Journal of Educational Administration and Policy

Language Ideology of Bilingual Education Policies for Ethno-linguistic Minorities in South Korea

Kang, Mi Ok[a] · Sohn, Bong-gi[b]

[a]Utah Valley University, Orem, Utah, USA
[b]University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

A B S T R A C T

Drawing from the national and regional governments' bilingual education policy documents for the languages of ethno-linguistic minorities, we investigated the intersections between bilingual education in the languages of ethno-linguistic minorities and language ideologies embedded in the selected policy documents. Applying a textual analysis of the data (Fairclough, 1995, 2003; Wodak & Meyer, 2009), we (a) explored the ways neoliberal language ideologies discursively (re)reproduced in the Korean national government's bilingual education policy for teaching the languages of ethno-linguistic minority students and their families in the school, and (b) examined how a regional government interpreted the national ideological agenda. In doing so, we (c) analyzed the ways that the national and regional governments applied the language-as-resource framework to legitimize bilingual competency and bilingualism as a social norm in South Korea as well as a global norm in the globalized new economy where South Korea is situated.

Keywords: bilingual education policy, language ideologies, ethno-linguistic minority, bilingual students, language-as-resource, neoliberalism

Ⅰ. Introduction

The promotion of bilingual education for ethno-linguistic minorities has achieved several positive outcomes. These include maintaining cultural affiliation, gaining cultural and linguistic resources, acknowledging linguistic and cultural diversity, establishing the rights of ethno-linguistic minorities to learn, use, and maintain their languages, cultivating the growth of a lingua franca, and promoting additive bi-/multilingualism (Cummins, 1986; Hornberger, 2005; Tollefson, 2013; Valdés, 2005). Among the various views that celebrate bilingualism and bilingual education, Ruiz's (1984, 2010) tripartite division of language planning – representing language as problem, right, or resource orientation – has continued to serve as a valuable lens through which to understand language

and its role in society. Within this framework, language-as-resource orientation is most widely accepted and celebrated for its mutually beneficial approach to bilingualism and bilingual education. As Heller (2003, 2010) explained, the globalized economy has accelerated the commodification of language and identity in many nation-states, and so have discourses of language-as-resource orientation in bilingual education (Bale, 2011, 2014). Promotion of the languages of ethno-linguistic minorities has been appropriated by many nation-states in an unprecedented manner (e.g., da Silva & Heller, 2009). Such a rapidly developing linguistic climate has changed the role of bilingual education policies, while specifically redefining the value of monolingual and bi-/multilingual identities in a nation-state and (re)constructing ethno-linguistic minorities' language, identity, and

relationships with those of linguistic majorities (Heller, 2003, 2010).

Although there has been recent discussion of these issues, current bilingual education policy plans for implementation in South Korea further complicate the widely accepted use of language-as-resource orientation. Drawing from the national and regional governments' bilingual education policy documents for the languages of ethno-linguistic minorities, we call for an investigation into the intersections between bilingual education in the languages of ethno-linguistic minorities and language ideologies embedded in selected policy documents.

Utilizing a textual analysis of the data (Fairclough, 1995, 2003; Wodak & Meyer, 2009), we explore three main issues in this study: (a) the discursive (re)production of language ideologies in the national government's bilingual education policy documents that specify ways to teach the languages of ethno-linguistic minority students and their families in K-12 school system, (b) a provincial government's bilingual education policy that refashions the national ideological scheme, and (c) certain language frameworks that the governments employed to sanction bilingual competency and bilingualism as a social and global norm.

A. Research Context

For the last three decades, South Korea has seen a rapid increase in the number of ethno-linguistic minorities (e.g., immigrants from China, the U.S., Vietnam, Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, Indonesia, Mongol, Canada, Sri Lanka, Bangladeshi, Nepal, Russia, Pakistan, Australia, India, Myanmar, U.K., Hong Kong, etc.) as a interlocking result of domestic and international geopolitical and economic changes such as industrialization, urbanization, globalization and facilitation of migration (Korea Immigration Service, 2016). The vast increase of migrants has changed the ethnic/racial, linguistic, and cultural dimensions in South Korea. It is documented that the total number of foreign residents in South Korea is currently 1.8 million, which has increased 9.3% annually, on average, over the past five years. The total percentage of foreigners in the population was 2.5% in 2010, and climbed to 3.6% in 2014 (Korea Immigration Service, 2016). These immigrants were mainly temporary migrant workers, international marriage migrants (who are predominantly female from East and Southeast Asian countries), foreign language teachers, North Korean refugees/migrants, foreign economic investors, and international students. In total, 539,000 labor migrant workers, 150,000 international marriage migrants, and 81,000 international students constituted the largest portion of ethno-linguistic diversity (Korea Immigration Service, 2016).

Over the last decade (2004-2014), the number of ethno-linguistic minorities has rapidly increased along with the trend of feminization of migration in Asia (Constable, 2005; Lan, 2008; Piper, 2004; Yang & Lu, 2010 and many others), where the South Korean government promoted female international marriage migration in order to maintain the domestic population by facilitating an increased birthrate and preventing an aging society (Paik, 2011). International marriages have become common in both rural and urban areas (Seol et al., 2005), constituting 8-13% of all marriages in the past decade (Statistics Korea, 2016). As marriage migration expanded, the numbers of children from these intercultural/interethnic families also increased: from 9,389 in 2006 to 46,954 in 2012, which constituted about 1% of all school-aged children (Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, 2012).

Though debatable, it is known that South Korea has long been engaged in state-driven homogenizing language policy, with processes that tie linguistic form and language users to create a sense of unity and national pride and strengthen the nation-building processes during its modernity (Coulmas, 1999; Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003; King, 2007). In response to growing diversities, the South Korean government recently initiated Korean as a second language (KSL) education for ethno-linguistic minorities in order to facilitate their integration into South Korea. For example, the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family provided different types of KSL programs through 217 Multicultural Families Support Centers spread around the country (Jung, 2013). At the same time, the Ministry of Justice offered the Korea Immigration Integration Program (KIIP) to long-term immigrants, although it is most likely to be merged into the programs of the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family (Cho, 2012).

While there is rapid development of KSL by national ministries, there is also a growing movement that advocates bi-/multilingual education in South Korea. As many bilingual scholars (e.g., Baker, 2006; Cummins, 1986)

have noted, bilingual education may promote the linguistic resources of ethno-linguistic minorities and enhance the dominant monolingual's understanding of ethno-linguistically different others. Nevertheless, little has been done to explore what kinds of bilingual education is implemented and how particular language ideologies facilitate the structure of bilingual education for ethno-linguistic minorities[1] although some studies have addressed the implementation of the bilingual education for ethno-linguistic minorities on a policy level (Jung, 2013; Seol & Kim, 2011). The South Korean government's bilingual education programs for ethno-linguistic minorities are still relatively new: hence, we argue that these initiatives warrant further scrutiny.

B. Bilingual Education in the Globalized New Economy

In many bi-/multilingual contexts where the language of the dominant people is the main medium for governance, education, and communication, minority languages are a source of concern. As described by Ruiz (1984, 2010), language-as-problem perspective reflects the assimilationist ideology in language, which assumes that minority language speakers have deficiencies to overcome and that they need to assimilate and use the majority language in order to excel. In this orientation, language minority groups are blamed for their limited mainstream language skills. This deficit-model normalizes social, educational, and economic disparities between mainstream language speaking and non-mainstream language speaking groups. In contrast, the language-as-right orientation has been commonly used to claim the right of linguistic minorities and immigrants to learn their home language. Nevertheless, it often tends to bring strong opposition from the dominant group since language-as-right is often perceived as a threat

to the dominant society (Wee, 2011).

In order to alleviate the tensions that may arise from these two orientations and defend linguistic pluralism, Ruiz (1984, 2010) argues that the language-as-resource orientation benefits both the dominant language and the languages of minority groups—it serves the needs of capitalistic trade and the global expansion missions of the majority while allowing minority groups to maintain their heritage languages and cultural identities. With its mutual benefits, Ruiz's language-as-resource orientation is a useful tool for promoting minority language, culture, and identities in many social contexts (see Davis, Bazzi, Cho, Ishida, & Soria, 2005) where the forms of multilingualism are no longer defined as threats to the unitary regime, identity, and social systems of nation-states.

Nevertheless, recent critical bilingual scholars argue that language-as-resource orientation can be misinterpreted and misused and unintentionally neglects the political and economic aspects of language (Bale, 2011; Kramsch, 2005; McGroarty, 2006). Also, language-as-resource orientation relies on a neoliberal approach to education (Petrovic, 2005; Ricento, 2005), where neoliberalism can be explained as a market-oriented ideology, which would lead students to develop competitive strategies for accumulating capitals in the globalized world (B. H. Lee, 2002). Language as a resource could serve as a competitive commodity where the value of minority languages shifted from protecting ethno-linguistic minorities' rights to learn to benefitting dominant group (Petrovic, 2005). Recent discussions of the role of the nation-state in bilingual education have highlighted that the nation-state shifted its protector position that secured linguistic resource of ethno-linguistic minorities to a producer position where bilingual education and minority/heritage languages represent capital in global politics and the economy (da Silva & Heller, 2009).

For example, the emphasis on economic reward often appeals to neoliberal economic interests used by the majority to perpetuate minority groups' resources (Petrovic, 2005). The market mentality of the mainstream population could serve to perpetuate an inequitable linguistic status quo. This coincides with neoliberal notion of 'selling' language diversity and bilingual education, where neoliberalism and neoconservativism coincide. Similarly, Kramsch's (2005) criticism of language-as-resource approach centered on the fact that the promotion of diverse languages is due to the demand for

---

1) Although there are vast diversities within ethno-linguistic minorities identified within South Korea (H.-K. Lee, 2010), for the focus of the study, we comprehensively examined ethno-linguistic minorities that emerged from international marriage migration in South Korea. Although this population is widely known and called as *Damunhwa* (multicultural) families, due to the controversy in the terminology (H.-S. Kim, 2014) and the focus of our study on bilingual education, we use ethno-linguistic minorities to refer to the families and children that are made up by international marriage between Korean men and foreign women.

communicative and multicultural competence in the global economy. Therefore, economic gain was inherent in the rationalizing and framing of bilingual education policies for minority/immigrant families (Kramsch, 2005).

Even though language-as-resource orientation preserves the linguistic rights of minorities, highlighting pecuniary interests in maintaining their language becomes problematic, especially when the neoliberal economic interest is taken up by the dominant group (Bale, 2011; Kramsch, 2005; Petrovic, 2005). As Kramsch (2005) and Petrovic (2005) maintained, while coincidentally favoring the dominant group's interests, the language-as-resource orientation ultimately assists the maintenance of the inequitable linguistic status quo, and even attacks the bilingual education that it aims to promote. Because of these controversies and complexities in bilingual education policy planning, it is important to scrutinize the ways in which certain language orientations, especially the language-as-resource orientation, were applied to a nation-state's bilingual education policy planning in relation to various language ideologies underneath the orientation.

C. The Promotion of Bilingual Education in South Korea

In 2010, the national government initiated bilingual education programs for ethno-linguistic minorities as part of its multicultural/bilingual family policies (The Ministry of Gender Equality and Family, 2010). This bilingual initiative may indicate a paradigm shift in bi-/multilingual education policy in South Korea from assimilation to linguistic pluralism. Before then, the major policy agenda for bi-/multilingual families focused on integrating the growing ethno-linguistic minority groups into South Korean society. Some of the commonly discussed issues in publications before 2010 included the struggles of the ethno-linguistic minority families with socio-economic disadvantages, cultural/linguistic conflicts with the dominant monolinguals, labeling based on stereotypes, low self-esteem, and limited social relationships with their peers (Lee, Kang, Kim, Lee, & Seo, 2008; Park & Jang, 2008; Seo & Lee, 2007; Yoon, 2009). The majority of these studies, despite variations, documented negative experiences of ethno-linguistic minority students and their families in schools and society. These studies, in either

direct or nuanced ways, mirror Ruiz's language-as-problem orientation because they attributed language minority groups' lack of Korean skills to their struggles in social, educational, and economic systems.

These studies supported the government's policy initiatives for KSL education, which emphasized the learning of the mainstream language, Korean, over those of ethno-linguistic minorities, and rationalized the government's KSL initiatives and educational plans. Accordingly, the national government has focused on Korean as a Second Language (KSL) education as a central education policy for the past two decades (Jung, 2013). Despite its benevolent approaches, this emphasis on KSL can be criticized for favoring Korean language over other languages and for promoting assimilative and monolingual frameworks. The South Korean government's bilingual education was guided by a language-as-problem orientation, focusing on assimilation into the South Korean society, and emphasizing interventionist KSL pedagogical approaches.

In spite of this, the national government released official policy documents in 2010 and 2012 that may facilitate bilingual education for the languages of ethno-linguistic minorities in K-12 school system. Subsequently, regional governments published bilingual education policies based on this national policy proposal, in process re-constructing the national policy documents to meet specific local needs and circumstances. These government bilingual education initiatives echo several research studies by advocating for bilingual education of ethno-linguistic minorities. There were two foci in these studies: (1) why ethno-linguistic minorities' languages and cultures should be acknowledged in the school settings, in addition to KSL programs (Cho, 2010; Hong, 2012; H. S. Park, Rhee, Rho, & Lee, 2012), and (2) why bilingual education needs to be expanded to include the dominant monolingual Korean students (O. S. Kim, 2012).

Studies examining bilingual education in South Korea are in the early stages, yet these authors (a) paid specific attention to the needs of bilingual education for the languages of ethno-minorities in South Korea, (b) carried both language-as-problem and language-as-resource orientations, and (c) suggested constructive ideas to policy makers for developing bilingual education. Despite these contributions, it is still unknown how the cultural and linguistic politics of the current bilingual education policies are established and how certain language

ideologies impact political and ideological bilingual education frameworks at the policy level.

When there are rapid demographic changes within a country that lead to ethno-linguistic diversity and require integration policies and programs, existing ideological frameworks are challenged, reformulated, and reorganized (Kang, 2014). These unaddressed issues in policy documents and the literature necessitate exploration of the discursive ideological movement of South Korean bilingual education for ethno-linguistic minorities, while critically engaging in understanding Ruiz's language-as-resource orientation in South Korean bilingual education policy.

Using a textual analysis (Fairclough, 1995, 2003) of three national and a regional government policy texts for K-12 bilingual education, we examine the language ideologies that are embedded in these policy texts, guided by these specific research questions: (a) what aspects of language frameworks/ideologies are represented in the national and regional government's bilingual education policy texts for the languages of the ethno-linguistic minorities, and (b) in what ways do cultural politics of the language ideologies helped the governments shape new discourses on bilingualism and bilingual education in South Korea.

Ⅱ. Method

A. Data Sources

We analyzed three national government's official policy texts that have both identified the need to establish bilingual education for ethno-linguistic minority families and suggested a few bilingual education models: *The 1st Basic Plan for Multicultural Family Policies for 2010-2012* (The Ministry of Gender Equality and Family (MGEF, 2010), *The 2nd Basic Plan for Multicultural Family Policies for 2013-2017* (MGEF, 2012), and *The Plan for Educational Advancement of Multicultural Students* (The Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MEST, 2012).

The *1st Basic Plan for Multicultural Family Policies for* 2010-2012 is the very first policy specifically designed for multicultural families. The second plan was published as a revision of the first plan for use from 2013 to 2017.

Besides these two basic policies for multicultural families, there are related multicultural policy plans designed by other national level ministries including the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, and the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. We choose MGEF and MEST's texts for two reasons: (a) since 2010, the MGEF (2010, 2012) took leadership among ministries in developing subsequent multicultural/ multilingual policies including the implementation of bilingual education programs, and (b) following the MGEF's policy planning, the MEST (2012) successively launched bilingual education programs for ethno-linguistic minorities in K-12 school systems.

We also included two provincial level government policy documents: *The Multicultural Education Support Plan* (Wooju Province Office of Education (WPOE, 2013, 2014) and *Teacher Education Materials for Multicultural Understanding* (Nabi City Office of Education (NOE), 2012). We selected these regional policy documents because they captured bilingual education trends in rural provinces[2], as opposed metropolitan cities and central urban areas, (e.g., Seoul and Kyunggido) and also based on relationships built by one of the authors in this study. Except for the capital areas, other local provinces have on average 11,254 multicultural/multilingual students who are now attending K-12 schools (Ministry of Security and Public Administration, 2013).

B. Analytical Mthods: Intertextuality and Interdiscursivity Embedded in Policy Texts

For our analysis, we relied heavily on the concepts of intertextuality and interdiscursivity, which are commonly used in textual analysis as critical methods (Bakhtin, 1986; Fairclough, 1995, 2003; Kristeva, 1980). Texts, by their nature, are a selective elaboration used to appropriate, normalize, and legitimize certain perspectives and ideologies. As van Dijk (2001) along

---

2) The South Korean government identified social, demographic, and regional differences between rural and urban areas and redistributed multicultural policy models based on the region (Oh, Jung, Ra, Park, & Kim, 2009). Following the government's modification on the policy for ethno-linguistic minorities in rural areas, we selected rural provinces and excluded the capital areas to focus on the regional governments' interpretation on the national bilingual education policies.

with Fairclough (1995) and Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) explained, intertexuality and interdiscursivity signal accumulated meanings across texts that are interdependent from one another. Therefore, intertextual/nterdiscursive analysis is useful for finding discursive and transformative networks between texts, specifically analyzing how certain networks construct, define, and produce certain knowledge, experience, and ideology while silencing other ways that deliver different perspectives. More specifically, intertexuality examines how textual discourses traverse in different social domains, creating, (re)producing, and transforming various meanings—for example, exploring how a speech is transferred from written text to a portion of a television news broadcast. Interdiscursivity deals with similar themes, styles, and structures that appear in different genres such as a political propaganda that appears in a newspaper, a blog, or an essay, or other sources.

Through the lens of intertextuality and interdiscursivity, we examine dialogical themes and voices present in the national government's bilingual education policy texts that are discursively transmitted to the regional governments' policy texts, otherwise known as textual and intertextual/interdiscursive analysis. In addition, we investigate the contextual analysis that specifically identifies the kinds of socio-cultural politics that are underneath. For instance, when a collaboration of lexical items in a national government's policy text appear in a regional government's text, the textual creation of the new language in the regional government's text can be a target of analysis to examine specific orders and relations between the socio-cultural, hierarchical, or hegemonic relationships present in the two texts (Barker & Galasiński, 2001; Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999).

In a hierarchical order, the governmental policy texts construct certain culture, language, and power as the norm while making others invisible (Bennett, 1998). In South Korea, the national government's policy discourses may regulate the ways in which regional governments define and produce bilingual education policy texts. The intertextuality/interdiscursivity of the national and regional governments' bilingual education policy texts for ethno-linguistic minorities is, therefore, central to our investigation into the ways national and regional governments achieve social regulation. In doing so, the meanings of government policy texts and underlying linguistic ideologies can be interpreted in various ways,

specifically the ways in which selected policy texts create new meanings that are interrelated across various regional and local communities.

C. Analytic Procedures

The analysis was conducted in two phases. The first phase applied a grounded theory approach (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser, 1992) to find salient themes in the selected policy documents. We first carefully read the texts, generating a list of open codes. We took substantial notes about our initial thoughts and impressions of the readings. Subsequent to the open code generation, we held several video-conferences to discuss our insights into the data, and compare/contrast each other's open codes. Through these conferences, we agreed on a list of axial codes for entire data sets. Themes related to identity, bi-/multilingualism, language orientations, and globalization were coded and made available as a set of databases.

The second phase of the analysis used thematic coding (Boyatzis, 1998). From the axial codes and texts developed during the first phase, we identified themes that would best correspond to our research questions. The key themes selected at this phase were identifiers that described bilingual education: assets, global/globe, deficit/lack, bridge, rights, and so forth. At this stage, these key themes were reexamined in the original text where they were first identified. We also cross-listed the key themes present in both the national and regional government texts for further interdiscursive and intertextual analyses of the data.

Themes related to asset, resource, and global were salient from the first and second phases of the analysis, and appeared frequently in both national and regional policy texts. In order to achieve rigor in the analysis we conducted same analysis three times with a two month interval between each trial. The new list of saturated themes was compared to the previous list until we developed a concrete list of key themes.

Ⅲ. Results

Three key findings emerged from this study. The government developed its bilingual education framework

through the language-as-resource perspective. The government also promoted bilingual education as part of global education through the specific lexical choice of "global" (e.g., global asset, global talent, global initiative, etc.). Finally, the government imposed a new identity and social roles on ethno-linguistic minorities using metaphoric expressions such as 'rainbow,' 'bridge' and/or 'rainbow bridge.'

A. Promoting the Perspective of Language-as-Resource

The following are key excerpts from the two government agencies and all italics are ours for emphasizing key terms that are specifically used in the analysis:

1. To support *language development* for multicultural students, and to operate '(bilingual) classes for *linguistically gifted students'* to help them acquire languages of their mother (father)3) (MGEF, 2012, p. 9).
2. In the past, multicultural students were treated as *passive* beneficiaries of the government supports; now the government will help them to grow as a *valuable asset* of our society by supporting them to *develop their aptitudes and talents* (MEST, 2012, p. 6).
3. To spotlight *multicultural students' strengths,* many extracurricular activities and bilingual education programs will be open, including classes for diverse cultures, histories as well as bilingual programs during the weekend and vacation (MEST, 2012, p. 4).

In Excerpt 1, the MGEF (2012) uses two terms, 'multicultural students' and 'linguistically gifted students,' where the former reflects ethno-linguistic minority students' identities while the latter demonstrates the national government's idealization of the subject through its bilingual education policies. Ethno-linguistic minority students are assumed to be 'gifted' bilinguals

---

3) All excerpts are translated from Korean to English by the authors. Each author translated selected policy texts separately, compared each other's translations for accuracy, and negotiated the parts in discrepancy though continuous communications until mutually agreed.

who would acquire their foreign parent's first language through the government's new bilingual education programs. Even though the bilingual programs are later open to all 'linguistically gifted students' who are willing to learn minority languages, the MGEF's (2012) policy discourse limits the use of the adjective 'gifted' exclusively for ethno-linguistic minority students by limiting the target languages only to the languages of 'their mother (father).'

In the circulation of the MGEF's (2012) policy texts that intended to create the particular ideal student within the bilingual education policies, the MEST's (2012) bilingual education policy texts in Excerpt 2 and Excerpt 3 (above) asserted that ethno-linguistic minority students are 'valuable assets' of South Korean society, and specified the role of the nation-state as an active supporter for their linguistic 'aptitudes and talents' (Excerpt 2) and 'strengths' (Excerpt 3).

It is worth mentioning that the MEST (2012) admitted the nation-state's language policies for ethno-linguistic minorities in the past were not appropriate by making the lexical choice of 'passive.' When we closely looked at patterns of representation of ethno-linguistic minority students and their families in the literature, ethno-linguistic minorities were frequently presented as linguistically and culturally deficient, using words such as 'difficulty,' 'problem,' 'delayed,' and 'risks' in many policy texts that were published prior to 2009 (e.g., CITE a list of examples). For example, earlier policy texts connoted language-as-deficit perspectives by describing ethno-linguistic minority students such as "developmentally *delayed* multicultural students" who" struggle to adjust to the school and larger society, which will result in *societal problems* (MHWF, 2008, pp. 5-6)."

However, there have been significant changes in the national government's perspectives and perceptions about ethno-linguistic minority students in the past 10 years, as illustrated in Excerpts 1-3. The national government texts explicitly represent linguistic skills of students from linguistically diverse backgrounds as assets, talents, gifted, and strengths. Through the drastic change from linguistic deficit to asset, the government shied away from negative images of ethno-linguistic minority students. Instead, it described them as fluent bilinguals or as potentially competent bilinguals who will become the ideal product through the government's bilingual education policies.

These re-appropriation processes opened up a new space for bilingual education programs to develop new

subjectivities among ethno-linguistic minority students. It is strategic in that positive language would help the government to produce ideal governable subjects (Flores, 2014), while barely challenging linguistic power relations within South Korean society.

In terms of positivism regarding ethno-linguistic minority student identities, many provincial education offices responded to the stated national perspective when they developed their own bilingual education programs. They followed the celebratory discourses of bilingualism as appeared in the national government's policy texts. The WPOE (2013, 2014) is one of the provincial education offices that escalated the national government's bilingual education policies and initiated many bilingual programs in public K-12 schools. The WPOE (2013, 2014) used the MEST's guidelines to reformulate the goals for bilingual education programs in the public schools in the Wooju Province and attempted to establish and manage multicultural-friendly school environments that celebrated ethno-linguistic minority students' self-identities. The WPOE (2013, 2014) specified a few expected outcomes of their bilingual education programs including:

4. To invest multicultural students' *self-confidence* by establishing *positive self-perception* (WPOE 2013, p. 19).
5. To strengthen multicultural students' *self-identity* and to establish *self-confidence* of their parents by educating their parent's home language and culture (WPOE, 2014, p. 7).

Instead of using a deficit discourse in the policy texts, the WPOE (2013, 2014) made lexical choices of 'self-confidence' (Excerpt 4 and 5) and 'positive self-perception' (Excerpt 4), which deliver an ideal image of ethno-linguistic minorities as governable selves in society, while normalizing the nation-state's constructive role as a supporter. Elaborating on the language of positivity in the national governments' bilingual policy texts, the WPOE (2013, 2014) also suggested that ethno-linguistic minority students' communicative behaviors would be manageable when they acquired their foreign parent's language and culture. In Excerpts 4 and 5, the provincial government delivers the messages to the public somewhat indirectly, but suggests that ethno-linguistic minority students' low self-confidence and poor sense of self-identity can be transformed into positive identities through WPOE's new bilingual education. The government

presents itself as a change agent to lead the identity transformation of ethno-linguistic minority students from ethno-linguistically marginalized to bilingually confident.

B. Positioning Bilingual Education as Part of Global Education

The MGEF and the MEST divide their roles based on children's age. The MGEF (2010) initiated supportive bilingual programs for the linguistic development of young minority children. As these children got older and entered into the K-12 educational system, government-initiated bilingual education policies and programs transferred to the MEST. Based on *The Plan for Educational Advancement of Multicultural Students* (MEST, 2012), the MEST is in charge of training bilingual instructors. Those who are trained as bilingual instructors are mainly mothers of the ethno-linguistic minority students. In addition, the MEST (2012) leads the development of specific curricular and extracurricular programs within the K-12 system to enhance students' multicultural understanding as well as to improve their bilingual skills. During the process of delegating bilingual tasks, the MGEF (2010) added the word 'global' to its policy documents (Excerpt 6), and the MEST (2012) used it more frequently (Excerpt 7 and 8):

6. Activating various bilingual education programs (e.g., afterschool bilingual education programs, bilingual education classes, etc.) in order to strengthen children's global *competency* (MGEF, 2010, p. 8).
7. To make *all students* grow as a *creative global asset* who understand diversity (MEST, 2012, p. 1).
8. To help multicultural students grow as *a global asset*, the government will⋯fund 150 *schools that lead global initiatives* nationwide (MEST, 2012, p. 6).

The MEST (2012) interchangeably used 'assets' and 'global assets' with having global assets appearing more frequently. In doing so, language-as-asset was tweaked to language-as-global-asset. The specific use of 'global' in the policy documents reflects the national government's approaches to initiate bilingual education as a step to nurture future global Korean leaders in the new globalized economy. As listed in Excerpt 6, the bilingual education policies aim at creating an educational environment that

is inclusive to ethno-linguistic minorities who become bilingual subjects with global competences. To accomplish this aim, the MEST (2012) released a new policy idea to support schools serving ethno-linguistic minority students under the new name of 'schools that lead global initiatives' (Excerpt 8) instead of labeling those schools with negative meanings. The MEST (2012) initiated those schools for global leaders in which the languages of ethno-linguistic minorities are taught for all students, who are all presumed to become 'global assets' in the future. Under this ideology, a growing number of schools nationally serve significant numbers of ethno-linguistic minorities.

The MEST (2012) announced a selection of 150 schools in 2012 to nurture global leaders (Excerpt 8). According to the MEST and the National Research Foundation of Korea (MEST and NRF 2012), 22 elementary and eight secondary public schools were selected in 2012 for governmental funding to take leadership in multicultural/global initiatives. Upon application, the funding was distributed to schools with significant numbers of ethno-linguistic minority students. The MEST (2012) announced they would select more schools in upcoming years, expecting those schools to influence neighboring schools that have silenced the voices of ethno-linguistic minorities.

Similar trends are found in the regional government's policy documents:

9. To nurture *global talent* by supporting multicultural students in finding their abilities (WPOE, 2013, p. 19).

10. To nurture general students' *global competence* by supporting their learning of various languages and cultures, specifically aiming at enhancing their multicultural understanding (WPOE, 2014, p. 7).

These excerpts detail the missions of the schools that lead global initiatives, reflecting how the national government's discourses present in regional education offices. Even though the WPOE had a relative degree of autonomy and authority to develop various bilingual programs to suit the surrounding communities' specific needs, the WPOE, in principle, followed the national governments' suggestions and guidelines. Similar to the national policy texts, the WPOE (2013) treated bilingual ability as a 'global talent' and reinforced a positive image of ethno-linguistic minority students.

For policy in practice, the WPOE (2014) initiated a few bilingual programs, including after-school bilingual education classes and curricular activities during the regular class period. In addition to establishing after-school and/or extracurricular activities, the WPOE (2014) suggested a new tactic for public schools to use to develop bilingual education programs. The WPOE recommended that each school develop various educational programs to meet students' bilingual needs in the new globalized world. The WPOE (2014) hired bilingual instructors to send to 30 public schools in the province to teach Chinese, Russian, Vietnamese, Mongolian, and Japanese. Starting in 2014, the province began to host a bilingual speech competition among ethno-linguistic minority students who fluently speak both Korean and their parent's language. The competition aims at "finding multicultural students' bilingual skills at early stages to encourage them to enhance their bilingual skills" (WPOE, 2014, p. 11). The winner of the provincial competition is sent to the national bilingual speech contest that has been hosted by the MEST since 2013.

As described, the collaborations between national and regional governments were systemic, as both agencies shared values, framing, and actual practices of bilingual education policies. Repeated circulation of similar policies at both national and regional levels reinforced the perspectives of ethno-linguistic minorities as a global asset in the educational system, leaving ethno-linguistic minorities to negotiate newly emerging roles in South Korean society.

C. Promoting New Identities and Social Roles for Ethno-Linguistic Minorities

In both national and regional policy documents, metaphoric lexicons such as 'bridge', 'rainbow', and 'rainbow bridge' are used. This requires further examination into how the meanings of lexical choices are made intertextually and interdiscursively in bilingual education policy texts. Both the WPOE (2014) and the NOE (2014) used one metaphoric lexicon, 'bridge,' specifically for ethno-linguistic minorities who will lead the implementation of successful new policies. The new roles that the government granted to ethno-linguistic minorities are twofold: (a) they should be a fluent bilingual/bicultural so as to to build a positive self-identity

and to reach a sophisticated understanding of their foreign parent's culture and language, and (b) they should 'bridge' linguistic and cultural differences between people from their parent's home country and South Koreans.

Therefore, ethno-linguistic minorities bear dual, conceptually contradictory identities. Even though their bilingual skills are very limited in reality, they must perform as gifted and talented bilinguals who have the potential to contribute to the political and economic advancement of South Korea in the global market. To help ethno-linguistic minorities fulfill this mission, the WPOE (2014) released *The Global Bridge Plan*, aimed at "developing multicultural students' potential capabilities by providing them with special programs such as gifted and talented education" (p. 7). The WPOE (2014) recruited ethno-linguistic minority students who specialized in math/science, language, arts/physical education, and leadership and planned to fund their educations to raise them as gifted and talented global assets.

Similar to the metaphoric conceptualization of 'bridge' for ethno-linguistic minorities' new identity in the globalized world, the MGEF (2012) and the NOE (2014) used the term 'rainbow' to represent coexistence with diverse people. For instance;

11. To support migrants in order to help them build self-help spirit through the *Rainbow Bridge Plan* (MEGF, 2012, p. 34).

12. To support mutual exchange of cultures and arts between ethno-linguistic minority students and general Koreans through the *Rainbow Bridge Plan* (MEGF, 2012, p. 34).

13. To open the *Rainbow Schools* specifically designed to help new immigrant youths enter into higher education and apply for jobs (MEGF, 2012, p. 34).

14. Qualifications for rainbow teachers are: International marriage migrant women who have associate university degrees or above and completed the *rainbow teacher* training programs (NOE, 2014, p. 1).

In these excerpts, the lexicon 'rainbow' is used for a multicultural/multilingual identity that 'bridges' two different cultures. The Rainbow Bridge Plan was initiated to encourage cultural/linguistic exchanges between migrated bilinguals and dominant monolingual Koreans (Excerpt 11 and 12), while the Rainbow Schools are

educational programs created to support newly arrived ethno-linguistic minority students (Excerpt 13). The NOE (2014) listed the qualifications of bilingual instructors (Excerpt 14)‒women who migrated for an international marriage‒and named them 'rainbow teachers.' The national government policy texts usually used gender-neutral terms such as 'multicultural parent', 'migrants', and 'foreign parent' for the bilingual teaching pool, while the NOE (2014) specified that the majority of the instructors were well-educated migrant females. Through this governmental process, idealized images of migrant females were reproduced and transmitted in education, while giving women who migrated to Korea for marriage an opportunity to take on special roles in society as fluent bilinguals. The NOE (2014) anticipated that bilingual female migrants would respond to the new policies with improved self-esteem. It was expected that bilingual education implementation would be greatly welcomed by these women.

IV. Discussion

Both national and regional governments highlighted bilingual competencies as a desired qualification of ethno-linguistic minorities in the new globalized economy. They were frequently described as an 'asset' or 'talent' and their bilingual abilities and bicultural experiences as key attributes for competitive human resources in the globalized world (Bale, 2011; Petrovic, 2005; Ricento, 2005). Under such ideological views, the national government and many bureaucratic agencies began to systemize various social, linguistic, and educational infrastructures for ethno-linguistic minorities. Such findings allow us to understand how benevolent approaches to ethno-linguistic minorities often emerge from situations where bilingual skills are conditionally valued as both material and symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1991).

A. Language-as-Resource Framework Promoting Neoliberal Language Ideology

The language-as-resource orientation was used to

commodify bilingual skills and to convert familial, cultural, and linguistic resources into important national assets. For example, the South Korean government expected that improvements in ethno-linguistic minorities' linguistic skills would reduce various social and economic difficulties. In addition, their bilingual competency was expected to produce globally competitive individuals who can serve as bridges between South Korea and the rest of the world. Therefore, ethno-linguistic minorities are expected to convert into neoliberal tools for the nation-state's economic advancement in the globalized world.

Although multilingualism/multiculturalism are widely perceived as incompatible with nationalism, in this context, the government's neoliberal managerial efforts transformed ethno-linguistic minorities' identities into a means of promoting nationalism. Ethno-linguistically diverse students and their families in the regional government's bilingual education policy texts echoed the national government's language-as-resource orientation and conveyed their designated role of 'bridging' between their home country and South Korea. In addition, the selected policy texts presented the women who migrated to South Korea for international marriages as linguistically competent agents. They also emphasized their commitment to contribute to the prosperity of both nation-states, and reinforced language ideologies of nationalism, which are enhanced through subjectifying ethno-linguistic minorities into commodifiable resources.

B. Cultural Politics of Language-as-Resource Framework in South Korean Contexts

The national and regional governments easily obtained public consent. First, the paradigm shift from language-as-problem to language-as-asset benefited ethno-linguistic minorities. After they negotiated between language-as-problem and language-as-resource orientations during bilingual education policy planning, the South Korean government quickly shifted its focus to the language-as-resource framework in 2010-2012. This shift guided ethno-linguistic minorities (a) to feel that their linguistic and cultural resources were validated and accepted in South Korea, and (b) to believe that they received acceptance from the government in the form of Korean language and cultural support programs designed to help

them successfully integrate into Korean society.

Based on the framework of promoting bilingual skills as global assets, the national and regional governments encouraged K-12 public schools to develop bilingual programs for South Korea's economic advancement in the neoliberal global market. Bilingual education programs in the selected public schools targeted other East Asian languages whose linguistic resources might promise the enhancement of the political and economic prosperities of South Korea. The guidelines for the selected schools implied that these schools arranged bilingual classes for both ethno-linguistic minority students and dominant Korean native speakers. In addition, the analyzed policy texts also suggested monolingual adults from the neighboring communities were welcome to be a part of these bilingual programs. This would lead dominant Korean native speakers (a) to acquire better understanding of linguistic diversity in the globe, (b) to make them beneficiaries of bilingual education policy reforms as outside observers, and (c) to believe that their participation in bilingual programs would increase their competency in the new globalized economy.

C. Conclusion

Our findings regarding the two research questions exploring aspects of language ideologies in bilingual education policy documents and the cultural politics of language-as-resource framework in South Korean contexts allow for two basic conclusions. With regard to the first research question, we conclude that the South Korean government has actively promoted neoliberalism in its bilingual education policy planning. For the second research question, the national and regional governments used the rationale that the new policy would benefit students who were language majorities and language minorities, which helped the government obtain public consent on the new bilingual education policy.

It is important to recognize that the development of bilingual education for ethno-linguistic minorities in South Korea was only recently initiated and that it is still an early stage form of bi-/multilingualism with much room for improvement during the implementation process. The national and regional governments view bilingual education as an important area for improvement and are taking steps toward that end. Attempting to foster such

outcomes, researchers need to critically examine the discursive operation of bilingual education programs. Future studies in this area could employ nuanced ethnographic methodologies as well as quantitative/comparative analyses that explore (a) how ethno-linguistic minorities negotiate their identities in the bilingual classrooms and in their other social domains (for example, with mainstream students, teachers, and families, in regular classrooms, at home, in after-school language programs); (b) in what ways dominant Korean native speakers develop bi-/multilingual competences via bilingual education programs; and (c) what other locally appropriate and socially democratic approaches for bilingual education could potentially be implemented in South Korea. Such examinations will provide more nuanced and ethically responsive approaches to bilingual education.

Acknowledgement

References

Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4th ed.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (V. W. McGee, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bale, J. (2011). Tongue-tied: Imperialism and second language education in the United States. *Critical Education*, 2(8). Retrieved from http://bit.ly/2gfLzWy

Bale, J. (2014). Heritage language education and the "national interest." *Review of Research in Education*, 38(1), 166-188. doi:10.3102/0091732x13507547

Barker, C., & Galasiński, D. (2001). *Cultural studies and discourse analysis: A dialogue on discourse and identity.* London: Sage.

Bennett, T. (1998). *Culture: A reformer's science.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cho, H. (2010). In search of a supporting plan for the Korean language teaching program for the children of multicultural families [In Korean]. *Bilingual Research*, 42, 243-271.

Cho, H. (2012). A study on extending implement of Korean language education in LIIP (Korea Immigration Integration Program) [In Korean]. *Bilingual Research*, 50, 235-267.

Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Constable, N. (Ed.) (2005). *Cross-border marriages: Gender and mobility in transnational Asia.* Philadelphia, PN: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Coulmas, F. (1999). The far east. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Handbook of language and ethnic identity* (pp. 399-413). New York: Oxford University Press.

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(1), 18-37.

da Silva, E., & Heller, M. (2009). From protector to producer: The role of the state in the discursive shift from minority rights to economic development. *Language Policy*, 8(2), 95-116. doi:10.1007/s10993-009-9127-x

Davis, K. A., Bazzi, S., Cho, H., Ishida, M., & Soria, J. (2005). It's our "kuleana": A critical participatory approach to language minority education. In L. Pease-Alvarez & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), *Learning, teaching, and community: Contributions of situated and participatory approaches to educational research* (pp. 3-25). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrece Erlbaum Associates.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis.* London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research.* New York: Routledge.

Flores, N. (2014). Creating republican machines: Language governmentality in the United States. *Linguistics and Education*, 25(0), 1-11. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2013.11.001

Glaser, B. G. (1992). *Emergence vs forcing: Basics of*

grounded theory analysis. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Heller, M. (2003). Globalization, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity. J*ournal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(4), 473-492. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9841.2003.00238.x

Heller, M. (2010). Language as resource in the globalized new economy. In N. Coupland (Ed.), *The handbook of language and globalization* (pp. 347-365). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Hong, J. M. (2012). Exploratory research on multi-cultural bilingual education: Examination on the marriage migrant women's mother tongue use [in Korean]. *International Area Studies Review*, 16(3), 279-302.

Hornberger, N. H. (2005). Heritage/Community language education: US and Australian perspectives. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 8(2), 101-108.

Jung, H. (2013). South Korea's multicultural socialization and language education policy [in Korean]. *Saegugeosaenghwal*, 23(4), 73-98.

Kang, M. O. (2014). *Multicultural education in South Korea: Language, ideology, and culture in Korean language arts education.* New York: Routledge.

Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B. (2003). *Language and language-in-education planning in the Pacific Basin.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Kim, H.-S. (2014). Female marriage immigrants' divorce and 'Damunhwa Policy': Immigration- and gender-blind union of family and women policies [In Korean]. *Korean Journal of Sociology*, 48(1), 299-344.

Kim, O. S. (2012). Multicultural society and bilingual education [In Korean]. *Humanities Research*, 43, 495-525.

King, R. (2007). North and South Korea. In A. Simpson (Ed.), *Language and national identity in Asia* (pp. 200-234). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Korea Immigration Service. (2016). *2015 yearbook for immigration statistics [In Korean].* Seoul, South Korea: Korea Immigration Service, Ministry of Justice.

Kramsch, C. (2005). Post 9/11: Foreign Languages between knowledge and power. *Applied Linguistics*, 26(4), 545-567. doi:10.1093/applin/ami026

Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in language: A semiotic approach to literature and art* (L. S. Roudiez Ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Lan, P.-C. (2008). Migrant women's bodies as boundary markers: Reproductive crisis and sexual control in the ethnic frontiers of Taiwan. *Signs*, 33(4), 833-861. doi:10.1086/528876

Lee, B. H. (2002). Characteristics and prospect of the neo-liberalsim educational reform [In Korean]. *Journal of Local Education Management*, 7, 151-169.

Lee, H.-K. (2010). *History of South Korea immigration policy* [In Korean]. IOM Migration Research and Traning Centre Working Paper, (2010-7). Goyangsi, Gyeonggido, South Korea.

Lee, J., Kang, S., Kim, H., Lee, H., & Seo, Y. (2008). *Educational status of children of multicultural families: Focusing on international marriage* [In Korean]. (RR 2008-12). Seoul, Korea: Korean Educational Development Institute.

McGroarty, M. (2006). Neoliberal collusion or strategic simultaneity? On multiple rationales for language-in-education policies. *Language Policy*, 5(1), 3-13. doi:10.1007/s10993-005-5915-0

Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. (2012). The final selection of 30 schools that lead global initiatives." [Press Release]. Retrieved from http://bit.ly/1nRz3eQ

Ministry of Gender Equality and Family. (2008). *Multicultural Families Support Act.* Seoul, Korea: Ministry of Gender Equality.

Ministry of Gender Equality and Family. (2010). *The 1st basic plan for multicultural family policies (2010-2012).* Seoul, Korea: Ministry of Gender Equality.

Ministry of Gender Equality and Family. (2012). *The 2nd basic plan for multicultural family policies (2013-2017).* Seoul, Korea: Ministry of Gender Equality and Family.

Ministry of Health, Welfare, and Family Policies. (2008). *The Support Plans for Multicultural Families according to Their Life Cycles* [In Korean]. Seoul, Korea: Ministry of Health, Welfare, and Family Policies.

Ministry of Security and Public Administration. (2013). *Report on the Current Status of Foreign Residents* [In Korean]. Retrieved from http://bit.ly/1jA7WVw

Nabi City Office of Education (Ed.). (2012). *Teacher education materials for multicultural understanding.* Nabi City, South Korea: Multicultural Support Center.

Oh, Y., Jung, M., Ra, H., Park, J., & Kim, S. (2009). *Multicultural family support center operation model and development plan* [In Korean]. Seoul, South Korea: Ministry of Health, Welfare, and Family.

Paik, Y.-G. (2011). "Not quite Korean" children in "almost Korean" families: The fear of decreasing population and state multiculturalism. In J. Song (Ed.), *New millennium South Korea: Neoliberal capitalism and transnational movements* (pp. 130-141). New York:

Routledge.

Park, H. S., Rhee, C. W., Rho, Y. H., & Lee, S. G. (2012). Impact of bilingual, bicultural home environment on mother`s parenting and children's outcomes [In Korean]. *Korean Journal of Social Welfare Studies*, 43(1), 365-388.

Park, J., & Jang, E. (2008). *Comparative analysis of classroom discourse for students from the multicultural families' adaptation to school subjects* [In Korean]. Paper presented at the The Discourse and Cognitive Linguistics Society of Korea, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Seoul, Korea.

Petrovic, J. E. (2005). The conservative restoration and neoliberal defenses of bilingual education. *Language Policy*, 4(4), 395-416. doi:10.1007/s10993-005-2888-y

Piper, N. (2004). Rights of foreign workers and the politics of migration in South-East and East Asia. *International Migration*, 42(5), 71-97. doi:10.1111/j.0020-7985.2004.00302.x

Ricento, T. (2005). Problems with the 'language-as-resource' discourse in the promotion of heritage languages in the U.S.A. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9(3), 348-368. doi:10.1111/j.1360-6441.2005.00296.x

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 8(2), 15-34. doi:10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464

Ruiz, R. (2010). Reorienting language-as-resource. In J. E. Petrovic (Ed.), *International perspectives on bilingual education: Policy, practice, and controversy* (pp. 155-172). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Seo, H., & Lee, S.-e. (2007). A study on the difficulties of children from international marriage families in agricultural regions. *The Journal of Korea Open Association for Early Childhood Education*, 12(4), 25-47.

Seol, D.-H., & Kim, S. K. (2011). *Bilingual education and cultural diversity for children of international marriage couples in Korea* [In Korean]. Seoul, Korea:

Save the Children.

Seol, D.-H., Kim, Y.-T., Kim, H. M., Yoon, H. S., Lee, H.-k., Yim, K. T. Han, G.-S. (2005). *Foreign wives' life in Korea: Focusing on the policy of welfare and health* [In Korean]. Hwacheon, Gyonggi Province, South Korea: Ministry of Health and Welfare.

Statistics Korea. (2016). The number of international marriage per country 2000-2015 [In Korean]. Retrieved Aug 12, 2016, from Korea National Statistical Office http://bit.ly/2gfIHsP

Tollefson, J. W. (Ed.) (2013). *Language policies in education: Critical issues* (2 ed.). New York: Routledge.

Valdés, G. (2005). Bilingualism, heritage language learners, and SLA research: Opportunities lost or seized? *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(3), 410-426.

van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Discourse, ideology and context. *Folia Linguistica*, 35(1-2), 11-40.

Wee, L. (2011). *Language without rights*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Wooju Province Office of Education. (2013). *Multicultural education support plan*. Wooju Province, South Korea: Wooju Province Education Office.

Wooju Province Office of Education. (2014). *Global bridge plan*. Wooju Province, South Korea: Wooju Province Education Office.

Wooju Province Office of Education. (2014). *Multicultural education support plan*. Wooju Province, South Korea: Wooju Province Education Office.

Yang, W.-S., & Lu, M. C.-W. (2010). *Asian cross-border marriage migration: Demographic patterns and social issues*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Yoon, H.-w. (2009). Multicultural society and Korean language education [In Korean]. *Korean Language Education Research*, 34, 1-25.