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In recent decades, South Korean universities have been emphasizing internationalization strategies in an attempt to address the shortage of local student population, and to benefit from the explosive increase in global student migratory flows. The government has not only been a major collaborator of this internationalization, but the main driver of diversifying domestic higher education institutions. This thesis provides a policy review of the Korean Government Scholarship Program (KGSP) and examines the formation of a multinational enclave for international students as a by-product of this policy. The KGSP is a fully funded scholarship program that annually invites students from over 150 nations to enroll in undergraduate and graduate programs around South Korea. My main argument is that the current objectives and the program layout of the KGSP accelerate a segregated migrant clustering, hence, leading to the materialization of the KGSP student multinational enclave.
In my conceptual framework chapter, I introduce the theoretical debates separating out the enclave from the ghetto, and illustrate the suitability of the term enclave for KGSP student communities. Vital to the formation of these enclaves is the current administrative frame of the immigrant integration policy in South Korea, which can be seen as a mix of assimilation and multiculturalism. The operation of the KGSP is a prime example of how seemingly opposing social integration measures can be put into practice.

Two chief aims of the scholarship program are to 1) cultivate pro-Korean human capital and to 2) internationalize domestic universities. These motives align closely with the state’s attempt to promote language and cultural assimilation to international students on the one hand, but on the other, to install a multicultural façade for domestic universities. The social engineering of the KGSP design helps to advance these goals. This research outlines the obligatory language program as the starting point of the enclave and the country-based quota system as the impetus for demographic diversity.

Despite the state-enforced beginnings of the multinational KGSP enclave, students come around to see the enclave as a shared asset for all members. In appreciating their sense of solidarity, and celebrating the convergence of diverse identities, students start to adopt a communal identity by the end of the language program. The multinational enclave may lose its spatial roots after the language program, but continues to exist and evolve in mobile forms throughout the students’ academic careers.

Through the case of KGSP student enclave formation, this thesis
explores the intersection of migrant integration, segregation, multiculturalism and assimilation in state policy. Academically, I am broadening the discourse of social integration by equating student migrants, who are mostly seen as temporary sojourners, with other long-term foreign residents. In so doing, I am contributing to growing literature that does not simply assume migrant category as static, but one that is plural and continually shifting. Student migrants, their migrant decision-making process, and their verdict to settle in one place or another are all complex. State responses to global migratory flows and migrant settlement are equally multifarious. This calls for further studies that may bridge academic conversations with policy evaluations regarding student migrant integration in South Korea.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

The accelerating pace of internationalization in Asian higher education institutions is a welcome trend for universities, national governments and the growing population of student migrants across the globe. Among various stakeholders, governments are major gatekeepers that drive the overall trend of student mobility – their roles ranging from investing in promotional activities for recruitment to regulating the influx of student numbers and their duration of stay. The introduction of Asian universities as new destinations of study abroad is a notable opportunity for Asian states to establish national brand image among the international higher education community. One of the tactics that state governments employ to capture the attention of the international community is to offer financial compensation for foreign students to study in domestic universities. Following precedents such as the Fulbright Program of the U.S. or the DAAD (German Academic Exchange Service) of Germany, Asian states such as Japan and South Korea also administer government scholarship programs for international students.

In South Korea, the Korean Government Scholarship Program (KGSP) is a primary means by which, the state aids and oversees the internationalization of domestic universities. The recipients of the scholarship are main contributors to this internationalization strategy and therefore, are indispensable agents in determining the successful operation of the scholarship program. Through policy review of the
KGSP and qualitative analysis on the adaptation of KGSP scholars, this thesis explores the intersections of state agenda with student migrant adaptation amidst pressures to open up national borders and partake in the internationalization of higher education.

1.1. Research questions and purpose

This thesis examines the formation of a multinational enclave for international students as a by-product of the Korean Government Scholarship Program (KGSP), and documents its transformation process over the course of the students’ academic transitions. In this study, I refer to the clustering of international students through the KGSP as an enclave. Similar to national government scholarship schemes around the world, the KGSP is a fully funded financial package granted to high-achieving international students wishing to study in Korean universities. By lowering the financial burdens for potential student migrants, the state is able to recruit from a broader pool of international student population with no particular country-bias. Ethnic solidarity is common among international students and joining ethnic student associations is a crucial adaptation strategy for these students. Yet the creation of a multi-ethnic, multicultural community with as strong bonds as some of these single-ethnic or single-national student associations is rare, which is what makes the KGSP student multinational enclave an interesting phenomenon. The enclave’s multicultural state encompasses a diversity of nationalities, ethnicities and race, which is representative of the program’s student demographic
originating from over 150 nations.

This study contributes to gaps in both theoretical and policy dimensions. Theoretically, my case study on the KGSP supplements rising literature on new destinations of student migration. Student migration trajectory had traditionally been one-sided, from former colonies to their imperial states, developing to developed nations, and non-Western to Western countries. With reversal and diversification of major student mobility trends in the last few decades, however, research is on the rise to document different global patterns, new motivation of students and the respective political responses of individual states. By focusing on one of these up-and-coming destinations, South Korea, I am broadening the spectrum of student migration scholarship. I also apply the concept of an enclave to help visualize the unique pattern of multinational clustering among international students on the KGSP. Although the usage of the enclave framework within scholarship has been dwindling, I claim its relevancy for the case of the KGSP and affirm its contemporary pertinence. Specifically, I define the KGSP students’ multinational enclave to be a clustering of international students who congregate to retain their respective ethnic and cultural identities by forming a multi-faceted global solidarity in the face of the host country’s singular and homogenizing Korean acculturation pressures. Hence, I regard this multinational enclave as a by-product of the KGSP.

Moreover, I focus on the government scholarship of South Korea and analyze this program to provide policy implications amidst worldwide restructuring of student migration flows. My analysis
evaluates the complex dimension of migrants’ social integration by uncovering assimilative and multiculturalist aims that remain and coexist within the government scholarship program. The KGSP is a branch off the nation’s increasing multicultural agenda, but has been sidelined due to the overemphasis of marriage migrant women and multicultural families in the academe and in practice. This study ultimately attempts to expand the domestic discourse of multiculturalism by highlighting student migrants as another group of foreign residents within Korea.

In my research, I analyze the formation process of this multinational enclave by reading into the terms and conditions of the scholarship program that follows a country-based quota system and requires its recipients to undergo a year of obligatory language program. Whereas the goal of the language program is to introduce international students to Korean language and culture and facilitate their adaptation to Korea, the current layout of the program rather induces closer interaction among the international students and imitates a “mini-world” within the language institution. This imitation of the globe is made possible by the country-based quota system that designates an allotted number of international students from more than 150 nations.

Global processes of student migration materialize within national boundaries, as globalization is not universally identical, but nationally constructed (Sassen, 2003) and manifested differently along national lines. It is not possible to interpret the adaptation of international students to South Korea without considering the
characteristics of localized immigrant agenda laden in the KGSP. As such, the scholarship program provides the soil for the initial shaping of a multinational enclave, which is then detached from the KGSP, further developed and maintained by the students throughout and post language program.

Using text analysis and in-depth interviews as my main method, this thesis aims to answer the following research questions.
1) How does the Korean Government Scholarship Program become the starting point of the formation of a multinational enclave for international students?
2) How does the identity and shape of this multinational enclave evolve over the course of the students’ academic transitions?
3) How may the presence of segregated multinational enclaves lead to revised understandings of multiculturalism, assimilation and migrant adaptation for the Korean society?

My first research question delves into the state’s stance on immigrant adaptation, by exploring the objectives and regulations of the KGSP. Previous research affirms the track history of the Korean state in enforcing assimilation through an instrumentalized multiculturalism. So I explore the link between assimilation policy and the government’s enforcement of multicultural ideals through the case of the KGSP. The assimilation agenda spans across numerous governmental branches and among different migrant categories, yet in the KGSP example, the wide variety of national, ethnic and cultural demographics of students combined with their temporary migrant status calls for a specific kind
of measure on part of the state. In particular, I highlight the KGSP’s attempt to cultivate pro-Korean human resource networks for future diplomatic interests, and demonstrate students’ reactions that conclusively do not align in its entirety with this state objective.

The second question follows the trajectory of the students’ academic careers and explores the evolving character and shape of the multinational enclave. For most international KGSP scholars, their very first experience in South Korea is the required one-year Korean language program at a government assigned institution located outside of the Seoul metropolitan area. Throughout their language program, students become used to the idea of the global KGSP community and the support they receive from this multinational enclave. When the program comes to an end, however, students move out to enroll in their main degree program throughout the Korean peninsula, and the enclave loses its physical and spatial form. Rather than a disintegration of this community, however, this research shows that the KGSP students actively strengthen their communal identity and maintain these bonds throughout their degree program and beyond graduation. This second question addresses the evolution of the multinational student enclave amidst the dispersion of students who can no longer physically remain together.

I address my last research question in the conclusion chapter, where I advocate for the need to clarify and reevaluate the Korean state and society’s stance on multiculturalism and assimilation. The difficulty to arrive at a consensus on migrant adaptation issues should not hinder academic discussions and proposals for pragmatic ways forward. My
thesis is an attempt to widen the discourse of migrant integration in Korean society and devise a working condition for the situated context of South Korea's immigration policy and practice.

1.2. Population of study

My population of study, specifically chosen to address the dynamics of my research questions, is the international student migrant group who are recipients of the KGSP from the years of 2011 to 2017. The KGSP scholars include both foreign undergraduate and graduate students who are funded by the government to study in universities throughout South Korea. In accordance with the objective to foster international exchange and friendship between countries, these scholars have been invited from all over the globe totaling 8,119 students from 155 nations from the initiation of this program (Ministry of Education [MOE], 2018a). While this type of governmental funding for international students had existed from 1967, various updates were made in the last two decades. Among them, the National Institute for International Education (NIIED), the executive agency in charge of the KGSP, started to publish scholarship application guidelines with official quotas per country alongside the initiation of the Global Korea Scholarship project in 2010. Hence, to reflect the national and cultural diversity among the KGSP student population, I chose graduate KGSP students, accepted after 2010 from various regions.

The KGSP scholars are uniquely positioned among the international student population within South Korea. Whereas a typical
model of an international student studying in Korea would be a self-funded Chinese student\(^1\), the countries of origin of KGSP scholars are in general, evenly distributed throughout the world. This research sets apart the KGSP scholars from the general international student demographic, because the government scholarship program provides a distinct environment, which fosters the students’ adaptation process. While not very representative of the total international student population, the specific case of KGSP scholars, however, offers a relational understanding of how government policy may nurture multicultural and global ideals among student migrants.

Among the four major subdivisions of KGSP – graduate, undergraduate, regional university and associate degree – I focus on the graduate KGSP (KGSP-G), which draws in almost six to seven multiples of students of the other three programs combined. Rather than incorporating all types of KGSP students, I selected graduate students as my target of study because the initiation period for each program differs by season. Whereas the graduate KGSP scholars arrive in August for their language program, the rest of the accepted students arrive in February, and are streamlined into a different community. This does not fit the purpose of my study, where I focus on the formation of a multicultural enclave among students who are going through the same program. Therefore, my interviewees consist of 14 students in their Masters, 2 in Ph.D., 6 who are MA graduates, and 2 who are Ph.D.

\(^1\) Approximately 89.2% of all international students are self-funded and Chinese students make up 55.1% of all international students currently residing in South Korea. Students receiving the Korean Government Scholarship are around 2.6% (MOE, 2017).
graduates. In total, I interviewed 24 international KGSP scholars (Refer to Appendix 1)\(^2\).

Among the different characteristics of my population of study, I followed the categorization set by the KGSP and based my interviewees on their countries of origin to represent governmental efforts in diversifying student demographics. From 2010, when a national quota system first appeared in the KGSP application guidelines, the NIIED has continued to announce quotas limiting the number of accepted students per country. According to these national quotas published in the KGSP application guidelines from 2010 to 2018, 47.8% are from Asia, 19.5% from Africa, 15.7% from the Americas, 15.6% from Europe, and 1.5% from Oceania\(^3\). The relatively even distribution of KGSP students by continent stands out in comparison to the national proportion of international students’ continental origins. Asia makes up 85.0% of students' regional background, while Africa is 6.4%, the Americas 5.5%, Europe 2.7%, and Oceania 0.4% (MOE, 2017).

As the eligibility conditions for KGSP candidates require both the students and their parents to be of foreign nationality\(^4\), the KGSP students are ethnically, racially and culturally diverse. So, in order to enrich my research with various narratives from the different regions, I

---

\(^2\) The factor of sex and gender are beyond the scope of this research.

\(^3\) Percentages calculated with data adapted from the NIIED’s "KGSP Graduate Degree Application Guidelines" (2010-2014; 2015a; 2016; 2017a; 2018a). The numbers exclude Korean adoptees, scholars accepted on a research program, and other students from categories that are not connected to any particular nation.

\(^4\) Korean citizens and dual citizenship holders (of the Korean passport and another nation) are not eligible to apply. However, Overseas Koreans – ethnic Koreans without Korean citizenships – are given separate quotas. This category includes Korean adoptees, children of Korean immigrants and descendants of the Korean diaspora.
diversified my pool of interviewees by region and hence, my 24 interviewees are from 13 different countries of Asia, Africa and the Americas.

1.3. Methods

As the aim of this thesis is to examine the formative and transformative processes of a multicultural enclave among international students, I present various reasons as to why I define and categorize certain phenomenon as multiculturalism or assimilation. Hence, the main interest of this research is in extracting undertones of the KGSP objectives and corresponding students’ experiences to interpret the phenomenon of their multicultural clustering. I chose qualitative methods of textual analysis and interviews as the appropriate tools for my investigation.

For my first research method of textual analysis, I accumulated documents on the KGSP published by the government – Ministry of Education (MOE) and the NIIED as the executive agency in charge of the KGSP – and referred to them as my main sources. The “2018 MOE Major Program Budget Report” [MOE Budget Report] (MOE, 2018a) and the “Expansion Plan for the Recruitment of International Students” [Expansion Plan] (MOE, 2015a) to situate the KGSP among other global education initiatives and gather information regarding the program’s objectives, budget, and expansion plan among others. I extracted national quotas of KGSP applicants and sifted through the terms and
conditions of the program from the annual “Korean Government Scholarship Program for Graduate Degrees Application Guidelines” [KGSP Application Guidelines] (NIIED, 2010-2014; 2015a; 2016; 2017a; 2018a) reported by the NIIED. In addition, I searched through the websites of Ministry of Education (moe.go.kr), NIIED (niied.go.kr) and other government run websites such as Study in Korea (studyinkorea.go.kr), for official and promotional documents of the KGSP program.

Secondly, I conducted semi-structured, in-depth interviews with 24 interviewees (Refer to Appendix 1) that I have previously specified. On average, these interviews spanned from 1 hour to 2 hours in length and have been conducted in various places from department lounges to coffee shops, and private offices to homes. While most of these interviews were face-to-face interviews, other interviews were conducted over the phone to accommodate interviewees living in other regions or in some cases even, abroad. Almost all interviews were individually conducted, but some were conducted in a group interview format. Conducted in a similar format as the individual interviews, group interviews, nonetheless, enriched the conversational dynamic between interviewee and participants as well as sparked discussions among the participants. Group interviews allowed for a shift in power dynamics. Whereas in an individual interview the interviewer mostly directs the conversation, the group interviews allowed for participants to discuss whether they had agreed on a particular idea, asking each other questions and in turn, shifting opinions and coming to a new consensus after a debate. All these procedural moments become more
evident in a group interview, more so than in an individual interview.

I used the technique of snowball sampling in order to recruit my interviewees. The reason for choosing this method lies in the networking characteristic of KGSP scholars. Due to their unique positionality among other international students, the KGSP scholars form groups according to their year of admittance as well as the university of their language study. By reaching out to one student in a particular batch, I was able to access the international network of friends who shared the same language university, but were then separated throughout universities in Korea to continue on their main degree program. This distribution ensured an effective random sampling of interview participants who were studying in different universities.

Research ethics were prioritized throughout my research process. Prior to the interview, my participants were informed of the method and detail of the interview. They were explained their right to reject and refuse any questions that they felt uncomfortable answering as well as given the option to voice any concerns before, during and after the interview. I have assured the anonymity of my interviewees by referring to them in pseudonyms throughout my thesis, and by omitting any sensitive information that could lead to personal identification. The interview questions asked the participants to recollect their migration decision-making process, adaptation in Korea, current degree-achievement status and future plans among others.

In order to lay foundation for my field research and provide contextual supplement, I conducted a pilot study and textual research.
Before my formal interviews, I underwent pilot informational interviews to gain a basic understanding for the field. I consulted university staff members, international organization employees and government officers involved in the field of international education and student migrations to solidify a starting frame. From these informational interviews and drop-in visits, I was able to narrow my population of study to the KGSP student group and understand their specific positioning within the student migrant population in South Korea. Throughout my time in the field and after the completion of my field research, I searched to validate the interview material with newspaper articles, census data and governmental reports published on the case of student migrants in South Korea and the KGSP. I also joined a Facebook groups for prospective KGSP students, read through student-operated blogs that summarize the KGSP experience, and involved myself in Korean language courses to acquire a multi-faceted perspective in viewing the lives of these student migrants.

Having been an international student migrant myself as an undergraduate student, I am both an insider and an outsider regarding my positionality as a researcher. This allowed me to establish personal encounters that helped the interviewer-interviewee relationship to become “a way of creating both greater empathy and attempting to reduce the power differentials” (McDowell, 2010, p.162). In doing so, I am recognizing the process of interviewing, not merely as an exchange of necessary data, but as an interactive exchange that uncovers the power relations laden in the complex and contested social nature of the encounter (ibid., p. 161). According to the feedback I have received from
my interviewees after the interview, some have used the interview as an opportunity to reflect on their initial trajectory as to why they underwent the student migration process, while others have expressed frustration leading to a re-evaluation of what being a student migrant in Korea means for them. In other words, the interviewees were not merely respondents to the questions posed, but active reflectors of their own lives and active, change-making agents of the student migration phenomenon in South Korea.

1.4. Thesis outline

This thesis will unfold as follows.

Chapter 2 reviews scholarly discussions on ethnic enclaves throughout the years and the transforming nature and shape of enclaves. I present different academic works that define the varying characteristics of an enclave to provide the theoretical basis of my word choice in describing the KGSP international student community. The balance between assimilation and multicultural aims in immigrant integration has always been an essential factor in the creation of enclaves, and the case of KGSP is not an exception. The intertwining of assimilation and multiculturalism within immigrant integration policy is not a new administrative frame for the nation of South Korea. Scholars have pointed out from time to time that adaptation programs proposed for other migrants, especially in the case of marriage migrant women and their multicultural families, fall under this scheme. By providing an overview of how the Korean state has maintained this
stance throughout the years, I demonstrate that the Korean Government Scholarship Program is not an outlier, but an expansion of state adaptation policy to other migrant categories.

Chapter 3 details out the various components of the Korean Government Scholarship Program and illustrates how the operation of KGSP fills a niche in addressing both pending domestic issues and rising global student migratory flows. The KGSP attempts to facilitate diplomatic relations by building a pro-Korean sentiment among student migrants and overcome declining rates of student population within domestic universities by increasing the international student quota. Also, with a concentration of more than 150 nationalities each year, the KGSP provides an ideal environment for the organization of a multicultural enclave. I introduce the characteristics of this multinational enclave for KGSP students to provide a basis for my argument in the next chapters.

In Chapters 4 and 5, I respectively address my two research questions. Firstly, Chapter 4 analyzes the rhetoric of the objectives, terms and conditions of the KGSP and examines how the state extends its assimilation-multiculturalism agenda to the students through the government scholarship program. Namely, the KGSP proposes two objectives that influence the design of the program – cultivating pro-Korean human capital and the internationalization of domestic universities. Through these initiatives the Korean state is enforcing a compressed assimilation, where students are to adapt Korean traits within the constricted time span of the academic degree program. While the state repeatedly pronounces the objective of the KGSP and declares
the success of having produced pro-Korean networks that have become cultural ambassadors in their respective countries, the creation and segregation of a multicultural student enclave testifies that there are gaps in defining and interpreting immigration adaptation between these two groups.

Secondly, in Chapter 5, I illustrate how the above goals of KGSP are enforced through the program’s design of an obligatory language program and a country-based quota system. While the obligatory language program binds the international students in time and space within the assigned language institution for a year, the country-based quota system is what diversifies the nationalities of the student demographic within each institution. This KGSP model becomes the two pillars that lead to the development of a multinational enclave. Despite the program specific formation of the enclave, this community becomes a valuable asset for the KGSP scholars themselves and remains a supportive core throughout their study abroad experience. The students build a strong solidarity throughout their time together on the common grounds of their international identity, which allows them to explore their own global capacity and cultivate a multicultural tolerance.

Lastly, I reinstate my arguments in the conclusion, Chapter 6. The creation of a multinational enclave in not a fully intended result of the KGSP, but a by-product of their assimilation-multicultural objectives to instill a pro-Korean identity among international students and promote internationalization of domestic universities. Rather than simply fostering the development of a pro-Korean identity, the KGSP’s design has gifted foreign students with a global network, and new perspectives
on what it means to retain one's own international identity within a largely homogenous Korean society. There are policy and academic implications that can be extracted from this conclusion. Firstly, this conclusion calls for a review of the assimilation-multiculturalism agenda behind KGSP objectives. Secondly, this paper aims to contribute to academic scholarship by expanding the discussions surrounding multiculturalism in South Korea, which still considers marriage migrants and their families as the primary focus. By including international students into the composition of multicultural entities, this research intends to build an integrative perspective of different foreign migrant groups residing within South Korea.
Chapter 2. Conceptual Framework

2.1. From ghetto to enclave: Types of segregated migrant clustering

Ethnic enclaves in cities are not uncommon. The tendency of a single minority ethnic group or immigrants coming together to conserve identity and tradition within a larger society eventually takes on a spatial outcome. Enclaves, or the creation of segregated neighborhoods that markedly stand out as different from the surrounding majority society, have historically been discussed alongside social integration and assimilation. Before I explain why I chose the term enclave to refer to my case, I will first follow the development of scholarship distinguishing the enclave from the ghetto.

It is necessary to clarify terminology before I discuss the academic development of each word. Referring to the formal definitions as assembled by Marcuse (2005), I see enclave as “an area of spatial concentration in which members of a particular population group, self-defined by ethnicity or religion or otherwise, congregate as a means of protecting and enhancing their economic, social, political, and/or cultural development” (p.17). Enclave, in other words is visible and locatable spatially as segregated from the main society, and consists of a group of individuals (often visibly discernable by features such as race and ethnicity) voluntarily coming together to form a community with a specific goal. Again, referring to the same list of definitions, I take the definition of ghetto as “an area of spatial concentration used by forces
within the dominant society to separate and to limit a particular population group, defined as racial or ethnic or foreign and held to be, and treated as, inferior by the dominant society” (Marcuse as cited in Marcuse, 2005, p.17). Ghetto, as indicated above, also exists spatially isolated from main society, but rather than voluntary participation of individuals, the emphasis is on the forces of the dominant society that leads to differential treatment.

Ghettos were not always defined in this sense. Tracing the origin of ghettos from Jewish history in Europe in the book *The Ghetto*, Wirth (1956) separates out voluntary ghetto from the compulsory ghetto. Voluntary ghetto stresses the spontaneity of in-group individuals coming together to practice their traditions unhindered and free from judgment of the out-group, but Wirth also notes, as time went on, the voluntary assembly of the Jews started to become a matter of forced spatial confinement. Walls were built around Jewish congregations and legal decrees suspended and sanctioned the interaction between Jews and their Christian cohorts all around medieval Europe. Yet in Wirth’s book, the definition of ghetto remains neutral, hinging on the voice of toleration of “a cultural community that expresses a common heritage, a store of common traditions and sentiments” (Wirth, 1956, p.289). This acceptance of the ghetto as sites of cultural self-preservation and members’ self-isolation became problematic, as Wirth took the matter of segregation casually and blurred the lines between voluntary and involuntary separation (Duneier, 2016, pp.43-44).

Contemporary scholars point out the limitation of Wirth’s, and more broadly, Chicago School’s interpretation of the ghetto. Perceiving
the difference between voluntary and involuntary involvement in shaping the ethnic community is important as to discern between socially acceptable and undesirable clustering (Marcuse, 2005; Y.M. Chang, 2010). Policies always impact the spatial organization of a demographic (Rothstein, 2017) and provide the direction of social integration and settlement of its local and migrant population. So, it is difficult to delineate the extent of policy and correspondingly, the extent of spontaneity in communal efforts, within the initial creation phase of an enclave or a ghetto. Thenceforth, the standard separating voluntary from involuntary involvement, and respectively, the enclave from the ghetto, arises from the members’ autonomous desire and solidarity to upkeep community.

As an extreme form of residential gathering, ghettos limit the choice of their inhabitants and often lead to deterioration of neighborhoods (Gregory, Johnston, Pratt, Watts, & Whatmore, 2009, p.303). Ghettos are seen to threaten identity, calling for government’s sanctionary measures as the “ghetto-society-problem” (Simonsen, 2016) in political discourse (Rothstein, 2017; Johnston, Manley, & Jones, 2016; Agnew, 2010; Gilbert, 2013). Especially in the case of black ghettos within the US, rather than full integration into majority society, their segregation has become so stringent and detrimental to the welfare of the community that the extremity of ghetto is likened to an “ethnoracial prison” (Wacquant, 2001). Again, the outcast status of ghetto does not simply arise from its formative origins, but from the lack of ownership and voluntary sense of communal participation among inhabitants.
Enclaves, on the other hand, are preferable as a mode of self-segregation from host-society, where occupants are voluntarily identifying with a collective identity. In most cases, members who have a choice are more likely to have ownership and become active in cohesively maintaining the community. In this manner, literature accepts the positive role of enclaves in prospering the diversity of the urban landscape. Enclaves are seen as a prime constituent of a multicultural city, which emanates an exotic vibe, attracting potential tourists (Khan, 2015). While on the one hand, scholars refer to the residential settlement of ethnic populations as enclaves, such as ethnoburbs (Li, 1998; 2009), they are also seen as places of vibrant economic activity and ethnic entrepreneurship as the ethnic enclave economy (Wilson & Portes, 1980; Waldinger, 1993; Liu, 2017).

Other studies highlight the transnational processes surrounding and molding the enclave (J.W. Kim, 2018; Gao-Miles, 2017; H.R. Shin, 2017). J.W. Kim (2018) refers to the Manhattan Koreatown as a “transclave,” to highlight the transnational commercial activity within an ethnic enclave of a global city. Whereas Gao-Miles (2017) identifies that an enclave does not have to remain isolated, and documents various multicultural engagements, interethnic interactions and translocal and transnational mobility among subjects surrounding a Chinese enclave within an Australian suburb. In yet another study linking transnational practices to the ethnic enclave, H.R. Shin (2017) uses the example of the ethnic Korean enclave in New Malden, London to argue that enclaves are not bounded, homogeneous or static, but are in a constant state of reterritorialization. As Chen and Ross (2015)
demonstrate in their study of Chinese student enclaves in the US, ethnic enclaves are not limited to residential and economic spheres, nor to long-term migrants and citizens of ethnic minorities, but can include temporary student migrants within the frame of higher education institutions.

The common denominator of these enclaves can be understood in the idea of “an instrumentalized ethnicity” (Al-Haj, 2002), or more relevant to my argument, the instrumentalized solidarity among enclave members. Al-Haj (2002) divides ethnic formation among immigrants into reactive-oriented identity or competitive-instrumentalized identity. While reactive-oriented identity among immigrants is mainly generated by alienation from the absorbing society, competitive-instrumentalized ethnicity is the outcome of ethnic-cultural pride and pragmatic consideration. Just as ethnicity becomes the focal point for immigrant groups in the instrumentalized perspective, the practice of solidarity among members surrounding a particular identity distinguishes the voluntary enclave from an involuntary ghetto.

Due to an obligatory language program, the international KGSP students are grouped together into assigned language institutions throughout regional South Korea, and for the most part, remain segregated from the main degree program and local Korean students. Despite their multinational, multi-ethnic and cultural backgrounds, the segregation from the local majority allows KGSP students to reconsider their isolated situation and find solidarity among each other, which becomes a key condition for the development of a collective enclave identity. The “ethnic agency” or the “co-ethnic cooperation” (Y.M. Chang,
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(2010) that binds an enclave together in the case of international KGSP students is not a single ethnicity, but an international and global identity coupled with values of cosmopolitanism.

While the initial formation of this KGSP scholar grouping is a result of state engineering and stringent policy measures, the desire among students to participate in a communal global identity manifests in their continuous efforts to maintain the enclave even after the termination of the language program. From the language program where students make the initial contact, they form bonds with others from various national, ethnic, cultural backgrounds and strengthen communal ties. Within the international student enclave, members consciously distinguish their identity from the local society. From the program layout and operation, KGSP students remain segregated from mainstream Korean society, but the students themselves actively embrace their international, multinational identity and fall back on this community for help and support. Despite their single common denominator being the governmental scholarship, the multinational enclave manages to persist throughout the language program year and beyond. Their autonomous contributions to give meaning to their what may have remained as a temporal, provisional community is the reason I assert that the international KGSP student community is in fact, a multinational student enclave.

**Figure 1** below represents my model of the multinational enclave of KGSP students. The bordering circular frame represents the government program while the smaller patterned circles symbolizes international KGSP students of different nationalities, demonstrating
the diversity forged by the country-quota system. The arrows represent the connection and relations between the KGSP and students as well as among the students themselves. As the KGSP requires students to undergo an obligatory year of language program, students’ first immersion into KGSP, as well as into the South Korean society, is through these regional language institutions. Students do not have a choice in selecting language institutions, which are mostly located outside of the Seoul metropolitan area, and therefore, have limited access to established foreign-friendly spaces like Itaewon, which are concentrated around Seoul.

![Diagram showing the layout of the language program](image)

**Figure 1. Conceptual model depicting multinational enclave of KGSP students**

The layout of the language program assembles international students of different national origins into one community, and in order for the students to continue on to the main degree they have to sit in for
Korean courses throughout the school day and prepare for TOPIK, the Korean language proficiency test. The regional location – located outside of metropolitan Seoul – of the language institutions as well as the separation of living spheres of the international students from local Korean student body propel segregation. In other words, the spatio-temporal subjugation of students’ mobility and time schedule under the language program forces cross-cultural interaction among these students and not with the mainstream Korean society. While the international students are learning Korean language and culture from their courses, their life patterns remain divorced from the local Korean environment. These various elements provide the backdrop for the development of stronger solidarity among KGSP students, and therefore, a multinational enclave. The bond between the students grow solid by the end of the year so that when the language program terminates, students choose to remain tied to this enclave as the main point of interaction, even if this enclave is spatially uprooted and its members disperse throughout the nation to attend their main degree program.

I follow the development process of this enclave from the initial stages of the language program to post graduation by referencing stories of interviewees in different stages of their academic career. While the KGSP multinational enclave may not be residential or economic-based as other ethnic enclaves, the student members put in communal effort to maintain the multinational bonding that prevents the dissipation of what could have ended as a temporary community held together by the obligatory language program.
2.2. Assimilation and multiculturalism as modes of integration policy

There was a time when assimilation and full acculturation of migrants and ethnic minority into mainstream society were seen as possible. The Chicago School scholars did not doubt assimilation as the end goal for migrants and predicted the spatial diffusion of minorities, hence, the eventual end of ghettos and enclaves (Y.M. Chang, 2010). Peach (2005) points out how the Chicago School interpreted the ghetto, enclave and suburb as a three-generational progression toward assimilation. As the first stage of assimilation, inner-city ghettos were seen as the least assimilated, whereas after a few generations of acquiring host language and upward social mobility, the immigrant or minority ethnic population would disperse to surrounding suburbs and achieve assimilative status. Yet, the constant influx of new migrants and the persistence of ethnic identity in enclaves or the structural inequality in ghettos, all challenged the sweeping theory of assimilation. Instead, these conditions called for a paradigm shift of social integration, requiring alternatives to or reconceptualization of assimilation.

The main criticism of the Chicago School's traditional assimilation model is its ethno-centrism, as presuming all migrants would and could pursue cultural-ethnic homogeneity (Alba & Nee, 2003). In other words, the complete dissolution into the mainstream is one-directional and does not leave room for a positive role for the ethnic or racial group (ibid, p.5). "The focus on a 'core' culture, the emphasis on consensus-building, and the assumption of a basic
patterned sequence of adaptation" (Portes & Manning, 1986, p.47) are components of assimilation theory that need refurbishing to accommodate the evident reality of enclaves and ghettos in all parts of the globe. New concepts have sprung up to address different outcomes of migrant and ethnic minority adaptation, such as segmented assimilation (Portes & Zhou, 1993; Zhou, 1997) and new assimilation theory (Alba & Nee, 2003). Segmented assimilation observes that ethnic difference not only occurs between the majority and minority groups, but intergenerationally, and focuses on the diverging destinies of assimilation for second-generation immigrants (Zhou, 1997). New assimilation theory emphasizes assimilation into the mainstream is still a valid option and remains predominant for all migrant groups in the case of USA. Alba and Nee (2003) defines this assimilation to be ‘the decline of an ethnic distinction and its corollary cultural and social differences’ (p.10), whether the end result converges to the mainstream culture or a fusion of the prior with other socio-cultural differences. Crul (2015) mentions that these theories, are too general to be applicable in this era and that the theoretical frame is too specific to the American case.

Another strand of scholarship turns toward plurality, or multiculturalism, in minority and migrant incorporation. In neighboring Canada, multiculturalism is the official state ideology and it has advanced from a private affair – of immigrants speaking their language, cooking homeland food and shaping their community based on their original roots – to a legal right – to form communal institutions “in the
public domain within the limits prescribed by the Canadian constitution and the charter” (Qadeer, 2005, p.49). This public acceptance of multiculturalism allows different types of enclaves to flourish, and feed off each other’s diversity. With multiculturalism and diversity as an asset of the city, ethnic enclaves are newly appraised as having economic power in the cultural economy (Collins, 2018). Mitchell (2004) describes multiculturalism as a state where “diverse ways of being in the world are recognized as legitimate, and the qualities of ‘out-group’ members are not stigmatized or relegated to the private sphere, but rather reconstitute the notion of civil competence within the public sphere” (p.642). In this frame, enclaves play a clear role in shaping the diversity of society, and as the source of “active multiculturalism” enclaves can provide new cultural perspectives and bring about transformation to important social institutions (H.R. Kim & I.G. Oh, 2011, p.1574).

Assimilation and multiculturalism are not the only two models of migrant integration into society. With accelerated mobility, transnationalism seems to offer a more contemporary view in understanding migrant livelihoods. However, these two terms remain relevant still as they continue to provide the South Korean state with a theoretical frame for social integration policy of immigrants. Especially in South Korea, the current immigration regime that presents multiculturalism as its slogan, combines assimilation and nationalism (Bélanger, H.K. Lee, & Wang, 2010; J.S. Choi, 2010; J.H. Ahn, 2012), as well as maintains the undertone of a unified “Korean” national identity.
(J.H. Ahn, 2014). Therefore, within this research, I chose to focus on assimilation and multiculturalism as the two frames for analyzing policy on the integration of student migrants through the government scholarship program.

Retaining national identity and ethnic homogeneity drives the core direction of immigration policy (S.E. Ha & S.J. Jang, 2015), and debates remain on the Korean state’s stance in attempting assimilation or multiculturalism. According to the analysis of J.Y. Jung and S.G. Chung (2014) on South Korea’s multicultural family policy, multicultural and assimilative aims are equally represented. Studies need to further address the intersection of multiculturalism and assimilation within state policies of migrant integration, and this thesis attempts to do so by analyzing governmental policy for student migrants.

Multiculturalism as a term appears to be popular among various branches of the government, but the government’s interest in creating a truly multicultural dynamic among locals and foreigners in South Korea is questionable. Historically, the “multicultural” discourse appeared alongside debates on policy approaches toward the livelihoods and the type of welfare deemed appropriate for marriage migrant women. With social welfare policies for migrants predominantly focused on marriage migrant women and their families (A. Kim, 2016), the term multiculturalism within Korean state policy mostly refers to multicultural families. As the state focuses welfare policies on marriage migrant women for their reproductive contribution in an increasingly aging society (M.J. Kim, 2013), other migrant categories remain largely hidden from the fore. Among this other category, student migrants are
especially left out of the social integration discourse, mostly because of the temporality of their status. However, they still constitute a visible presence within the Korean multicultural society and undergo the same dilemma of identity positioning as other residential migrants. By addressing the student migrant population in this study, I analyze how the policy targeting international students parallel or differ from that of marriage migrant women and multicultural families and provide an overall picture of immigrant state policy as representing multicultural and assimilative aims. I note how the “concern to reproduce the next generation of human capital” (G.C. Kim & Kilkey, 2017) carries on over from marriage migration policy to the KGSP in an attempt to create pro-Korean human network and benefit national interests.

2.3. State intervention in international student recruitment

Where students go to study, is not simply decided upon by coincidence, but a good indicator of the complex political processes at play in the landscape of student migrant decision-making. As a report mentions, the “direction of travel is everything; when some countries are clamping down and others are opening up, the wider world notices” (Lawton, 2011, p.4). The direction of study abroad had been fairly consistent with the ‘Big Five’ destinations being United States, United Kingdom, Germany, France and Australia (Kell & Vogl, 2012), but recent statistical trends point to the rise of China as replacing Germany among
this top five. If the top eight destination nations were, in order, United States - United Kingdom – Germany – France – Australia – Japan – Spain - Belgium in 2001, this list was changed to United States - United Kingdom – China – Australia – France – Canada – Russia - Germany by 2017 (Institute of International Education, 2018). The inclusion of China and Russia in this list not only signifies the rise of new destinations, but also a diversification of needs and objectives that students wish to acquire through study abroad.

The 4.6 million migrant students of 2017, which has more than doubled from 2.1 million in 2001 (ibid.), are responding to a changing nature of education. Robertson (2013), in the case of Australia explains the education-migration nexus as a big merit for students who plan to remain after their studies. The education-migration nexus refers to the connection of economic migration to student migration in that students do not merely embark on international study abroad for the education, but for an opportunity to acquire legal residential status, and thus, a higher chance of employment in the host-nation. Furthermore, states are introducing similar strategies to retain an elite labor force (ibid.). This shows the continuous blurring of the separation between student migrants from economic migrants and encourages a larger population around the world to partake in mobility for higher education.

Another aspect of the changing nature in education refers to changing rhetoric from prior “destination” countries. Universities in the US, for example are introducing new requirements that encourage outward migration of domestic students (Brooks & Waters, 2011). Brooks and Waters (2011) also mention how prior sending countries of
student migrants are now “taking energetic steps to enter the market for overseas students themselves” (p.136). They acknowledge how individual nations retain substantial decision-making powers in the inflow and outflow of student migrants around the world despite intensifying globalization and neo-liberalization (p.22).

Asian governments have been very proactive (Ziguras & McBurnie, 2015) in their attempts to enter this overseas students market, leading to an explosive growth in higher education enrollment rates throughout Asia in the last 20 years (Varghese et al., 2014). “Two-way travel began when a growing number of students from the developed economies in the West went to the less developed economies for further studies, while students from Asia have diversified their destinations for overseas study” (Mok, Yu, & Wu, 2013, p.139). In an attempt to draw students, Asian nations are introducing new strategies that defy traditional higher education systems. “Twinning” programs connecting educational institutions to local government-run and private firms in Malaysia, and distance learning joint programs of Hong Kong are all part of this new trend. Joint-degree programs that allow students the freedom to study at both campuses and receive supervision are other options offered to obtainees in Singapore. This all represents a “much diversified ecology of higher education” (Mok & Yu, 2011, p.239).

South Korea is no exception in this global struggle to recruit foreign students. The initial focus of the state in implementing international student recruitment policies was to quantitatively expand the total number of incoming students, which later shifted towards improving infrastructure by supplementing policy on qualitative supervision and
management (S.H. Bae, 2015). Based on the immigration policy structure from the 3rd Basic Plan for Immigration Policy (Ministry of Justice, 2018), the state actor in charge of international student policies is the Ministry of Education (MOE) (**Figure 2**).

Owing to rigorous recruitment by the MOE, the overall numbers of foreign student migrants have dramatically increased from 2003, reaching its first climax in 2011. The numbers stagnated for a few years from 2011-2014, but reached a new high with the introduction of a new expansion plan in 2015 (**Figure 3**). From 2003 to 2017, international students enrolled in domestic higher education institutions have increased nearly ten-fold.

![Figure 2. Government branches in charge of immigration policy](Source: Ministry of Justice, 2018, p.7)
In the Expansion Plan (MOE, 2015a), the government took issue with stagnating numbers from 2011-2014, and used this period as a rationale to revamp policy and programs. Within this plan, new measures were added to increase domestic infrastructure to accommodate 200,000 students by 2023.

In the next chapter, I introduce the context of South Korea as a new destination for international student migration, and the unique positioning of the KGSP among international student support initiatives in the nation.
3.1. Overview of the Korean Government Scholarship Program

The Korean Government Scholarship Program (KGSP) invites talented international students from all over the world and funds their undergraduate and graduate studies within higher education institutions in South Korea. According to the Ministry of Education (MOE) Budget Report, the KGSP recruits around 700 graduates and 150-60 undergraduates every year from 155 nations around the world, and the it funded a total of 8,119 students between 1967 to 2017 (MOE, 2018a, p.1813).

Governmental support for international students began with the KGSP in 1967, but the number of students taking advantage of this system was minimal until the last two decades. Entering into the new millennium, global and domestic pressures to internationalize higher
education led to an increase in governmental response. Unlike prior attempts at internationalization of higher education on part of the government, the launching of the Study Korea Project in 2005 (proposed 2004) by the MOE brought about fundamental changes in implementing international cooperation at a higher level. This was followed suit by the launch of the Global Korea Scholarship (GKS) in 2010, as an attempt to improve national brand image to foreign students and scholars (Bader, 2016) and KGSP was incorporated into the broader GKS scheme. In 2015, MOE released the Expansion Plan, which includes plans to revamp the recruitment infrastructure and the quality of domestic university infrastructure, all to reach a total of 200,000 foreign students in South Korea by 2023 (MOE, 2015a).

In relation to the total number of international students within South Korea, the proportion of KGSP students appears to be minimal. As an example, among the total of 123,858 foreign students residing in South Korea in 2017, the majority, 89.2%, are self-financed students while the rate of KGSP scholars is at 2.6% (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-financed students</strong></td>
<td>84.4% (73,321)</td>
<td>85.4% (73,420)</td>
<td>86.2% (73,138)</td>
<td>86.3% (78,845)</td>
<td>87% (90,703)</td>
<td>89.2% (110,472)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KGSP students</strong></td>
<td>3.4% (2,944)</td>
<td>3.3% (2,799)</td>
<td>3.2% (2,701)</td>
<td>3.2% (2,901)</td>
<td>2.6% (2,734)</td>
<td>2.6% (3,175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate of change of KGSP students</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-145</td>
<td>-98</td>
<td>+200</td>
<td>-167</td>
<td>+441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100% (86,878)</td>
<td>100% (85,923)</td>
<td>100% (84,891)</td>
<td>100% (91,332)</td>
<td>100% (104,262)</td>
<td>100% (123,858)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Ratio of international student by categories
(Source: Data adapted and reconfigured from MOE, 2013;
Although the rate of KGSP students among the total international student population remains at around 2~3%, the significance of the KGSP lies in observing the direction of state engineering. The various objectives and design of the governmental program offers a glimpse into the state’s attitude towards migrant integration.

Figure 5 depicts the various government branches that partake in executing the KGSP. Three ministries – the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Education (MOE) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs –

---

5 Figures from 2010-2011 are not included, as the categories of international students were not separated out in statistical reports before 2012.
involve themselves with the KGSP, but the program for the most part, falls under the responsibility of MOE’s NIIED. The KGSP is the biggest initiative under the GKS, and is operated by the tri-partnership of NIIED, overseas embassies and designated domestic universities. The announcements of the government scholarship program are posted on the NIIED and Study in Korea website, but is also promoted by overseas Korean embassies, Korean cultural centers, and language institutes around the world. In the case of domestic universities, university staff and faculty are advised to direct fund-seeking students to the KGSP. Therefore, overseas Korean embassies and designated domestic universities are not only involved in the promotion of the government scholarship program, but also in the application procedure.

The KGSP application consists of two tracks and applicants must pass three selection stages in total to become the final recipient. In the first selection process, applicants either submit their applications to any Korean embassy around the world or to partnering universities in Korea. Students may either choose to apply to a Korean embassy and follow the embassy track, or apply directly to universities, following the university track.

In the embassy track, students do not apply directly to a single university, but they fill out a preference list of their top three choices among a designated list of participating universities. The embassy is in charge of screening through applicants in this first round to recommend successful candidates to NIIED for the second round of selections. For applicants of the university track who are applying to one specific university, it will be up to the respective universities to screen their pool
of applicants and recommend desired candidates to the NIIED. In the second round, the NIIED selection committee will review through the nominated embassy and university track applicants and will go through another screening process. The third selection process is for embassy track applicants who have made it past the second round. These NIIED nominees’ applications are sent to the three universities that they have previously listed for a final admission. Candidates must be accepted from at least one of their university choices. If these applicants end up receiving no admission offers from any of the three schools, they will lose out on the opportunity to receive the government scholarship.

As this comprehensive three round application process shows, the NIIED, overseas Korean embassies and domestic universities maintain close partnership in the promotion and execution of the KGSP. The tight-knit cooperation of government and higher education institutions all the more reflect the high profitability of expanding the international student pool for the national economy and upholding a global brand-image. The MOE plans to further invest in the student migration market and quantifies this interest through expansion in budget. The budget for GKS, the policy category that encompasses KGSP, underwent a 14% increase, arriving at KRW 51,941 million with 3,980 target beneficiaries. Within the GKS, KGSP is the biggest program with a budget of KRW 48,223 million, targeting around 3,200 beneficiaries (MOE, 2018a).

According to the Study in Korea webpage, individual scholarship benefits for KGSP students include airfare, tuition fees, monthly allowance, medical insurance, settlement allowance, and completion
grants. KGSP offers full coverage for its recipients and the list is as follows: living costs (800,000 won for undergraduate, 900,000 won for graduate students per semester) tuition fee (up to 5 million won per semester), Korean language training fee (800,000 won per quarter), research fees (210,000 to 240,000 won per semester), medical insurance fee (20,000 won per month), airfare (accordingly), reserve fund for entry and departure, etc. (Study in Korea, 2018).

In my thesis, I highlight two characteristic designs of the KGSP that distinguish the program and its recipients from the rest of the study abroad experience – the obligatory language program and the country-based quota system (Further described in Chapter 5). The duration of the program for an undergraduate degree is five years, three years for associate and MA degree, and four years for Ph.D. Unless given exemption, the program is constituted of an obligatory one year language program for students that they must sit through before their main degree. This language program requirement is the focus of my research, as it becomes the converging point for the variegated nationalities, leading to the formation of a multinational enclave.

The KGSP is unique in its attempt to recruit students from more than 150 nations every year. Unlike the current ratio of international students residing in Korea from different continents (Figure 6), the demographic distribution of KGSP scholars are relatively even. Even the standards of “a foreign nationality” are strictly adhered to in that both the parents of the KGSP applicant need to have foreign passports. The applicants are required to submit a document that provides evidence of the parents’ nationalities.
Along with this attempt to equally distribute KGSP scholars per continent, the KGSP seeks to diversify the quota by country, which I refer to as the country-based quota system. While the quotas shift around per year\(^6\), the demographic pool of KGSP scholars is more or less evenly distributed, averaging 4.05 slots per nation in the years of 2010 to 2018 (Refer to Appendix 3 for an exemplary table of quotas per nation from the 2018 Application Guidelines). Whereas China possesses a bigger quota than any other individual nation, the quota is not large enough to make a significant difference in the diversity of the nationalities within the program. In other words, the diversity of the 150+ nations is more characteristic than the single concentration quota of China. This relatively even distribution of nationalities leads to multinational representation among the KGSP student demographic –

\(^6\) The annual change in quota reflects diplomatic measures: “Diversification of recruitment areas for foreign students such as ASEAN and Africa, where Hallyu is fueling interest in Korea, and CIS regions, where many overseas Koreans reside” and “Proactive efforts to recruit students on government sponsorship from countries with special relations to Korea through presidential overseas trips and high-level meetings” (Ministry of Education, 2015a).
an important premise promoting intercultural diversity within the proposed KGSP student enclave.

With increasing number of graduates and their successful return homeland, the KGSP is gaining more publicity, boosting the competition rates annually. The competition rates for top 10 nations were revealed in a 2016 evaluation report published by the Ministry of Education. The reported competition rates for the embassy track was 31:1 for the Philippines, 48:1 for Indonesia and the highest, Mongolia was at 51:1. The competition rates for the university track was relatively lower, but even so, their average competitive rates for country were around 8:1 for Pakistan and Indonesia, and 11:1 for Bangladesh. Among this same top ten list, countries other than from the Asian region were included, notably Rwanda (21:1) and Turkey (20:1) from the embassy track and Cameroon (7:1) and Russia (5:1) from the university track (MOE, 2016a).

As demonstrated throughout the section, the Korean Government Scholarship Program maintains a unique position among other national initiatives targeting international students. Research of the KGSP is timely, as the influence and popularity of the KGSP is growing by the year, and the state continues to actively invest in internationalization of the domestic higher education sector.

Especially in policy and practice of the KGSP, some degree of acculturation alongside plurality is inevitable. I focus on language as a major indicator of assimilation (Portes, Fernández-Kelly, & Haller, 2005; Alba & Nee, 2003). On the one hand, the obligatory language program of the KGSP that requires international students to obtain a conversational
level of Korean falls under the criterion of language assimilation. On the other, the country-quota system of the KGSP that diversifies the student body and broadens multinational representation within the language institutions imitates a multicultural agenda. Explicit policies directly influence the living patterns and spatial distribution of migrant settlement (Rothstein, 2017) and in the KGSP case, the fusion of assimilation and multiculturalism objectives lead to the formation of a multinational enclave.

In the next chapter, I explore how assimilative and multicultural aims become the underlying pillars in the shaping of a multinational enclave.
Chapter 4. Intersection of Assimilation and Multiculturalism within the Scholarship Program

Aims

"To build human capital that can benefit national interest through discovery and cultivation of outstanding foreign talent..."
(Ministry of Education, 2018a, p.1818; italics added)

Benefiting national interest is an important criterion of the Global Korea Scholarship (GKS) objective. The Korean Government Scholarship Program (KGSP), operated under the GKS, runs on an allotted budget from the Ministry of Education (MOE) and represents interests of the state. As laws and state agenda reflect the corresponding attitude of social distance and group-consciousness (Wirth, 1956, p.8), it is important to understand how “national interests” underlying the KGSP gives rise to assimilative and multicultural program design. From the policy end, I draw from the “MOE 2018 Major Program Budget Report” (Budget Report) and the “Expansion Plan for the Recruitment of International Students” (Expansion Plan) to analyze what national agenda underlies the structure of the KGSP and spurs on the development of a multinational enclave among KGSP scholars.

A closer look from the perspective of policy implementation discloses two major goals of the KGSP. One is to build a pro-Korean human resource network, namely training foreign students as human capital representing Korean interests in their respective nations and the
broader international community. The other is to develop domestic higher education institutions, especially regional universities, and bolster their global standards and infrastructure. These objectives become the grounds that lead to the blueprint of two main pillars constituting KGSP, which I identify as country-based quota system and obligatory language program – essential preconditions of a multinational enclave.

4.1. Cultivating pro-Korean human capital

Variations of the phrase “pro-Korean human capital” (MOE, 2015a; 2018a) appear in objective statements and project description throughout policy reports of the KGSP. Within the Budget Report, the KGSP purpose statement includes the aim “to establish a global HR network that is favorable to Korea” (MOE, 2018a, p.1798). Not only is the national scholarship program seen as a tool “to enhance...national brand value in the international scholarship market” (ibid, p.1803), but also to fulfill a public diplomacy purpose in “enhanc[ing] friendship among countries and strengthen mutual cooperation by promoting education exchanges through international agreements” (p.1819).

In other words, the international outreach that the state tries to achieve through the KGSP is an exercise of soft power diplomacy (Rasch, 2016; Bader, 2016). The state is identifying international students as potential pro-Korean human capital and global human network that can take back a positive perception of Korea and enhance national brand
image to the rest of the world. In order to secure diplomatic success, the state specifies standards for international students who may bear the title and properly carry out the role of cultural ambassador. From the very start of the KGSP application phase, the state conducts a screening process, inviting “talented international students” whose value lies in their potential to become “future global leaders” (NIIED, 2018b).

The KGSP Application Guidelines (NIIED, 2010-2014; 2015a; 2016; 2017a; 2018a) offer clues into how the state deciphers talent. One of the most important qualifications for an applicant, as written in the eligibility section of the guidelines, is grade point average (GPA). There have been slight changes regarding the exact details of the guideline over the years, but the most recent version states:

An applicant must maintain the overall grade point average (CGPA) equivalent to or higher than any ONE of the followings:
- 2.64 on a 4.0 scale; 2.80 on a 4.3 scale; 2.91 on a 4.5 scale; 3.23 on a 5.0 scale; or
- Score percentile: 80% or above (Exception: A former or current KGSP scholar must hold the grade of 90% or above) (NIIED, 2018a)

The GPA requirement became more rigid over the years; whereas this GPA standard started out as a suggestion in 2010 (NIIED, 2010), it quickly became compulsory by 2011 (NIIED, 2011), and in 2012, the NIIED solidified the finality of GPA as an essential criteria by adding on the condition, “If an applicant does not satisfy the above GPA criteria, he/she will be disqualified from applying to this program” (NIIED, 2012). As such, GPA is a key factor that defines the quality of students, and makes up an important component of the talent that the state is
looking for in its applicants. When asked if students had prepared for the scholarship in any way, Minh (9) responded,

“So you have to have like volunteer certificate and language certificate. GPA also. Koreans really care about GPA. They do care about that a lot...I remember there was one girl, her GPA was not good and they [the program interviewers] asked why your GPA is so low?”

Minh (Interviewee 9. See Appendix 1.)

GPA is an absolute category that qualifies the applicant for KGSP, but as Minh points out, students’ capability to receive high GPA in academics, speak several languages and provide public service by volunteering, all strengthen students’ applications. From 2011, the application guidelines explicitly express how applicants with Korean and English proficiency are given preference (NIIED, 2011). Therefore, the state is attempting to maximize the objective of national branding by drawing upon prior resources international students already possess. The cultivation of elite pro-Korean human capital in practice can be read as, tapping into international students’ pre-formed individual capability and adding on a pro-Korean perception.

Along these lines, examples of ideal KGSP graduates are those who return to their relative countries, take on important positions and become prominent members of society. The Annual Plan introduces two success cases in its program evaluation section (Figure 7 and Figure 8).

Figure 7 below presents the case of Laotian KGSP alumni who were invited to the Korean embassy in Laos and were featured in the local newspaper, the Vientian Times. This media coverage, stated in the description, “created an opportunity to publicize study abroad in Korea”,
and “contributed to the promotion of bilateral relations”.

Figure 7. Successful case of national branding through Laos KGSP graduates
(Source: Ministry of Education, 2018a, p.1813)

Figure 8 introduces the feat of an alumna, a Korean professor in a Thai national university, who is promoting the usage of Korean throughout
Thailand. Along with a snapshot of her interview by the Korean newspaper *Joongang Daily*, a summary of her contributions is provided on the right-hand side. According to this description, after returning to Thailand in 2001, she opened a Korean language major in her university and graduated 300 Korean language majors. She contributed to the adoption of Korean as a second foreign language subject in Thai university entrance exams from 2018 and authored the first Korean textbook and grammar book in Thai.

These examples are illustrative of how the KGSP expects international students to play the role of pro-Korean human capital. The objective of the KGSP to “promot[e] international exchange in education, as well as mutual friendship amongst the participating countries” (NIIED, 2010-2014; 2015a; 2016;2017a; 2018a) is in fact, tied to the promotion of study abroad in Korea and the advancement of the Korean language and culture within native countries of the KGSP scholars. Therefore, the international students’ acquirement of Korean language and culture is essential for the state to achieve its national branding, which results in strong enforcement of assimilative aims through the obligatory language program. By setting up a language minimum for students to pass in order to receive scholarship benefits, the state is in effect, enforcing language assimilation to KGSP scholars. As international students are temporary migrants, their mode of Korean language and cultural assimilation must take place within the span of their academic degree in South Korea. The limited time frame of transferring Korean traits to international students for them to take on a pro-Korean identity leads to compressed assimilation. In order to
effectively enroot a sense of Korean-ness in the international students so that they may return to their homelands and disseminate Korean culture, the KGSP prioritizes the obligatory language year program where students sit through intensive language and acculturation courses.

Neither are graduates who choose to remain in South Korea completely free from carrying out the role as pro-Korean human capital. Their contribution has two dimensions – to fulfill the state’s education official development assistance (ODA) aim and to supply the domestic economy with additional workforce. Firstly, the idea of development through education is clarified within one of the KGSP objective statements as "contributing to national development in developing countries" (Ministry of Education, 2018a, p.1798). More specifically, the Global Korea Scholarship (GKS) indicates education ODA as “foreign aid that employs software aid elements to educate HR from developing countries on the basis of Korea’s higher education competitiveness and comparative advantage” (ibid, p.1803). The perspective of education ODA neither stops at training international students from developing countries with necessary skills to bring about improvement in their respective home countries, nor at facilitating knowledge circulation. There is a national interest component to education ODA in that, “unlike other ODA initiatives, most of the supporting fund gets consumed domestically, which will activate the domestic economy” (ibid). In short, the flow of logic here is that the government investment of KGSP students from developing nations, will in turn be returned to the domestic economy as the students will remain and spend within the
Another way that international KGSP students benefit the national economy is through the labor that they can provide by becoming employees of domestic firms and organizations. Statistics Korea reports that the working age population will continuously decrease after reaching the peak of 37.63 million people in 2016 (ibid.). This means that foreign labor, especially talented international students familiar with Korean language and culture, is invaluable in filling the gap of local labor force, amidst the constant decline of the working age population. The government envisions the connection between foreign elite labor and the revitalization of small-medium enterprises of South Korea expressing that it will lay foundational conditions for “small-medium enterprises to easily utilize foreign outstanding talent” (A summary of the opening statement of 2017 Ministers’ Meeting on Economic Relations. MOE, 2018a, p.1796). As such, the urgent need to address growing labor deficit leads to added efforts by the government to bring in more international students and foreign talent.

4.2. Internationalization of domestic universities

If cultivating pro-Korean human capital is one major stream of how the KGSP can benefit national interest, the other is achieving internationalization of domestic universities. Within the Expansion Plan, the task of internationalizing higher education institutions is evoked alongside the task to enhance national and university competitiveness (MOE, 2015a, p.2). Here, the standard of
competitiveness is based on domestic HEIs performance in the world university rankings. Nations do not have much choice but to enter into a new era of globalized higher education with annual publication of the world university rankings driving competition between universities (Jöns & Hoyler, 2013), which exceeds the efforts of individual universities and calls upon support at the national scale. University rankings came up often within interviews, such as in the case of Nicole (Interviewee 6) who googled “top rank universities” to decide where she wanted to enroll. For Daniela (Interviewee 11), her decision to study in South Korea came after she realized that “in Korea there were some world-wide high ranking universities,” which would secure “more opportunities in the future.”

Just as the interviewees demonstrate, South Korea faces the pressure to respond not only to international demands of the ever-fluctuating higher education market but also meet the needs of potential foreign student applicants by maintaining world-class HEIs. The Expansion Plan acknowledges such global pressures and mentions that, “Despite the quantitative growth and development of overall tertiary education, our university’s competitiveness is relatively low, especially in the internationalization sector” (MOE, 2015a, p.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Ranking</th>
<th>SNU</th>
<th>KAIST</th>
<th>POSTECH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization Index* Ranking</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Proportion of foreign faculty, foreign students, international joint research paper presentations

**Table 2. Times World University Rankings 2014 – 2015**
(Source: Translated from Ministry of Education, 2015a, p. 2)
As indicated in Table 2, the proportion of foreign students makes up an important criterion of the internationalization index. So, one of the easiest ways to raise the internationalization index in the short run is to bring in international faculty and students to domestic universities. Securing international representation by diversifying the faculty and student body is not only beneficial for world rankings, but also visibly apparent, with new multiethnic and multiracial additions to the campus landscape. Out of all the elements of diversity such as race, ethnicity and culture, nationality is the easiest to enumerate and therefore, most quantifiable. To have a larger variation in nationalities of the student population translates to achievement of higher numbers in the internationalization index and world university rankings.

It is no surprise that the KGSP operates a country-based quota system to recruit a wide range of multinationals. R. Moon (2016) demonstrates how “Korean universities pro-actively recruit foreign students, yet reject ideas of inclusion and diversity” (p.92), and refers to this effort as “internationalization without cultural diversity.” Despite the missing component of cultural diversity from internationalization efforts by universities and the state at large, the state is still inducing multi-nationalism, if not partial multiculturalism in the substantive sense. Here, visible multiculturalism occurs through the KGSP as the state brings in foreign bodies of different ethnicities and races (also observable factors of diversity) to populate domestic campuses, prompting an overall mixture of locals and foreigners. Although intercultural interactions may largely be absent on the micro-scale, the
spatial coexistence of multinational individuals with locals illustrates the visual results of policy multiculturalism. Therefore, the country-based quota system indicates a multicultural aim of the KGSP that is meshed together with the assimilative aim to necessitate students’ absorption of Korean language and cultural through the obligatory language program.

The supply of international foreign students is especially important for the survival of regional universities. As with the working age population, declining birth rates for the South Korean nation is eating away at the student population. With rapid decrease of students enrolling into higher education institutions, universities – especially ones located outside of the Seoul metropolitan area – are developing survival tactics to maintain the revenue flows and evade large restructuring process or worse, eventual closure. The KGSP is closely in tune with this national need and operates a specialized regional university track that officially assigns a portion of the KGSP applicants to enroll in regional universities. Started in 2015, 50 graduate positions were allotted to the regional university track among a total of 820 graduate applicants from the KGSP (MOE, 2015a, p.11). The MOE plans to expand the regional track quota over the years. For the government, the KGSP offers an efficient route of financially supporting regional universities, while centrally evaluating their performance. Rather than providing direct monetary support to be used at the disposal of individual institutions, funding through KGSP allows the government to cover revenue all the while monitoring the direction of institutional development.
The government manages a list of partner universities that are certified through the International Education Quality Assurance System (IEQAS) and students applying for the KGSP may only enroll in these partner schools. For regional universities, receiving the IEQAS accreditation is highly beneficial as this IEQAS status allows institutions to become hosts of the obligatory language program. The obligatory language program is a big survival strategy for regional universities, which meets both assimilative aim of enforcing Korean language and multicultural aim of providing internationalization to homogenously skewed campus environment. Therefore, the country-based quota and obligatory language program both fulfill assimilative and multicultural aspirations of the KGSP and become the premise of the by-product of multinational enclave.
Chapter 5. Formation of Multinational Enclave as a By-Product

5.1. Obligatory language program as starting point of enclave

The first condition that leads to a unique composition of multinationals in one space, is the Korean Government Scholarship Program’s obligatory language year. A major requirement for KGSP scholars is to acquire a level of intermediate proficiency in the Korean language before starting their official degree course. To be exempt from the yearlong Korean language course, one needs to pass Level 5 or higher in TOPIK (Test of Proficiency in Korean) prior to entry into Korea. The linguistic competency of TOPIK Level 5 corresponds to advanced mastery, and requires fluency close to that of a native speaker7. In other words, excluding a very low percentage of students who have studied Korean extensively prior to their acceptance into the program, majority of the students end up in language institutions for the first year of their academic career in South Korea.

Even for interviewees with prior exposure to Korean language and culture through local Korean embassies and cultural centers or through majoring in Korean Studies, only Liwei (Interviewee 19) and Ahn (Interviewee 20) were exempted from the language requirement.

---

7 A Level 5 TOPIK holder commands: 1) high fluency in using the Korean language in professional research or work, 2) understands and discusses less familiar topics in politics, economics and other fields, 3) uses appropriate expressions, distinguishing formal and informal, written and spoken, by context (TOPIK, 2018).
Ahn had graduated with a Korean studies major and Liwei had spent a semester studying abroad in a Korean university during undergraduate years. Others, especially interviewees from Africa (Interviewees 1, 10, 17, 22), mentioned how they never imagined Korea as their study abroad destination and came only because they were accepted. For many, Korea was not their first choice study abroad destination, but because other options fell through, they ended up looking for any scholarship to fund their study abroad. Yanelle (10) emphasizes how relatively simple the process of applying for the KGSP was, compared to other scholarships she applied for in America, Canada and Germany. She and her friend, who applied for the same university track, found out about the scholarship three days before the deadline and applied for it. Christian (17) confesses a similar story, where he gathered his documents within a week and sent it off through express mail after finding out about KGSP last minute. For Farah (12), she also took the relevant documents from other scholarship applications, and only needed a few more hours to alter the information to fill in the application form for KGSP. Among all the other countries that interviewees applied for, KGSP announced its scholarship decision the earliest, which was the reason why Yanelle (10), James (1), Joshua (21) and Christian (17) ultimately chose Korea. Even though Christian (17) had a prior academic relation with an Indian professor, who recommended him to apply for the Indian national scholarship program, the acceptance into the KGSP gave him a sense of security. The uncertainty of scholarship and admission prospects for other study abroad programs drive students to settle with the first chance that they
come across, which in this case happened to be the KGSP.

Hani (24) had initially applied to four other countries, but mentioned how difficult it was to get a scholarship in Europe. She made up her mind to go to the first place that guaranteed a full scholarship, which happened to be Korea. As Fatima notes (16), the KGSP’s financial package opens up new opportunities for foreign students who would never have thought of Korea as an option before. The economic merit is enough to pull in students who were first introduced to Korea through the KGSP on Google Search. Unlike the majority of self-financed international students who arrive from nearby East and Southeast Asian countries such as China and Vietnam, these financially motivated students who accept the KGSP are largely unfamiliar with South Korea. In the case of Rabia (7) who is from Eurasia, the foreignness of South Korea became the selling point in comparison to Germany, a country that she can apparently visit any time because of the geographic proximity.

I was planning to go to some European country like France or Switzerland... if I go to those countries I need to learn the new language... KGSP provides one year for language and the other scholarship, you have no time to learn the language.

Van (Interviewee 13)

Van makes an interesting connection on the role of the language program in recruiting students. Although Van and many other international students start off at the same point – without much knowledge of or exposure to the Korean society and culture – they see
the language program as a distinguishing merit of the KGSP, allowing them to gradually immerse into a new culture and language. The language program is the element that negotiates what would have been an “out of reach” destination, to one that is attemptable.

Either way, other than the exempt students who enroll straight into their main degree program, the rest of the KGSP students are assigned to one of the 10 language institutions located throughout the country. The NIIED is the executive agency responsible for the assignment of students’ language institutions. To accomplish the policy task of revitalizing regional universities, KGSP scholars are sent to language institutions included within these regional universities, mainly located outside of metropolitan Seoul. While NIIED does not reveal the specifics of language institution assignment, the guidebook states:

All KGSP scholars are assigned to a language institution located in a different city from where their degree university is. This is to provide the scholars with opportunities to experience different local cultures around Korea and to ensure the focused and intensive Korean language learning. (NIIED, 2017b, p.38)

This condition means that most KGSP students will be located in a provincial area outside of Seoul for their language institution, as majority students enroll in universities at Seoul for their main degree. Not only universities, but also with most foreign-friendly infrastructure concentrated around metropolitan Seoul, international students may miss out on the opportunity to establish social networks around ethnic
establishments and foreign neighborhoods that are representative of their culture.

We were isolated, the downtown was 20 minutes by bus. We just spoke Korean with other international students so when I move to the university sometimes what I said in Korean did not have much sense or sounds weird. I think that there should be more opportunities to interact and get involved with Korean citizens.

Daniela (Interviewee 11)

Daniela hints at the double spatial isolation of international students from the urban mainstream of South Korea. Foreign KGSP students in language programs are not only positioned outside of metropolitan Seoul, but also away from local downtown areas, as most regional campuses maintain distance from the center of town and are located in suburban and rural settings. While the regional university is within a Korean setting, with local Korean students, faculty and staff, the international students lack the Korean skills to interact with locals. This language barrier can be applied to local Koreans as well, who find it difficult to speak English. The double spatial isolation coupled with the language barrier, in fact creates triple layers of segregation for Daniela and other international students to integrate into mainstream South Korean society.

The living conditions of international students during the language program reinforce the segregation. While living conditions may vary from one university to another, in most cases, international students are assigned to separate dormitories from the locals. Maryam
Interviewee 8) and Minh (Interviewee 9) recall living with foreigners throughout the language year.

We had like one dorm, which is just for foreigners (only foreigners) and going to university, the class is only for foreigners. So it’s like I was living with foreigners. For a whole year...international country.

Maryam (Interviewee 8)

So in every language school there will be like 70 students. Those 70 students hang out together. Living in the same dorm, going to the same school, doing the same routine everyday.

Minh (Interviewee 9)

As Maryam mentions, during the language year, her main conversational partners were foreigners and her main sphere of living was the international dorm. Minh’s livelihood pattern of “living in the same dorm, going to the same school, doing the same routine everyday” further draws the boundary between in-group and out-group members, but eventually brings in-group members closer together. The KGSP students spend most of their time together, as the language program requires students to attend intensive Korean courses from Monday to Friday for 5 to 6 hours. Afterwards, they are given assignments, essays and exams throughout the semester. Depending on the language acquisition skill of the concerning student, the daily schedule can extend beyond language program hours. Therefore, the language program restricts KGSP students’ spatio-temporal mobility and binds their activity sphere to the language program, so that the students are
not free to interact beyond the language institution.

The KGSP restrictions also fuel the isolation of international students. Acquiring the Korean language and immersing oneself in the Korean culture is the utmost requirement of the KGSP scholars. The aim of this language assimilation is prioritized to the degree that restrictive measures are put in place to minimize cross-border mobility of students.

**Temporary Departure during Language Program**
- NIIED does not permit the temporary departure for KGSP scholars in the Korean language program.
- However, the scholars in the language program might request an approval for a temporary departure to the language institution only in the following cases:
  - Temporary departure not exceeding 4 weeks during vacation; or
  - Case of emergency such as the passing of a family member or serious health concerns: A scholar may leave Korea during the school semester for a period of no more than 2 weeks. Upon returning to Korea, evidential documents must be submitted to the language institution.
- Attention! The monthly allowance for the period of departure during the language program (including vacation), will not be provided at all circumstances. (NIIED, 2017b)

According to the temporary departure rule of KGSP scholars during the language program, NIIED controls the arrival and departure of the international students and requires students to report their travel plans within 3 days of re-entry. There are limitations to not only the number of times that students are allowed to leave Korea and come back, but
also a set duration that they cannot infringe. With these stringent restrictive measures in place, students are left with no choice but to remain within the nation if they are to receive monthly allowance. In other words, the objective that the language program is trying to achieve is to assimilate students with the Korean language and cultivate pro-Korean human capital in the fastest way possible.

This strict segregation from mainstream society as well as authoritative assimilation leads to clustering among international students, which becomes the beginnings of a multinational enclave. However, as in the definition of an enclave, this is not enough to have a spatial clustering due to segregation. A sense of solidarity and shared identity needs to be present to bind the enclave together.

One aspect that commonly binds the KGSP students’ experiences within the language program is the TOPIK exam. Unlike Maryam and Minh above, some other interviewees had a Korean roommate and were involved in a Korean buddy program. Despite their opportunity to forge meaningful relations with locals, many interviewees mention how they and many other friends stress out over the TOPIK Level 3 requirement. The KGSP regulation states that in order for students to move onto the main degree, they have to pass Level 3 of the TOPIK exam. If the KGSP recipient fails to obtain Level 3, they are first given a 6-month extension to fulfill this requirement. Failure to achieve this requirement after completion of the language course results in a penalty of temporary suspension and cancellation of scholarship. Written among the various reasons that result in the cancellation of scholarship are:
- Reception of three (3) or more warnings for missing the language classes without prior approval;
- Reception of three (3) or more warnings for the departure without approval or the failure to return as scheduled;
- Failure to attain level three (3) on the TOPIK after completing the one-year Korean language program (NIIED, 2017b)

The cancellation of scholarship is difficult to swallow when one has come so far to study. The fear that they would not be able to even begin their main degree is magnified through their language year. Due to some visa problems, Yanelle (10) arrived later than the assigned date and ended up meeting students who were being sent back to their countries for failing to pass the language exam.

So when we just came, that day, some people did not have Level 3, so they took them back to the airport, to go to their country. Oh my god that was so scary. I was crying, if I don’t study language, I have to go back! They actually sent them back. I think 3 of them.

Yanelle (Interviewee 10)

This instilled in her a sense of fear that she could as well be in their shoes if she didn’t pass the language exam. Expressing how the language program was the biggest challenge she faced in her academic career, she put in all her effort to make sure she was not sent back because of the TOPIK requirement. On top of the required hours for language program, which for others ended at around 4 pm, her instructor made her remain behind until 7 pm. In her words, she “went
from school to room, room to school...For the first six months, I wasn’t interacting with anybody. I was so wounded and angry.” Yanelle expresses how her daily mobility was restricted to the language institution, dormitory and cafeteria, which represent the limitations to her spatial boundaries imposed by the psychological pressure that the language requirement emits.

In conversation with her Korean language teacher, Daisy (3) received the impression that due to the financial support she was receiving from the government, she had to do what they expect of her. She was told, “You are getting paid to be here, so you better pass the test...you have learn Korean.” Daisy’s assimilation to Korean language and culture is a trade off, in the case of the Korean language teacher, for her “taxes [that] are paying you basically.” Whether it is simply the rhetoric of an individual KGSP staff member or the general tone reinforced by the KGSP, the program’s curriculum more or less reflects this assimilative goal of producing “pro-Korean” global human capital.

Especially if you are KGSP, you hear from a lot of people...you have to adapt to Korean culture...you have to learn Korean language...Whether or not that’s correct... as time passes by, [you] feel a bit more, aware of your own culture. You have more pride in it than when you were in your own country.

Daisy (Interviewee 3)

For Daisy, the constant emphasis to learn Korean from not only the KGSP language program, but also from her frustration in interacting with the Korean society at large opened her up to a revitalized sense of her own culture. The KGSP language program had not given her the
freedom to explore her identity in relation to the host society, but rather a one-way enforcement of what the program defined as Korean language and culture. Daisy’s method of dealing with the persistence of KGSP’s assimilative aims had been to find ways to express herself and her identity distinct from that being enforced on her.

Like Daisy, many international students start off the program expecting to be surrounded by Korean friends, immersed in the local experience through the KGSP. However, the pending reality of the TOPIK Level 3 requirement and intensive language courses end up confining foreign students to the schedule and location of the language program, segregating their daily spheres from that of the local Korean students. This spatial, cultural division between foreign and local students outward, in turn lead to a heightened interaction among foreign students, inward. Their close ties eventually lead to the formation of a KGSP student enclave, which becomes a community where members can get away from these pressures to localize and become more Korean, and rather, retain their identities all the while respecting that of others.
5.2. Country-based quota system or demographic diversity

If the KGSP’s obligatory language program creates a segregated spatio-temporal condition that shapes the exterior of the foreign students’ enclave, the country-based quota system produces the inner substance of national diversity within this enclave. As briefly outlined in Chapter 3, the country-based quota system allocates a set limit to the number of KGSP recipients by country per year. Since 2010, the Study in Korea website has been annually publishing an updated quota within the application guidelines. The guidelines state that, “the quota allocation is decided based on the mutual agreements on cultural and education cooperation between Korea and the countries listed” (NIIED, 2018a, p.2). This means that the quota systems vary from year to year, reflecting changes in the landscape of national diplomacy. Due to the changing nature, it is difficult to average and predict statistical trend of this quota, but generally, the recipient quota per country ranges from 1 to 28 students and the demographic pool of KGSP remains more or less equally distributed among an average of 150 nationalities (See Appendix 3 for example).

It appears as if the country-based quota system attempts to model the ideals of multiculturalism and the coexistence of variegated diversity, at least in the national sense. The first characteristic of this system is that NIIED artificially designates the quota so that not one nation maintains particular dominance over others. As shown in Appendix 3, even the two highest quotas that are China and America, at
28 and 16 slots respectively, are very small considering that out of the total 450 quotas, this is in percentage wise, 6.2% and 3.6%. The rest of the quotas are quite evenly distributed among the 144 nations that are additionally on this list. The quota system, in other words, ensures a multinational distribution of the KGSP population, and limits the concentration of a single ethnic minority. This representational diversity is the easiest type of diversity to control for and imitate by the state as it is quantifiable.

After the first stage of multinational assortment through the application process, the NIIED repeats the same pattern of assigning students to language institutions along country lines. This double-layered process of mixing students of different nationalities ensures a high rate of representational diversity within each language program. Until 2011, the language programs for KGSP scholars took place at the same university as their major degree. NIIED first started to designate specific language institutions in 2012 and from then on, has continued to assign students to each of these places by their continental origins. In the case of the 2017 language program assignment, there are no more than three students of the same nationality within each language institution.

The percentage of diversity per institution, as calculated below in Table 3, shows very high rates of mixture. In the case of Busan University of Foreign Studies, the percentage of mixture of multinational students is at 91% with 41 different nationalities among 45 students. Even the lowest rate of Inha University at 68% has a relatively high diversity rate with 30 nationalities represented in 44
students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Institutions</th>
<th>Total # of Students</th>
<th>Total # of Different Nationalities</th>
<th>Percentage of Diversity*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Busan Uni of Foreign Studies</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dongseo Uni</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Pai Chai Uni</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Sunmoon Uni</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Chonnam Nat Uni</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Chungnam Nat Uni</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Inha Uni</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Konyang Uni</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Daegu Uni</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Chosun Uni</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempted</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>573</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Diversity calculated by dividing “Total # of Different Nationalities” with “Total # of Students”

**Table 3. Language institution assignment of 2017 KGSP recipients**
(Source: Reconfigured from NIIED, 2017c)

Regarding a published notice by the NIIED, the design of language institute placement is strategic to meet fundamental goals of “balancing a good proficiency mix, maximizing interregional sociocultural interaction, and ensuring accurate institute assessment” (NIIED,
2015b). In other words, their principle is to provide students with “a chance of exploring variable Korean cultures and immerse on Korean language learning,” and their priority, “to enable...the KGSP grantee, to experience new cultures, and to have many opportunities to create exchanges with KGSP grantees from other countries” (ibid.). Here, the NIIED is demonstrating attempts to both assimilate the KGSP students with Korean language and culture on the one hand, and to promote multicultural exchanges among the KGSP grantees.

Interestingly, the KGSP promotes a mixture of assimilative and multicultural ideals, which has double standards for interaction of locals to KGSP students and among the KGSP students themselves. While the goal to facilitate multicultural exchange between KGSP grantees is clearly indicated, any mention of that between locals and KGSP students are devoid. In other words, the relationship between locals and KGSP students is only in theoretical terms of language and cultural assimilation⁸, leaving out the component of substantial interaction concerning the two groups. The KGSP allows for interaction among the international students themselves, however, which makes for an enclosed multiculturalism within the student enclave.

---

⁸ The Korean state’s interpretation of language and culture are static in this assimilative approach. It appears as if the policy does not take into account the nature of language and culture that constantly evolves and diffuses with the introduction of new concepts through the movement of people and ideas.
Figure 9. KGSP’s two-track model of assimilation and multiculturalism

Figure 9 illustrates the two-track model in place by the KGSP – the assimilation model between locals and KGSP students, and the multicultural model among KGSP students. Here, the promotion of assimilation and multiculturalism by the Korean state is in fact, presenting a segregated form of social integration. The state acknowledges multiculturalism among foreigners to the extent that it does not breach the borderline of mainstream Korean society. The role of the language program keeps the locals and mainstream Korean society separate from the foreign student community, and a divisive boundary is held in place by strictly enforced regulations of the KGSP that restricts spatio-temporal mobility of the international students. While the state on the one hand requires students to assimilate to Korean language and culture on an individual scale, it prevents the
immersion of foreign students into the core Korean society on the community scale. Instead of cross-cultural interaction between migrants and its host society, the students are told to interact among themselves. As long as the structural frame of society remains principally Korean in language and culture, the diverse interactions among student migrants are accepted and tolerated by the state.

With these aims in mind, it is important for the state to distribute the country quotas to limit a large concentration of single nationality or ethnicity. By diversifying the foreign student demographic, the state can maintain dominance of the Korean identity as majority culture, and prevent the growth of any ethnic consolidation that may threaten this Korean unity. Therefore, the multinational enclave of KGSP students and its spectrum of diversity representation can be seen as a by-product of the state's attempt to prevent single ethnic concentration and maintain predominance of Korean national identity.

5.3. Multinational enclave as a valuable asset for KGSP scholars

The previous sections provided evidence on how the international students’ multinational enclave is a by-product of the obligatory language program and country-based quota system of the KGSP. Despite segregation from mainstream society and other restrictive measures in place being the cause of enclave formation, the members value their enclave as an asset. Students unfailingly express
how the relations formed in their multicultural community were unexpected, yet pleasant surprise of their program. Before starting up their language program, students had expected to forge “Korean” networks and connections. When asked about the kind of classroom environment they had been expecting, Maryam (Interviewee 8) initially thought that she would end up with many Korean friends. She didn’t even think about having a “good relation with foreigners,” by which she means non-Korean international students. Minh (Interviewee 9) agreed with Maryam when she said, “it was so difficult [to make one Korean friend],” and pitched in herself, claiming that this problem was the same for all international students. Instead of primarily forging Korean ties as many expected to do so during their study abroad, students were exposed to what Maryam refers to as an “international country” through the language program. Despite its location in rural and suburban Korea, the language program imitates a mini-world where students are able to make connections with people from countries they have never even heard of.

Before coming to Korea and partaking in the language program, Quang (14) says he “never had the chance to meet the world.” Coming from Asia, the language program was the first opportunity he had to learn more about Latin America or Africa and carry out cultural discussions and debates with people from there. Hani (24) listed her group of friends and marveled at how her nine KGSP colleagues were all from different nations of Europe, Asia, South America, and Africa, yet ended up together as a “natural click.” Living with them for a year and seeing them almost everyday, she said they developed an intimacy,
which she describes as an “intense” relationship.

The geographic distance is not only condensed inter-continentally, but also intra-regionally through the KGSP. James (1) reminisces about the moments he interacted with people from “10 different countries,” but he also explains how his roommate had been from a different African country. While James and his roommate are from neighboring countries, their close interaction would not have been possible if not for the KGSP language program. Among other valuable friendships made, Van (13) describes how he is particularly thankful of his friend group consisting of other Southeast Asians like himself from “Singapore, Malaysia and Thailand, Indonesia and Philippines.” From these accounts, it appears as if the KGSP is producing dynamic inter-regional student allegiance alongside its initial design of creating pro-Korean human networks. New ties between individual students, which may amount to potential networking between their countries of origin, are almost as divergent as the nationalities represented in the KGSP program.

Even though there are differences in the views and the way people think, I felt a kind of...international community...I am more international as time passed...being able to live in peace with all these people who have different opinions and different ideas. I felt it's like an achievement...a skill.

James (Interviewee 1)

As James recounts, the international bonds that he formed throughout the language year turned out to be a big personal achievement and skill.
Therefore, it can be said that the KGSP enclave, is not simply a “product of policy fixes and community cohesion or consensus” (Amin 2002, 960), but an enclave where members cultivate a shared sense of global identity and put in efforts to maintain a distinct international characteristic. While the Korean government may have had language and culture assimilation in mind for the international students, the program provided them with the opportunity to learn from each other’s multicultural backgrounds and bond over diversity. In other words, their foreign traits that segregated them from the Korean mainstream became their main asset within the multinational enclave. Students’ shared common identity – a desire to participate in the multiculturalism and globalization – is what continues to drive students to strengthen their ties and form solidarity. The KGSP students, who initially entered Korea to further their individual academic careers, slowly start to take on a sense of shared responsibility to cultivate and maintain relations among themselves, which solidify into the form of an enclave.

Now, I do not feel as a citizen of one country, I feel as a global citizen. My projects and commitment will be focused on the welfare of the humankind. I want to work wherever I can be useful.

Daniela (11)

Daniela expresses her engagement with her KGSP enclave as a type of citizenship. Her commitment to her community is not just an ensemble of personal relations and common goals, but a deep bond, almost like that of a family at times, that gets her through the thick and thin of
study abroad. This enclave, from the way James, Daniela and other interviewees do not hesitate to defend, is not simply a reaction to the othering process of majority Korean society. They become active agents when it comes to defending their global identity and they do so with the help of other members from the enclave.

The students’ strong bonds and their eagerness to identify with their community arise from accumulated moments of hardships that they endure together. When asked what was the most memorable moment from his study abroad experience so far, Van (13) recounts the time he had to get an operation for a serious injury, incurred during a football match. He had to stay in the hospital for more than half a month, during which he could barely walk.

During that time, without relatives, without families, it was a tough time for me, I mean during the time of operation and recovery time also. So friends and teachers are the only ones I have...I can say this is one of the worst and one of the best, I experienced...many things at the same time.

Van (13)

Van’s account is a strong evidence for the KGSP enclave, as Van saw his accident not just as a hardship faced during his study abroad, but as an opportunity for deeper bonding with his group of friends. Also, while Van’s problem was an individual one, the KGSP students gathered together to help a friend in need, which demonstrates that a strong sense of community.

One of my friends got sick, and she needed money $5000 or
more...she went to the...But it didn't work, so we decided to do with KGSP students.

Minh (9)

Minh’s experience showcases the essence of the multinational enclave among KGSP students. Just like Van, Minh’s friend had to front around $5000 for hospital fees and could not afford to pay it off herself before being refunded by insurance. Again, with Van’s case, the enclave of KGSP students took what could have remained as a private, individual matter and publicized one student’s adversity as a joint issue, calling for participation of the whole community. In order to help a sick friend, the cohorts collected fees from the KGSP student community to pay for hospital fees. By gathering together as a group and exercising communal responsibility, the international students are fortifying solidarity among each other and heightening a sense of belonging to the enclave. Although KGSP students do not come from the same ethnic or national background, the “skill” of multicultural coexistence that they end up developing through the language program becomes the driving force keeping the enclave functioning.

This pursuit of a common identity is what allows the multinational enclave to exist beyond the time and space of the language program year. After the obligatory year at their language institutions, students move on to their main degree program located throughout the peninsula. Whereas the uniform time and space provided by the language program may no longer keep the KGSP students together, the enclave members find a way to maintain their
bond, but in alternative forms of networking. The enclave becomes mobile along with its mobile constituents.

The students’ primary method of maintaining contact is through social media. Students have group chats where they update each other with their latest news, and receive moral support as they adjust to a predominantly Korean environment at their new programs. This virtual connection takes on a physical outcome from time to time. Quang (14) describes how he met up with KGSP friends to travel together to a third country several times. Once, one of his Thai friends took him and his group of KGSP friends on a tour around Thailand. They also visited Indonesia to celebrate the wedding of a fellow Indonesia KGSP student. Nicole (6) confesses that it was convenient to travel around Korea with KGSP friends, because she already knew their travel patterns from their one-year language program together. She ended up visiting a fellow KGSP scholar when she attended a conference in Poland with her lab colleagues from graduate school.

The multinational KGSP community becomes especially important for students who transition from the language program into a lab culture of their main degree program, which is an unavoidable factor constituting the life pattern of a Korean graduate student. Even if students may have become accustomed to restrictive movement, sitting for hours on end in language institutions, they would have been surrounded by other foreigners who share similar experiences as international students and could fluently converse with in English. However, in the new Korean lab setting most common in engineering and natural science fields, KGSP students end up confined in labs as one
of the only foreigners in a sea of local Korean students, many of whom are either reluctant to speak in English or simply don’t have the conversational skill to do so. For many interviewees, this became the biggest stress factor that eventually led to a sustained gap of interaction with local students, but a closer reliance and appreciation of their KGSP enclave.

In between such busy lab schedule and graduate school life, interviewees made time to convene offline, expressing how their preferred destination was the town of their language program universities. While students ended up in different regions for their main degree program, they still went back to hold reunions at these “second hometowns” in Korea. There, students would go to visit restaurants and other social establishments they frequented during the language year; and think back on the days where they struggled together to pass the Korean language exam. After graduation, when the KGSP community are separated across borders, students may also remain connected with the help of the NIIED and Korean overseas consuls. While close friends keep in touch over Skype and other modes of SNS, alumni of the KGSP also have the option to attend alum events hosted by the NIIED in Korean embassies or cultural centers (NIIED, 2018a). Even if KGSP alum events may be to verify the success of the program’s pro-Korean human capital aim, students may tap into this resource for networking and maintaining ties with other KGSP students and community. All of these examples demonstrate the ever-changing, mobile characteristic of the multinational KGSP enclave throughout students’ academic transitions.

From these developments of the multicultural enclave it can be
said that the enclave first started out as a relief and safe space away from assimilation pressures of local society. The current frame of social integration in Korea is that without a degree of language and cultural assimilation, the segregation between Korean local mainstream and the foreign students would persist. Therefore, students were driven to find an alternative manner to retain their own cultural identities from pressures of KGSP administrators and staff to “learn Korean” and “make do with the Korean ways.” The multinational enclave became that alternative space, allowing students to self-identify. Within this enclave, students are recognized as active agents for shaping their community with a cosmopolitan and global identity, that does not have to comply to Korean standards of assimilation. While the students end up immersing into Korean campuses where the population is predominantly locals, the enclave allows them a cultural and emotional refuge to solicit camaraderie when pressures build up. Within the multinational enclave, diversity continues to flourish in new forms and most of all, it is valued as an asset. Ultimately, the students’ pursuit for active multiculturalism is what leads to the formation of a unique community of multinational international students throughout the KGSP.
Chapter 6. Conclusion

With technology advancement fueling accelerated mobility, student migratory flows are expected to continue. Student migrants, who were simply viewed as temporary residents to host societies, and therefore, not as threatening to the national status quo, are now becoming more of a fixture and core constituents of the national demographic mosaic. It is amidst such situational proceedings that my research on the Korean Government Scholarship Program (KGSP) provides an overview of the intersection of state policy, student mobility and migrant integration.

This study has articulated the formation and development of the multicultural enclave of students on the KGSP from a policy initiated makeshift community to a voluntary enclave with multicultural solidarity among its members. Through my findings, I have demonstrated the dominant influence of state policy in coordinating and regulating student migratory flows as well as their integration into the national mainstream. I have drawn upon previous literature to indicate how assimilation and multiculturalism within the rhetoric of South Korean state are not opposites, but have coexisted in policy. Even within the KGSP, the state promotes both language assimilation and culture on the one hand, but on the other, leaves the foreign community alone when it comes to multicultural interactions among themselves. The KGSP promotes a form of segregated multiculturalism, where as long as the foreign community is willing to become pro-Korean, and
aptly assimilated with a communicative level of Korean language and culture, can partake in the mainstream society.

This idea carries over to the objectives of the KGSP, which designs its program to further two national interests of cultivating international students to become pro-Korean human capital and of internationalizing domestic universities. I have proved that through the country-based quota system, the KGSP is attempting to bring in a broad spectrum of multinational students who become potential bridges connecting South Korea to each of their respective nations, advancing Korea’s diplomacy efforts and augmenting the nation’s soft power. Through the obligatory language program, these international students are compelled to undergo intense assimilation of Korean language and culture, which are necessary traits for them to step into the role of pro-Korean human capital. I have referred to this type of adaptation as compressed assimilation, which requires students to cram Korean traits into their identity within a limited scope of time. By bringing in students to regional universities, the KGSP is aiming to advance domestic interests of internationalizing local higher education institutions, but it is also creating a spatio-temporal fix that leads to the KGSP students’ segregation from mainstream society and heightened interaction among themselves.

International students, by their presence alone add diversity to the predominantly Korean environment of regional domestic universities. Whether the state intentionally drove this outcome or not, the foreign students are distinctly separated from the locals in their daily spaces of living, and there is a strict division in place between the
two groups due to the design of the program. I posit that an enclaved multiculturalism is occurring, where the celebration of diversity does not flow beyond the enclave into the mainstream society.

As interviewees have mentioned, the multinational enclave is an asset, from the fact that students are given a space to freely investigate and advance a global sense of mind by interacting with a wide spectrum of people from all over the world. By learning how to live among themselves, face conflicts and find ways to resolve them through conversations, individual students are not only taking on features of their multicultural classmates, they are rediscovering new aspects of their own culture and can reflect on their own positionality within the increasingly globalized world. Therefore, it is not a surprise that students put much effort into maintaining their multinational enclave even after the language program is over.

After the obligatory language program, when students scatter to different locations throughout the Korean peninsula to enroll in their main degree program, they develop the form of their enclave. Instead of a program-specific, place and time-bounded community, the multinational enclave becomes virtually connected, spanning across regions in Korea, but also beyond national boundaries once students graduate and move back. Due to constraints of time and space, the enclave is predominantly maintained through virtual connections on SNS, but materialize from time to time as students meet up for reunions throughout Korea and even abroad in a third country. The dispersion of students does not signify a disintegration of their enclave, as proved throughout this study, but rather an adoption of a new mobile shape,
connected virtually across time and space. This evolution to a mobile multinational enclave is essential for the student migrants’ adaptation and identity formation and remains a supportive core throughout the duration of their study abroad, but also post-graduation.

If academic contributions of this thesis has been to bridge Korea’s policy assimilation and multiculturalism of foreign students to the phenomenon of enclave formation, the policy implications lie in providing a frame to balance state ideals in order to brace for new challenges of immigrant integration. Once migrants are within the social demographic fabric, the state has no other choice but to see multiculturalism not as theory but as a working condition. This requires a reevaluation of how the state understands immigrants, and their potential to take on social and legal citizenship of the nation. New social values as well as policies would be introduced and that is the current phase that the South Korean nation is undergoing with increasing populations of student, labor, and marriage migrants in the last few decades.

At the rapid speed that Korea is accepting new migrants, the state faces equal challenges and high volume of requests from the migrant communities asking to facilitate their integration. Government branches and domestic organizations cannot simply choose to delay their response as more conflict on all sorts of fields can be expected to rise from both the local institutions and migrants ends. There does not seem to be a simple answer to addressing the ideal way forward for social integration of new migrants into host society, but it does not help
to continue in ambiguity that is the current stance that the state seems to be taking with assimilation and multiculturalism.

Continuing from this frame, total assimilation is a relic that is no longer accepted by academia nor in practice, but scholars do agree that a degree of unity is necessary for coexistence. With communication a necessity for conflict resolution and general connection of different groups of ethnic majority and minority, language assimilation is still seen as the common base for integration of immigrants into host society. Too much assimilation that requires the erasure of individual's cultural identities are not only frowned upon as infringing upon migrant rights, but it has also been proven to be futile throughout history, as with the persistence of ethnic enclaves amidst high pressures to assimilate in the past.

When migrants come to South Korea, they come with expectations to pick up the Korean language and aspects of the culture, even if each individual may have different ideas of what that means in practice. Therefore, partial assimilation is still relevant, not only for the host nation but also for migrants themselves. The idea of assimilation, then is not something that should be abolished, but redefined or reconceptualized to reflect diversity and multiculturalism that migrants are requesting to have recognized as active residents themselves in Korean society. To do so, it first needs to be said that all culture is not static and has never been absolute. A convergence to a fixed point of culture is meaningless, because it disqualifies, or belittles the continuous advancement of culture in general. Assimilation, therefore, needs to also be understood as a fluid concept – one that highlights and
emphasizes unity, but not to a fixed unity. Just like the nature of a fluid culture, assimilation needs to be understood as an adaptive system that can transform according to the different contexts of the variegated social institutions within host society.

Multiculturalism then needs to evolve alongside this new definition of assimilation. From the case of the multinational enclave of international KGSP students, diversity is an asset that accompanies many benefits not only for the students themselves, but if employed in the right manner, for the nation itself. Rather than segregating the local society from the KGSP students, it would be greatly beneficial for the state to come up with an upgraded design so that the idea of global citizenship can be shared amongst local Korean students, staff and faculty of domestic universities as well. In order for culture to develop and flourish, it needs to be challenged and face the test of time. The KGSP needs to devise a system that can acknowledge plurality in a way that can benefit international students as well as national interests. By doing so, the student migrant case can become testing grounds for the larger national immigrant integration policy at hand.

Despite the seeming stagnation of current times with closing of borders in America and Great Britain, and the rise of anti-immigration political parties in other parts of Europe, many academic studies and national policy practices indicate that cultural diversity brings even more diversity to a society. Diversity is not simply an ideal that sounds nice, but a constructive way forward for the advancement of society. The Korean society is facing a contemporary fork in the road, and needs to find concrete ways to move forward in working multiculturalism and
diversity to its advantage. It is time that the Korean state and general society sees the current migrant population, not as a social problem to be dealt with, but as a great resource that can advance national interests and enrich cultural livelihoods of all living within the boundaries of South Korea.
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Appendix

Appendix 1. List of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Year of Acceptance</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Region of Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>MA Graduate</td>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Ph.D. Graduate</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Daisy</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>MA Student</td>
<td>America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Putri</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>MA Student</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Samadhi</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>MA Student</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>MA Graduate</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rabia</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>MA Student</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Maryam</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>MA Student</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Minh</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>MA Student</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yanelle</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Ph.D. Graduate</td>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Daniela</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>MA Student</td>
<td>America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Farah</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>MA Student</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Van</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>MA Student</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Quang</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>MA Student</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>MA Student</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fathima</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Ph.D. Student</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>MA Graduate</td>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Thanh</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>MA Student</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Liwei</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>MA Student</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ahn</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>MA Student</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>MA Graduate</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Nathaniel</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>MA Graduate</td>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>MA Graduate</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Hani</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Ph.D. Student</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2. Timeline of the Global Korea Scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Key Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Selection and sending off of scholars on foreign government scholarship program after the signing of Korea-Japan Cultural Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Initiation of the Korean Government Scholarship Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Initiation of foreign student invitation program of major Southeast Asian nations to diversify international education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Designation of the ‘Study Korea Project’ as key venture to recruit foreign students (Proposal of Study Korea Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Expansion of the Korean Government Scholarship Program to undergraduate courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Development Plan for Study Korea Project to expand recruitment and management of foreign scholars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>'Promotion of International Scholarship Program of Ministry of Education, Science and Technology' reported in 2009 presidential briefing (Dec. 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Global Korea Scholarship listed as Top 10 priority government tasks in the presidential report at the Presidential Council on National Branding (Mar. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Promotion of GKS at the ASEAN-Korea Summit (Jun. 1-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Rebranding of GKS as national scholarship program by reorganizing the Korean Government Scholarship Program and establishing new tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Major expansion of the Korean Government Scholarship Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Strategic recruitment of international students according to the Study Korea Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Expansion Plan for Recruitment of International Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Pilot initiation of KGSP Associate Degree Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Initiation of ASEAN Countries' Science and Engineering Undergraduate students program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Re-initiation of KGSP graduate research program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Initiation of GKS for African and Latin American Undergraduate Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Reconfigured and translated from MOE, 2018a)
# Appendix 3. Country-based quotas in the 2018 KGSP Application Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Congo, Republic of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bahamas, The</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Quebec (Canada)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>U.S.A</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: NIIED, 2018a)
국문초록

정부초청장학제도 국제화 추진전략의 by-product로 다국적 엔클레이브(enclave)의 형성

정부는 국내 대학들의 국제화 추진전략을 지원하는 협력자이자 국제화의 흐름과 방향성을 주도하는 주체이다. 본 연구는 한국의 정부초청장학제도의 정책을 검토하고 이 정책의 by-product로 국외 학생들의 다국적 엔클레이브(enclave)가 형성되고 있음을 밝힌다. 정부초청장학제도는 매해 150국 이상으로부터 학생을 선발해 한국의 학부 및 대학원 과정에 진학하도록 지원하는 제도이다. 본 연구에서는 현재 정부초청장학제도의 사업 목표 및 내용이 독립적 공간 밀집 현상을 초래하며 이를 장학생들의 다국적 엔클레이브로 지칭하고자 한다.

이 연구에서는 타율적으로 형성되는 게토(ghetto)와 달리 구성원들의 자발적 의지가 독립된 공간 밀집 형태를 만든다는 엔클레이브 개념을 제안함으로 정부초청장학제도가 의도했던 정책적 방향과 다른 시나리오가 펼쳐졌음에 주목한다. 장학제도의 주요 목표는 1) 친한·지한 네트워크를 구축하고 2) 국내 대학을 국제화하는 것으로 요약될 수 있다. 즉, 정부초청장학제도를 통해 유학생들에게는 언어와 문화적 동화를 관철시키며 국내 대학의 국제화 지수를 높이고자 함을 알 수 있다. 정부초청장학제도의 두 가지 설계적 측면이 이 목표를 가능케 하는데, 첫번째는 한국어 의무 연수과정이며 두번째는 국가별로 지원자를 제한하는 국가별 쿼터(quota) 제도이다. 본 연구에서는 한국어 의무 연수과정을 엔클레이브의 시작점으로, 국가별 쿼터제도를 정부초청장학생 커뮤니티 내의 인구학적 다양성을 높여주는 촉매제가 될을 논의한다.
이와 같이 정부초청장학생들의 다국적 엔클레이브가 정책 목표와 설계로부터 파생되어 나오기는 했지만 시간이 지남에 따라 학생 구성원들에게 이 엔클레이브는 소중한 자산이 되기 시작한다. 집중이수를 통해 한국어를 확산시키고자 하는 것이 정부가 의도한 한국어 언어프로그램의 목표였지만 이와 더불어 언어교육원은 서로의 다문화적 정체성을 확인하고 유대관계를 유지시키는 장이 됨으로 엔클레이브를 체계화하는 계기를 마련해준다. 따라서, 임무한국어 연수 이후에는 엔클레이브의 공간적 토대는 없어지지만 엔클레이브의 모형은 학생들의 학업 과정 전반에 걸쳐 유동적인 형태로 진화해간다.

본 논문은 임시 체류자로만 여겨지는 학생 이민자들의 적응 사례를 밝힘으로써 장기 체류 외국인들 이외에도 한국에 함께 거주하는 외국인들까지 사회통합의 답문을 널려가고자 했다. 이주자의 범주는 정적이지 않으며, 그들의 정체성과 이주 동기, 체류 결정 과정 등은 항상 변화하며 복잡함을 밝히고자 했다. 세계적인 이주의 흐름과 이주민 정착에 대응하는 정부의 반응도 마찬가지로 횡일적일 수는 없다. 따라서, 이런 복합적 관점을 다양하게 포착할 수 있도록 국내 유학생들의 사회 통합에 관한 정책 평가와 학술적 논의는 계속 확장되어야 한다.

주요어 : 정부초청장학제도, 유학생, 엔클레이브(enclave), 대학, 국제화, 다문화, 동화주의, 사회 통합
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