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Abstract

Since the 1990s, demographic and societal changes in South Korea (Korea) influenced by a low birthrate and globalization triggered a discussion of multiculturalism in Korea. This discussion led to the formation of Korea’s first multicultural education policy in 2006. In this study, I drew on the critical multiculturalism theoretical framework which consists of functionalist and critical perspectives, globalization and neoliberalism ideologies, and five approaches to multicultural education to delve into the conceptualization of multicultural education, the construction of “multicultural students,” and power relations between multicultural students and mainstream students in the policy. I used Critical Discourse Analysis methodology to critically analyze the ideological assumptions of Korea’s multicultural education policy and other intertextually related discourses, and its shifts over a decade.

My intertextual analysis identified two different ideologies for different groups: customized education for multicultural students, which focused on helping multicultural students adapt to the Korean school system; and education for multicultural understanding for all students, which aimed at helping mainstream Korean students accept difference by emphasizing human relations, tolerance, and anti-prejudice. In this framework, multicultural students are still constructed as deficient in terms of Korean language, culture, and academic achievement, whereas mainstream students represent the norm. Over a decade, the institution and legislations have been improved to accommodate new-comer students in the Korean school system. However, the government’s orientation still rests on an assimilationist and human relations approach.

This study recommends that policy makers and educators, despite the challenges they face, should address the taken-for-granted social inequalities and should endeavour to develop
education that promotes a more democratic and equitable society. Multicultural education needs to move beyond the Korean language-centred learning and experience of foreign cultures, to address the politics of difference and social inequalities, and to empower all students and raise their critical awareness.
Preface

This thesis is original work attributable to the author, H. Lee. The findings of this study have not been published.
Table of Contents

Abstract ........................................................................................................................................ ii
Preface .......................................................................................................................................... iv
Table of Contents ....................................................................................................................... v
List of Tables ............................................................................................................................... viii
List of Figures ............................................................................................................................. ix
Acknowledgements .................................................................................................................... x
Dedication ..................................................................................................................................... xii

CHAPTER 1: Introduction .............................................................................................................. 1
1.1 Context of the Study ............................................................................................................... 1
   1.1.1 A rapid transition to a multicultural society ................................................................. 1
   1.1.2 The historical contexts of Korean multicultural education policy ............................... 5
1.2 Personal Background ............................................................................................................ 8
1.3 Purpose of the Study and Research Questions .................................................................... 11
1.4 Overview of the Study .......................................................................................................... 13

CHAPTER 2: Literature Review .................................................................................................. 15
2.1 Western Perspectives on Multicultural Education .............................................................. 15
2.2 Policies of Countries with Long Histories of Immigration ............................................... 17
2.3 Perspectives from Historically Homogenous Countries ...................................................... 20
2.4 Globalization and Neoliberalism .......................................................................................... 21
2.5 The Discourses on Multicultural Education in Korea ......................................................... 23

CHAPTER 3: Theoretical Framework ........................................................................................ 26
3.1 Introduction .......................................................................................................................... 26
3.2 The Functionalist Perspective and Socially Critical Perspective ....................................... 27
3.3 Various Philosophical Approaches to Multicultural Education ........................................ 29
3.4 Different Approaches to Multicultural Education ............................................................... 31
### CHAPTER 4: Methodology ................................................................. 40

4.1 Introduction .................................................................................. 40
4.2 An Overview of Critical Discourse Analysis .................................. 41
4.3 Data and Document Collection Processes ..................................... 46
4.4 Data Analysis Procedures ............................................................ 49
4.5 Limitations of the Study ............................................................... 54

### CHAPTER 5: A Critical Discourse Analysis and Findings .................. 57

5.1 Introduction .................................................................................. 57
5.2 Description of the Historical Contexts of Korean Multicultural Education Policy ........................................................................ 57
5.3 The Conceptualization of Multicultural Education ......................... 63
5.3.1 Theme 1: Customized education for multicultural students .......... 64
5.3.2 Theme 2: Education for multicultural understanding for all students .................................................................................. 65
5.4 The Construction of Multicultural Children and Mainstream Children .................................................................................. 65
5.4.1 The construction of multicultural children .................................. 66
5.4.2 Different and characterized as linguistically, culturally, and economically deficient ........................................................................ 67
5.4.3 Talent with bilingual ability and diverse cultural experience ........ 72
5.4.4 The construction of the relationship between multicultural children and mainstream children ........................................................................ 74
5.5 The Ideological Manifestation in Customized Education for Multicultural Students .......................................................... 75
5.5.1 Customized education: What and for whom ................................ 76
5.5.2 The discourse of equal educational opportunity .......................... 77
5.5.3 Assimilationist approach and monolingualism ............................. 81
5.5.4 The human capital approach and education for a neoliberal society ........................................................................ 85
5.6 The Ideological Manifestation of Education for Multicultural Understanding ........................................................................ 89
5.6.1 Toward a Human Relations approach to multicultural education ........................................................................ 90
5.6.2 Valuing a teacher’s neutrality in education .................................. 95
CHAPTER 6: Conclusion and Recommendations .......................................................... 99
  6.1 Summary of the Research and Findings .......................................................... 99
  6.2 Reflection on the Study ................................................................................. 102
  6.3 Implications and Recommendations ............................................................ 104
      6.3.1 Recommendations for policy makers and teachers .......................... 104
      6.3.2 Recommendations for future research ............................................. 106

References ............................................................................................................. 108
Appendices ........................................................................................................... 119
List of Tables

Table 4.1  *The characteristics of Critical Discourse Analysis* .............................................. 43

Table 4.2  *Governmental Policy Documents on Multicultural Education* .............................. 48

Table 4.3  *Policy Subject Framework* ................................................................................. 51

Table 4.4  *CDA Social Processes Framework* ..................................................................... 52

Table 5.1  *The Outlook of the 2015 Korean Multicultural Education Policy Document* ........ 62
List of Figures

Figure 1.1 The trend of foreign residents in Korea ................................................................. 3

Figure 1.2 The trend of total students and multicultural students in Korea......................... 4

Figure 3.1 The critical multiculturalism theoretical framework ............................................. 27
Acknowledgements

My sincerest gratitude goes to my supervisor, Dr. Cash Ahenakew, and a committee member, Dr. Handel Wright. I especially thank to Dr. Ahenakew for his strong and devotional support, and for offering me a chance to reflect my academic work as well as my experiences at profession. His respectful attitude and encouragement helped me concentrate on my work and complete my study. I also appreciate Dr. Handel for advising and bringing his extensive knowledge of multiculturalism into my research processes. I am grateful to external examiner Dr. Amy Metcalfe for sharing her comprehensive understanding of my research area and critically engaging during the examination.

My special thanks go to my study buddies, Dr. Jeongja Kang and Hyera Byean who are very smart and committed to their multiple roles of a doctoral student and a mother. Sharing the experience of academic journey, encouragement, and realization as researchers and professionals with them inspired me much. I appreciate Dr. Romee Lee for her advice and encouragement. I also thank to my cohort, Paola, Ran, Sarah, Ryan, Yaying, and Zhaoying. Attending to the class with them, I could learn various interests in education and get comfort and encouragement. My special thanks go to Erin Williams who copyedited my work and helped me write more succinctly and effectively. My sincere gratitude goes to my husband, Yongjik Song, and my adorable children Chaemin and Seungheon. Their love and support gave me power to go through and complete my study. I deeply appreciate to my mother, Sunja Song, and my father Mansul Lee. With their unconditional love, faith, sacrifice, and support, I can complete my academic journey in Canada. My special thanks go to my mother-in-law Youngsuk Park, and my father-in-law Jinwoo Song, who always cherish and support us. I thank to my sister Seungyeon Lee for her constant encouragement and love. I thank to my grandfather Haksun Lee, and my grandmother
Sunnam Yu, who always trust and encourage me. I thank to my friends in Korea: Sunmin, Won, and Seongmin who always stand for my side. And my many thanks go to my relatives who send me constant love and pulled for me.
Dedication

For my family,

특히, 변함 없는 믿음과 사랑을 주시는 부모님께

For a more inclusive, equitable, and just society,
CHAPTER 1: Introduction

1.1 Context of the Study

1.1.1 A rapid transition to a multicultural society

Historically, South Korea (hereafter Korea) has been one of the most ethnically and linguistically homogeneous countries in the world. Korean society emphasizes unity of ethnic and cultural identity rather than diversity of identity and multiculturalism (Nagy, 2014). In Korea, it has been emphasized that the country has had a long, five thousand-year history, and that Koreans are descended from the same ancestor, Tangun, who was the founder of Korea. Thus, for a long time, Koreans have believed that Korea is a single-race, one-blood nation that has maintained the same language and culture throughout its history. This belief and collectivistic spirit have played a significant role in Koreans’ resisting frequent invasions by foreign countries, uniting together, and overcoming crises over several centuries (Lim, 2009).

Shortly after 36 years of Japanese colonial rule (1910-1945), the devastating Korean War (1950-1953) left the peninsula divided into North Korea and South Korea. This division has engendered clearly perceived differences between two, and South Korea has maintained a strong tendency to prefer a homogeneous and uniform society, which has been reinforced by nationalist and anti-communism thoughts. As a result, Koreans have had little experience with racial and linguistic diversity and tend to view themselves as sharing a common identity and being a tightly knit community and cohesive nation (Mitchell & Salsbury, 1996).

From the 1960s to the 1980s the Korean government encouraged emigration as a means of population control, immigration into Korea was allowed only for highly skilled groups. However, since the late 1980s Korea has faced rapid globalization, mass migration, and a dramatic demographic change in ethnicity, race, and language (Kim, 2009). One reason for
increased migration to Korea is the slowing growth of the labour force, due in part to the influence of expanding compulsory education and the need for workers for the booming housing construction industry (Kim, 2009). Foreign workers have also been needed to meet the demand for low-paying and unskilled labour positions (called “3D” positions, meaning they are dirty, difficult, and dangerous) that Koreans shunned. Since the 1990s, these changes have forced the Korean government to make changes to its immigration policy in order to bring in and to control the arrival of foreign workers (Kim, 2009). However, the government has been mainly concerned with the import of a cheap labour force in some industrial sectors, while also preventing these workers from pursuing permanent residency (Lee, 2009).

Another reason for increased migration to Korea is the country’s rapid urbanization and related social changes. Historically, Korean rural families were agriculture-based and followed Confucian traditions. However, globalization and urbanization have altered this traditional way of social organization. For example, with rapid urbanization, many young women in rural areas have chosen to leave the challenges of hard labour and economic troubles, and have migrated to urban areas in search of better education, careers, and spousal opportunities. As a result, rural men have had more difficulty finding a Korean partner. The government therefore responded by focusing on an immigration policy to attract foreign women for settlement in rural areas. Men who could not get married began to find spouses from outside the country, and thus the number of marriage-immigrants has increased.¹ These women have migrated mainly from Southeast Asian countries such as the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam. This has led, in part, to the

---

¹ According to the National Statistics Office (2014), the proportion of international marriages jumped nearly eight-fold since 1990. In 1990, the percentage of international marriages among all marriages in Korea was 1.2%, but it soared to 13.6% in 2005, and is now at around 8% as of 2014.
creation of a multicultural family category for immigrants.

These trends and policy changes have intertwined with the country’s low birth rate and aging population, which resulted in a drastic transition in Korea’s demographic profile (Figure 1.1.). Now, there are 538,587 foreign workers and 295,842 marriage-immigrants (Ministry of Government Administration and Home Affairs, 2014). As a result, the number of children from Korean-immigrant families and foreign workers’ families has increased (Figure 1.2.), which has brought about challenges in public education. In Korea, these two groups are labeled “multicultural families.”

Figure 1.1. *The trend of foreign residents in Korea*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Foreign residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>540,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,740,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Ministry of Justice (Republic of Korea)*

2 According to the Ministry of Government Administration and Home Affairs (2014), there are 295,842 marriage-immigrants, 85.5% of whom are women; they are mainly from China (69%), including Korean-Chinese (35%); Vietnam (24.2%); the Philippines (19%); Japan (5.6%); and Cambodia (2%). There are 538,587 foreign workers residing in Korea; they are from China (42.2%), Vietnam (10%), Indonesia (5.8%), the Philippines (4.5%), and Thailand (4.2%).

3 The term “multicultural families,” including foreign workers’ families and families comprised of a Korean and an immigrant spouse, was first used in the “2006 Educational Support Countermeasure for Children from Multicultural Families,” published by Ministry of Education. However, according to the Multicultural Family Support Act, which took effect September 22, 2008, the term “multicultural family” means a family comprised of an immigrant by marriage (or a person who has acquired nationality of the Republic of Korea through naturalization) and a person who has acquired nationality of the Republic of Korea. It does not include foreign workers’ families.
Figure 1.2. The trend of total students and multicultural students in Korea

* Source: Ministry of Education (Republic of Korea)

Though the Korean government has welcomed migrant workers and marriage-immigrants as solutions to the country’s falling birth rate and aging population, there are also corresponding social concerns that relate to linguistic and cultural differences. For example, several studies have shown that multicultural families face difficulties with language and cultural differences even within their own families, as well as between them and other Koreans. Other difficulties include the possibility of poverty and alienation because of the unequal distribution of social capital and discrimination (Oh, 2006; Cho, Park, Sung, Lee, & Park, 2010; Y. Lee, 2013). For multicultural families, the immigrant spouse’s different language and culture (and lack of Korean language skills and culture), and the Korean husband’s low socio-economic status can combine to increase the possibility of marginalization in Korean society. Moreover, studies have shown that when children from multicultural families enter school, they have lower levels of linguistic
and academic performance and they experience higher levels of peer isolation compared with students from mainstream Korean families (Cho, 2006; Oh, 2006; Oh, 2008). This has led, in part, to changes in Korea’s educational policy.

1.1.2 The historical contexts of Korean multicultural education policy

The soaring number of foreign workers in Korea has influenced that country’s social, cultural, and educational issues. For example, Korean activists and international organizations have identified deep-rooted racial discrimination in schools and workplaces, and they have pressured the Korean government to formulate policies that support immigrants, mixed-race people, and their children through protection of their human rights (UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, 2003). President Roh’s Administration (2003-2007) presented foreigners as subjects of harmony and coexistence, which played a role in the development of a multicultural policy (Kim, 2013). In 2006, Hines Ward, the 2006 NFL Super Bowl MVP and son of an African-American father and a Korean mother, visited Korea and appealed to people to end discrimination against mixed-race people.4 This episode triggered public interest and support for multiculturalism, and prompted the Korean government to adopt legislation to improve the status of multicultural families (Shin, 2006; J. Lee, 2013).

In April 2006, the government held a cabinet meeting during which the President, the Prime Minister, various heads of ministries, and experts discussed plans to improve the conditions of migrant workers, marriage immigrants, and their children in Korea (J. Lee, 2013).

---

4In a media interview, he revealed that he had experienced various forms of discriminations in the U.S. because he is a mixed-raced person, and because he was raised by a single mother in a low-income family. He confessed, however, his mother’s effort and sacrifice for him enabled him to actualize his dreams and to take pride in his identity as a half-Korean. His success as a football player inspired many mixed-race people in Korea to believe that they can succeed and overcome discrimination by Koreans. It also prompted many Koreans to recognize the need not to be prejudiced against Others.
Through such discussions, they proposed that new types of families and the human rights of foreign workers should be included in the school curriculum and textbooks, and that the concept of mono-ethnicity should be eliminated from the curriculum.\(^5\) Schools would now be required to prepare multicultural education programs for students from multicultural families. Consequently, that same month the Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development (MOE & HRD)\(^6\) announced policies on educational support for multicultural students (MOE & HRD, 2006). The policies included a focus on helping multicultural children adjust to school and learn more effectively, and on helping mainstream Korean students perceive and respect diversity and difference. The most significant aspect of this policy was reform of the national curriculum and textbooks to include a focus on societal change toward a multicultural society and a variety of types of families (Cho et al., 2010). Since then, the government has formulated successive plans to better support children of multicultural backgrounds and make teachers more aware of the multicultural society.

Korea has a centralized education system, which falls under the jurisdiction of both the central government and provincial governments. The central government formulates the national education policy, which provides state-wide guidelines and norms. It also has the authority to set up national curriculum and criteria for textbooks. The provincial governments formulate annual

\(^5\) As of the 2000s, Korean textbooks (e.g. Social Studies, Citizenship Education), had various contents emphasizing pride in being a ‘single-race’ and ‘pure-blood’ country, a form of praise for the unique Korean language system and shared cultural values (Choi, 2010). International organizations (e.g. the UN CERD (Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination)) conveyed their concerns to the Korean government about Koreans’ racial discrimination against foreigners and mixed-race people and their failure to protect their human rights, and compelled the government to revise its textbooks, including eliminating these discussions of Korea as a ‘single-race’ and ‘pure blood’ country (J. Lee, 2013).

\(^6\) The Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development (MOE & HRD) was reorganized and renamed to the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MEST) in 2008, and reorganized and named to the Ministry of Education (MOE) in 2013 and currently.
education-support plans (including school budgets) and disseminate these plans to schools; they supervise and advise schools and teachers. The central government can allocate monies to provincial governments to promote new and significant policies, which in turn influences provincial governments and schools to implement these policies and participate in national projects. While provincial governments have some autonomy, under a centralized education system, they are considerably influenced by national education policy and agendas. The national multicultural education policy represents the education across Korea, and is a focus of my analysis.

Although the history of Korea’s multicultural education policy has been short, nonetheless, there have already been various criticisms of it. The first relates to the use of the term “multicultural families/students” and the programs that are designed exclusively for these students, such as Korean language and Korean culture education. Critics argue that such terms and programs can create stigma and inequity associated with difference, and can lead to segregation of multicultural students from mainstream Korean students (Park & Sung, 2008; Park 2009; Cho et al., 2010; Olneck, 2011). Second, some scholars have criticized Korea’s multicultural policy for having two different (and incompatible) ideologies: one that emphasizes assimilation of the multicultural students, and another that focuses on mainstream students’ tolerance and understanding of ‘Others’ (Park & Sung, 2008; Y. Lee, 2013). Third, there has been criticism of Korea’s superficial approach of introducing and experiencing foreign foods, costumes, and customs, pointing out that this approach is far from the type of multicultural social justice education suggested by Banks and Banks (2003), and Sleeter and Grant (1987, 2007); that is, this approach does not deal with difference, inequality, power, and privilege in a sufficiently meaningful way (Han, 2007; Y. Lee, 2013; Grant & Ham, 2013).
The importance of my present research is that it critically analyzes Korea’s multicultural education policy and how it has changed in response to these recent developments in this field.

1.2 Personal Background

My research interest in analyzing multicultural education policy is related to my ten years of experience as a policy maker, as well as my more recent experience in Canada, as both an international graduate student and as an immigrant mother with two kids encountering a new environment in terms of language, race, and culture.

I have worked at the Korean Ministry of Education for over ten years. I participated in making policies and projects for enhancing educational equity to help address issues associated with marginalized students and families. In the late 2000s, as the Korean economy worsened and many people faced economic and social difficulties, the demand to reinforce the government’s role in developing the social safety net grew. As a result, the government formulated multi-faceted solutions and policies. I participated in the policy-making process and became well aware of the policy outcomes and their limited ability to mediate conflict between various stakeholders. In many cases, the policy outcomes reflected the dominant stakeholders’ ideal models or opinions rather than the underprivileged population’s substantive needs.

From 2008 to 2010, I was in charge of formulating Korea’s multicultural education policy with a team of people. During that time, I met a lot of people, including teachers, principals, district officers, multicultural families, social activists, policy experts, and staff members of volunteer organizations. Most people were concerned that multicultural children could become delinquents who would not integrate well into society, and requested for the government’s action. However, after different experiences with various groups and multicultural families, I began to ask myself: on what and for whom should multicultural education policy be
focused? Is the policy’s focus still on assimilation? Can we move beyond that? To what extent are our citizens aware of difference and ultimately willing to embrace it?

In Korea, there are different kinds of multicultural families depending on their home countries, race, wealth, educational level, and so on. For example, some multicultural families in which at least one of the parents is white and from North America or Western Europe, speaks English, and has a high economic status, might be treated well in Korea. Though they may have some difficulties in communicating and learning, they will experience an amicable atmosphere. On the other hand, some multicultural families whose parents are from a developing country, have low socioeconomic status, and are not fluent in Korean or English can experience discrimination and prejudice. Also, the support they receive from the community varies depending on their home country, religions, and residential area. For instance, immigrants from China or Japan are part of well-established immigrant groups, and have larger and stronger ethnic networks than those from Vietnam or the Philippines. Those who are in Korea due to marriages arranged by the Unification Church, which has promoted international marriage, are provided support by their network. Those who live in the rural area have less access to community services than do those living in metropolitan areas, partly because of the simple fact of physical distance, but also because of their (Korean) family members often discourage them from using such services. These differences influenced the government’s policy making, specifically its perception of social problems, policy subjects, aims, orientations, and priorities. In that decision-making process, the groups that were assumed to have the weakest support became the main policy subjects and were perceived as marginalized and far from being empowered. Based on these experiences in making policy, I question whether Korean multicultural education policy is socially just and fulfills the needs of multicultural families.
In 2014, I travelled to the University of British Columbia to further my academic journey. Unexpectedly, I experienced the challenges of transitioning from being a Korean citizen who is a part of the majority and mainstream culture to a non-citizen who is a part of a minority in Canada. I am a MA (Master Degree’s) student whose first language is not English, and also a mother who has to bring up and guide my two children in dealing with entirely new and different circumstances. My family’s experiences have greatly impacted my understanding of the challenges of immigrating to a different country, while my studies of multicultural education policy have changed my perspective on how policy could better respond to such challenges in Korea.

Before I arrived in Canada I was in charge of formulating Korea’s multicultural education policy. One model we examined was Canada’s 1971 adoption of mosaic multiculturalism and multicultural policy, which celebrates and respects diversity. Canadian multiculturalism as an ideology (Ng, 1995) inspired me to think of the image of a liberal, tolerant, and celebratory multiculturalism. The policy outcomes are evident in Vancouver, where many immigrants from diverse countries seem to put down roots and play a significant role in society. In Canada there also seems to be less prejudice against immigrants as compared to Korea. Nevertheless, racism and prejudice are still evident in Canada, especially as seen through Indigenous peoples’ experiences of Indian residential schools and institutional racism against visible minorities in higher education, the job market, and promotion within various professions. Furthermore, it has been my experience that, despite praise for “mosaic multiculturalism,” the area of education has seldom taken into account advanced models of multiculturalism. My critical analysis of ‘Diversity in BC schools’ (British Columbia Ministry of Education, 2008) is that it underscores the differences between individuals and cultural groups, and encourages understanding,
accepting, mutual respect, and inclusion. However, it seems that the most fundamental objective is for all students to learn the English language and Canadian values in schools aside from some programs to support Mandarin language learning or French immersion education. Although Kymlicka’s (2010) study showed that Canada outperforms other countries on a wide range of measures of immigrant and minority integration, it is difficult to find similarly significant practices in education.

These experiences and findings encouraged me to analyze multicultural education policy from a critical perspective. This gave me a chance to look back on what I contributed to and what I had overlooked during my own work in policy development in Korea. At the same time, my experiences have provided me an opportunity to explore policy options that may lead to better schooling and equitable futures for all diverse cultural groups in Korea.

1.3 Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to investigate the assumptions and ideologies behind Korea’s multicultural education policy, focusing on how the policy conceptualized multicultural education for multicultural students and mainstream students, how the policy constructed multicultural students as deficient; and what was promoted through the policy and what was discouraged. I also examine shifts in the policy over a decade, focusing on what has been achieved with the policy and whether it has contributed to making a more equitable Korean society or whether it has simply served to maintain the existing order. A Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) methodology frames my analysis of the discourse and my interpretation of multicultural education policy texts and representations within the official policy documents of Korea. Because CDA is “an interdisciplinary set of theoretical and analytic tools” (Rogers, 2008, p. 53) that are applied to the study of the relationships between texts (spoken, written, multi-
modal, and digital), discourse practices (communicative events), and social practices (society-wide processes) (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000; Fairclough, 1995), this approach helped focus my analysis not only on the discourses in the policy, but also on relationships of power and privilege in social interaction, institutions, and other bodies of knowledge that are constituted through language’s mediation (Rogers, 2008). My analysis examined five multicultural education policy documents published by the Korean Ministry of Education in 2006, and from 2012 to 2015. The central government’s policies as discursive sources are most appropriate for this study as Korea has a centralized education system, and education policy made at the national level filters down to the provincial and school level where it is delivered.

Throughout my study I used the lens of critical multiculturalism to provide an analytic framework to gain a deeper understanding of how race, ethnicity, class, and gender were represented in various social contexts. Critical multiculturalism is grounded in the theoretical framework of critical theory, which is concerned with issues of justice, equity, and social change in education (Banks, 2009; Giroux, 1988; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; McLaren, 1997; Sleeter & Grant, 1987, 2007), all of which are very important for advancements of policy and practice.

For this analysis, I also drew on Sleeter and Grant’s (1987, 2007) *five approaches to multicultural education* as a theoretical framework. These approaches include Teaching the Exceptional and the Culturally Different, Human Relations, Single-Group Studies, Multicultural Education, and Education that is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist. I discuss this further in Chapter Three.

In analyzing the policy, I focused on two themes relating to the classified groups of minority (e.g. multicultural students) and majority (e.g. mainstream Korean students, teachers, and the public) and the policy agendas for those groups. I used a contextual approach to better
understand Korean society’s acceptance of diversity and examined multicultural family categories to account for student variation by racial, ethnic, cultural, and language background.

With these aims, the major research questions in this study are:

1) How does the policy construct multicultural education, multicultural students, and the relationship between multicultural students and the majority?

2) What ideological assumptions and aims are embedded in the multicultural education policy of Korea? What approach toward multicultural education has the government of Korea drawn on to support multicultural students and to encourage Korean citizens to accept diversity and difference?

3) What kinds of shifts have been made to the policy over the past decade? In what way does the policy promote a change in education, or in what ways does it promote maintenance of existing values?

1.4 Overview of the Study

In this introductory chapter, I have explained the contexts of this study, illustrating the demographic, economic, and social changes in Korea, and provided a brief explanation of Korean multicultural education policy. I also discussed the source of my interest in and relationship to this topic, namely my role as one of the developers of Korean multicultural education policy and my interest in critiquing and improving it, especially since my role and disposition has led me to empathize with the situation of immigrants living in Korea. These comprise the aims of the research and its research questions.

Chapter Two provides a review of the pertinent literatures on multicultural policy and multicultural education from the Western perspective, and on discourses on multicultural education policy and practice in Korea. In Chapter Three, I explain the theoretical framework
that I drew on for this study. Critical multiculturalism is the overarching framework for analyzing Korea’s multicultural education policy, in particular, I used Sleeter and Grant’s (1987, 2007) five approaches to multicultural education as part of a critical approach to multicultural education. In Chapter Four, I explain a critical discourse analysis as an appropriate methodology for this study. Using a Critical Discourse Analysis methodology allowed me to examine the ideology and power relations embedded in multicultural education policy, and in policy more generally, and to interrogate the social process mediated by language. Chapter Five provides a critical analysis of the multicultural education policy documents and related discourses and suggests key findings. In the last chapter, after analyzing and reflecting on the work, I suggest what should be given more consideration in policy making and practice in multicultural education in order to contribute to a more socially just society. I also make recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2: Literature Review

In this chapter, I outline the multicultural education policy research that has been conducted from various perspectives and approaches in diverse countries with distinct histories. This literature review comprises three main parts: first, I review the Western perspectives and theories on multicultural education; second, I review multicultural policy and multicultural education policy of the countries that have considerable experience with different ethnicities, cultures, and languages; third, I review the discourses on Korea’s multicultural education policy. I took this comparative approach because different multicultural societies have different histories and traditions and include different kinds of cultural diversity (Parekh, 2006).

2.1 Western Perspectives on Multicultural Education

In the U.S., the Civil Rights Movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s influenced education to become more equitable for various groups (Sleeter & Grant, 1987). Multicultural education, originally linked with concerns about racism in U.S. schools, has expanded to deal with gender, class, and disability (Sleeter & Grant, 1987). Multicultural education first emerged as an idea or reform movement to change the content and practices in schools, and was considered an ongoing process to make critical changes in schools and in society (Banks, 2004). Sleeter and Grant (1987) developed a taxonomy of multicultural education, and suggested the five approaches: (1) Teaching the Exceptional and the Culturally Different, (2) Human Relations, (3) Single-Group Studies, (4) Multicultural Education, and (5) Education that is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist. They suggested the last approach, education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist, was a desirable perspective for teachers in order to challenge social inequality and make society more just (Sleeter & Grant, 2007).
Likewise, Banks and Banks (2004, 2010) suggested a conceptualization of the five dimensions of multicultural education: (1) (multicultural) content integration, (2) the knowledge construction process, (3) prejudice reduction, (4) an equity pedagogy, and (5) an empowering school culture and social structure. Briefly, each dimension can be described as follows: content integration relates to the extent to which teachers use the examples and content from ethnic and cultural groups in some disciplines such as social studies, language arts, and music; the knowledge construction process relates to the extent to which the teacher helps students understand how implicit assumptions, frames of reference, and bias influence the way knowledge is constructed; prejudice reduction refers to how teachers’ lessons can help students have positive attitudes toward different cultural, ethnic, and racial groups; an equity pedagogy describes the situation in which the teachers modify their teaching styles to facilitate the academic achievement of the students from diverse backgrounds; and an empowering school culture and social structure relates to school culture and organization that will promote gender, racial, and social class equity. Banks argues that these dimensions can inform teachers about their transformative roles in the classroom. Specifically, he emphasizes an empowerment of school culture and social structure as key aspects of multicultural education, due to its potential to restructure institutions, including schools, in order to foster a society that is equitable for all its members.

Critical scholars (McLaren, 1994; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; Sleeter & Grant, 2007) claim that multicultural education should move beyond promoting the pluralism of cultural diversity, and should interrogate the relationship between power, privilege, knowledge, and difference. Kincheloe and Steinberg (1997) offer five philosophical approaches to
multiculturalism: conservative multiculturalism, liberal multiculturalism, pluralist multiculturalism, left-essentialist multiculturalism, and critical multiculturalism. According to them, conservative multiculturalists regard non-white and poor children as inferior to those who are from white, middle-class families, and they focus on assimilating these children into mainstream society. Meanwhile, liberal and plural multiculturalists emphasize the provision of equal opportunities children need to compete in society, as well as the need to accommodate cultural diversity. Nevertheless, they do not pay attention to the social structure that generates inequality, which gives rise to a critical multiculturalism that calls for attention to the inequities of race, gender, and class (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997).

2.2 Polices of Countries with Long Histories of Immigration

In Canada, multiculturalism is a state-initiated enterprise with a legal and governing apparatus consisting of legislation and official policies. Since adopting “multiculturalism within a bilingual framework” as an official state policy in 1971, the federal government has grounded these policies with legislation such as the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982), the Employment Equity Act (1986), and the Canadian Multiculturalism Act (1988) (Frideres & Kim, 2010). Canada’s multicultural policy has four aims: to support the cultural development of ethnocultural groups; to help members of ethnocultural groups overcome barriers to full participation in Canadian society; to promote creative encounters and interchange among all ethnocultural groups; and to assist new Canadians in acquiring at least one of Canada's official languages (Kymlicka, 1998). This policy targeted diverse ethnocultural groups in Canada, though did not include Anglo-Canadians, French Canadians or First Nations; Moreover, French Canadians in Quebec insisted on the maintenance of French language and intercultural policy, and refused to embrace the federal policy (Ghosh & Abdi, 2013; Wright, 2012). However, even
in Canada, there has been a long debate over the effectiveness of the policy of multiculturalism. Some scholars have criticized Canada’s multiculturalism, saying it decreases the rate of integration of immigrants, thereby also increasing the degree of separation between ethnocultural groups and leading to more mutual hostility between them. These critics also pointed out the policy’s incompatibility with liberal democratic values (Bissoondath, 1994; Gwyn, 1995). Meanwhile, scholars like Kymlicka asserted that multiculturalism in Canada has played a constructive role in both individual identity and institutional design. That is, multiculturalism has enabled Canadian-born citizens and immigrants to Canada to have a high level of mutual identification, which has helped in establishing national identity and in creating feelings of solidarity. Also, he has insisted that multiculturalism has helped make educational institutions and political processes more inclusive of difference (Kymlicka, 1998, 2010).

Yet, another view of multiculturalism has pointed out that the policy and practice of multiculturalism continues to position certain ethno-racial groups at the margins, rather than in the mainstream of public culture and national identity. Many scholars have criticized multiculturalism's failure to deal with systemic racism in Canada (Dei, 1996; Goldberg, 1994; Henry, Tator, Mattis, & Rees, 1995). Dei (1996) criticized the much vaunted idea of the mosaic as a hierarchy of cultures, and called for anti-racism education. Situated in liberal-pluralist discourse, multiculturalism as an ideology has supported individualism, tolerance, and equality “without altering the core of common culture and dismantling the system of inequality” (Henry et al., 1995, p. 48).

This criticism of liberal multiculturalism has some things in common with anti-racism. Anti-racism is a strong trend in the U.K. and U.S, and more recently in Canada. Anti-racism education aims at dismantling structures and systems that have generated and perpetuated the
racial barriers and inequities in policies, programs, and practices of the educational system (Dei, 1996; Henry et al., 1995).

The history of Canadian immigration and immigration policy reflects the country’s changing vision of national identity and how it has influenced multicultural education policy. Wright (2012) points out that Canadian multiculturalism has evolved over time. Referencing Fleras and Elliott’s study (2007), Wright explained the three broad and overlapping stages in Canadian multiculturalism policy: in the 1970s, an initial stage was marked by notions of “ethnicity”; in the 1980s, a second stage was dominated by notions of “equity”; and in the 1990s and the present, a third stage puts “civic responsibility” front and centre (Wright, 2012, p. 107). Unlike those Western European countries where conservative leaders pronounced a retreat from multiculturalism, Canada has tended to maintain it. However, Wright (2012) warns of its demise due to a duality of external and internal threats.

Ghosh and Abdi (2013) also analyzed ideological shifts in Canadian multicultural theory as divided into five phases in which the main concept is one of the following: assimilation, adjustment, accommodation, incorporation, or integration. In the first stage, assimilation, difference was equated with the inferiority, and the majority did not make the other ethnocultural groups’ needs a priority. In the second phase, adjustment, cultural pluralism and the need to help minorities adjust to the dominant culture through compensatory programs were emphasized. In the third stage, the accommodation of other ethnocultural groups is achieved, but the removal of racism and discrimination is not. The fourth stage of incorporation enables the removal of barriers through affirmative action and equal opportunity programs. Lastly, in the final stage, integration, all groups are regarded as equal and the empowerment of school cultures is encouraged. Criticizing “the ethnic hierarchy” (Ghosh & Abdi, 2013, p. 86) within Canada,
Ghosh and Abdi concluded that multicultural policy should lead to the stage of integration by putting equal value on dominant and subordinate ethnocultural groups and encouraging their active participation.

Joshee and Sinfield (2013) classified the diverse discourses on multicultural education policy in Canada into three groups (liberal social justice discourses, neoliberal discourses, and neoconservative discourses), and claimed that the current combination of neoliberal and neoconservative discourses in multicultural education has constructed diversity as a problem or threat to safety, and has positioned minority students as having deficits that need to be addressed. They pointed out the recent shift in Canadian multicultural education policy from social justice to social cohesion, and demanded a call for liberal social justice discourse.

These studies inform us that even in countries with heterogeneous populations and state-led multiculturalism policies, there are ongoing debates over the relationship between unity and diversity, and liberal democratic principles and the politics of difference. Meanwhile, Canada’s efforts to interrogate the current state of social inequality and to move toward a more equitable world can shed light on possible implications or lessons for Korean multicultural education policy.

2.3 Perspectives from Historically Homogenous Countries

In comparison with Canada’s form of multicultural education, countries with more restrictive immigration policies and less experience with ethnic diversity, such as Japan, constructed their multiculturalism policies based on ethnic and cultural homogeneity (Nagy, 2014). Research by Okano (2006) and Tsuneyoshi (2010) has shown that Japan projects itself as an ethnically and linguistically homogeneous nation, and it has nurtured a sense of what it is to be ‘Japanese’ and has assimilated other ethnic groups under this umbrella. Hirasawa (2009)
argues that the Japanese government assimilated its longstanding ‘invisible’ minorities, which include the Indigenous peoples of Hokkaido (the Ainu), the people of Okinawa, and descendants of ethnic Koreans and Taiwanese who were brought to Japan during its colonial occupation of those areas; however, it has created ‘cultural adaptation’ policies for new ‘visible’ minorities, which include foreign workers, foreign spouses of Japanese people, and South Americans of Japanese descent.

Nagy (2014) points out that Japan has maintained a restrictive immigration policy and has had no state-level mechanism supporting migrants in Japan. Instead, it was local governments that began to initiate incorporation policies, policies toward foreigners, multicultural co-existence policies, and social integration policies because migrants entering Japan had to register at the local government office where they lived. He claimed that it is a service-centred policy (e.g., providing social welfare, medical services, and education) rather than a multiculturalism policy that considers multiethnic or multicultural identity. He also argued that there are “no policies at the local or state level that prohibit the ethnicity-based discrimination” (Nagy, 2014, p. 168).

These studies show that social, economic, and demographic changes prompted the Japanese government to create a multicultural education policy, but this policy mainly focuses on new arrivals and excludes the country’s long-standing ethnic minorities. Even though the policy emphasizes coexistence, it does not yet include efforts to challenge social inequality through multicultural education.

### 2.4 Globalization and Neoliberalism

Globalization and Neo-liberalism exerted its influence to economy, migration, boundary of nation-state, public sectors, and to people’s way of thinking and living globally and locally
Globalization is one of the most important factors that have accelerated the advent of multicultural society in Korea, with its flows of people, ideas, and information (Appadurai, 1996). At the same time, globalization has brought about problems because it subsumes social, cultural, and political matters under an economic logic (Harvey, 2005).

In the globalized era, mobility is unevenly distributed (Bauman, 1998). To some, mobility reflects privilege or capital in that it allows people to maintain or improve their cultural and economic status within a stratified society by becoming transnational elites (Castells, 2000). However, to some, the mobility is triggered by the lack of economic opportunity in one’s home country, or one’s political dispositions. Migrant workers who move from developing countries to global cities are not privileged (Sassen, 1998; Waters, 2001). This unequal distribution of motivation for mobility frequently leads to differential treatment in the migrants’ new or host countries.

Furthermore, the spread of the neoliberal logic around the world, which has reduced governments’ role in social welfare and accelerated reliance on the market, has meant an uneven distribution of wealth (Giroux, 2014; Harvey, 2009; Hirrt, 2004). The withdrawal of government from its role in securing social infrastructure has left individuals responsible for their own security in the social, economic, and employment arenas (Harvey, 2005). Thus, this era of global capital allows only the strongest, fittest, and fastest to obtain more opportunities; similarly, the worsening conditions for the underprivileged classes are explained as a result of their lack of rigorous work, whereas their lack of equal opportunities to develop competitive strengths tends to be overlooked (Harvey, 2005).

Neoliberal globalization demands that education systems be more aligned with economic considerations and market efficiency, and has brought about an increasing polarization and
hierarchicalization of education and the workforce (Hirrt, 2004). It leads to discourage critical education that seeks for critical enquiry, political literacy, and promoting democratic and social equality (Giroux; 2014; Rizvi & Engel, 2009).

2.5 The Discourses on Multicultural Education in Korea

With the influence of globalization and neoliberalism, a Korean society came to pay attention to diversity in ethnicity, language, and culture, within it. Since announcing its initial multicultural education policy in 2006, many studies have been conducted on multicultural families and multicultural education. Studies have shown that the number of multicultural children has increased rapidly, and that their non-Korean parents’ home countries were Japan, followed by China, the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam (Cho et al., 2010; Oh, 2006). Many multicultural students have shown lower levels of achievement than mainstream Korean students, and have experienced discrimination in school (Jeon, 2008; Oh, 2006; Oh, 2008).

Several studies on multicultural education programs revealed that the two most common programs were cultural education for multicultural understanding for both mainstream Korean students and multicultural students, and Korean language education for multicultural students. Furthermore, most of the programs were geared towards multicultural students only, and most courses were one-time events rather than on-going courses (Cho et al., 2010; Park & Sung, 2008; Park, 2009).

In reviewing the recent studies on the multicultural education policy of Korea, even though they were based on different theoretical frameworks, such as Young’s (1990) politics of difference (Grant & Ham, 2013), Berry’s (1997) notion of acculturation (Kim, 2014), and Sleeter and Grant’s (2007) five approaches to multicultural education (Y. Lee, 2013; Grant & Ham, 2013), researchers have argued that Korea’s multicultural education policy still focuses on
multicultural students’ adaptation and assimilation into mainstream culture. Also, they have criticized the use of the terms “multicultural family” and “multicultural students,” which created the stigma toward them (Y. Lee, 2013; Kim, 2014; Grant & Ham, 2013). Furthermore, Lee (2010), in her critical policy analysis, described five policy discourses that are embedded in the multicultural education policy of Korea: culture-based discourse, paternalistic sympathy-based discourse, global human capital discourse, identity-based discourse, and human rights-based discourse.

Specifically, some studies examined the multicultural education policy using critical discourse analysis, and revealed the policy’s ideological assumptions and the relationship between the central government’s policy (texts) and the interpretation by news media and teachers at the local level (Y. Lee, 2013; Kang, 2015). Y. Lee (2013) claimed that policy makers reframed multicultural education at the level of early childhood to assimilate ethnic minorities, and that the experiences of teachers and the voices of parents and children from different cultural backgrounds were not represented sufficiently. Kang (2015) examined the ideological and socio-cultural politics underlying Korea’s national curriculum reform and multicultural education policy. Through a Critical Discourse Analysis of the government’s policy documents on multicultural education and national curriculum reform, and articles from diverse news media (from conservative to progressive), specifically those focused on language, ideology, and knowledge production, she revealed how the policy was interpreted by the news media and textbook authors, and how it contributed to reproducing the image of migrant Others represented in the textbooks. Kang (2015) concluded that the politics of government-led multicultural education policy and the reproduction of discourse through conservative news media contributed to maintaining this hegemony.
Although many analyses have been insightful, several of these studies focused on showing the government’s orientation of assimilation in multicultural education policy, and on issues related exclusion/inclusion and naming/labeling Others. I looked into how other subjects, including mainstream Korean students, teachers, and the public, as well as multicultural students, are perceived in the multicultural education policy, and what agendas are suggested for them to raise their critical consciousness. Also, it was necessary to analyze the shift of discourses represented in multicultural education policy during the past decade, and to identify how the values and the centrality of the policy have changed, in what ways, and what can be done to achieve a more equitable society. This is a way to present the policy in its current state, and how responsive it has been to external changes and policy subjects’ needs.
CHAPTER 3: Theoretical Framework

3.1 Introduction

In this study, critical multiculturalism was the umbrella theoretical lens that formed the foundation for my research process and informed the critical discourse analysis (CDA) of Korea’s multicultural education policy. It is through this lens that I explored, analyzed, and interpreted the underlying ideologies, assumptions, and relationships within multicultural policy and related social processes. Within this primary framework, I also drew upon Sleeter and Grant’s (2007) five approaches to multicultural education and Kincheloe and Steinberg’s (1997) philosophical approaches to multicultural education for a more focused approach for selecting and analyzing the relevant social and educational policy ‘texts’. As a prior stage, I utilized the two different perspectives viewing policy and purpose of education of the functionalist perspective and the socially critical perspective. These helped me identify dialectic relations between the explicit agendas and implicit assumptions in the policy.

On the other hand, globalization ideology and neoliberal economic discourse (e.g. capitalist economy, privatization, democratic government) which originated within the business field, have now colonized or have been recontextualized within the field of education and policy (Fairclough, 2016). In Korea, globalization and neoliberalism are forces that have accelerated immigration, introduced societal change, and permeated the policy discourse through which the Korean government established its position on multicultural education. As such, these lenses informed some of my discussion within my wider theoretical approach.

In this way, critical multiculturalism and the various approaches to multicultural education directed my application of Fairclough’s CDA framework to highlight the dialectic relationships between policy, social structure, and social events (Fairclough, 2016).
In summary, the critical multiculturalism theoretical framework that I constructed consists of four main theoretical lenses: first are functionalist perspective and socially critical perspective which included deficit thinking model. Next are the globalization and neoliberalism ideologies. The five philosophical approaches to multiculturalism followed. Finally, five approaches to multicultural education helped me focus my study on multicultural education policy (see Figure 3.1).

Figure 3.1. *The critical multiculturalism theoretical framework*

### 3.2 The Functionalist Perspective and Socially Critical Perspective

First, I adopted the different perspectives on policy, society, and the role of education because these different perspectives can inform me of how to delve into understanding the government’s intentions, the underlying assumptions of the policy, and its dialectic relationships. Yang (2007) suggested two perspectives found in researchers’ views of policy, the rational perspective and the conflict perspective, which are based on Dahrendorf’s (1959) explanation of
society’s two faces of conflict and consensus. Yang (2007) explained that the rational perspective, which draws from a positivist view and functionalist assumptions about society, emphasized cost-efficient decision making, value-neutral manners, and an orderly and rational policy process, but ignored issues of power. He claimed that in this perspective the institutions in society contribute to the ongoing stability of the whole. In contrast, the conflict perspective highlights the role of power in maintaining social order (Yang, 2007); at the institutional level, the power relations of policy settlements are “systemically asymmetrical,” that is, “different individuals or groups have a different capacity to make a meaning stick” (Thompson, 1984, p. 132). As Ball (1990) pointed out, policy is derived from the consequences of struggle and compromise between various interest groups, and eventually makes the dominant values of the authoritative group hegemonic. In this perspective, we are required to ask whose values are validated in the policy, and whose are not.

With regard to the role of education, Raffo, Dyson, Gunter, Hall, Jones, and Kalambouka (2009) identified the distinctive positions of the functionalist perspective and socially critical perspective by reviewing the literatures on the nature, role, and purpose of education, and what counts as ‘good education.’ According to Raffo et al. (2009), both perspectives assume education as potentially beneficial. The functionalist perspective takes it for granted that education plays an important role in the functioning of society; when it works well, education is seen as bringing benefits such as economic development, social cohesion, and enhanced life chances for individuals, and that these benefits accrue to both society and to individuals within that society. However, the socially critical perspective sees that the social structure is inherently inequitable, and that education in its current form both reflects and replicates unequal distribution of power and resources. The failure of education to produce benefits for those living in poverty is not
simply a glitch in an otherwise benevolent system, but rather is a result of the inequalities built into society and the education system (Raffo et al., 2009).

These perspectives that view policy and education from such contrasting assumptions enabled me to identify the government’s ostensible arguments and strategy in selecting certain policy agendas, and in turn, the assumptions that underpinned the policy and what was not addressed in the policy.

3.3 Various Philosophical Approaches to Multicultural Education

In their book Changing multiculturalism, Kincheloe and Steinberg (1997) discussed several philosophical approaches to multicultural education, which helped me develop my theoretical lens for analysis and discussion of discourse within this study.

According to Kincheloe and Steinberg (1997), conservative multiculturalism, or monoculturalism, at the end of the twentieth century was “a form of neo-colonialism which embraces the tradition of white male supremacy” (p. 3). This approach was based on the assumption that poor and non-white students are inferior to those from white, middle-class families. In Korea, we can think of this as the relation between children from multicultural family and mainstream Korean students. Conservative and monoculturalists dismiss the notion of power relations between such different groups, and thus, racism, class bias, and gender bias are not given consideration in the construction of their argument. In a decontextualized manner, they attempt to assimilate poor and non-white students into the common majority culture, and what many people consider an unjust society (McLaren, 1994; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997).

In contrast, liberal multiculturalism emphasizes sameness, innate commonalities, and universal equality among groups (McLaren, 1994). That is, individuals from diverse
races, classes, and gender groups share a natural equality and a common humanity, which allows them to compete equally for resources in a capitalist society. Liberal multiculturalists believe that the causes of inequality across the groups involve “the lack of social and educational opportunities to compete in the economy, not difference characterized by conservatives as deficiency” (p. 10). Nevertheless, Kincheloe and Steinberg (1997) criticized this approach to multiculturalism as a “liberalism hyperrationalizes process” (p. 14), and argued that liberal multiculturalism fails to address racism, sexism, and class bias, or to engage in a critical analysis of power asymmetries that maintain social and educational inequalities.

Meanwhile, pluralist multiculturalism links race, gender, language, culture, and disability as part of a larger effort to celebrate human diversity and equal opportunity. It emphasizes developing “multicultural literacy” (p. 16) in order to successfully operate in situations of cultural difference. It also promotes pride in one’s own ethnic heritage and culture. However, pluralist multiculturalism fails to recognize the power relations among identity construction, cultural representation, and struggles over resources. And it promotes a form of cultural tourism, rather than focusing on historical oppression, and treats the status quo as “an unthreatening construction of culture” (p. 18).

Left-essentialist multiculturalism takes a simple and static notion of ethnic/racial identity, the essence of which transcends the forces of history, social context, and power. Its search for authenticity in identity and history leads to privileging identity as the grounds for political and epistemological authority, that is, “oppression privilege” (p. 21), assuming that only authentically oppressed people can possess moral agency. Kincheloe and Steinberg (1997) pointed out the narrowness of essentialist multiculturalism in that they
overlook the importance of the intersectionality of oppression and the possibility of a broader coalition for an inclusive political, cultural, and economic democracy.

Critical multiculturalism is concerned with the contextualization of what gives rise to race, class, and gender inequality, and with the intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991) of social identities or related systems of oppression, domination, or discrimination, to understand how systemic injustice and social inequality occur on a multidimensional basis. Also, it focuses on “the way the power shapes consciousness, by which ideological inscriptions are imprinted on subjectivity, power forces hegemonic outcomes, and discursive powers shape thinking and behavior” (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997, p. 25). It refuses to position the mere establishment of diversity as its final objective; instead, it seeks a diversity that understands the power of difference within a larger and ultimate concern with social justice (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997).

3.4 Different Approaches to Multicultural Education

In this study, I drew on Sleeter and Grant’s (1987, 2007) five approaches to multicultural education to analyze the orientation and agendas of Korea’s multicultural education policy. Even though the approaches were organized and used to study context in the U.S., they can nonetheless be applied to the Korean case to show diverse perspectives on diversity, and how policy makers and teachers deal with difference and promote sensitivity.

In their book Making choices for multicultural education, Sleeter and Grant (2003) contended that although educators have used different names for school reforms, “multicultural education has emerged as an umbrella concept that deals with race, culture, language, social class, gender, and disability” (p. 31). The authors combined two typologies, one from Gibson (1976) and the other from Pratte (1983), pointing out the limitations of each, such as the lack of a
more elaborate theorization, an overemphasis on race (and not gender or social class), and a tendency to deal with issues of cultural diversity, but not social equality.

Sleeter and Grant constructed their own typology of *five approaches to multicultural education* (1987) based on how each approach understands difference. These approaches helped me focus my critical discourse analysis. They are: Teaching the Exceptional and the Culturally Different, Human Relations, Single-Group Studies, Multicultural Education, and Education that is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist.

First, *Teaching the Exceptional and the Culturally Different* focuses on improving minority students’ achievement and helping them succeed in mainstream society through education. It is based on human capital theory, which regards education as a form of investment in that individuals acquire knowledge and skills that can be used to get better jobs. Sleeter and Grant (1987, 2003/2007) pointed out that educators who adopt this approach tend to have one of two orientations – deficiency orientation related to deficit thinking (Valencia, 1997) or difference orientation – according to how they perceive difference. Sleeter and Grant (2003) critically claimed that policy makers and educators who adopt a “deficiency orientation” (p. 42) perceive students of colour, lower-class people, and language-minorities as culturally deprived, and they focus on their deficiencies as something to be remedied. Meanwhile, those who adopt a “difference orientation” (p. 49) focus more on the strengths and backgrounds of the students as resources to help them achieve. However, people of both orientations aim to help students assimilate into the mainstream and ignore the wider social structural issues, such as structural barriers to economic access, and discrimination and inequality perpetuated by the majority group.

The second approach, *Human Relations*, aims to foster tolerance and positive feelings
among different groups, and to reduce prejudice and stereotyping, thus helping students of
different backgrounds fit in with others and easily adapt to mainstream society. The educators
who adopt this approach try to construct their classrooms to celebrate individual differences, and
they regard difference as normal and valuable. However, Sleeter and Grant (2007) critically
pointed out that this approach normalizes the distribution of power, and does not address
institutional racism and the advantages that social stratification confers to dominant groups.
Instead, they regard prejudice as simply a matter of individual emotional disturbance.

Third, the *Single-Group Studies* approach raises questions about the myth of the
neutrality of education, the nature of knowledge, and the purpose of schooling. The advocates of
this approach adopted Apple’s (1996) assertion that knowledge is the result of a complex
struggle and cultural politics of identifiable groups, and that knowledge is shaped by the
distribution of power within a society. Thus, they emphasized that curriculum reform is the
restructuring of knowledge, and they insist on including the stories and histories of the
oppressed. Single-Group Studies also focuses on the strength of the oppressed groups, and help
them clarify their identities, and take pride in their ethnicity. Single-Group Studies
counterbalances the White, male, and middle-upper class dominant perspective, and includes
Black Studies, Chicano Studies, Women’s Studies, LGBTQ Studies, and so forth. Unlike the first
two approaches mentioned above, which consider the contents and the process of schools as
essentially fair and preferable, this approach recognizes that education is not neutral because it
mainly reflects the dominant groups’ perspective, and because it emphasizes political power,
social action to bring about social change, and the need to raise teachers’ awareness. However,
this approach also has some limitations in that despite its emphasis on curriculum, curriculum is
in fact left unreformed, or additional programs exist merely as add-ons and do not pay attention
to multiple forms of oppression.

The fourth approach, the *Multicultural Education* approach, promotes cultural pluralism and social equality by reforming aspects of the schooling process, such as curriculum, pedagogy, parent involvement, and tracking, for all students. Though this approach pays more attention than the other three approaches to issues of social inequality and injustice, its limitation is that educators in multicultural education often treat multiple forms of diversity (e.g. race and gender) as parallel but separate (Grant & Sleeter, 1986). Moreover, it fails to address the complex and contradictory nature of experience and diversity within groups (Sleeter & Grant, 2003/2007), and puts too much emphasis on celebrating differences without sufficiently dealing with issues of social inequality.

Finally, *Education That Is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist* calls attention to the intersectionality of multiple forms of oppression, and aims to help create a society that is more socially just, ethnoculturally equal, and democratically free (Sleeter & Grant, 1987, 2007). This is distinctly different from the Multicultural Education approach even though the two share the goals of promoting social structural equality and cultural pluralism. Sleeter and Grant (2007) described the four practices unique to this approach as follows: practicing democracy, analyzing the circumstances of one’s own life, developing social action skills, and coalescing. That is, by practicing democracy, students can learn to articulate their interests, openly debate issues with peers, organize and work collectively with others, and acquire and exercise power. By analyzing the circumstances of their lives, students can develop consciousness about real injustices that exist in society and can bring about social, political, and economic change in the future by using their skills for social action. In the processes of doing this, they can also coalesce across race, class, and gender lines. Sleeter and Grant (2007) concluded that even though some educators see
the *Education That Is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist* approach as radical or infeasible in terms of implementation, they nonetheless favour this approach because it can teach students how to challenge the status quo, and promote coalitions between oppressed groups and other groups, including some that belong to the dominant racial, class, and gender groups.

As indicated above, these five approaches have different orientations and loci of interest in multicultural education; however, in examining relevant policy documents, these approaches are nonetheless useful in analyzing their status within policy documents, the ideology behind the policies, and how policy subjects are perceived. These approaches can also be useful in analyzing invisible power relations, and whether the multicultural education policy actually lessens the difficulties that multicultural children face. In other words, did the policy address structural factors that produce or reinforce injustice and inequality, or did it simply accentuate individual differences?

### 3.5 Globalization and Neoliberalism

As mentioned above, neoliberal globalization demands that education systems be more aligned with economic considerations and market efficiency. This means that education systems are expected to (re)produce a workforce, citizenry, and consumers who are fit for a global capital economy, equipped with the relevant skills and attitudes, and ideologically compliant and suitable for producing capital (Giroux, 2014; Rizvi & Engel, 2009). Neoliberal globalization has brought about an increasing polarization and hierarchicalization of education and the workforce (Hirrt, 2004). It has also discouraged education for the sake of critical inquiry or seeking alternative modes of politics (Giroux, 2014). What is emphasized in neoliberal education is individual responsibility and one’s obligation to oneself; it is far from the type of system that emphasizes social/ethical responsibility to a just society or interest in the public sphere or
building a sustainable and democratic society. In this regard, public education is used to reinforce mass testing and memorization, and for surveillance by authorities; according to this logic, critical education is not a priority (Giroux; 2014; Rizvi & Engel, 2009).

Within the liberal globalization discourse, a new rhetoric of access and equity has emerged. This discourse is concerned only with formal access to educational institutions based on an overriding concern with capital accumulation, not with the “broader issues of structural inequalities” (Rizvi and Engel, 2009, p. 529). This focus on access and equity is in sync with the argument in favour of “equal opportunity,” which is part of liberal multiculturalism, and this discourse is subject to similar critiques by critical scholars (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; McLaren, 1995; Young, 1990). An emphasis on equal opportunity within an uneven society does not contribute to a more equitable social structure.

The globalization and neoliberalism frameworks led me to examine the backgrounds of Others and their migration to Korea, their settlement and incorporation into Korean society, and the Korean public’s awareness of these new-comers. Also, neoliberalism that permeates and influences education policy, including multicultural education policy, helped me examine the process of policy formulation, the values on which it is based, and the shifts in policy agendas.

3.6 Critical Multiculturalism

Critical theory emerged from the Frankfurt School of Social Research in Germany in the 1920s. Critical theories have been concerned with how domination takes place, as well as how human relations are shaped in the workplace, in schools, and in everyday life. The critical theorists emphasize that an individual should be conscious of himself or herself as a social being (Freire, 2000), and that she or he should also realize how and why his or her political opinions, class, gender role, and racial self-image are shaped by dominant perspectives (Kincheloe &
During the 1990s, critical approaches have received growing attention in the field of multicultural education. These approaches have been called different names, such as *critical multiculturalism* (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997), *revolutionary multiculturalism* (McLaren, 1995), *education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist* (Sleeter & Grant, 1987, 2007), *transformative pedagogy* (Cummins, 2000), *social reform* (Nieto, 2003), and *multicultural citizenship education* (Banks, 2007). Nevertheless, these critical approaches have in common that they emerged in opposition to liberal multiculturalism (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; May & Sleeter, 2010).

Critical multiculturalists and anti-racist theorists point out the limitations of liberal multiculturalism in that it fails to address material issues of racism, disadvantage, and related forms of discrimination and inequality, as well as the power relationships among groups and the structures that maintain inequality (Dei, 1996; May & Sleeter, 2010). As Kincheloe and Steinberg (1997) put it, complex relations of power and human suffering get lost amidst the celebration of individualism and citizenship. Dei (1996) contended that anti-racism theory mainly focuses on analysis of power relations and the relationship between social differences, and it seeks relationships that are more representative, equitable, inclusive, and capable of responding to the concerns and aspirations of marginalized communities.

Critical approaches to multicultural education focus on a discourse analysis of social phenomena that distribute power and thereby contribute to inequalities between diverse ethnocultural groups. These approaches also draw attention to how marginalized groups resist the cultural hegemony of the majority group. Critical scholars conceive of multicultural education as something that should emphasize critical reflection and taking action that leads to social change.
3.7 Summary

The theoretical framework of philosophical approaches to multicultural education (Kinchemoe & Steinberg, 1997), Sleeter and Grant’s (1987, 2003/2007) five approaches to multicultural education, and critical multiculturalism are interrelated. Specifically, critical multiculturalism that seeks social equality and social justice guided my analysis of the underlying assumptions of the multicultural education policy and helped me focus on what was represented in the policy document and what was not represented. It also helped me appreciate what is needed in order to move toward a more just society. At the same time, the various approaches to multicultural education that informed me of the foci and goals of each approach helped me identify the values and orientations that underpin the multicultural policy, and also helped me examine the implicit power relations between multicultural students and mainstream Korean students that are constructed through the policy. In the process of doing this, the theory of the ‘deficit thinking’ model (Valencia, 1997) helped me understand how the two groups are distinguished according to their constructed differences. The theory of globalization and neoliberalism informed me of the impetus behind the migration of others to Korea, their differential treatments in Korean society, and the impact that neoliberalism has had on the education policy framework within which the multicultural education policy is situated. The functionalist and socially critical perspectives help us examine the outcome and the limitations of the multicultural education policies, the contradiction between the policies’ intentions and the ongoing results of the policies.

I brought these theoretical frameworks together to critically analyze the policy document, focusing on the ideology of the policy, the construction of the image of multicultural children,
and the progress or changes that were made through the policy. These are interwoven
dialectically throughout the policy. I conducted this analysis using Fairclough’s (2002/2016)
dialectical-relational CDA approach of three-level social processes, which focuses on the
dialectical relationship between social structure and social events ‘mediated’ by social practice,
that is, multicultural education policy.
CHAPTER 4: Methodology

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I outlined my methodology for this study. I drew on a Critical Discourse Analysis to examine the underlying assumptions of the Korean multicultural education policy. My qualitative research approach situated me as “the researcher is [as] a multicultural subject” (Guba & Lincoln, 2005, p. 193; Creswell, 2013, p. 78). Qualitative research aims to understand the meaning of human action and phenomena, and it emphasizes the researchers’ subjectivity, seeing knowledge as something that is constructed, rather than discovered (Stake, 1995; Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Creswell, 2013). This approach helped me to assess my social and political roles in multicultural education. This qualitative approach informed my critical stance and CDA methodology, which I combined with my theoretical framework of multicultural education and textual analysis of Korea’s multicultural education policy documents from 2006 and 2012 to 2015.

In terms of paradigmatic stances, I subscribe to the critical paradigm. I therefore hold a “historical realism” ontology, which posits that life is a “virtual reality shaped by social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic, and gender value crystallized over time” (Guba & Lincoln, 2005, pp. 193-196). Critical theorists, such as Adorno, Marcuse, and Horkheimer, see the world as situated in social, political, and historical contexts; they regard knowledge as the product of power, privilege, and hegemony, and thus, in the epistemology of this paradigm, the relationship between the knower and the known is subjective and political (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). Critical researchers focus on issues of power and domination, and they view language use and discourse as socially and historically constructed to maintain the status quo and to reproduce the existing social order (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000; Glesne, 2014). My study reflects this critical
paradigm because I see the world and knowledge as the product of the social, political, and cultural struggles, and of asymmetries of power relations.

In this study, the following are the three research questions I address: (1) How does the policy construct multicultural education, multicultural students, and the relationships between multicultural students and the majority? (2) What ideological assumptions and aims are embedded in the multicultural education policy of Korea? (3) What kinds of shifts have been made to the policy over the past decade? In what way does the policy promote a change in education, or in what ways does it promote maintenance of existing values?

By using a critical discourse analysis, I explored how majority groups and multicultural families are constructed within the policy and how their needs and policy agendas are interrelated. I paid attention to the orientation of the policy, namely, whether it focused on maintaining the status quo or on bringing about change. In this study, the meaning of the policy and its priorities were traced with analysis within and across the policy documents.


4.2 An Overview of Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) brings together social theory and text analysis (Rogers, Malancharuvil-Beckers, Mosley, Hui, & Joseph, 2005). CDA provides the theory and method for the empirical study of the “relations between discourse and social and cultural developments” in different social domains (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002, p. 60). Critical Discourse Analysis is an “attempt to bring social theory and discourse analysis together to describe, interpret, and explain the ways in which discourse constructs, becomes constructed, represents,
and becomes represented by the social world” (Rogers et al., 2005, p. 366). According to Meyer (2002), CDA scholars play an “advocatory role for groups who suffer from social discrimination” (p. 15). He argues that CDA makes an effort to make explicit power relationships which are hidden in discourse, and thus, to derive results that have practical relevance (Meyer, 2002).

CDA is related to critical theories that are concerned with issues of power, privilege, justice, and hegemony. Scholars in the critical research tradition share some assumptions: that thought is mediated by historically constituted power relations; that facts are not neutral, and are always embedded in contexts; and that language is central to the formation of subjectivities and subjugation (Rogers et al., 2005). Scholars in the CDA tradition define discourse as language use as social practice, which reflects and constructs the social world dialectically, and which is mediated by power relations. Foucault's theories of discourse have had a tremendous impact on the social sciences. Fairclough and Wodak (1997) outlined several features of discourse, namely, that it does ideological work, it constitutes society and culture, and it is situated and historical. Moreover, power relations are partially discursive, and the role of the analyst is to study the relationship between texts and social practices.

Though different terminologies are used, CDA is “an interdisciplinary set of theoretical and analytic tools” (Rogers, 2008, p. 53) applied to the study of the relationships between texts (spoken, written, multi-modal, and digital), discourse practices (communicative events), and social practices (society-wide processes) (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000; Collins, 2004; Fairclough, 1995). CDA is popularly used to describe, interpret, and explain important educational problems. Specifically, CDA scholars focus on how language mediates relationships of power and privilege in social interaction, institutions, and bodies of knowledge (Rogers, 2008).
Their interest is in uncovering domination through power and unequal relationships, and in transforming the conditions of inequality. These characteristics of CDA can be summarized as in Table 4.1.

**Table 4.1 The characteristics of Critical Discourse Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Critical</strong></th>
<th>It focuses on issues of power, privilege, justice, and domination.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discourse</strong></td>
<td>It emphasizes on language use as social practice, which reflects and constructs the social world. Discourses do ideological work within historical contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td>It suggests analytic tools for relationships between texts, discourse practices, and social practices. It is used for description, interpretation, and explanation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Chouliaraki & Fairclough (1997); Fairclough (2002/2016); Rogers et al. (2005)*

My CDA examined what assumptions and ideologies were embedded in Korea’s multicultural education policy, what perspectives the policy makers had on multicultural families and multicultural education, what were perceived as social problems, who the beneficiaries of the policy were, and whose voices were heard and whose were ignored. By analyzing multicultural education policy (written text, documents) and critically interpreting the meaning of the text through the lens of CDA, and by focusing on wording, metaphors, ethos, grammar, interactional control (Fairclough, 1992), I was able to detect what ethnic and cultural issues and inequalities are hidden in the educational policy.

Secondly, I believed the CDA approach was useful in identifying changes in multicultural education policy over time. These changes include, for example, the types of discourses that were constructed and enacted through the policy; what values were encouraged or discouraged in the policy; what the policy’s priorities were and how these have changed; and
what perspectives the policy makers had and how these perspectives were reflected in the policy. Drawing on CDA, I was able to determine the discursive practices in producing and consuming the text (the policy document) on multicultural education (Fairclough, 1992).

CDA is grounded in a wide variety of theories, “ranging from micro-sociological perspectives (R. Schollon) to theories on society and power in Michel Foucault’s tradition (S. Jäger, N. Fairclough, R. Wodak), [and to] theories of social cognition (T. van Dijk) and grammar” (Meyer, 2002, pp. 17-18). Among those different theories, I drew on Fairclough’s work because he focused more on social conflict and tried to detect its linguistic manifestations in discourse, particularly elements of dominance, difference, and resistance (Fairclough, 1989). Fairclough argues that discourse is an important form of social practice, which reproduces and changes knowledge, identities, and social relations, including power relations. However, he disagrees with Foucault’s understanding of power as unchanging, top-down, and unitary through social technologies such as surveillance.

Fairclough (2002) developed a version of CDA based on the view of “semiosis as an irreducible part of material social processes” (p. 122). Thus, CDA is an “analysis of the dialectic relationships between semiosis (including language) and other elements of social practices” (Fairclough, 2002, p. 123). Fairclough (1995) insists that the goals of CDA are to contribute to social equity in multiple realms, including education. CDA regards education as a significant area for the reproduction of social relations, ideology, identity-formation, and possibilities of change (Blommaert, 2005).

My study further contributed to an understanding of the Korean multicultural educational fields through an application of Fairclough’s (2002/2016) dialectical-relational version of Critical Discourse Analysis in transdisciplinary research. In this approach, Fairclough (2002)
focused on analyzing and explaining the dialectic relations between semiosis, which includes language and multi modalities, in order to clarify “how semiosis figures in establishment, reproduction, and change of unequal power relations and in ideological processes” (p. 163). With an emphasis on the centrality of context to language, CDA allows for an investigation of the relationship of language to power and to other social processes, actors, and relations (Hyatt, 2013).

Social processes can be seen as the interplay between three levels of social reality: social structure, social practice, and social events (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Fairclough, 2002/2016). Social practices mediate the relationship between general and abstract social structures and particular and concrete social events (Fairclough, 2002/2016). Fairclough suggests that in this approach, analysis is focused on two dialectic relations: “between structure (especially social practices as an intermediate level of structuring) and events (or structure and action, structure and strategy), and within each, between semiosis and other elements” (2016, p. 88). He demonstrates that there are three main ways in which semiosis relates to other social elements of social practices and social events: as a facet of action, in the construal of aspects of the world, and in the constitution of identities, which correspond with genre, discourse, and style, respectively (Fairclough, 2016).

Networks of social practice are articulated through discourses (Hyatt, 2013). The aim of policy analysis is to uncover how authors of texts which are seen as semiotic representations of social events represent and construct the social world, institutions, identities, and relationships, and how these are shaped and characterized ideologically through relations of power (Hyatt, 2013). It offers a systematic framework for analysis, uncovering how language works as an agent in the discursive construction of power relations. Hence, it can provide insights into engaging
with policy texts, in which policymaking is seen as an arena of struggle over meaning, and policies are seen as the outcomes of struggles “between contenders of competing objectives, where discourse is used tactically” (Fulcher, 1989, p. 7, cited in Hyatt, 2013, p. 837).

In this study, a CDA framework provided a systematic approach to investigate the relationships between multicultural children, multicultural education policy as social practices, and ideologies as represented through Korean literatures on social phenomena and policy documents. The analysis drawn on Fairclough’s dialectical-relational version of CDA was guided by the following research questions:

1) How does the policy construct multicultural education, multicultural students, and the relationship between multicultural students and the majority?

2) What ideological assumptions and aims are embedded in the multicultural education policy of Korea? What approach toward multicultural education has the government of Korea drawn on to support multicultural students and to encourage Korean citizens to accept diversity and difference?

3) What kinds of shifts have been made to the policy over the past decade? In what way does the policy promote a change in education, or in what ways does it promote a maintenance of existing values?

4.3 Data and Document Collection Processes

My data gathering process began by examining the Korean policy context and social practice related to multiculturalism. I first reviewed the related policy documents of other Ministries of Korea (e.g. the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family, the Ministry of Justice, the Committee for Policy on Multicultural Families, and the Foreigners’ Policy Committee) (See References). This strategy helped me understand the orientations of related policies within the
larger social structure, and how these policies constructed multicultural families in a dialectical relationship with the ‘mainstream’ majority in Korean society. Then, I conducted data gathering and a preliminary content analysis of media and research in order to further examine textual representations of ethnocultural groups in Korea. From there, I began to examine specific educational policy documents for a focused CDA.

In reviewing the related policies of other ministries, I determined that different values and agendas were proposed for different groups. For instance, “The Second Basic Plan for Immigration Policy” (Ministry of Justice, 2012), under the vision of a “vibrant Korea growing with immigrant” (p. 23), identified the following values: openness, social integration, human rights, public safety, and cooperation. In particular, openness was aimed at attracting foreign talents (professionals) in order to contribute to supporting the economy; social integration was targeted more at marriage immigrants; human rights were targeted at everyone; and public safety was aimed at illegal migrants. In this framework, we can sense the unequal relations and hierarchy embedded in the category of foreigners and immigrants, and that this influenced their life in Korea as well as Koreans’ perception of the category of foreigners.

This study examined a single type of document: the Korean (central government) national policy documents related to multicultural education, known as “Educational Support Plan for Students from Multicultural Families,” as well as documents with similar titles. These documents are produced annually by the Ministry of Education of Korea. From the Ministry of Education’s website, I downloaded ten such documents published between 2006 and 2015. From these documents, I chose to use five dating from the year 2006 and the years 2012 to 2015 (Table 4.2).
Table 4.2  *Governmental Policy Documents on Multicultural Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Title of Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006. 5.</td>
<td>2006 Educational Support Countermeasure for Children from Multicultural Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012. 3</td>
<td>2012 Plan for the Educational Advancement of Multicultural Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013. 2.</td>
<td>2013 Educational Support Reinforcement for Multicultural Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014. 2.</td>
<td>2014 Plan for promoting the Multicultural Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015. 3</td>
<td>2015 Educational Support Plan for Multicultural Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the data collection phase, I found that among these policy documents, the one released in 2006 and the one released in 2015 best represented the major shift and recent trends in multicultural education policy, as well as the policy agendas and goals. By reviewing them, I was able to trace a shift of the policy within the span of a decade. In fact, prior to the 2006 document, there was little mention or representation of multicultural students or families in such documents. The government and Korean society assumed that multicultural students and families would be assimilated into Korean schools and society, and therefore the government did not consider them an important policy subject at that time. The announcement of the 2006 policy has particular significance in that it was the first major shift in official governmental policy, and this shift influenced subsequent research, policy making and implementation, and school practices. The 2015 policy document, the most recent one, is important in that it was formulated by the new team that was established within the Ministry of Education earlier that year to focus on multicultural educational policy. After long discussions about the need to create a separate team to focus on multicultural education policy, the team was eventually established and was able to devote itself fully to its mission. As such, the creation of this new team confirms the growing importance of multicultural education policy. It also provided me with the most recent
educational policy for my critical discourse analysis.

The reason I chose the Korean central government’s multicultural education policy documents is that the government formulates the education policy annually and then disseminates it to the seventeen provincial education offices. Therefore, this document functions as a kind of nation-wide standard in the area of multicultural education. Even though the implementation of the policy at the local level varies to some extent according to its circumstance, the central government’s funding and evaluation of the provincial Educational Offices and schools propel the implementation of the policy.

4.4 Data Analysis Procedures

I conducted my data analysis concurrently with my data collection. My analysis of the policy documents followed a critical discourse analysis that helped me identify the different themes and purposes embedded in the policy documents (Fairclough, 1995, 2002/2016). I organized, categorized, and coded the documents according to the research questions.

The first phase of my coding process involved the translation (e.g. from Korean language to English language), and my coding analysis was directed by the research question on the conceptualization of multicultural education, multicultural students, and the relationship between multicultural students and mainstream Korean students. I chose to utilize both thematic analysis and the analysis of lexical choices to select, code, organize, translate, and file the selected textual sections or excerpts from the documents (Glesne, 2014). In doing this, I read through the Korean language documents several times and found frequently used and emphasized words that were associated with specific groups, that is, policy subjects. For example, the categories of multicultural children and mainstream Korean children were associated with different words and orientations depending on the policy agendas.
Two main themes emerged from the preliminary coding process: educational support for multicultural children, and education to enhance multicultural understanding for all children, specifically for mainstream Korean children. The former is focused on the characteristics of multicultural children, such as their lack of Korean language, lack of academic achievement, and their potential for dual language capacity, and is aimed at promoting their adaptation to school. The latter is focused on encouraging all students’ experiences of cultural diversity, which aimed at raising the mainstream students’ acceptance and sensitivity toward different races, ethnicities, and cultures. These two types of education are pillars of Korea’s multicultural education policy, which seems to create unequal relations in the process of promoting harmony and coexistence. For their part, multicultural children should learn the Korean language in preparatory courses or after school program in order to be included in the mainstream school system, while mainstream students should learn tolerance and diversity in order to accept multicultural children as their peers. This preliminary finding informed later phases of my CDA. Prior research had shown that analyzing the policy documents with a critical or poststructuralist perspective can help in detecting the different positioning of majority and minority groups (Y. Lee, 2013; Jahng & Lee, 2013). This strategy helped me recognize the recent policy’s bifurcated orientations, and then refine the codes and categories for the policy subjects and policy agendas. Through this coding and categorization process, the data provided indications of how policy subjects were socially constructed. For example, the main policy subjects are children from multicultural families, which refer to international marriage families, foreign workers’ families, and refugees; they were conceptualized and portrayed as deficient both individually and in terms of their families. Meanwhile, mainstream Korean students were not explicitly mentioned as policy subjects, which meant that they were seen as the norm. Furthermore, the multicultural students whose parents
were from North America or Western European countries were not likely to be regarded as policy subjects as they were assumed to have more chances and higher abilities despite their different ethnicity. For instance, the children from the affluent families can attend the international schools or foreign schools, among which 60 percent provide the curriculum of private schools of England or the U.S. by English-speaking teachers, but the tuition fee is high. I present this framework below in Table 4.3. I will elaborate on this construction of multicultural students and the relation with mainstream students in the next chapter.

Table 4.3  Policy Subject Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy subject</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children from multicultural families</td>
<td>International marriage families</td>
<td>First mentioned and portrayed as deficient in 2006, which led to the development of two types of international marriage family children. The difficulties they encounter are different, but they are treated nearly the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign workers’ families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Korean students</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not explicitly mentioned as policy subjects Regarded as the norm, which makes others appear to be deviating from the norm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English-language speakers (from Europe, North America)</td>
<td></td>
<td>By definition, this group is included in the multicultural family group. But given the high socioeconomic status, it is not conceived as a policy subject.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 In fact, according to a survey by the Ministry of Gender Equity and Family (2012), the types of professions held by the immigrants’ spouses vary depending on their gender and home country. Many Korean husbands who have married to spouses from China, Mongolia, the Philippines, and Vietnam work as machine operators or builders, whereas the majority of Korean wives whose spouses are from the U.S., Canada, or Western Europe, and their occupations are as professionals, experts, or administrators.

8 According to MOE (2015), there are 46 international or foreign schools, among which 28 follow a curriculum for English-speakers, and 13 are for Chinese speakers. These schools have a certain quota for Korean students who had lived in foreign countries for over three years, and the competition for entering these schools, specifically English-speaking schools, is high despite the high tuition fees. This situation also helped construct the image of English-speaking multicultural children as different from other multicultural children.
With the second research question, which focused on the ideological assumptions and relationships underlying the emerging themes, I drew upon the critical perspective of multicultural education and Sleeter and Grant’s (1987, 2003/2007) five approaches. Ostensibly, policies’ lexical choices were consistent with neo-liberal democratic values, and this will be discussed in the next chapter; however, my primary aim was to “uncover the dynamics beyond surface meanings or shallow description and to articulate underlying implications” (Madison, 2012, p. 76). In part, to help focus my CDA and examine the hidden meanings within and between different policies and other texts, I paid a close attention to Fairclough’s (1999, 2002/2016) social process framework, which focused on the discursive dialectic relations between three levels of social processes, which were suggested in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4  *CDA Social Processes Framework*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Social Process</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Focus in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social structures (macro level)</td>
<td>Abstract and general</td>
<td>Historical, social, and wider discursive context Social structures involved 2006 multicultural education policy, and were represented by statistics, media, and research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social practices (meta level)</td>
<td>Social practices mediate social structures and social events</td>
<td>2015 multicultural education policy document Policy texts were dialectically connected and emerged from the social-structure level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social events (micro level)</td>
<td>Particular events and actions</td>
<td>Social events were represented by various reports or comments from teachers, students, and activists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Adapted from Fairclough (2002/2016)

This CDA framework helped me focus my approach on selecting and analyzing the relevant social and educational policy ‘texts’ that represented policy subjects and ideologies in dialectical relationships within intertextual documents that were representative of “macro-level social structures, meta-level social practices, and micro-level social events” (Fairclough, 2016, p. 52)
The CDA social processes approach focused on two dialectic textual relations: (a) between social structures (macro-level) and social practices (meta-level), or (b) between social practices (meta-level) and social events (micro-level). In this approach, all social processes constitute a social field, an educational institution, or political organizations, and are represented through discursive text (Fairclough, 2016).

In my study, social structure, which is general and abstract, reflects the historical, economic, social, and political contexts of Korean society. My selection of ‘social structure’ involved text that focused on relationships of difference that were organized through social policies, represented in nation-wide surveys, or presented as discursive images within the wider media and research literature. I then focused on the social practices that ‘mediate’ the relationship between social structures and social events, which are particular and concrete. For the ‘social practices’ dimension in Fairclough’s (2002/2016) model, I selected Korean multicultural educational policies, which is central to my CDA. In a critical discourse analysis, the meta-level social practices were representative of the general field of education and how political elites used discursive strategies and images within this field to maintain or reproduce social privilege and ethnocultural inequalities. Finally, for social events, I primarily selected texts that examined the policy subjects in relationship to discourses about their social conditions (SES: Socio-Economic Status), educational outcomes, or opinions, as represented by statistics and reports. This multilevel model is complex and was only utilized for a few CDA processes. This will be explained in the next chapter.

Another critical discourse analysis focused on the research question about the historical context of Korea’s multicultural education policy over a decade. To explore the shifts in the policy, I first analyzed the policy document from 2006, and focused on its rationale, its
orientation, and its perception of multicultural students and their families. Then, I used these attributes to analyze similarities and differences between the other documents leading up to the 2015 policy document. A preliminary finding was that there was considerable progress made in instituting the 2006 policy recommendations within other policies, institutions, and infrastructure related to multicultural education policy; however, what I focused on was the current ideology and the fact that its underlying assumptions revealed that little had shifted or changed, and thus it reproduced existing values and inequalities, and contributed to only minor social change. This was the focus of my CDA.

In this research I took the position and the perspective of a critical researcher, and this led me to deconstruct the assumptions underpinning the social order, society’s existing principles, and the representations of majority and minority groups in the policy. In this way I hope to contribute to advancing the field of multicultural educational policy. This approach also provided me with a new opportunity to look at the policy and its priorities more deeply and with greater reflexivity, beyond my existing social policy values, norms, and procedures.

4.5 Limitations of the Study

In collecting and analyzing the data for this research, I encountered some limitations. The first was that the policy documents available for analysis limited the study’s scope. In Korea, the first official policy document on multicultural education was only published in 2006. Before this time, there was recognition in Korea of demographic changes and new immigrant groups with diverse educational needs, but this was only acknowledged by teachers and activists at the local level. There were no policies addressing these emerging issues at the central government level. Since that time, and since the creation of the first government policy document in 2006, governments (central and local), policy makers, researchers, and citizens have begun to pay more
attention to social and educational issues of multicultural students and their families. As such, the focus of my CDA could only include polices and discourses that presented the social perspective and the practices with respect to multicultural families and multicultural education starting in 2006 and the shifts afterwards. This was the main limitation on my data collection and analysis.

Second, my study focused on a textual analysis of the central government’s multicultural education policy. Thus, my research did not deal with interpretation and practices at the local level. This presented a challenge and some limitations in representing the dialectical relationship between the wider educational policy, as social process, and examples of social events or social actors who implement the policy recommendations. I was limited in my ability to analyze the more local-level and unequal power relations between several groups such as children from multicultural families, mainstream Korean children, and diverse teachers and parents.

Another limitation involved the government’s policy documents, which were all written in Korean. Thus, I first read and analyzed policy documents in Korean. The language shifts between Korean and English added another level of complexity to my research and analysis. To begin the analysis, I first had to translate the relevant English documents that related to critical multiculturalism discourse, the five approaches to multicultural education, and other discourses into Korean. This helped me use of theory to select valid texts. I thoroughly read the policy documents and selected the pertinent excerpts that showed the orientation or priorities of the policy, and then translated them from Korean to English so that I could place them within my English thesis. However, when I translated these excerpts into English, I found it difficult to preserve the complex meaning and nuance of the labeling of the policy subjects, such as multicultural children, mainstream Korean students, and new-comer students. As such, my translation processes may have affected the accuracy of a CDA that endeavours to focus on
discursive vocabulary, grammar, syntax, and critical interpretation, in order to capture and convey the subtle nuance and sophisticated meanings. Thus, to convey the relevant backgrounds and meanings of the terms used in the policy documents, I made considerable efforts to select the most appropriate and accurate words in English by consulting with my supervisor and my native-English-speaking Canadian friends who major in English literature, while paying particular attention to words, metaphors, configurations, and priorities. Nevertheless, it was a major challenge to translate, analyze, and interpret Korean text into the English language as well as to apply English theories and CDA methodology into Korean discourses. This represented another form of intertextual and dialectical analysis (Fairclough 2016).
CHAPTER 5: A Critical Discourse Analysis and Findings

5.1 Introduction

Chapter Five provides a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) of the Korean government’s multicultural educational policies and other relevant multicultural discourses within the media and other research. My CDA focused on multicultural educational policy documents that were published between 2006 and 2015. First, I provide a brief overview and description of the main characteristics of the 2006 and 2015 policy documents. The focus of the analysis was the main purposes, agendas, and perceptions of the policy subjects, as well as discursive changes in the policy over time. More specifically, my critical discourse analysis focused on: (a) how the policy conceptualized multicultural education and how it categorized and perceived children from multicultural families and their relationship with mainstream Korean students; (b) what ideologies and underlying assumptions were embedded in the policy texts; and (c) what shifts or changes have been made in the policy’s aims and priorities over a decade, in particular those that contributed to changing or maintaining the existing values.

5.2 Description of the Historical Contexts of Korean Multicultural Education Policy

In Korea, the first multicultural education policy at the central government level was formulated in 2006, and mainly focused on the difficulties that multicultural families and their children faced, such as discrimination and hardship in adapting to Korean schools and society. The policy was influenced by a multi-ministry effort to promote the integration of mixed-race people and immigrants into a Korean society, eliminate discrimination against them, and protect their human rights. The Presidential Committee suggested the establishment of relevant legislation and improvement of public awareness to reduce discrimination, promote immigrants’ self-actualization, and provide customized support to meet immigrants’ urgent needs
(Presidential Committee on Social Inclusion, 2006). Related to this, the Ministry of Education (MOE) was mandated to examine the current situation of multicultural children and their needs, and to make an action. Thus, the Ministry of Education formulated the policy to support children from multicultural families and to encourage schools and teachers to accept these children and provide relevant programs for them.

The 2006 policy was based on a recognition of the current demographic and societal changes in Korea, and the need to lessen discrimination against mixed-race people and immigrants (especially immigrant women). Hence, the policy document of 2006 explicitly used the term “multicultural families,” defining them as “families who have members with different ethnocultural backgrounds from us [native-Korean families]” (MOE, 2006, p. 1). This definition was aimed at banishing the use of discriminatory terms like “Kosian” (the compound term of Korean and Asian, which means the child of a Korean parent and an immigrant parent from Asia, especially Southeast Asia) or “a child of mixed blood” (MOE, 2006, p. 2). Despite the intention behind the introduction into the policy of the terms “multicultural families” or “multicultural students”, the term “multicultural students” came to mean students who were different from or inferior to mainstream Korean students, especially in terms of the appearance, family members, and Korean-language ability. These distinctions were reinforced by a survey conducted by educational authorities that identified students from multicultural families as needing support from the government, and by the separate (after-school) programs to teach them Korean language and culture. Thus, this term has functioned as a marker to distinguish them and in effect to discourage them from integrating with mainstream students. In this policy document, three groups were included as policy subjects: children from international marriage families, children from foreign workers’ families, and North Korean defector youths. The first educational policy
for multicultural children began as a program of educational welfare to help the disadvantaged groups in Korean society, with considerable effort on examining their difficulties as socially and economically disadvantaged minorities. Whether it was intended or not, the perception of multicultural children, as portrayed in the government policy document and proposed policies for improving their situation, created a border between multicultural children and mainstream Korean students, and reinforced the perception of these children as deficient (Valencia, 1997). The following excerpt from the 2006 policy document illustrates this:

Most multicultural students, whose legal, economic, and social status is weak, show low levels of academic achievement due to a lack of Korean language proficiency and mal-adjustment to Korean culture. They also experience identity confusion resulting from social prejudice (MOE, 2006, p. 1).

However, at the same time, the policy makers acknowledged the role that multicultural families play as “disseminators of multiculturalism and global human resources who can speak different languages” (MOE, 2006, p. 1).

Nevertheless, the policy document of 2006 declared that the government was adopting the perspective of “multiculturalism,” free from ethnocentrism, in order “to acknowledge the existence and uniqueness of different cultures in one nation-state” (MOE, 2006, p. 1). It emphasized respect for and understanding of cultural diversity.

As the members with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds in our society have increased in number, it is necessary to promote a social environment geared toward respecting and understanding the culture and history of these people, and to call for the protection of human rights of diverse members and social cohesion” (MOE, 2006, p. 1, emphasis added).
Under the multiculturalism umbrella, the government’s orientation toward multicultural education is to embrace the minority into mainstream society with the metaphor of the “melting pot” (MOE, 2006, p. 26). This represents an assimilationist approach to difference, similar to Americanization and Anglo-conformity in the U.S. (Gordon, 1964), as shown below:

“The vision of (multicultural education) policy: Turning Korea into a Cultural Melting Pot through cultural democratic integration” (MOE, 2006, p. 26).

My preliminary discourse analysis suggested that the principles were related to Sleeter and Grant’s (2003/2007) ‘teaching the exceptional and the culturally different’ approach, as it focused on improving minority students’ achievement and helping them adjust to mainstream society through education and development of knowledge and skills that can be used to get lower-level jobs. This discourse takes the deficit orientation (Valencia, 1997), which views multicultural students (policy subjects) as having deficiencies that need to be remedied. The discursive construction of the multicultural family and student identity will be expanded on in the following sections.

Since 2006, the Ministry of Education has formulated an annual multicultural education policy. Even though there was a shift from a progressive government to a conservative government in 2008 (and a conservative government remains in power today), the government’s interest and investment in multicultural education policy has increased. Kang (2015) criticized the conservatives’ proactive multicultural policy as a product of its pro-imperialist, and capitalist tendencies, and as a policy that marginalized migrant Others. This ideological approach has been associated with globalization and neoliberalism. Education policy in Korea has become more geared toward globalization and building a knowledge-based society, with greater emphasis on autonomy, accountability, choice, competition, and diversity (Lee, 2008). It became quite
apparent that Korea’s multicultural education policy and framework were now firmly informed by the wider discourse and orientation of neoliberal ideology. The structural developments and changes of the policy orientation between 2006 and 2008 provided social structure-level historical context for the development of the social events-level and social practice-level discourse represented in the 2015 multicultural educational policy.

The 2015 policy document states that “actualizing equal educational opportunity and cultivating multicultural talents through customized multicultural education” is the vision of the multicultural education policy (MOE, 2015, p. 7). Under this vision, the policy identifies three goals: (a) to strengthen the pre-emptive and customized education that, staring from early childhood, takes the characteristics of multicultural students into consideration; (b) to expand education for multicultural understanding, which promotes cultural diversity; and (c) to strengthen collaboration among all ministries and connections within the region. The policy document’s vision, directions, and main agendas are shown in Table 5.1.

In the 2015 government policy document, the policy vision ostensibly suggested a connection with the ‘Multicultural Education’ approach (Sleeter & Grant, 2007), which is promoted by reforming aspects of the schooling process, such as curriculum, pedagogy, and parent involvement. But the policy and curriculum changes do not appear to directly support cultural pluralism and social equality, and again seemed to present an image of multicultural students as deficient and even somewhat of a threat to society.
### Table 5.1 The Outlook of the 2015 Korean Multicultural Education Policy Document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Actualizing equal educational opportunity and cultivating multicultural talents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main Agendas</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1) Provide customized education, strengthening basic academic achievement, and career education | *Piloting support for multicultural children in kindergartens as a pre-emptive action*  
*Expanding preparatory schools to provide Korean-language education for international marriage couples’ new-comer children*  
*Strengthening the mentoring of undergraduate students for enhancing multicultural students’ basic academic achievement*  
*Strengthening career education that is suitable to one’s ability and aptitude* |
| 2) Expand education for multicultural understanding | *Expanding the stronghold schools for mutual understanding education*  
*Strengthening the teachers’ competence for multicultural education*  
*Providing education and information for multicultural parents*  
*Supporting the stronghold schools for researching local/school-based practice*  
*Sharing best practices and creating a forum on multiculturalism* |
| 3) Encouraging collaboration among all-ministries and connections within the region | *Supporting the children of international marriage couples according to their stages of school adaption*  
*Developing a system for sharing educational materials for multicultural education*  
*Forming an association for Korean-language education in which all relevant ministries participate*  
*Providing efficient support to multicultural students utilizing the resources in the regions* |

*Source: 2015 Educational Support Plan for Multicultural Students (Ministry of Education)*

Demographic data and statistics were used to confirm that Korea became a multicultural society, and to justify the call for “pre-emptive action” (MOE, 2015, p. 1). The policy document of 2015 showed that the number of multicultural students attending elementary, middle, and high schools was 67,806 in 2014, a seven-fold increase since 2006. In 2006, multicultural students made up 0.11% of the total student population, but in 2014 this percentage rose to 1.0%. This was almost a ten-fold increase.\(^9\) This growth demonstrated the social urgency for government to

---

\(^9\) The soaring number of multicultural students stands in contrast to the overall decrease in the total school-age
intervene earlier. This discourse connected to the 2006 policy as social structure-level statement in this section that perceived multicultural students as having deficiencies that needed to be remedied. From a critical lens, the government’s perception of the situation, and the use of language such as *pre-emptive action*, suggests an image and assumption that multicultural children are a serious problem and threat to society. This kind of discourse is likely to convey to mainstream Koreans a fear of the increasing immigration of foreigners. The policy further constructed the policy subjects by illustrating and conceptualizing multicultural students as deficient through the use of statistics showing that they had higher dropout rates than mainstream Koreans and lower academic achievement.

5.3 The Conceptualization of Multicultural Education

In this textual analysis, I focused on the priorities of the policy agendas, the lexical choices, the frequency and omission of key words, and the categorization of policy subjects. Finding out what was present and emphasized and what was absent was significant, as it showed the policy’s goals, assumptions, and ideological orientation. Prior research (Park, 2009; Cho et al., 2010; Y. Lee, 2013) has pointed out that Korean multicultural education policy tends to show different orientations to two distinct groups: children from multicultural families and mainstream Korean students. This informed my selection of texts and excerpts for my policy analysis.

The 2006 policy document provided the social structure that focused mostly on ‘*educational supporting of multicultural children,*’ and partly emphasized the agenda to improve mainstream Koreans’ awareness through curricular reform and revision of in-service teacher-education (MOE, 2006). In this policy document, multicultural children were described as population due to a low birth rate, and shows the growing importance of this population in school and education policy.
deficient subjects who needed intensive learning of Korean language and culture to make up for their lack of academic achievement. These perceptions, images, ideologies, and agencies interacted with the social event level, or the 2015 document’s explicit development as social practices. From my critical discourse analysis two key themes emerged: customized education for multicultural children, and education for multicultural understanding by mainstream students (and teachers) (MOE, 2015). These two themes and findings showed that the development of the multicultural educational policy explicitly suggested that there were two different types of students, and that each type would experience a different focus in their education. As a result, I extracted the two themes comprising the Korean multicultural education policy: one was customized education for multicultural children, and the other was education to promote multicultural understanding for all students (including teachers). In the next sections I explained one of the first phases of my thematic analysis through which I extracted lexical choices and key words and through which these themes emerged.

5.3.1 Theme 1: Customized education for multicultural students

The first theme, customized education for multicultural students, emerged from the following lexical choices: (a) education for KSL (Korean as a Second Language) and Korean culture, (b) earlier adaptation to school, (c) preparatory courses (for facilitating entry into school), (d) after-school programs to boost academic achievement, (e) customized education that takes the various characteristics of multicultural students into consideration, (f) cultivating multicultural talents, (g) bilingual ability, (h) mentoring, and (i) equal educational opportunity, as well as other words.

These keywords support the contention that customized education is only for multicultural students, and that this education is mainly for addressing their deficiencies in
Korean language, culture, and related academic achievement, even though the government also has interests in cultivating their bilingual abilities and experiences of different cultures. In certain aspects, it is assumed that this type of education – that is, customized education for multicultural students – can be provided separately from the mainstream class or school.

5.3.2 Theme 2: Education for multicultural understanding for all students

The second theme, education for multicultural understanding for all students, emerged from the following lexical choices: (a) cultural diversity, (b) multicultural awareness, (c) mutual understanding, (d) multicultural acceptance, (e) understanding and respecting other cultures, (f) anti-bias education, (g) teacher’s (multicultural) competencies, and (h) mainstream Korean students, as well as other words.

These keywords appeared in the document without formal definitions or concrete examples of activities for promoting them.

Both themes were interrelated with the perception, construction of the policy subjects and their relationship within the policy document. Thus, in the next section, I will examine how multicultural children were constructed in the policy document, and how the dialectical relationship between multicultural children and mainstream Korean students was viewed in the multicultural education policy. It is theorized that the multicultural educational policy and the relationship between policy subjects are informed by and embedded within the wider social structure, as represented by Korean educational policy and social policy, which are intertwined with neoliberal globalization.

5.4 The Construction of Multicultural Children and Mainstream Children

In this section, I examine the following: the definition of multicultural children as policy subjects, as they are presented in the policy; who was and was not included as policy subjects;
what kinds of benefits and disadvantages were associated with each type of policy subject; and how the policy influences the construction of policy subjects.

5.4.1 The construction of multicultural children

The Ministry of Education’s (2006) multicultural education policy socially structured, coded, and delineated the policy subjects into three groups: (a) children from international marriage families, (b) foreign workers’ families, and (c) Saeteomin, or North Korean defectors’ families. All three of these groups are assumed to have different ethnic or cultural backgrounds that deviate from mainstream Korean families. These groups were designated and thus constructed as the Others, “a new disadvantaged class” (MOE, 2006, p. 1). Interestingly, mainstream Korean students were not overtly represented in the policy text, and this strategy signified that they were the norm from which other policy subjects were seen to deviate (Jahng & Lee, 2013).

The policy discourse of 2006 as social structure was dialectically interrelated to the social processes of the 2015 policy discourse in that the policy subjects were further separated into four groups: (a) children from international marriage families who were born and raised in Korea, (b) children from international marriage families who were born and/or raised in a foreign country and came to Korea recently, (c) children from foreign (workers’) families, and (d) refugee children (MOE, 2015).

These changes reflected the perception that the children in the first category, that is, children from international marriage families who were born and raised in Korea, represented the longest standing group and made up of a majority of the country’s multicultural children. Despite some challenges in academic achievement, they are reported to have had little difficulty using
Korean language in everyday life and culture. Meanwhile, the children in the second category\textsuperscript{10}, that is, children from international marriage families who were born and/or raised in a foreign country and who recently came to Korea, are similar in education to the third category of foreign families’ children in that they have little experience with Korean society. Although these groups are small in number, and although they have had various difficulties, they have become an important category within the educational policy. Finally, the change reflected the perception that North Korean defectors had special needs and should be treated differently from the other groups due to the possibility of South Korea’s reunification with North Korea.

Even though there was some change in the policy’s subject categorization between 2006 and 2015, the perception of the people in these categories has not changed very much. Multicultural students are still constructed with contradictory images of deficiency and talent. Mostly, they are constructed as deficient in terms of their Korean language ability and academic achievement, but, they are also constructed, in part, as talent with bilingual abilities. In the next section, I look into the implicit construction and categorization of the multicultural students in the educational policy text

5.4.2 Different and characterized as linguistically, culturally, and economically deficient

At the social structure level, the 2006 policy began to represent multicultural children as encountering various problems that related to learning and adapting to Korea society (MOE, 2006). Their difficulties were attributed to several kinds of deficiencies that related to individual learning deficits, improper parenting, and unstable home environments. From a critical lens, this

\textsuperscript{10} Children in this category were officially recognized as policy subjects in 2010. Many of them came to Korea without any experience of Korea as teenagers because of one of their parent’s (re)marriage to Korean citizen. It was reported that their lack of Korean language, their age, and their family circumstances (economic, emotional, and social) impede their adaptation to Korea even though they can easily obtain nationality of Korea.
image can be seen as socially disempowering these students and presenting them as children with special needs that require governmental and non-governmental action and support. Within the broader societal consciousness, perspectives and treatment of different categories of multicultural families have been uneven. For example, those who have attained certain levels of economic and social status, even though they are from foreign countries, are given little consideration within this policy and are regarded as more empowered citizens who deal with their new lives in Korea more independently.

The following excerpts are from my textual analysis of the 2006 policy, which provided further evidence of the discursive representation and construction of multicultural children as deficient policy subjects with difficulties that required differential education (See Appendix A to review the description with added emphasis).

1. Children from international marriage families have a very limited understanding of their classes because of language retardation and cultural maladjustment, and they show signs of mental retardation with an extremely passive attitude, violent behaviour, or ADHD (MOE, 2006, p. 5).

2. Many school-aged children from foreign families were neglected in their education in that it was reported that only sixteen percent among the assumed school-aged population of foreigners attended school (MOE, 2006, p. 8).

3. The low family income of foreign workers’ families, poor housing conditions, and weakness in educating children were given as reasons for their children’s lower basic learning abilities compared to their peers (MOE, 2006, p. 8).

4. Children from international marriage families have experienced bullying, and one of the most reported reasons for this was that their mother came from a foreign country (MOE, 2006, p. 5).
The Korean society’s exclusiveness, presented as severe prejudice and discrimination against foreigners (specifically from underdeveloped countries), has discouraged multicultural children’s early adaptation (MOE, 2006, p. 8). Some images of multicultural students included attributes such as low basic learning ability, language retardation, cultural maladjustment, a passive attitude, violent behaviour, low-income families, and experience with bullying, prejudice, and discrimination. Even though the ‘undocumented children’ were included in the policy, their “unstable status prevented them from entering into public education, or from concentrating on their schooling” (MOE, 2006, p. 8).

The social structure of the 2006 policy developments provided that the representations of students had not changed much in the past decade. These images and discourses were intertextually related to the social practice-level of policy development in 2015. This discourse informed the characterization of multicultural children as having different attributes that supposedly resulting from factors such as family formation, family members, place of birth, and age. The policy suggested that customization was needed for educational content, teaching staff, and how teaching can be expanded to take account of the characteristics of multicultural children. This discourse informed further policy development, which proposed four categories of multicultural children: (a) children from international marriage families who were born and raised in Korea, (b) children from international marriage families who were born and/or raised in foreign countries and came to Korea recently, (c) children from foreign (workers’) families, and (d) refugee children. The excerpts below expand on the discursive representation of each group.

1. Children from international marriage families who were born and raised in Korea generally have little difficulty using practical Korean, though some of them are not good at academic Korean language and show the tendency toward underachievement. They
also avoid telling others that they are from a multicultural family (MOE, 2015, p. 4, emphasis added).

2. Children from international marriage families who were born and/or raised in a foreign country and came to Korea recently\(^{11}\) are not good at Korean, thus have difficulties enrolling in school. Also, they experience underachievement, especially in the subjects of social studies and science. They also have psychological problems resulting from adapting to a new (second-marriage) family and Korean culture, and from having an identity crisis (MOE, 2015, p. 4, emphasis added).

3. [Among diverse groups] some foreign workers’ families, due to their unstable status, cannot provide sufficient support to their children, and thus children from these families are poor at Korean language and show a tendency toward low academic achievement (MOE, 2015, p. 4).

4. There are also refugees below eighteen years of age, but the size of this group is small yet (MOE, 2015, p. 4).

The different categories have the common discursive representation of having poor Korean language skills and low academic achievement. Their weakness and deficiency have become the raison d’être of the multicultural education policy. Moreover, the 2015 document provided statistics of these students’ basic academic achievement, and these statistics reinforced the image of multicultural children as deficient. It showed empirical evidence that distinguished multicultural students from mainstream Korean students in terms of academic achievement. The figures seemed to legitimate the view of multicultural students as deficient and underpinned the argument that the different educational programs be provided for each group.

My intertextual analysis suggested that these images are related to the social structure level represented by media accounts and research. My summary showed that over the past

\(^{11}\) I will refer to this category of multicultural students as “new-comer students” throughout the analysis.
several years, a series of news reports and research articles enabled the government to gather more information on multicultural families and children, and to provide the rationale that these new groups required governmental support. For example, in the news, the second category of students was presented as mostly born or raised in a foreign country, some of whom are not the offspring of Korean citizens and have not had the chance to live in Korea and learn the Korean language and culture. Due to their lack of Korean-language skills and unfamiliarity with Korean schools, they are not permitted to register for school. Despite the government’s efforts to lessen their difficulties, the perspective that focuses solely on Korean language and academic achievement produces and reproduces the image of multicultural children as educationally and socially deficient. This image was reinforced by 2015 policy statistics that were based on a nationwide scholastic achievement test in 2014.\footnote{Since 2008, Korea has carried out a nationwide scholastic test every year for students in grades 6, 9, and 11 to determine whether the students meet the minimum standard of academic achievement. To identify the factors influencing their achievement level, some information such as gender, region of residence, and family background are also gathered. Since 2011, the multicultural students’ achievement can be classified separately.} The test results showed that multicultural students, in comparison to mainstream Korean students, had lower academic achievement in the areas of Korean language, English language, and math. This seemed to be an objective confirmation of multicultural students’ lower level of achievement. They were represented in the text as follows:

The table shows that the percentages of multicultural students below the minimum standard in Korean Language, math, and English language are, respectively, 13%, 13.5%, and 8.5%, compared to 2.0%, 5.7%, and 3.3% of mainstream Korean students (MOE, 2015, p. 2).
In addition, the policy document of 2015 showed that 42% of the families that took part in the survey were low-income (under two million Korean won, or nearly $2,000 CAD a month), and many of these children were likely to experience economic difficulties.

These factors influence not only multicultural children’s self-esteem and achievement in school, but also public awareness of multicultural families. These perceptions underpin the government’s assumption that multicultural families with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds and a weak economic base do not have sufficient competences in school and society. They remain “vulnerable members of society” (MOE, 2016, p. 20) in the governmental framework of policy. This “ratification of group boundaries and the simplification of their identities can result in distorted representation of particular groups and other forms of discrimination and oppression” (Y. Lee, 2013, p. 114). It is still necessary to recognize and respond to multicultural students’ educational needs, but they should be free from negative labels that restrain them from full participation and self-realization in school and society.

5.4.3 Talent with bilingual ability and diverse cultural experience

In addition to emphasizing the difficulties and deficiencies of multicultural children, the government also sheds light on their strength and talent for bilingual language use. The 2006 policy text below demonstrates the cultivation of language education that included both Korean and heritage languages.

[The government] provides children from international marriage families with programs to support their dual language learning, paying attention to the asset of being exposed to two languages at home, and encouraging them to use their mother’s language, for example, to teach greetings to classmates (MOE, 2006, p. 31)
These perceptions of multicultural students’ strength in speaking dual languages have been maintained and cultivated for years. The government has attempted to give well-educated immigrant women the roles as instructors of bilingual education, cross-cultural awareness programs, and education for multicultural understanding at schools after they completed a particular type of training (MOE, 2008, 2009). By introducing this practice into schools, the government expected several benefits. For example, immigrant mothers can self-actualize and participate more fully in society; multicultural students can be proud of their parents and their heritage while receiving help directly from bilingual teachers; and mainstream students can learn another language and culture and lessen their prejudice against foreigners. However, some issues, such as vague job descriptions, the politics within schools, limited interest by students, and low salaries impeded these activities and their integration into the school environment.

This policy text of 2015 continued to reinforce the images and perspectives that represented multicultural children as talented students with bilingual abilities. The Global Bridge Project and Dual Language Speech Contest were suggested in order to cultivate multicultural students’ talents.

[The Global Bridge Project] aims at promoting the talents of multicultural students in terms of bilingual ability, math, science, and art/sports, and [the Dual Language Speech Contest] aims at discovering their language gifts and encouraging their language learning early (MOE, 2015, pp.13-14).

Viewing this from a critical perspective, the government seemed to assume that multicultural students have potential and strength in areas other than Korean language and culture. Bilingual abilities (foreign language), math, science, art, and sports are the very areas where multicultural students were assumed to have shown their competitiveness. Despite this construction of the
gifted multicultural student, insufficient infrastructure and funding to develop these abilities have
constrained these programs’ sustainability. For example, courses for learning dual language in
school were limited to after-school hours, weekends, and during vacation; the funding for
educating the qualified immigrants and enabling them to teach in school was temporarily halted
in 2015. Also, within social structures that have privileged English, the policy to promote
heritage languages – something described as strength of multicultural students – and their
possibility of empowerment have not developed much. Nevertheless, as Lee (2010) pointed out,
the global human-resource discourse has claimed that multicultural children with bilingual
abilities, an understanding of Korean culture, and an understanding of other cultures can become
global leaders. The image in the policy and wider research might represent a departure from the
‘deficit thinking’ model of multicultural children and toward a more positive image, but, this
discourse remains at the initial stage of development in Korea.

5.4.4 The construction of the relationship between multicultural children and
mainstream children

My analysis found that mainstream Korean students were mostly absent as policy
subjects in the multicultural educational policy documents. As such, the relationship between
multicultural students and mainstream Korean students was not explicitly represented. Within the
policy, Korean students became policy subjects in that they were required to participate in
courses on multicultural understanding in order to better understand other cultures and global
issues. The assumption is that the mainstream Korean students are the norm, but should be
encouraged to learn about and respect diversity, and should accept peers with different
backgrounds in order to get along with them. The 2006 policy document proposed that this type
of education would “strengthen one-on-one ties between a student from multicultural family and
a mainstream Korean student” (MOE, 2006, p. 28). It may be the case that multicultural children experienced peer bullying due to prejudice (Jeon, 2008; Oh, 2006). However, viewing this issue through a critical lens suggested that within this discursive relationship, multicultural children are just passive subjects that need to be accepted by mainstream students (Sleeter & Grant, 1987/2007). Despite the attempt to overcome the stereotypes of different groups and to improve relations between multicultural and mainstream students, they did not succeed in establishing an equal relationship. In the end, multicultural students were represented as relatively deficient linguistically, culturally, and socially compared to mainstream students, who were represented as needing to tolerate and help the minority students.

This unequal and disinterested relationship between the two groups of students provided the discourse for further policy. Despite the catch-phrase “education for multicultural understanding for all students” (MOE, 2015, p. 15), the courses have placed considerable emphasis on reducing prejudice, attaining a superficial understanding of other cultures, and contributing to a better relationship between the two groups of students. Multicultural children are still the ones who are to be included and understood by mainstream students, and this uneven relationship is hardly questioned.

5.5 The Ideological Manifestation in Customized Education for Multicultural Students

In this section, I will unpack the meaning of customized education for multicultural students, and then critically examine its ideological manifestation, focusing on whether it contributes to a more just society or to reproducing the existing order. Using an intertextual analysis of Korean multicultural education policy, educational policy, and multicultural policy, I focused on the dialectical relations between social structures, which are represented by the 2006
policy and which provide the context for further development of the social practice represented by the 2015 policy.

5.5.1 Customized education: What and for whom

Ten years have passed since the formulation of the first policy document, which provided a social structure and policy discourse. During the past decade, more groups with diverse needs and agendas were recognized and included in the policy.

The 2015 policy document claims “to actualize equal educational opportunity and to cultivate multicultural talents” (MOE, 2015, p. 7) through the government’s first policy direction of customized education for multicultural children. The intention of this policy direction can be interpreted as education taking into account an individual’s different abilities, needs, and learning styles.

Within these documents, the proposed orientation of the customized education can be interpreted as a three-fold approach according to one’s Korean language ability, talent, and family environment. First, new-comer students and foreign students should engage in Korean language-centred education. It is seen as urgent to provide them with proper support for Korean language acquisition and culture education. Second, many multicultural students experience a policy orientation that involves career education and occupational education. In the 2015 policy document, the main category of multicultural students is seen as not having difficulty in everyday Korean language, and therefore is able to explore future careers. Third, the policy presented a form of gifted education for excellent students that focused more on their bilingual ability, math, and science skills. Looking at this through a critical lens, even though the policy is intended to provide more responsive educational support to those with different needs, the
classification of students into four categories, with their related forms of knowledge, curriculum, and education, can produce a hierarchicalization within society of multicultural students.

5.5.2 The discourse of equal educational opportunity

At the social structure level, the policy of 2006 emphasized educational rights for children of foreign families, but also stated that the unstable status of the children of undocumented migrants prevented them from receiving an education. Overall, the policy document identified that children of foreign families should have the same rights to education as mainstream Korean children, and this is based on the Korean Constitution and International Convention on Protection of The Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (MOE, 2006). Furthermore, undocumented migrant children should have the same rights as the children of foreign families. This policy discourse confirmed that all multicultural children have an equal right to education (MOE, 2006). The government reinforced these policy orientations at the local level, where school authorities were hesitant to accept foreign students and undocumented children because of their unstable and low socioeconomic status, and because of the perceived challenges that would pose to their education.

Using different wording and phrasing, earlier multicultural policy documents emphasized equal education opportunity, such as “multicultural-friendly schools for all students” (MOE, 2012, p. 5; MOE, 2013, p. 11). This provided the structural context for the practice of developing “equal education opportunity” (MOE, 2015, p. 7). Nevertheless, it was still not understood what equal education opportunity meant, nor how it could be achieved.

Throughout the 2015 policy document, equal education opportunity as a policy orientation was emphasized as a major success. This discourse represented an improvement in
procedure for equal entry into schools for multicultural children. This improvement targeted foreign families’ children and new-comer students.

[The ministry] improved the legislation and institutions to make it easier for multicultural students to enter or transfer to domestic schools, and promoted the operation of preparatory courses. As a result, their attendance rate has increased (from 87.3% in 2013 to 94.0% in 2014). And this was accompanied by a systemization of Korean language education (MOE, 2015, p. 5).

In the 2015 policy document, the discourse of equal educational opportunity emerged and focused on the new-comer students’ access to the public school system. Even though the government recognized the difficulties facing undocumented children, they did not address them explicitly. While an increasing number of new-comer students were more likely to have Korean ancestry or to become Korean citizens, the children of foreign workers’ families tended to be more absent as policy subjects.

The intention of Korean policy makers can be understood from a functionalist perspective that assumes that ‘equal educational opportunity’ means enabling all students to access school because they believe education makes it possible for anyone who works hard and succeeds in school to be more socially mobile. That is, it is believed that through education, children can get the knowledge and skill needed to succeed in society, which promotes their social mobility. However, in the 2015 policy documents, ‘equal educational opportunity’ is narrowly focused on formal access to institutions, even though the policy suggested the development of special courses, multicultural-multilingual instructors, and the revision of the KSL curriculum. With these actions, policy makers intend that once new-comer students are accepted in public education, they can be incorporated quickly into the mainstream, self-actualize, and become productive citizens.
However, from the *critical multiculturalism* and *democratic racism theory*, this belief in the roles of education is one of the prevailing myths and discourses that form the foundation for criticism of (neo) liberal forms of education (Henry & Tator, 2000). This discourse criticizes the myth that all we need to do is to treat everyone the same for fairness and equality to be ensured. This statement is understood through the *liberal multiculturalism philosophy* and its underlying assumptions that we all begin from the same starting point, that everyone competes on a level playing field, and that individual merit determines who succeeds in school, the workplace, and politics. However, this liberal and ethnocentric approach does not address white privilege and the systemic racism that function through social processes to empower the elite majority and oppress minority ethnocultural groups (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; Henry & Tator, 2000).

Viewing this through a critical lens further suggests that a rigid social structure and monolithic education system that overemphasizes tests, grades, and rankings produces poorer results for students from different cultures and languages. At the social event level of schools, these students are often regarded as burdens to teachers and schools because they do not hold the same cultural norms, knowledge, and identities as mainstream students, and therefore require more effort and resources in order to attain even basic knowledge. Even though the government’s policy emphasizes equal educational opportunity, at the school level new-comer student issues are challenging to address in terms of equal education.

These social event-level educational issues and discourses are seen as interrelated with the new media discourse at the social structure level, which discusses issues of equality and mobility through the use of the Korean metaphor of “golden spoon and dirty spoon.” This metaphor was recently recreated and disseminated in Korean society to criticize the socio-
economic inequalities that are exacerbated through the inheritance of family property and wealth. The ‘golden spoon’ refers those individuals with wealthy parents, and for whom the inheritance of wealth, along with their educational and professional backgrounds, determines their higher social class. Meanwhile, persons with a ‘dirty spoon’ are from working class and poor families. They have a few real opportunities for better education and work, and thus feel they have few chances for social mobility no matter how much effort they make. For example, for several years, the students who graduated from specific-purpose high schools such as foreign language schools and science schools, and those who graduated from independent private high schools, have accounted for almost half of those who have passed the entrance examination of Seoul National University, a very elite university. Although it is difficult to generalize, many of them are from rich families who can afford to pay for additional and specific preparation and private tutoring, which is a big advantage in competing for admission to an elite high school. This, in turn, gives them a good chance of getting admitted into elite university or of going overseas for better opportunities, which in turn puts them in a strong position within the job market. In summary, this Korean metaphor reveals that people from working class cannot move into the middle or upper classes based on their efforts and abilities alone. This metaphor and discourse are intertextual and are supported by media and research documents.

Statistics Korea’s (2015, 2016) reports and relevant research (Yeo, Jeong, Kim, Kim, Kang, Woo, & Kim, 2015) support this social mobility phenomena. A review of Statistics Korea’s (2016) household income reports (2011-2014) showed that eight out of 10 households

\[\text{\textsuperscript{13}}\text{ In Korea, public schools and private schools are similarities in that they share a curriculum and use similar textbooks. However, with the diversification of the type of high schools, specific-purpose high schools and a few designated private school (called independent private schools) that were geared toward providing an elite education became an attractive option for excellent students, despite the high-stake tests and high tuition fees.}\]
experienced no increase in their family income or assets, and therefore were not able to elevate their social status. A 2015 social survey (The Statistics Korea, 2015) showed a similar impression: only 21.8% of Koreans believe that they can be socially mobile through their own efforts. Additionally, those in the lower social classes had even lower expectations that their children would be more socially mobile than they were (Yeo, et al., 2015). Thus, the lower classes now demand policies that create decent job opportunities. They also demand that the social safety-net be strengthened. Through both measures, they hope, the effects of inequality can be reduced. These statistics and the survey reflect a social structure level in which social and economic inequalities are firmly embedded. Thus, at the social-practice level of the multicultural educational policy, the policy recommendation for ‘equal educational opportunity’ is not likely to ‘level the playing field’ or lead to equal outcomes.

Within this social structure, a Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist perspective might anticipate that new-comer students will experience the intersectionality of multiple forms of oppression from racial and ethnic discrimination as it relates to limited educational and economic mobility (Sleeter & Grant, 1987/2007). An important question I ask is: if we are to move toward a more socially just society, how should policy and practice address the complex and interrelated inequalities that are embedded in our social processes of social structure, social practice, and social events?

5.5.3 Assimilationist approach and monolingualism

In this section, I discussed the underlying ideologies of educational policy and indicated that they reflected an assimilationist perspective. In 2015 the Korean government’s agenda required new-comer students to participate in intensive Korean language programs in order to adapt them to schools and society. The new agenda supported the education for multicultural
children in kindergartens, expanded preparatory Korean language and culture courses for newcomer and foreign students, and the development of assessment tools for Korean language ability. Most policies and curriculum changes were related to improving immigrants’ Korean language ability so that they could fit into the school system and Korean society. The assimilationist perspective suggests that such a response to the difference is interconnected with a language ideology that is embedded within Korea’s monolingual society (Park, 2008). According to Park (2008), Korea became a monolingual country that was born out of colonialization and modernization. Monolingualism, through elimination of social, ethnic, and linguistic diversity, created a language ideology and homogenous population that served to create a strong common national identity\(^{14}\) (Park, 2008). Despite today’s declaration that Korea is a multicultural society, the ideology of monolingualism still exerts strong nationalistic influence. The monolingual ideology’s strong nationalist mobilizing effects are well supported by sociolinguistic studies and sociology of education research that has examined how language, ideology, and cultural identity are intertwined with symbolic domination (Apple, 1996, 1999; Bourdieu, 1997a, 1997b). Bourdieu (1977a, 1977b, 1984) assumed that linguistic ability is a form of embodied cultural capital that forms the habitus from a long socialization process within a group. Moreover, members of upper classes who have the power and privilege of their form of cultural capital promote and legitimize their linguistic capital, which is most valued in the nation-state and therefore privileged (Kang, 2015). In the struggle over different forms of capital,

\(^{14}\) For example, the elevation of standard Korean to the national language - by definition, modern Korean with Seoul cadence used by well-educated people- ignores the varied regional dialects of Korean and the languages spoken by ethnic minorities such as the small but recognizable community of ethnic Chinese. Also, a state-driven language purification movement in the 1970 attempted to purge Korean of various elements of slang, vulgar language, and influence of foreign languages (Go, 1995). The externalization of foreign language as un-Korean helped to maintain the ideology of monolingualism and the sense of national unity (Park, 2008).
certain dialects or languages are eliminated or subordinated. This can be associated with the Korean monolinguist approach, which insists that if new-comers are to be accepted by society they must learn and speak the Korean language. Therefore, through education, new-comer’s native languages get subordinated to Korean language, and are thereby eliminated for future generations, as children lose the ability to speak the language of their parents.

This process unfolds through the multicultural education policy, as elite groups and policy makers, on the assumption that they are closing the gap between mainstream children and multicultural children, customized Korean language programs for immigrant children and youth.

By providing *earlier educational action* at the kindergarten level, and by providing them the opportunity to learn Korean language and basic-level learning, *an equal starting point and equal educational opportunity will be guaranteed* to multicultural children (MOE, 2015, p. 8, emphasis added).

The programs will also be supported by mentoring in early childhood education by undergraduate students (MOE, 2015). This social practice-level educational policy text is intertextually related to the social event level of school language program implementation within 30 kindergartens in five regions.

According to the monolingual ideology and government rationale, immigrant children will suffer from slow cognitive development and inadequate learning if they are not able to interact socially by using the Korean language. The government recommends that only when these children learn the language will they be included in classes with mainstream children, according to their assessed stage of development and multicultural attributes (MOE, 2015).

In addition, the government’s policy agenda for addressing the ‘politics of difference’ is similar for new-comer students and foreign students. Preparatory institutions have been
designated to address this, and relevant courses are provided to facilitate students’ early adaptation (MOE, 2015). The preparatory courses are essentially primer courses that help minority students enter into inclusive schools and classrooms. The social practice level represented through the policy is intertextually related to and supportive of my personal experiences and discourses at the social event level within the dialectical-relational CDA framework (Fairclough 2016). My previous experiences and conversations with teachers and activists revealed their perception of new-comer students and foreign students as too unprepared to enter the Korean school system. Teachers have recommended that students complete stepping-stone courses before entering regular classroom because the teachers were overwhelmed by the need to accommodate new-comer students because they lacked adequate support to provide them feedback in a timely manner. The preparatory courses can allow the teachers and new-comer students to interact in a more efficient way. However, activists suggested that although courses on Korean language and culture are offered, in fact such school practice does not truly represent equality of learning opportunity, as immigrant children first have to satisfactorily complete these preparatory courses before they are considered qualified to enroll in mainstream courses and schools, whereas mainstream students need not go through this process, regardless of their skill and knowledge levels.

In summary, education policy and customized education focused on the new-comer students’ lack of Korean language, which is related to their lower academic achievement. Examining this through the lens of deficit thinking theory (Valencia, 1997) suggested that the government pays close attention to multicultural students’ deficiencies, and that the policy text represents them as problems to be solved. It ignores the diversity these students bring, and does not address racism, discrimination, and inequality in Korean society. In this respect, the 2015
multicultural education policy is still associated only with Sleeter and Grant’s (2003/2007) first approach to multicultural education, the *Teaching the Exceptional and the Culturally Different* approach. And thus, it is not able to lead to equal educational opportunity and a just society due to high levels of ethno-cultural stratification (Grant & Ham, 2013; Kang, 2015). In the end, a policy based on a monolinguist ideology for nationalist purposes could be considered part of an assimilationist agenda and orientation.

5.5.4 The human capital approach and education for a neoliberal society

In 2006 the social structure and education policy focused on Korean language-centred programs for multicultural students and families. At the social practice level my analysis of the 2015 educational policy text showed a little shift in its discourse and agenda. The policy discourse now presents exploring jobs and obtaining relevant skills through career education and vocational education programs. It is suggested that through career education, multicultural students can explore and decide on their career options.

In my analysis in this section, I first described and summarized the 2015 policy document, and then provided my critical discourse analysis. To promote multicultural students’ career exploration and career choices, the 2015 policy document proposed (a) provision of educational materials for career education and counseling to promote their strength of bilingual ability, (b) the expansion of vocational education and courses to students in non-vocational schools, (c) the expansion of opportunity for university admission, and (d) support for alternative schools for multicultural students’ vocational education, in which their tuition fees and dormitory fees are covered by the government (MOE, 2015). According to the 2015 policy document, multicultural students have two main career options based on their interests, aptitudes, and circumstances. One is to enter into the university after graduating from high-school. For
example, those who were selected by the Global Bridge Project, which aimed to develop multicultural students’ talent in terms of bilingual ability, math, sciences, and art, can cultivate their potential and then go on to university. The other option is to go to a vocational high school, get a job after graduation, and then go to university when they need more training (MOE, 2015).

Looking at this through a critical lens, I first analyze the career option of going to university within the Korean social structure. In Korea, competition to get admitted to ‘good’ universities is very high because most high school students prepare extensively for the university entrance exam. It has been a prevalent belief indoctrinated within middle- and upper-class families that graduation from elite universities leads to a good job and a brilliant life. These families also spend large amounts of money on private tutoring in order to create the best chances for their children’s success. In this sense, students from middle- and upper-class families have extensive resources and better opportunities for education, and therefore, they have better chances to enroll in universities than do students with limited resources and from lower-class families.

The issue of social inequality in terms of parent wealth, private tutoring, and university entrance has attracted more and more attention. To address this kind of inequality in higher education access, many universities now use screening processes for socially vulnerable groups as one way to implement an affirmative action policy. This provides quotas and possibilities for university admission for students from low-income, single-parent, multicultural, North Korean and rural area families. According to the 2015 policy document, the screenings process for

\[\text{In terms of college entrance statistics, 53\% of multicultural children and 68\% of Korean students go on to higher education (Ministry of Gender Equity and Family, 2015).}\]

\[\text{The name of the type of screening varies across universities, and includes, for example, equal opportunity}\]
multicultural students was expanded for 2,200 students across 65 universities and five colleges. Additionally, the University of Education (university for elementary school pre-service teachers) established a screening process for multicultural students on the assumption that multicultural education requires teachers from diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds as role models and representatives. In fact, there is a high degree of competition to enter the University of Education due to the strong possibility of becoming a teacher and thereby having a stable profession. Thus, from the functionalist perspective, the trend of increasing opportunity for multicultural students to enter ‘good universities’ can increase the possibilities of their integration into mainstream society as productive citizens. However, in the wider competitive structure that is constantly reproduced, it is doubtful that providing a few more chances for multicultural children to go to university can make an impact on reducing social inequalities and result in a more socially just Korean society.

Next, I look into the career option of preparing for jobs. Social activists have long argued for an explicit process for the provision of vocation-oriented education and the establishment of vocational alternative schools for multicultural children. The functionalist perspective-based rationale is that new-comer students are not very good at the Korean language, which leads to difficulty in finding jobs; however vocational schooling provides them the opportunity to learn job skills that do not require a high level of Korean language and knowledge. From a more

screening, subjects for social consideration screening, social integration screening, multicultural children screening, and so on.

17 In Korea, the types of high-school include regular schools, specific-purpose schools, and alternative schools. An alternative school is allowed to have a school curriculum with half of the mandatory subjects, with the rest of the time used, at the school’s discretion, for classes with hands-on practice, experiential activities, and vocational programs, based on the legislation. Thus, in a vocational alternative school, students can spend more time on vocational skills training and practice, rather than learning regular subjects such as math, science, and social studies.
socially critical lens, recent world events related to terror issues in European countries have led to heightened fear of immigrants in Korea. The Koreans discourse is conceived around the idea that multicultural students with low education will not be able to work, will remain at bottom of the social hierarchy, and will become resentful and possibly turn to acts of social evil. Thus, vocational education is grounded in this implicit fear of difference. Nevertheless, the government takes the functionalist view that emphasizes education as a means to enable immigrants to play a role in their new society.

For example, Dasom School was the first vocational alternative school for multicultural students. The purpose of providing this vocational education was to address the government’s concern about solving the immigrant problem. In this school, all students live in the dormitory, learn to communicate in Korean, learn job-related manufacturing skills, and can obtain a technician’s license. An interview with a senior member of a company affiliated with this school (cited in the policy document) provided the textual representation of new-comer students who can easily adjust to new schools, learn new skills, and integrate into society through the vocational education.

[They are] excellent in the technical skills needed to utilize the machines used in industry, and in Korean language. They can be put into the work immediately (MOE, 2015, p. 14).

This discourse takes the functionalist perspective that this type of education provides new-comer students with the low-level skills that help them integrate into the manufacturing industry, thereby keeping them out of trouble and encouraging them to contribute to the social good. This

---

18 Dasom School was opened in 2012 with the cooperation of several ministries, such as the Ministry of Labor, the Committee on Social Integration, the Ministry of Education, Educational Offices in the provinces, and Polytech, a job training institute. They cooperated as follows: Polytech provided the facilities and teaching staff for skills training; the Ministry of Labor offered tuition and dormitory fees; and the Educational Offices gave certificates for high-school graduation.
aligns with the neoliberal globalization perspective that demands that education systems be more aligned with economic considerations and market efficiency (Hirrt, 2004; Rizvi & Engel, 2009). This means that education systems are expected to (re)produce a workforce, citizenry, and consumers who are fit for a global capitalist economy, equipped with the relevant skills and attitudes, and ideologically compliant and suitable for producing capital (Giroux, 2014; Rizvi & Engel, 2009). The policy discourse can also be associated with the Teaching the exceptional and the culturally different approach (Sleeter & Grant, 1987, 2003/2007), as new-comer students are perceived as human capital to be trained so that they can adjust to the mainstream society. The policy text fails to address the complex and contradictory nature of experiences with ethnic diversity within the multicultural group itself, and does little address the intersectionality of multiple forms of oppression.

5.6 The Ideological Manifestation of Education for Multicultural Understanding

In this section, I discuss the ideology embedded in the education for multicultural understanding. The 2015 policy document established the second goal as expanding education for multicultural understanding, and targeted mainstream students, and multicultural students, parents, teachers, and the larger educational community. To promote mutual cultural understanding, stronghold schools are designated and given funding for activities to activate multicultural understanding education for all students and to enhance their acceptance of multiculturalism.
5.6.1 Toward a Human Relations approach to multicultural education

Up to the mid-2000s, Korean Social Studies and Citizenship textbooks emphasized being a ‘single-race’ and ‘pure-blood’ country as a source of nationalist pride, along with having a unique Korean language system and shared cultural values (Choi, 2010). This, in turn, functioned as a mechanism of exclusion and discrimination against Others who did not belong to the Korean ‘race.’ International organizations such as the UN conveyed their concerns about Koreans’ racial discrimination against and human right violations of foreigners and immigrants. They advised the Korean government to revise its policy, curriculum, and textbooks, and to eliminate discourses that represent Korea as a ‘single-race’ and ‘pure blood’ country (Y. Lee, 2013).

Accordingly, the government’s underlying assumption was that curriculum reform required removing ethnocentric representations of a single-race nation, and replacing them with an emphasis on embracing difference and tolerance toward Others. This was thought to contribute to the reduction of prejudice and stereotyping, thus enabling mainstream children to get along with and tolerate multicultural children. However, other than a general declaration, few concrete guidelines or content were provided to teachers and schools for how to teach about difference, diversity, and prejudice. There was also no articulation of what activities might enhance students’ understanding of multiculturalism. Despite its abstract agenda and implicit orientation, this part of the policy’s textual development can be understood through Sleeter and Grant’s (2007) second approach, Human Relations, aims at fostering tolerance and positive feelings among different groups, and reducing prejudice and stereotyping, thus helping students of different backgrounds fit in with others and easily adapt to mainstream society. The educators who adopt this approach try to construct their classrooms to celebrate individual differences, and they regard difference as normal and valuable. However, Sleeter and Grant (2007) critically point out that this approach normalizes the distribution of power, and does not address institutional racism and the advantages that social stratification confers to dominant groups. Instead, they regard prejudice as simply a matter of individual emotional disturbance.

---

19 Sleeter and Grant’s (2007) second approach, Human Relations, aims at fostering tolerance and positive feelings among different groups, and reducing prejudice and stereotyping, thus helping students of different backgrounds fit in with others and easily adapt to mainstream society. The educators who adopt this approach try to construct their classrooms to celebrate individual differences, and they regard difference as normal and valuable. However, Sleeter and Grant (2007) critically point out that this approach normalizes the distribution of power, and does not address institutional racism and the advantages that social stratification confers to dominant groups. Instead, they regard prejudice as simply a matter of individual emotional disturbance.
Grant’s (1987, 2003/2007) *Human Relation* approach, as it puts an emphasis on reducing prejudice, racism, stereotyping, and fostering tolerance among different groups. This is a content thread that is present as recently as the 2015 policy.

But again, the 2006 multicultural educational policy mainly targeted teachers, rather than Korean students, in order to promote an understanding of multiculturalism and minority families. The policy’s agenda focused on national curriculum and textbook reforms which would be used by all teachers and students (MOE, 2006). For this analysis I will focus on curriculum revision and the policy agenda that all students should receive education for multicultural understanding. Teacher education for multicultural understanding will be analyzed in the next section.

In 2006, the governments started to change the agendas and wanted to promote a more multicultural image of Korean society through education reform. The educational policy document encouraged teachers to “find all the representations of a ‘single-race nation’ in the textbooks and revise them” (MOE, 2006, p. 30). The government wanted elements of multicultural/multiethnic education within the new curriculum and text books. Specifically, the reforms would reflect the discourses on “respecting and understanding other culture, overcoming prejudice, and tolerance,” and determined that this “should be included in Social Studies, Citizenship Education, and Korean Language Art so as to promote learning about multiculturalism” (MOE, 2006, p. 30). Subsequently, the supplementary materials based on these multicultural ideas were disseminated to teachers and schools.

During the next ten years, the education for multicultural understanding focus has shifted from curriculum revision to encouraging the use of class activities for student learning about multiculturalism. This shift is due to the criticism that even though multicultural children make the effort to learn Korean language and culture in order to adjust to mainstream society, if
mainstream students are not prepared to accept them and to respect diversity, the two groups of students will not get along (Cho et. al, 2010; Oh, 2008). This shift also reflected a consideration that while curriculum revision takes a considerable amount of time because it involves developing and publishing revised textbooks, multicultural activities can happen immediately during regular classes, club-activities, and school events, and can be delivered in a rapid and concrete manner. As a result, the government designated several stronghold schools to promote this form of education for multicultural understanding. Reforms would align with the individual school’s circumstances, such as the ratio of multicultural children, their (parents’) country of birth, availability of resources, and community support (MOE, 2010, 2012, 2013, 2015). The government distributed funding based on these attributes to designated schools and recommended the purposes and practices of education for multicultural understanding.

The social-practice level of the 2015 educational policy text explained education for multicultural understanding. The most prominent point is that unlike the customized education for multicultural students, which was analyzed in the previous section and which targets only multicultural students, education for multicultural understanding targets all students.

Education for multicultural understanding will be carried out for all students. It aims for multicultural students and mainstream students to respect differences and get along. For these purposes, education for enhancing multicultural sensitivity, multicultural understanding, and anti-prejudice will be conducted. And it will be accompanied by customized guidance that takes into consideration multicultural students’ language and academic achievement (MOE, 2015, p. 16).

However, the policy document does not include detailed information about the content and themes that should be the focus of either multicultural understanding education or students’ activities to promote it. We can only infer that the government intended to suggest the main
purposes of multicultural education, and to empower the authorities to determine and implement
general reforms of teachers and schools according to their unique circumstances. By analyzing
some examples in the policy documents, we can trace how the education for multicultural
understanding is executed. For example, activities such as traditional arts and games that
introduce foreign countries’ cultures and histories provide a chance to promote mutual
understanding between multicultural and mainstream students (MOE, 2012). Also, all schools
are encouraged to hold a ‘harmony week’ event (or week for multicultural education) once a year
to improve students’ perception of multicultural education. This includes diverse cultural
activities and programs, such as multicultural festivals and club activities, drawing and writing
activities that involve the theme of multiculturalism, a contest for singing in one’s heritage
language, and a dual language speech contest (MOE, 2013). These programs are intended to
provide more opportunities for all students to experience cultural diversity and better understand
those with different backgrounds, but, these programs remain superficial, focusing on things like
ethnic food, costumes, singings, and fairs, all of which happen as a celebration of individual
cultural differences within the *Human Relations* approach (Sleeter & Grant, 2007; Y. Lee, 2013).

This final CDA demonstrated that there was an intertextual relationship between the
discursive analysis of the policy and research texts described above, and the social structure level
of wider Korean consciousness or perceptions of multicultural phenomenon and foreigners
(Fairclough, 2016). According to recent survey research (Ministry of Gender Equality and
Family, 2015), the index score of multicultural acceptability has improved over the past three
years, and acceptance was highest among the young, the high-income, the well-educated, and
those who have been exposed to high amounts of multicultural education (Ahn, Kim, Ma, Moon,
& Lee, 2015). These results supported the premise that recent policy reforms and programs
aimed at improving multicultural understanding have reduced prejudice and have fostered more harmony between the minority and majority. Nevertheless, Koreans’ awareness and openness are still lower than in other developed countries. For example, the World Values Survey (2010-2014) asked whether respondents agreed with the following statement: “When jobs are scarce, employers should give priority to people of this country over immigrants.” Over 60% of Korean adults agreed, while only 42% of Germans, 50% of Americans, and 52% of Australians agreed. Furthermore, over 30% of Koreans agreed with the statement, “I would not like to have immigrants/foreign workers as neighbours.” In comparison, only 22% of Germans, 14% of Americans, and 11% of Australians felt this way. These two responses showed that many Koreans still hold prejudicial views and discriminatory attitudes toward immigrants. This also is representative of the macro-level dialectical relationship between neoliberalism and the institutions that are part of the Korean social structure, in which mainstream and minority groups compete against each other for scarce educational and employment opportunities. This refocuses hostility towards each other and solidifies social stratification, as the disadvantaged, less skilled, and less powerful foreign groups are pushed further to the margins of society.

Thus, the discourse analysis in this section found different discursive representations of Korean society and education. My analysis of the policy suggested that concepts such as tolerance, accommodation, sensitivity, harmony, and diversity lie at the core of the multicultural ideology, and these attributes are firmly embedded in Korean multicultural educational policy, curriculum, and discourse. These underlying assumptions for education for multicultural understanding can still be understood through Sleeter and Grant’s (2007) Human Relations approach. However, as my analysis and discussion of the World Values Survey (2010-2014) suggests, while one must accept the idiosyncrasies of Others, the underlying assumption is that
the dominant people and culture are privileged and superior (Henry & Tator, 2000). Within this minimal form of recognition of difference, the dominant culture and the guardians of social order create a ceiling of tolerance, and immigrants should not contest these limitations. As Mohanty argues, the declaration of the need for tolerance, accommodation, sensitivity, harmony, and diversity tends to conceal structural and systemic inequalities and the unequal power relations that exist in the democratic liberal society (Mohanty, 1993). Advanced and socially just approaches to multicultural education should help address these social processes, which produce social and ethnocultural disharmony.

5.6.2 Valuing a teacher’s neutrality in education

Several studies on multicultural education have emphasized the role of teachers in multicultural education because their perspectives on diversity and difference influence their teaching practice, their classroom culture, and their own critical awareness, as well as that of their students (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; Sleeter & Grant, 2007; Ghosh & Abdi, 2013; Mo & Lim, 2013). The critical scholars claimed that schools should be sites for emancipation and empowerment rather than for normalizing students in the existing social structure, and that teachers should engage in critical enquiry that dignifies meaningful dialogue (Freire, 1977/2000, Giroux, 1988, Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997). In the Korea’s multicultural education policy, the importance of teacher education in relation to multicultural education has been emphasized constantly.

In 2006, in the early stages of Korea’s multicultural education policy, in-service teacher education and professional development were mostly geared to introducing multiculturalism to the field of education, strengthening teachers’ consideration of minorities, encouraging
understanding of multicultural students’ difficulties, and emphasizing KSL (Korean as a Second Language) and Korean culture education (MOE, 2006).

It is recommended that teacher professional education include education about multicultural understanding, teaching for underachieving students, and anti-bullying education. Also, guidebooks should be developed to address issues that arise in relations to minorities in society and how to seek for solutions to issues (MOE, 2006, p. 29).

The recommendations for teacher education in 2006 included a guide for teachers to help multicultural students with different needs as well as a proper pedagogy and counseling; however, dialectically, the (re)presentation of multicultural students in the policy document, by associating them with underachievement and bullying, has solidified the image of multicultural students as deficient. The assumptions embedded in teacher education in 2006 have become social structures that influence the public’s awareness of multicultural students and difference. The lack of teacher education programs for multicultural education due to limited resources and prejudice against multicultural students were intertwined and generated negative images of multicultural students. The 2015 policy showed that diverse teacher education programs on multicultural education were provided, such as courses for pre-service teachers at the University of Education, along with programs for in-service teachers, principals, and administrators, ranging from two-hour introductory courses to 30-hour intensive courses. These were designed to “enhance the teachers’ understanding of multicultural students and their competencies on guiding multicultural students” (MOE, 2015, p. 16). The 2015 policy emphasized that the pre-service teacher education program should include a course on multicultural education for all teachers in order to enhance their multicultural competencies and understanding of multicultural students. Over a decade, the interest in and funding for multicultural teacher education increased,
and many teacher education institutions and professional development programs began offering diverse courses on multicultural education.

Despite the quantitative growth in teacher training programs focused on multicultural education, these programs remain introductory or superficial (Mo & Lim, 2013). The focus of these programs is on encouraging teachers to understand the difficulties faced by multicultural students and to embrace and respect diversity in their classrooms. The focus is not on helping multicultural students represent themselves in their schools and in society, or on encouraging them to pay attention to the inequality they might face. The areas of focus align more closely with the functionalist perspective, or teaching the exceptional and culturally different approach, in that the teacher education programs pay attention to how to get multicultural students to adapt more easily by improving their Korean language and learning abilities. They do not yet focus on the politics of difference or social justice. In fact, within the Korean social structure, it is assumed that teachers should be politically neutral, otherwise they might negatively influence immature and/or sensitive students in developing a distorted view of society and of nations. Therefore, teacher education has been unlikely to promote teachers’ and students’ critical awareness through conscientization (Freire, 2000).

Within critical multiculturalism, scholars advocate that teachers understand and perceive how their work relates to politics, power, and culture, and that they adopt a critical stance (Banks, 2009; Giroux, 1988; Nieto, 2000; Sleeter, 1996; Sleeter & Grant, 2007). This view of teachers’ role exposes the fallacy of objective, neutral, de-politicized teaching (Gorski, 2006). Within this framework, teachers “play as transformative intellectuals who develop counterhegemonic pedagogies” (Giroux, 1988, xxxiii) that empower students by giving them the knowledge and social skills needed to be critical agents, and by educating them for
transformative action. However, the 2015 policy does not emphasize critical perspectives on education. Without concerns for social justice and inequality, teachers will continue to produce and reproduce the concept of multicultural students as socially and culturally vulnerable, and will continue to see the ideal type of multicultural education as something that assimilates multicultural students into the mainstream society.

The leading scholars of multicultural education confirm that the teachers’ role in engaging with a diversity of races, languages, cultures, classes, and identities should transcend the technicalities of their daily routines; it requires a critical perspective of multiculturalism and a form of social activism (Banks, 2009; Nieto, 2000; Sleeter, 1996). Moreover, teachers should question taken-for-granted assumptions and adopt transformative practices to trigger real change (Banks, 2009).
CHAPTER 6: Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on a theoretical framework of critical multiculturalism (Kincheleoe & Steinberg, 1997), the five approaches to multicultural education (Sleeter & Grant, 1987, 2007), neoliberal globalization theory, and other critical theories, I have completed a Critical Discourse Analysis, focused especially on dialectical-relational analysis (Fairclough, 2002/2016), of the Korean multicultural education policy and other intertextually related discourse. In this chapter, I provide final summaries, a conclusion, and recommendations.

6.1 Summary of the Research and Findings

My first research question asked how the Korean multicultural education policy has perceived and constructed multicultural education, multicultural students as policy subjects, and the relationship between multicultural students and the mainstream Korean majority. One of my major findings through my Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough, 1995, 2002/2016), which focused on the lexical choices used in the policy document, showed that the categorization and description of multicultural children constructed them as deficient and as challenges to the Korean school system because they deviated from the norm that was represented by mainstream Korean students. Even though the term ‘multicultural students’ was created and used to identify the range, characteristics, and current situation of multicultural families as a basis for the multicultural education policy, instead, it has functioned as a marker to distinguish them from mainstream Korean students, stigmatize them as deficient, and to prevent their equal participation in society, including in school. This was the point that prior research has made (Park & Sung, 2008; Park, 2009; Cho, et al., 2010; Olneck, 2011). Multicultural students were one of the main factors that initiated the government’s intervention, and that is the reason why the Korean multicultural education policy mainly focused on providing support to help them
adapt to school and society, rather than addressing the need to educate every student or to pay more attention to cultural pluralism. The second major finding showed that there were two primary bifurcated policy orientations: one is customized education for multicultural students, and the other is education for multicultural understanding for all students (mainly for mainstream Korean students). Within the theme of customized education, multicultural students were classified into several groups depending on their different needs and the levels of their adaptation, but they were generally perceived as deficient in terms of Korean language, culture, academic achievement, and socioeconomic background. To critically discuss this discursive process, I utilized the theory of deficit thinking and a critique of conservative multiculturalism approach (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; Sleeter & Grant, 2007; Valencia, 1997). Also, I found that mainstream Korean students as an explicit category of policy subjects were absent. This again suggested that Korean students were the taken-for-granted norm from which all other students deviated. For their part, multicultural students were also perceived as a form of talent or human capital because some of them were expected to have bilingual abilities, which could be used as a bridge to other countries.

My second research question asked: what ideologies or underlying assumptions are embedded in the multicultural education policy of Korea? What approach has the government drawn on to promote multicultural education? To answer this I drew on a critical multiculturalism and examined the ideological assumptions of the policy. I particularly drew on five philosophical approaches to multicultural education (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997), and Sleeter and Grant’s (1987, 2007) five approaches to multicultural education, to shed light on the specific policy vision, the policy agendas of Korea, and the current stage of Korean multicultural education policy. I took these approaches because I did not find evidences that the policy’s
orientation was consistent with a critical multiculturalism that emphasized social equality or social change through social actions. In this sense the policies were aligned mainly with the *Teaching the exceptional and culturally different* approach, and sometimes the *Human relations* approach, both of which are apolitical. Thus, the more political approaches that focused on minorities’ oppression, social inequalities, and social changes could not be applied directly to the analysis; instead, I was able to use them in detecting the absence of these discourses. One interesting finding was that customized education for multicultural students was intertwined with contradictory assumptions. For example, under the pretense of providing ‘equal educational opportunity’ to different students, the policy actually provided differential support and had a variety of orientations that are suggestive of the *Teaching the exceptional and culturally different* approach, an assimilationist approach, a human capital approach, and a cultural diversity approach. In this regard, the new-comer students were required to adapt to the Korean school system through Korean language learning-centred support. The more well-adjusted new-comer students or older students were regarded as human capital to be trained through vocational education so that they could function in the neoliberal society. In contrast, education for multicultural understanding was representative of the *Human relations* approach, which emphasizes tolerance and positive relations between the different groups. Although they were vague in orientation and application, teachers’ multicultural sensitivity and multicultural competencies were encouraged through teacher education reforms. The overall policies focused on the various individual groups as policy subjects and made an effort to improve their situation; however, the policy did not address issues of social justice and structural inequalities.

My third research question involved the shifts in educational policy over a decade and how these shifts contributed to changing or maintaining existing values. My intertextual analysis
of the 2006 policy document and 2015 policy document examined the perceptions of the policy’s subjects, aims, and priorities. With Fairclough’s (2002/2016) dialectical-relational CDA approach, I was able to determine that the 2006 policy was close to the Teaching the exceptional and culturally different approach, and in part, the Human relations approach. My analysis showed that even after a decade, the 2015 policy still adhered to the same approaches, but the newly recognized multicultural groups became policy subjects and were presented as more diverse and as having more disadvantages. Importantly, the 2015 document showed more of an overall shift toward the Human relations approach, with more recognition of cultural diversity. It has made progress in implementation and legislation to embrace the new categories in the Korean school system, which the government had presented as equal educational opportunities. However, a greater focus on new groups that were seen as more likely to be incorporated into Korean society took attention away from the foreign workers’ families and undocumented children groups. This lack of attention raised social justice and inequalities issues. In the end, the policy shifts between 2006 and 2015 did not go so far as to address social awareness, social inequalities, and social changes, and thus has mainly contributed to maintenance of existing values by making them seem natural and normal rather than questioning them.

6.2 Reflection on the Study

In conducting this study, I utilized CDA and critical perspectives for the analysis of Korea’s education policy documents. It was like a journey of discovering myself in relationship to the society to which I belong, as well as to the institutions within which I operate and the people who constitute Korean society. Thus, it is important for me to state that I was encouraged to take the position of social justice researcher and to use the lens of a critical scholar, which I had developed through my graduate-level academic practice in Canada. Therefore, I confess that
as a loyal Korean citizen and government official, a critical analysis of Korea’s social structures and processes made me a bit anxious. Although there are many policy analysts in my country who can provide society with the explicit meanings of policies, there is also a need for some researchers to provide more critical views of those same policies in order to detect the more implicit meanings and unseen challenges. Only then can we offer recommendations that move us toward a more socially just and inclusive society.

As a social justice researcher who has worked as a government officer, I did not mean to entirely denigrate the ministries’ policy makers who initiated the policy because I knew that it required considerable effort to formulate the policy from the incipient stage, and to try to improve the legislation and institutions to improve the inclusion of new-comers and multicultural families. Nevertheless, studying and using the CDA methodology led me to realize that policy makers including me drew on a functionalist perspective in policy making, mainly paying attention to the visible and immediate phenomena such as multicultural children’s difficulties as perceived by teachers; and that we formulated the policy in order to relieve such problems. Specifically, with the application of Fairclough’s (2002/2016) dialectical version of CDA, I came to pay close attention to the relations between the social structure and social events, which enabled me to situate the multicultural education policy in the context of the larger social structure, and to see the social inequalities more clearly. Because the policy documents were written using viable and desirable words and logics, it is challenging to uncover the embedded assumptions without linking the policy to the social structure.

In Korea, education is still a conservative domain with regard to the value system that espouses the functioning of society and equal opportunities. Thus, it is not easy to address the inequalities or power relations within education. Nonetheless, more effort is required to address
social wrong (Fairclough, 2002/2016) and to move toward a more just society, beyond the taken-for-granted hierarchy.

Lastly, the process of translating the Korean multicultural education policy and my analysis from Korean into English has resulted in some ambivalent meanings: on the one hand, the shifts between Korean and English could be seen as a limitation in that during the process I could miss the subtle meaning of the policy, discourses or embedded assumptions. On the other hand, this analysis could provide a site to examine the Korean multicultural education policy from a critical perspective within the dialectic relations of social structure and social events to the English-speaking readers and inspire more discussions on the emergent themes of multicultural education.

6.3 Implications and Recommendations

6.3.1 Recommendations for policy makers and teachers

-Based on my analysis, I recommend that policy makers initiate a more inclusive policy and practice of multicultural education. As demonstrated in Chapter Five, more of the policy’s focus could be put on Korean-language learning for new-comer students in order to accommodate them into the Korean school system. Despite the importance of learning Korean language, we should put an even higher priority on creating a more inclusive and socially just school atmosphere and curriculum. Thus, if we are to nurture more socially minded students, education for multicultural understanding of all students should focus on how different groups are represented in discourses and how they can be involved in the practices, and more concrete programs and practices should be provided. It is also necessary to move beyond superficial experiences of foreign countries’ cultures, ethnic foods, and festivals. Policy makers and teachers should put much more effort on find ways to teach about the lived experiences of multicultural
children and those of mainstream Korean students that might encourage equal relations between them. More importantly, it is imperative to change public consciousness of difference in order to acknowledge the implicit ethnocultural hierarchies of power and privilege.

In conducting the analysis, I acknowledged that in Korea there are policies for minorities such as multicultural families, women, low-income families, and the disabled, but these policies are formulated and implemented separately. Even though each policy has its own vision and policy subjects, it is necessary to consider the multiple challenges face by these groups rather than treating the challenges separately. I recommend that future policy should pay attention to the intersectionality of oppression, including race, gender, and social class, which could lead to a more inclusive policy that works toward a more equitable society.

My experiences inform me that policy makers usually draw on a functionalist perspective that assumes that institutions such as education function to provide orderly structure. It is believed that individuals, through education, can self-actualize and develop the skills necessary to contribute to the work force and to a functioning society. However, as I demonstrated in Chapter Five, it is becoming more difficult to provide equal opportunity under the influence of neoliberalism because under neoliberalism, an individual’s background and wealth have more bearing on one’s success than does simply being given an opportunity. This should be taken into account in changes to the multicultural education policy. From a critical perspective, in a society that only focuses on competition, ranking, and efficiency in education, it is difficult to change the prevalent norms and values that contributed to the existing order. However, policy makers and teachers should reflect on their roles, privileges, and obligations to transform multicultural educational policy and curriculum, in order to move us to a more socially just and equitable society. Specifically, multicultural education should contribute to the nurturing of students and
teachers with critical consciousness, and away from a policy that creates discursive images of deficient Others.

6.3.2 Recommendations for future research

This study aimed to analyze the ideologies, orientations, and representations embedded within the Korean multicultural education policy, and whether policy shifts contributed to change. However, this study faced some limitations. The first involved the application of the methodology. For example, in order to shed light on the dialectical relations of educational polices and discourses through the three levels of social processes (social structures, social practices, and social events), I adopted Fairclough’s (2002/2016) dialectical-relational version of CDA. My analysis focused on the social practices level, which was represented by the 2015 multicultural education policy document. I also used statistics, surveys, and news articles to represent the social structure level, and some interviews and observations from prior research for the social event level, but could not find sufficient social event-level data for my analysis. Future research might include more observations and text from interviews with multicultural students, mainstream students, teachers, and parents, which could provide more specific and more vivid micro-level information about day-to-day experiences, descriptions, and explanations of the relationship between policy subjects and how they perceive policy implementation and the relationships at the local level. Specifically, I recommend that future research pay attention to how the different types of education are executed in multicultural education at the micro level; focus on the curriculum and content adopted in the class, how multicultural students and mainstream students interact in class and how they perceive each other and their relations, how teachers perceive these groups and their relations and how this affects their pedagogy and other educational guidance and support.
Second, I did not include specific analysis of teacher education for multicultural education because of limitations in gathering relevant data. However, I recognize that teachers are the most significant educational subjects when it comes to understanding and disseminating multicultural education. In this regard, if future researchers could examine teacher education programs related to multicultural education, including the specific content of these programs, they might be able to elucidate the orientations of teacher education. Such research could shed valuable light on the teachers’ perceptions of multiculturalism and multicultural education. More specifically, we could learn about what these teachers would focus on in terms of students with ‘difference,’ in terms of the structure that treats difference as deviant, and in terms of how they can influence their pedagogies and their students’ critical awareness.

Third, I recommend that future research delve into the intersectionality of multicultural students in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic background, and disabilities. In this study, I perceived and demonstrated that multicultural students experience multiple forms of difficulties derived from the difference in ethnicity, language, and socioeconomic background, but I could not explore this in deeper level. If future research is conducted in this area, it can shed light on multicultural students’ identity struggle, their perception of themselves, society, and multiple forms of oppression. Through this process, we can explore more about what should be included in the education and society to make more equitable and inclusive society.
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Appendices

Appendix A: The description of multicultural students as deficient in the policy documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006 policy document</th>
<th>Excerpts from policy documents (emphasis added)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Children from international marriage families have a very limited understanding of their classes because of <strong>language retardation</strong> and <strong>cultural maladjustment</strong>, and they show signs of mental retardation with an extremely <strong>passive attitude</strong>, violent behaviour, or <strong>ADHD</strong> (MOE, 2006, p. 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Many school-aged children from foreign families were <strong>neglected in their education</strong> in that it was reported that <strong>only sixteen percent</strong> among the assumed school-aged population of foreigners <strong>attended school</strong> (MOE, 2006, p. 8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The low family income of foreign workers’ families, poor housing conditions, and <strong>weakness in educating children</strong> were given as reasons for their children’s <strong>lower basic learning abilities</strong> compared to their peers (MOE, 2006, p. 8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Children from international marriage families have experienced <strong>bullying</strong>, and one of the most reported reasons for this was that their <strong>mother came from a foreign country</strong> (MOE, 2006, p. 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The Korean society’s <strong>exclusiveness</strong>, presented as severe <strong>prejudice and discrimination</strong> against foreigners (specifically from underdeveloped countries), has discouraged multicultural children’s early adaptation (MOE, 2006, p. 8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 policy document</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Children from international marriage families <em>who were born and raised in Korea</em> generally have little difficulty using practical Korean, though some of them are not good at academic Korean language and show the tendency toward underachievement. They also avoid telling others that they are from a multicultural family (MOE, 2015, p. 4).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. Children from international marriage families who were *born and/or raised in a foreign country and came to Korea recently* are not good at Korean, thus have difficulties enrolling in school. Also, they experience underachievement, especially in the subjects of social studies and science. They also have psychological problems resulting from adapting to a new (second-marriage) family and Korean culture, and from having an identity crisis (MOE, 2015, p. 4, emphasis added). |

| 3. [Among diverse groups] some foreign workers’ families, due to their unstable status, cannot provide sufficient support to their children, and thus children from these families are poor at Korean language and show a tendency toward low academic achievement (MOE, 2015, p. 4). |

| 4. There are also refugees below eighteen years of age, but the size of this group is small yet (MOE, 2015, p. 4). |