was only able to observe classroom interactions of Ms. Kang, music teacher in Daham and Ms. Lee, English teacher in Sindo as the other two teacher participants did not permit classroom observation. One teacher mentioned that research that involved observing teachers’ classes is too invasive and rare in Korea. Although I have various supplementary research data and teaching materials which also show convincing information, the reduced classroom
observations are a limitation with respect to making inferences regarding the kinds of instruction that teachers were implementing.

The case studies of the two schools identify issues and experiences that characterize administrators, teachers and students in these schools but the findings cannot be generalized to all of the teachers and students in these schools or to the education of multicultural students in general in Korea. The interviews document phenomena observed or experienced by the teachers and students whom I interviewed. As such, these phenomena require interpretation and can generate insight into the dynamics of intercultural communication and education in these particular sociocultural and socioeconomic contexts.

It is my hope that the phenomena documented in the present research will stimulate dialogue about appropriate educational provisions for multicultural students in Korea. This dialogue should go beyond a focus on problems to also encompass an exploration of educational opportunities associated with cultural and linguistic diversity.
Epilogue

Although I am presently disconnected from most of my student-participants, a few participants have been sporadically communicating with me to say ‘Hi’ from time to time through social media. Suji, who was perceived as a quiet student in Sindo High School, is one of the students with whom I keep in touch. My relationship with Suji has become transformed from a teacher researcher to a mentor. She is now a university student majoring in Tourism in a university located northwest of Seoul. She said that although she was not satisfied with her achievement in high school and as a result she is not in a prestigious university, she still desires to be a hotelier. I have also been exchanging messages with Jinu. He is serving in the Korean military as part of the mandatory military service for all Korean male citizens. I have not heard anything from Inha since our last chat in 2014 when he told me he was in Indonesia having difficulty continuing school. Neither did I hear from anyone else.

I would like to end my dissertation with a bilingual poem that I wrote thinking of my student participants. It is naïve to argue these students alone can make change or that educators’ teaching practices alone can make a difference while ignoring the convoluted issues surrounding diversity. Yet, it is not my intention to argue there is no hope in Korean multicultural education. Rather, there needs to be a more critical linguistic and cultural awareness and implementation of active multicultural teaching practices that take a critical approach and embrace orientations of diversity as resource, rights, and empowerment. Educators’ negligence in considering these possibilities in their teaching can contribute to reproducing unequal power relations that disadvantage linguistic and cultural minorities and perpetuate the hegemonic status quo in Korean society.
Rainbow, Rainbow, Never Stop: For the Seed in the Pursuit of a Beautiful World

A seed,
Dreaming of living in a beautiful world,
Spreading across the world,
Enlightening the whole world with your hidden essence.

Uncomfortable stares, verbal violence and maltreatment aimed at your very existence make you feel trepid, lonely, and small.
Rooted in the nation’s embrace of pure blood ideology which has only been a fantasy existing in imagination,
Rooted in the ideological construction of ethnocentrism formed in the shadow of colonialism,
Rooted in the nation’s embrace of neoliberalism which has only marginalized social justice and equity,
Your feelings of being marginalized, othered, and made hopeless all rooted in these unfriendly ideologies.

Resist, beautiful seed,
Shout, sing and perform your feelings aloud and ardently.
Let the world know about you and your dreams, wherever you are.
Let the world know that this is the space and time that everyone shares.
Let the world know that everyone is part of making it better.
Although this may sound romantic, change will only be made with your songs, shouts, and performances in the pursuit of your dreams.
무지개야, 무지개야, 멈추지마라: 아름다운 세상을 꿈꾸는 씨앗을 위하여

씨앗아,
아름다운 세상을 꿈꾸고 있는 씨앗아,
더 넓은 세상으로 더 멀리 나아가거라,
너의 아름다운 항기로 세상을 깨우거라.

존재하지도 않는 흔상의 순혈주의가,
식민지주의 그립자를 안은 이데올로기, 자민족 우월주의가,
사회정의와 평등은 그늘진 곳에 두고, 경제적 부를 우선하는 신자유주의가,
너를 구석에 넣어 두고, 너의 존재에 대해 불편한 시선으로, 폭력적인 말로 널
움츠려들기하고, 외롭고 두려워 하며, 세상밖으로 멀리 날아갈 희망조차 갖지 못하게
하였지.

씨앗아,
세상이 너의 존재를 너의 꿈을 알 수 있게 내가 있는 그 자리에서 소리치고, 노래하고,
몸부림 처 보거라.
내가 있는 이 공간과 이 시간은 모두가 함께 하는 것임을,
그래서 모두가 함께 아름다운 세상을 만들어 갈 것을 상기시키자.
이런 생각 자체가 낭만주의적으로 들릴 지 모르겠지만,
꿈꾸지 않고, 또 행동하지 않으면 변화는 없을 것이므로,
너의 아름다운 노래로, 몸부림으로 세상에 희망의 빛을 비추어라.
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Appendices

Appendix A

Multicultural Education Policy Documents

- 2006 Educational Support Countermeasures for Children from Multicultural Families (MEHR, 2006)
- 2009 Customized Educational Support Plan for Students from Multicultural Families (MEST, 2009)
- 2010 Educational Support Plan for Students from Multicultural Families (MEST, 2010)
- 2012 Educational Advancement Plan for Multicultural Students (MEST, 2012b)
- 2013 Educational Support Reinforcement for Multicultural Students (MOE, 2013)
## Appendix B

### Newspaper Articles

#### Chosun (CS) Newspaper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th>Writer/ Reporter</th>
<th>YY/MM/DD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem of multicultural families, Internet is the answer</td>
<td>Jungsun Kim</td>
<td>2008/05/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think of the children from multicultural families in 10 years</td>
<td>NA (Reporter)</td>
<td>2010/03/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 thousand adolescents from multicultural families who are not attending school</td>
<td>Jaebun Lee (Researcher)</td>
<td>2010/03/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide mentor support to the children from multicultural families who suffer from school bullying</td>
<td>NA (Reporter)</td>
<td>2012/01/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention and support to Midway arrived children</td>
<td>GyuhoHong (NA)</td>
<td>2012/02/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind pure-blood ideology that will ruin the nation’s future</td>
<td>NA (Reporter)</td>
<td>2013/05/02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dong-A (DA) Newspaper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th>Writer/ Reporter</th>
<th>Published Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children from multicultural families that think school is a hell</td>
<td>Hyunji Kim (Reporter)</td>
<td>2008/10/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural families are our asset</td>
<td>Jongsik Kong (Reporter)</td>
<td>2008/11/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inviting committee chair, Yundae Eo from Nation brand committee</td>
<td>Hyesueung Kang (Reporter)</td>
<td>2009/01/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 No more integration with Jjampong (sporadic mixing) ... Respect diversity | Juhyun Jin (Reporter) | 2010/01/21

5 New Korean Project | Seyoung An (Professor) | 2011/12/02

6 Abused multicultural policy without philosophy | Misuk Kim (Researcher) | 2012/01/26

7 UN Committee on the Rights of the Child(CRC) chair, Jean Zermatten | Imsu Jung (Reporter) | 2012/04/30

8 Another multicultural family, early study-abroad student returnees | Taegyu Son (Professor) | 2013/01/03

---

Hangyeore (HG) Newspaper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th>Writer/ Reporter (Position)</th>
<th>YY/MM/DD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiculture is not something to be shouted (?)</td>
<td>Jongmin Lee (Manager)</td>
<td>2007/10/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects for social care?</td>
<td>Myeonghak Lee (Professor)</td>
<td>2009/10/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy(?), no thank you … Korean Wave (e.g. K-pop) that destroys us, no thank you</td>
<td>Gyeongtae Ko (Reporter)</td>
<td>2011/03/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There needs legalization of anti-racism</td>
<td>Jeonghun Lee (Student)</td>
<td>2013/08/21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kyeonghyang (KH) Newspaper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th>Writer/ Reporter</th>
<th>YY/MM/DD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If Obama lived in Korea…</td>
<td>Hoyeon Cho (Editor)</td>
<td>2008/11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper policies for the immigration society for adaptation are urgently needed</td>
<td>Jaegi Do &amp; Ayoung Kim (Reporter)</td>
<td>2009/06/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towards multicultural society transcending essentialism</td>
<td>Sangbong Kim (Professor)</td>
<td>2009/06/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education that is bias-free to other ethnic groups is needed</td>
<td>Eunju Lee (Instructor)</td>
<td>2010/03/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language service at the national certificate for immigrants</td>
<td>Hangu Lee (Manager)</td>
<td>2010/03/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If we wish Steven Jobs-like figure to be born in Korea…</td>
<td>Jeongeun Gu (Manager)</td>
<td>2011/07/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There needs of choice for the first foreign language that is not English</td>
<td>Hongsik Cho (Professor)</td>
<td>2012/03/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ji, daehan, Multicultural child</td>
<td>Inhwa Yu (Reporter)</td>
<td>2012/12/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural education that brings us dream and confidence</td>
<td>NA (NA)</td>
<td>2012/12/26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C

**Labels referring to multicultural students in MEP documents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Position in Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Children from multicultural families</td>
<td>Policy title, section and subsection title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children from international marriage families, Children of foreign workers</td>
<td>subsection title, within section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children of marriage immigrants/migrants, KOSIAN Children /KOSIAN, Children of illegal residents, Foreign Students, mixed blood Children, minority, foreigners at the school age, Children of female marriage immigrants, persons of mixed blood, Children of mixed blood, North Korean Refugees, Children of foreign workers</td>
<td>Within section and appendices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Children from multicultural families</td>
<td>Policy title, section and subsection title and within Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children of foreign workers, Children from international marriage families</td>
<td>subsection title, within section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Students, Children of illegal residents, agricultural village marriage immigrant women and their children, KOSIAN (Mixed blood children), Marriage immigrant women and the second generation, students from international marriage</td>
<td>Within section and appendices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Students from multicultural families</td>
<td>policy title, head title, section and subsection title within Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students from international marriage families; Children from multicultural</td>
<td>Within section and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Students from multicultural families</td>
<td>policy title/sub-section title/content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children from multicultural families</td>
<td>content/appendix title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Students from multicultural families</td>
<td>document title; sub-section title; content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children from multicultural families; infants, toddlers and preschoolers from multicultural families; accompanying/newcomer children (from remarriage families); Multicultural North Korean defector students</td>
<td>content; appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Students from multicultural families</td>
<td>document title; sub-section title; content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children from multicultural families; infants, toddlers and preschoolers from multicultural families; accompanying/newcomer children (from remarriage families); Multicultural North Korean defector students</td>
<td>content; appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Multicultural students</td>
<td>document title; sub-section title; content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newcomer children; Children of foreigner; Foreign Residents and their children; Children from international marriage families; Children of foreign families; Children of foreign residents</td>
<td>content; appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Multicultural students</td>
<td>document title; sub-section title; content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students from multicultural families; Children from international marriage families; Children from families of foreigner and Korean</td>
<td>content; appendix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Example curriculum for bilingual teacher development program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Semester</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>● Understanding of the Korean society</td>
<td>● Korean spiritual culture and moral character education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Domestic life and culture of Korea</td>
<td>● Understanding of multicultural education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Korean culture visit 1</td>
<td>● Korean culture visit 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>● Understanding of Korean elementary education</td>
<td>● Children psychology and counselling strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>● Arts education for children from multicultural families</td>
<td>● Math education for children from multicultural families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>● Multicultural society and bilingual education</td>
<td>● Pedagogical approaches to KSL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Understanding of Korean literature 1</td>
<td>● Understanding of Korean literature 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Korean grammar 1</td>
<td>● Korean grammar 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Understanding of Korean language</td>
<td>● Story-telling and play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Korean language listening and speaking 1</td>
<td>● Korean language listening and speaking 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Korean language reading 1</td>
<td>● Korean language reading 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Korean language writing 1</td>
<td>● Korean language writing 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Classroom observation</td>
<td>● Classroom teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td>● Classroom observation</td>
<td>● Teaching at an elementary school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
한국어, 영문, 언어, 교육-학습 지도법, 교육설습 등을 포함한
이중언어 교수요원 양성과정 개발 및 운영

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>소개</th>
<th>교육과정(예시)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>교양</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한국 사회의 이해</td>
<td>한국의 경제문화와 인성교육, 다양한 교육의 이해</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한국 문화 탐방 1</td>
<td>한국 문화 탐방 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>표제</td>
<td>한국 교육학교 교육의 이해, 다문화가정 자녀를 위한 특수교육, 아동성장과 상담기법</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한국 문화 탐방 2</td>
<td>다문화 가정 자녀를 위한 수업과 교육</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>경정</td>
<td>다문화 사회와 이중 언어 교육</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한국의 문화 1</td>
<td>한국의 문화 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한국어의 이해</td>
<td>한국어 문화의 이해 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한국의 문화 탐방 1</td>
<td>한국어 문화의 이해 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한국의 문화 탐방 2</td>
<td>한국어 문화의 이해 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한국어 쓰기 1</td>
<td>한국어 쓰기 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한국어 쓰기 2</td>
<td>한국어 쓰기 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>수업 관찰</td>
<td>수업 관찰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>교육설습</td>
<td>알선 교육학교 관람 관찰</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

※ 6개월, 900시간 연수

(MEST, 2010, p. 13)
Appendix E

Recruitment handout

A case study of multicultural education in South Korea

Hello! I am Heejin Song, a PhD student at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) of the University of Toronto. I am doing my doctoral thesis research regarding multicultural education in South Korea. I am looking for teachers, administrators, cross-cultural learners who are children from international marriages or immigrant families and their parents who wish to participate in my research project.

My study aims to investigate how multicultural education is conceptualized through various perspectives in South Korea. By conducting interviews and observing classes, this study attempts to examine how cultural and linguistic differences and cross-cultural learners are understood and/or treated by different stakeholders such as teachers, administrators, cross-cultural learners and parents. In addition, learner participants will experience creating their own identity texts to reflect their lives and identities. The data collection will take place during one school semester. The research findings will provide a critical understanding of the current status of multicultural education and will contribute to the development of better multicultural policies and practices in Korea.

If you are interested in participating in this research and/or if you wish to hear more information about the research, please do not hesitate to contact me or my faculty supervisor at the email addresses listed below.

Contact information

Researcher: Hee Jin Song

Email: heejin.song@mail.utoronto.ca
한국 다문화교육 사례 연구

안녕하세요. 저는 캐나다 토론토 대학교 온타리오 교육 연구소 박사 과정 연구생 송희진입니다. 저는 현재 한국 다문화교육에 대한 주제로 박사 논문을 준비하고 있으며, 본 연구에 참여할 학생, 부모님, 교사, 그리고 학교관리자를 모집합니다.

본 연구는 다양한 주체의 관점을 통해 한국의 다문화 교육이 어떻게 개념화 되는지를 연구합니다. 인터뷰와 수업 관찰을 통해서, 교사, 관리자, 학생, 그리고 부모님에 의해 어떻게 문화적, 언어적 차이, 그리고 간문화적 학생이 이해되고 다루어지는지를 검토하고자 합니다. 연구 결과는 각 학교가 안고 있을 수 있는, 그리고 간문화적 학생들과 그들의 문화적, 언어적 차이를 개념화하는데 영향을 미칠 수 있는 사회 문화적, 역사적, 정치적 제약들과 관련하여 논하게 될 것입니다. 또한 학생 참여자들은 직접 자신의 정체성 텍스트 만들기 작업에 참여함으로써 자신의 삶과 정체성을 되돌아볼 수 있는 지를 경험하게 될 것입니다. 데이터 수집기간은 1 학기로 4 월 부터 7 월까지 진행될 예정입니다. 본 연구는 한국 다문화 교육의 현위치를 재조명해볼 수 있는 기회가 될 것이고, 다문화교육 정책과 실천에 있어 더욱 발전시켜야 할 부분들을 모색해보는 연구가 될 것입니다.

본 연구에 참여하고자 하시거나 본 연구에 더 많은 정보를 원하신다면 주저하지 마시고 아래 연락처로 문의 주시면 본 연구와 연구 참여에 대해 자세히 알려드리겠습니다.

연락처

연구자: 송희진
이메일: heejin.song@mail.utoronto.ca
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Information Letter and Consent Form

A case study of multicultural education in South Korea

Investigator: Hee Jin Song    Faculty Supervisor: Dr. Jim Cummins

The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), the University of Toronto

Purpose of the study

My study aims to investigate how multicultural education is conceptualized through various perspectives in South Korea. Using an in-depth case study approach, this study attempts to examine how cultural and linguistic differences and cross-cultural learners are understood and/or treated by different stakeholders such as teachers, administrators, cross-cultural learners and parents over the period of one school semester. The findings will be discussed in relation to sociocultural, historic and political conditions that the schools are situated in and may influence participants’ conceptualizations of cross-cultural learners and their cultural and linguistic differences.

Participant

My participants are teachers, administrators, cross-cultural learners, and their parents who may be more directly involved in multicultural education in their schools and their local communities. My study focuses on the secondary education. For cross-cultural learner participants, I am particularly interested in grade 11 students, the second year of high school in Korea. I will obtain informed consent from all participants and for cross-cultural learners’ participation, I will receive their parents’ consent.

Participation details

Term of the participation: During one school semester between March and July in 2013
Expectation from the participants: I will observe and interview participants from your organization. I would like to collect the following data from your organization:

- I will recruit two teachers, one administrator, four cross-cultural learners and their parents. Once I obtain the consent from your school, I will visit your school to recruit participants. For the recruitment, I will ask for the permission of your school to disseminate a recruitment handout and approach students and teachers.
- Once participants are recruited, I will interview participants and observe classes. For this process, I will visit your school twice a week.
- School curriculum, newsletters, and other materials that are disseminated to students and teachers will be part of document data in this study.

The participant's rights

Confidentiality

- Data obtained from the study, including observation field notes, recording files, and interview transcripts collected from you, will be treated with absolute confidentiality.
- To further preserve your school’s confidentiality, a pseudonym will be used in coding, analyzing and presenting data, and any identifiable information will be kept strictly confidential in the presentation and publication of the research findings.
- All data will be kept in a secure place, and only I and my faculty supervisor will have access to this information.
- Upon completion of the study, upon request, the final result will be made available to you.
- I will inform all participants how to obtain access to the thesis if they wish to read it. In the thesis, however, identifiable personal/organizational information will be treated as confidential by using pseudonyms or, if necessary, being excluded from the texts.
- Your school should not take students’ or teachers’ participation in this study into consideration in your evaluation of their performance, whether it is positive or negative.

Withdrawal from participation

Participation in this study is absolutely voluntary. Participants may, at any time, choose to refuse to answer any question, stop participating in any part or procedure, or even withdraw from the study altogether. In addition participants may request that any data related to them are destroyed. Your organization’s decision not to participate or your withdrawal from this study will not have any consequences.

Contact information

You may ask questions about the research at any time. For questions, please contact me, Hee Jin Song at heejin.song@mail.utoronto.ca, or my supervisor Dr. Jim Cummins at james.cummins@utoronto.ca.
**Benefits**

Through participating in this project, participants from your school can reflect upon their thoughts on multicultural education and cross-cultural learners. The findings of this study are expected to contribute to a critical understanding of multicultural education at the policy and practice levels in South Korea. If your school wishes, I can conduct a short workshop for teacher, parents, and administrators about multicultural education in Canada based on my graduate studies and my lived experience in Canada. Also, I will provide a summary of final findings written in non-academic Korean and English languages upon request. I will also inform you how to obtain access to the thesis if you wish to read it. The thesis will be written in English.

**Risks**

The participants including students, teachers and an administrator from your school may feel uncomfortable with my presence. In order to alleviate any potential discomfort, I will give detailed information to and obtain informed consent from all who participate in this project.

**Signature**

I certify that I have read and understood the above, that I have been given satisfactory answers to any questions about the research, and that I have been advised that I am free to withdraw my consent and to discontinue participation in the research at any time, without any prejudice or loss of benefits. I agree to allow Hee Jin Song to use findings, examples, and quotations from the study for purposes of publication, academic presentation, and teaching, provided that anonymity is maintained. **For information about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Office of Research Ethics at ethics.review@utoronto.ca / 416-946-3273.**

_________________________________________  ________________________

Print your name     Date

_________________________________

Signature
한국의 다문화 교육의 사례 연구

연구정보 및 동의서

연구자: 송희진  지도교수: 짐 커민스
토론토 대학교 온타리오교육연구소

연구 목적

본 연구는 다양한 주체의 관점을 통해 한국의 다문화 교육이 어떻게 개념화 되는지를 연구합니다. 구체적으로 심층 사례연구 형태를 통하여, 두 학교에 소속되어 있는 교사, 관리자, 학생, 그리고 부모님에 의해 어떻게 문화적, 언어적 차이, 그리고 간문화적 학생들(다문화가정 학생들)이 이해되고 다루어지는지를 검토하고자 합니다. 연구 결과는 각 학교가 안고 있을 수 있는, 그리고 간문화적 학생들과 그들의 문화적, 언어적 차이를 개념화하는데 영향을 미칠 수 있는 사회 문화적, 역사적, 정치적 제약들과 관련하여 논하지 않을 것입니다.

연구참여자

본 연구는 학교 및 지역 공동체에 다문화 교육과 관련하여 좀 더 직접적으로 활동하는 교사, 관리자, 학생, 그리고 부모님을 대상으로 연구하고자 합니다. 특히 이 연구는 중등 교육 상황에서의 다문화 교육에 초점을 두고 있습니다. 간문화적 학생 참여자의 경우, 고등학교 2학년에 재학중인 학생들을 참여자로 선호하며 이들의 연구 참여 동의는 연구 율리상의 문제로 부모님의 동의서를 대신 받도록 하겠습니다.

연구참여 세부사항
참여기간:
- 본 연구의 데이터 수집 기간은 6개월입니다.

참여내용: 본교의 연구 참여자(관리자, 교사와 학생)를 관찰하고 인터뷰를 하게 됩니다.
특히 아래와 같이 데이터를 수집하고자 합니다:
- 교사 (적어도 2명), 관리자 (적어도 1명), 학생 (적어도 4명), 그리고 참여학생의 부모님(가능하면 4명)을 연구 참여자로 모집할 것 입니다. 본교로 부터 동의를 얻은 후 매주 연구 참여자를 모집하기 위해 학교를 내방할 것입니다. 또한 참여자 모집을 위해 학교 계시판과 교실 계시판에 연구 모집에 대한 설명서를 게재할 것이며, 교사와 학생들과 직접적인 대면도 있을 것입니다.
- 연구 참여자가 다 모집된 후, 참여자 인터뷰를 수행하고 교사와 학생 참여자에 대해서는 동의를 구한 후 수업을 관찰할 것입니다.
- 학교 교육과정, 신문, 그리고 가정통신문 등 학교에서 공식적으로 배포되는 자료들 또한 본 연구의 자료로 이용될 것입니다.

연구참가자의 권리

익명성
- 본 연구 중에 획득된 녹음파일, 인터뷰 전시자등 어떠한 자료에 대해서도 비밀이 절대적으로 보장됩니다.
- 연구참여자의 익명성 보장을 위해 연구 자료 코드 및 분석 시 가명이 사용되며, 학회 발표나 논문 작성 시 신분을 확인할만한 정보는 최대한 노출되지 않도록 할 것입니다.
- 본 연구의 자료는 안전한 장소에 보관될 것이며, 연구자 본인과 연구자의 지도교수만 열람 가능할 것입니다.
- 원하시는 경우, 연구 종료 후 최종 결과를 알리드릴 것입니다.
- 연구에 참가한 분들이 만약 논문을 읽기를 원할 시, 어떻게 논문에 접근할 수 있는 지 알려드릴 것입니다. 하지만 논문에서 어떠한 개인적 정보도 가명을 사용하거나 필요한 때 논문 자료에서 제외하여 익명성을 보장할 것입니다.

참여철회
본 연구에의 참여는 자발적이어야 합니다. 언제든지 어떤 이유에서든지 본 연구에의 참여를 거부하거나 연구 참여를 중단하실 수도 있으시며, 연구 참가 중 어떤 질문이나 어떤 형태의 자료 수집 절차도 거부하실 수 있습니다. 이에 대해서는 학교 관리자, 장학사와 지인과의 관계를 포함하여 어떠한 불이익도 없습니다. 연구 참여 중단 시 이미 수집된 자료에 대해서 파기를 요청하실 수 있습니다.
관련문의
연구와 관련된 제반 질문은 연구자 송희진 (heejin.song@mail.utoronto.ca) 혹은 지도교수 짐 커먼스 (james.cummins@utoronto.ca)로 하실 수 있습니다.

해택
본 연구 참여를 통해 연구 참여자들은 다문화교육과 간 문화적 학습자에 대해 생각해볼 수 있는 기회를 갖게 될 것입니다. 또한 본 연구의 결과는 한국의 다문화교육의 정책과 실천에 비판적 이해에 공헌하게 될 것입니다. 원하신다면, 관련된 교사, 학부모 및 학교 관리자들을 중심으로 저의 캐나다 생활 경험과 박사과정의 연구를 바탕으로 다문화 교육에 관한 워크숍을 진행할 수 도 있습니다. 또한, 원하신다면, 본 연구의 결과를 한국어와 영어로 간략히 요약하여 제공하겠습니다. 제 논문 작성 완료 후, 제 논문을 읽기를 원하신다면 원문에 접속가능한 방법을 또한 알려드리겠습니다. 인터뷰시, 간단한 음료와 음식이 제공될 수 있습니다.

위험요소
연구참여자는 연구자에게 개인의 일상이 노출되거나 이에 대해 이야기해야 될 수 있습니다. 연구에의 참여가 주변 인간관계에 영향을 줄 가능성이 있습니다. 하지만 이로 인해 감정적인 불편함이 생길 수 있습니다. 이런 경우, 연구자에게 솔직히 말씀해주시면 이부분을 재검토하도록 하겠습니다.

사례
연구 종료 시 연구 참여에 대한 감사의 뜻으로 상품권 (캐나다 달러 50 불 상당)을 드릴 것입니다. 또한 인터뷰시 간단한 음식이나 음료수도 제공 될 것입니다.

서명
저는 위의 연구정보 및 동의서를 읽고 이해하였으며, 연구와 관련된 질문에 충분한 답변을 받았으며, 언제든지 어떠한 불이익 없이 연구 참여를 중단하거나 거부할 수 있다는 점도 들었습니다. 저는 연구자 송희진이 본인의 신분이 익명으로 처리되는 한 연구발표 논문작성과 같은 학술적 목적을
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Interview Questions for Participants

Interview questions for learners

Personal backgrounds:
- Name
- Age
- Gender
- Places of birth and residence
- Name of school and year
- Parents’ nationality
- Parents’ birth and residence places
- First language
- Second/third language and proficiency level
- Language used at home
- Career goals

Understanding multicultural education
- What do you think of cultural diversity in general in Korea?
- How do you feel about your school policies and approaches to accommodate diversity?
- What is your perception on being different from the majority in the Korean society?

Understanding cultural and linguistic identities
- What should be the main focus for multicultural education for you?
- How do you identify yourself in terms of cultural and linguistic identities?
What do you think of your cultural and linguistic uniqueness?

Interview questions for teachers and administrators

Personal backgrounds:
- Name
- Age
- gender
- Places of birth and residence
- Name of school and position
- Number of years in working at schools
- Teaching subject/ Specialized area
- Oversees experience
- First language
- Second / third language and proficiency level

Perceptions of multicultural education and cross-cultural learners
- What do you think of cultural diversity in general in Korea?
- How do you feel about your school policies and approaches to accommodate diversity?
- What is your perception on cultural and linguistic differences and cross-cultural learners?
- What should be the main focus for multicultural education for you?
- What do you think of learners’ cultural and linguistic uniqueness?
- What are your linguistic and cultural experiences?
- What role, if any, does parents’ culture have in school?
- What are your concerns and expectations on multicultural education and cross-cultural learners, if any?