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ABSTRACT

This dissertation on adult education for immigrants in South Korea consists of two independent studies shedding light on immigrants’ formal and informal learning experiences. The first study, titled Adult Immigrants’ Deterrents to Participation in Korean as a Second Language Courses, aimed to understand immigrants’ deterrents for participation in Korean language programs by finding the underlying structure of the deterrents to participation and investigating the types of immigrants depending on their reasons for nonparticipation. A new instrument with 39 items that measures adult immigrants’ deterrents to participation in South Korea was developed; in total, 267 responses were collected, and 170 complete useable responses were analyzed. A series of statistical analyses revealed that a lack of time was the most compelling reason for nonparticipation. In addition, three latent dimensions of deterrents to participation were discovered: Negative Attitudes, Social Isolation, and Competing Demands. Finally, a cluster analysis identified five distinctive groups of survey participants according to their nonparticipation reasons: Active Young Workers, Income-oriented Temporary Workers, Isolated Long-term Resisters, Integrated Professional Immigrants, and Married Residents.
The second study, titled *Marriage-Immigrant Filipinas’ Acculturation and Learning Experiences in Korea*, is an interview-based qualitative study that aimed to understand the acculturative experiences of marriage-immigrant women in South Korea from an adult learning perspective. Filipinas, who had Korean husbands, migrated to South Korea to live with their husbands, and could speak English, were recruited for the research. Interviews with 15 Filipinas were analyzed; as a result, the stories of each of the research participants were reconstructed based on their interviews, and three common themes and 11 subthemes emerged from the constant comparison method are presented. First, marriage-immigrant Filipinas learned about the role and position of a daughter-in-law in South Korea; secondly, as mothers with foreign backgrounds, marriage-immigrant Filipinas’ motherhood had to be negotiated; finally, marriage-immigrant Filipinas actively engaged in developing extrafamilial support in South Korea by expanding their horizons.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The Republic of Korea (hereafter South Korea) is a country that has recently experienced rapid changes in demographics due to immigrant populations. For centuries, South Korea has been regarded as an ethnically homogenous country; in fact, because of the colonial expansion by Japan that ended in 1948, the South Korean government has officially promoted nationalism, so the Korean people often assume Korean nationality means Korean ethnicity.

In recent decades, the South Korean economy has advanced significantly, especially compared to some neighboring Asian countries, and South Korean popular culture, including music, drama, and movies, has been widely consumed in many Asian countries. While the economic impact of South Korea on Asian countries has been promoted, the Korean population has steadily decreased; the population growth rate was reported as 0.45% in 2016 (Statistics Korea, 2016). The total fertility rate of South Korea, which indicates the average number of children that would be born per woman, was 1.239 in 2015 (Statistics Korea, 2015). According to the World Bank (2017), this rate is one of the world’s lowest among 222 countries, resulting in a decrease in the workforce in Korea. Consequently, there has been an increasing need to accept immigrants into the country.

Given the circumstances, South Korea has transformed from an “emigrant country” to an “immigrant country,” resulting in approximately two million foreigners
residing in South Korea as of December 2016 (Korea Immigration Service, 2017) and steadily increasing by 9.2% yearly over the past five years (Korea Immigration Service, 2017). This number represents nearly 4% of the South Korean population. This dissertation focuses on the emerging immigrant adults in South Korea who are in need of new lifelong educational support.

The Korean population has been decreasing, while South Korea’s economic growth requires an increasing workforce. Therefore, the number of foreigners residing in South Korea has significantly increased in recent years, and the trend will probably continue in upcoming years. A new population implies new learners with new educational needs. International transition requires much learning in terms of language, law, and culture; additionally, if the transition involves work or marriage, it demands additional learning in the workplace, working culture, marriage system, family culture and so on. This transitional learning experience is called acculturation (Berry, 1997) or adjustment at an individual level. At the country level, corresponding to the increasing foreign population, Korea is transitioning from an ethnically homogeneous country to a more ethnically diverse nation and is experiencing the positive and negative dynamics of an emerging multicultural society.

However, Korean society has prepared for this demand and transition to a multicultural society in various ways; the government has fully implemented the 2nd Basic Plan for Immigration Policy 2013-2017, which includes Korea Immigration and Integration Program (KIIP) (Immigration Policy Commission, 2012). These educational programs for immigrants intend to help immigrants’ integration into Korean society by teaching both Korean language and Korean culture to immigrants. The government has
also provided teachers, government officers, and the public with educational opportunities to understand the necessity of accepting foreigners and how to cope with the emergence of various ethnic groups in Korea. The media has increasingly dealt with foreigners in South Korea from various aspects: demographic changes, victimization, fraud marriage, inferior working conditions, marriage lives and other aspects of social changes. Students have been taught about other ethnic groups in South Korea and their cultures.

These actions for improving awareness about foreigners and the differences of their cultures have brought controversy from nationalists who maintain Korean ethnic oneness. At the same time, the current practices were criticized in that the approaches assume foreigners’ one-way adjustment into Korean culture and that the portraits of foreigners are biased in favor of westerners and the binary between victim and exemplary (Kim, Park, & Lee, 2009).

**Problem Statement**

Scholars in South Korea have shown increasing interest in immigrants; much of the interest in immigrants originated from the fields of social work, feminism, and law (Nho, Park, Kim, Choi, & Ahn, 2008). However, lifelong education scholars have shown increasing, but limited, interest in adult education for immigrants; the lack of adult educational input could result in curricula that do not take into consideration the basic understanding of adult learners or adult immigrant learners. Also, without enough acknowledgement, programs, such as KIIP, tend to be designed based on the K-12 school model, a provider-centered program, which might not work for adult immigrants.
In short, the current practices of assisting immigrants and education for immigrants tend to be unilateral: enforced adjustment into Korean culture and, given the provider-centered educational programs, based on little acknowledgement of the new learners and the diverse backgrounds of the immigrants. Experiences with immigrants and their educational needs need to be understood and examined from learners’ perspectives, with educational lenses, for the sake of better practices and possible further development of Korean multiculturalism.

**Purpose of the Dissertation**

The purpose of this dissertation is to understand immigrants in South Korea and their acculturational experiences from the learner’s perspective. This means two specific approaches; one is to understand the limitations of the given educational programs for immigrants from the learners’ side. Specifically, this dissertation aims to investigate the reasons why some immigrants do not participate in the existing education programs. The other approach is to frame immigrants’ acculturational experiences as learning experiences.

Two broad research objectives guiding this dissertation are as follows:

1. To develop a questionnaire measuring immigrants’ deterrents to participating in current education programs for immigrants and to investigate the underlying structural pattern of the deterrents; and

2. To understand the acculturation experiences of immigrants living in South Korea with respect to their learning process and its adult education implications.
Structure of the Dissertation

This dissertation consists of five chapters: two introductory chapters, two related independent studies, and a concluding chapter at the end. An overview of each chapter is provided below.

Chapter One, the current chapter, presents the problem statement, the purpose of the dissertation, the descriptions of the two research studies, and the significance of the study.

In Chapter Two, an extended literature review of related themes is presented. First, the background and contexts of this dissertation are described in terms of the demographics of immigrants in South Korea in order to improve the understanding of Korean immigration situations. Then, immigrants’ general and unique challenges living in South Korea and the support system for adult immigrants in response to these challenges are presented. Additionally, theoretical frameworks that guided the deterrent study are included in this chapter.

Chapters Three and Four are composed of two interrelated studies. Each chapter presents an independent research study, consisting of an introduction, purpose for the study, literature review, methodology, findings, discussions, implications, and conclusions.

The final chapter of the dissertation synthesizes the results from the different studies, provides a summative conclusion of the findings of the two studies, and discusses comprehensive implications for immigrant education in South Korea. The final chapter also mentions the remaining knowledge gaps and offers suggestions for further research.
Description of the Two Research Studies

Two independent studies shedding light on immigrants’ formal and informal learning experiences were conducted and are presented in Chapters Three and Four. Overviews of each study are briefly described below.

The first study, titled Adult Immigrants’ Deterrents to Participation in Korean as a Second Language Courses, is a questionnaire-based study on immigrants’ deterrents to participation in Korean language education programs. A specially tailored instrument that measures reasons that may influence immigrants’ decisions not to participate in Korean language programs in Korean contexts was developed. Three research questions guided this study: what deters immigrants from participation in Korean language education; is there a conceptually meaningful underlying structural pattern of the deterrents; and what types of immigrants exist with respect to the empirical dimensions of deterrents to participation in KSL programs? Responses were collected from 267 immigrants from the Philippines and Vietnam who had lived in South Korea for more than 3 months. Each research question is answered in order, and implications for the further development of Korean language education for immigrants are provided.

The second study, titled Marriage-Immigrant Filipinas’ Acculturation and Learning Experiences in Korea, is a qualitative interview based study on marriage-immigrant Filipinas’ acculturation and learning experiences in South Korea. Marriage-immigrants, defined as non-Korean women who married a Korean husband and migrated to South Korea to live with their husbands, were purposely selected from among the various types of immigrants in South Korea due to their size and significance. For cultural and linguistic reasons, marriage-immigrant wives from the Philippines were
recruited, and 15 Filipina marriage-immigrants were interviewed regarding their experiences with marriage and living in Korea. Themes that emerged from the data analysis are presented, and discussions and implications are provided in Chapter Four.

**Significance of the Dissertation**

The South Korean government has put earnest efforts into enhancing immigrants’ lives in Korea and promoting multicultural perspectives among native Koreans over the last decade. An examination of current practices and further understanding of the immigrant learners’ lives would be a foundation for a well-supported educational system for immigrants in South Korea. Furthermore, for a more integrated society with an increasing population of persons from foreign backgrounds, understandings of immigrants’ lives in South Korea should be diligently pursued.

Immigrants, by nature, are learners; they constantly observe native people and try to understand an unfamiliar culture. They formally and informally learn the new culture, including the language, gestures, adequate social interactions, and so on. Sometimes, they change their cultural practices according to their observations; sometimes, they hold on to their own practices. Instead of dominant native Koreans’ judgement and enforcement on what immigrants need to know, an examination of what immigrants experience during the acculturational process and how they happen upon these experiences would provide insight for the development of Korean multiculturalism. Findings from these studies would contribute to the further development of the education system for immigrants in South Korea in various ways.

More specifically, findings from the study on deterrents to educational participation, first, can assist multicultural institutions and educators in understanding
reasons for the low participation in the programs and developing more accessible Korean language education programs for immigrants. Acknowledgement of more rooted factors of nonparticipation and customized approaches to recruitment using the research findings would contribute to an improvement in the participation and the retention rates of the programs, thereby ultimately helping immigrants lead easier and happier lives in Korea.

Then, findings from the qualitative interview study about marriage-immigrant Filipinas’ acculturation experiences in South Korea would be valuable for immigration policy makers, as well as immigration researchers, counselors, and adult educators who are working with immigrants, to better understand immigrants’ lived experiences, their educational needs and the challenges that they have to confront, by providing lived narratives told by immigrants themselves, focusing on a small homogenous ethnic group of the largest immigrant population in South Korea. Moreover, this study would help all marriage-immigrants perceive their lives in a larger context and for future newcomers to project their lives in Korea. Theoretically, this study also provides insights for adult informal learning; the marriage-immigrant wives learned in formal educational settings, but more valuable learning occurs at home, workplaces, and on the street, informally. An understanding of immigrants’ formal and informal learning environments would enable researchers to explore the possibilities for educational interventions for smoother acculturation experiences for immigrants.

In terms of immigration, Korea is entering a second phase that is necessary for being more integral, multi-faceted, and prepared than the first phase was, which has included catching up with existing needs and changes. Previous practices of education for immigrants have been provider-oriented; the Korean government designed the
program, and each institution followed the instructions. As a result, a limited number of immigrants have benefitted from the program. To respond to immigrants’ educational needs, current educational practices for immigrants should be examined. Empirical examinations of current practices are significantly important to make the right adjustments in policies and practice in a timely manner and to pinpoint the directions of future development. Ultimately, how immigrants, a social minority, survive in South Korea would reveal structural problems of Korean society; at the same time, learning how immigrants cope with Korean society would guide us in how to solve the problems and the role adult education can play in meeting this population’s needs.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

South Korea has a relatively short history of immigration; the cause and the development of its immigration is significantly different from that of Europe or North America. This chapter describes the historical development of immigration in South Korea: why immigrants began their influx and who they are. Immigrants’ challenges in the process of adjustment in a new society, including Korea’s unique social context regarding multiculturalism, are addressed, followed by the Korean government’s responsive actions to these challenges. Furthermore, previous research on deterrents to educational participation is presented.

Background and Demographics of Immigration in South Korea

The phenomenon of immigration, instead of emigration, does not have a long history in South Korea. However, the population of immigrants has been dramatically increasing, and the nature of immigration is becoming more diverse. Accordingly, the importance and impact of immigrants is becoming more significant in Korean society. In other words, South Korea is becoming a multicultural society, at least in terms of the demographics of its population.

Korea’s trend of immigration started when the Korean government formally announced its drive for globalization by opening the Korean economy to the global market in the 1990s; however, few Koreans expected to have to make cultural adjustments as a result of globalization at that time. The number of foreigners residing in
South Korea has steadily increased since the 1990s. Figure 2.1 shows the historical trend of foreigners staying in South Korea for more than 90 days each year from 1998 to 2016. The number of foreign residents was 308,339 in 1998, but over the last 20 years, that number has grown by 665% and composes 3.96% of the Korean population in 2016 (Korea Immigration Service, 2017).

In 2016, with respect to their purposes for visitation, 29% of visitors stay in Korea to work, more than 7% of them stay in Korea to live with their Korean spouses, and almost 6% of them are studying in Korea. Detailed information about their purposes for visitation is presented in Table 2.1. As can be seen, the major immigrant populations in South Korea are non-professional workers, oversea Koreans (Korean diaspora), marriage-immigrants, foreign students, and immigrants’ visitors. In terms of their nationalities, people from China (including ethnic Koreans from China, hereafter Korean-Chinese)
made up 49.6%, Vietnamese 7.3%, Americans 6.8%, Thai 4.9%, Filipino 2.8%, Japanese 2.5%, and people from other countries 26.1%. The nationality composition can vary significantly depending on the classification of visitation. For example, most Americans are either English teachers or American soldiers, while most non-professional foreign workers are from other Asian countries. Among those over 2 million foreign residents, 208,971 people (10.2%) are illegal residents (Korea Immigration Service, 2017).
Foreign Workers

First, a majority of the immigrant population are foreign workers, in particular non-professional workers. The influx of foreign labor workers began in the late 1980s due to Koreans’ avoidance of the so-called “3D” jobs – Dirty, Dangerous and Difficult. Upon great and increasing demands for labor workers in the industries that required dirty, dangerous, and difficult work, the government first introduced the Industrial Trainee System in 1992 and legalized unskilled foreign labor workers’ employment in South Korea. The system allowed foreigners from six Asian countries, including China, Indonesia, Vietnam, and Bangladesh, six months of training (later it was extended to two years of training) and limited their industrial opportunities to manufacturing, construction, coastal fishing, agriculture, and livestock farming.

The system first opened up legal working possibilities for unskilled foreign workers in South Korea and solved the lack of a workforce in a few industries to some extent; however, the system caused serious social problems, as well. For example, from the Korean government’s perspective, those workers tended to flee from their assigned jobs to earn more money as illegal workers. From the workers’ perspectives, employers did not provide good learning opportunities or pay them as they were promised, because the workers were hired as trainees instead of as workers. In short, because of those foreign workers’ “trainee” status, they were paid less, so they often voluntarily chose to become illegal workers to earn more as workers. However, this voluntary decision made their working conditions worse and restricted their own human rights.

Because of these serious social issues, the government launched the Employment Permit System in 2004, which acknowledged foreign labor workers’ contributions to
Korean industries, improved foreign labor workers’ legal status from trainees to workers and permitted companies that failed to find Korean workers to legally employ a certain number of foreign workers. One of the purposes of this system was to prevent the creation of illegal workers by increasing the government’s control through companies or employers. However, in addition to allowing longer working periods and better legal status, the system ultimately prevented foreign workers from obtaining Korean citizenship or permanent residency by limiting their visas to up to 4 years and 10 months. Although foreign workers are permitted to be re-employed, they have to leave the country and re-enter Korea after spending at least three months abroad. Because one of the eligibilities to be naturalized as a Korean citizen is to legally stay in South Korea for more than five years, the government can continue to control them as foreigners.

According to the Korea Immigration Service 2016 Annual Report (Korea Immigration Service, 2017), with respect to the type of visa regardless of visa status (i.e., legal or illegal stays), there were 549,449 foreigners working in South Korea and holding non-professional working visas (E9, E10, & H2), and 99.8% of them were from Asian countries: China (Korean-Chinese, 42.5%), Vietnam (8.5%), Cambodia (6.9%), Indonesia (6.6%), Uzbekistan (5.9%), Nepal (5.4%), the Philippines (4.8%), Sri Lanka (4.6%), Thailand (4.5%), Myanmar (Burma, 3.7%), and other Asian countries (6.4%).

Because the government has treated them as temporary workers, the government has paid less attention to building a supportive system for them, such as Korean language programs and social integration programs. Rather, non-government organizations, including labor unions, human rights advocates, and religious institutes, have actively helped them by consulting in cases of overdue wages, industrial accidents, violence and
other legal complications by providing health care services and shelter, teaching the Korean language, and building meaningful associations.

**Marriage-Immigrants**

The next most increasing foreign population is marriage-immigrants, particularly marriage-immigrant women from Asian countries. International marriages between Asian women and Korean men started in the 1990s, initiated by a religious agency, the Unification Church, also known as the Moonies. Thus, at that time, more marriage-immigrants were from Japan and the Philippines where the Unification Church had influence. Then, in the 2000s, local governments in rural areas, which faced a significant decrease in younger populations and had many unmarried bachelors, began building networks with international marriage agencies and encouraged marriages with mail-order brides. Starting in 2002, the number of marriage-immigrants increased by more than 28% each year until 2007; then, the increase rate decreased to 2.1% in 2009 due to their home countries’ policies. The rate again increased to 13.2% in 2010; however, the increase rate declined to 2.1% in 2011, and the rate continued to decline in 2012 because of the Korean government’s introduction of a revised enforcement decree, the *Immigration Control Act* of 2010. This act strengthens the inspection of visa applications of foreign spouses and requires completion of an “international marriage guidance program” for both brides and grooms (Ministry of Justice, 2013).

An additional decrease occurred once the Korean government introduced another regulation for the marriage-visas issued in 2014: proof of the foreign spouse’s Korean language ability that reaches the low beginner level of TOPIK, proof of the Korean spouse’s income to be more than 120% of the minimum living cost defined by the
government, and other regulations. After the introduction of this reinforced regulation, the increase rate has stayed at less than 1% since 2014.

As can be seen in Table 2.2, among those 152,374 marriage-immigrants, women comprise 84.3%, and men are 15.7%. Around 37.4% are from China; 27.4% of them are from Vietnam. Recently, increasing immigrant populations have come from Vietnam, Cambodia, Mongolia, and Thailand. The number of international marriages has dramatically increased, while the number of marriages between Koreans has decreased; currently, international marriages peaked to 11% of the total number of marriages in
2013; while in 2016, international marriages compromised 7.3% of the total number of marriages. Accordingly, the Korean government introduced a revised *Immigration Control Act*, which has made it easier for those foreign spouses to achieve Korean citizenship. For marriage-immigrants, the usual eligibility of a five-year residency in South Korea for naturalization has been shortened to a two-year residency, and the Korean language test can be replaced with the completion of *Korea Immigration and Integration Program* (KIIP), which is a government-certified education program that consists of courses on the Korean language and on understanding of the Korean society. Consequently, the number of naturalized citizens in 2015 was 10,924, and 63.7% of them were marriage-immigrants. Marriage-immigrants often invite their family members from their home countries, and those family members and relatives of marriage-immigrants contribute considerably to the increase in foreigners in South Korea.

**International Students**

Another major group of foreigners is foreign students. There were 115,927 foreign students in 2016, comprising 5.7% of the total foreign residents; 31.7% of them were pursuing Bachelor’s degrees, 34.4% came to the country to learn the Korean language, and 16.4% were pursuing Master’s degrees. Regarding their nationality, 57.3% were from China (excluding the Korean-Chinese), 13.1% were from Vietnam, 5.2% were from Mongolia, 2.1% were from Uzbekistan, and another 2.1% were from Japan.

**North Korean Refugees**

When the number of non-ethnic-Koreans, who already achieved South Korean citizenship through naturalization, is taken into consideration, the number of residents in South Korea who originated outside of South Korea would be more than the number of
foreigners registered. Beside those foreigners, there is an increasing number of North Korean refugees. As of March 2017, 30,490 North Koreans have admitted to living in South Korea (Ministry of Unification, 2017). North Korean refugees/defectors are automatically treated as Korean citizens once they prove their North Korean nationality, because the South Korea government does not officially admit the existence of the other government on the Korean Peninsula; therefore, fundamentally, all Koreans on the Peninsula are South Korean citizens. Therefore, North Korean refugees in South Korea are controlled and supported by the Ministry of Unification instead of the Ministry of Justice, which is supposed to manage immigration services. Although these North Koreans can be regarded as immigrants in terms of settling in and acculturating themselves into a new society, they are not the focus of this dissertation.

**Ethnic Enclaves**

The ratio of foreign residents to the whole population is approximately 3.96%. However, depending on location, the ratio exceeds 46% of the local population. For example, 7% of the population of *Ansan* City, a well-known ethnic enclave of non-professional foreign workers, is foreign-born from various Asian counties. Within the city, in Wongok-Bon-dong and Wongok-1-dong, the ratio of foreign residents is 40.6% and 46.1%. A part of the city is named the “*Ansan Multicultural Village Special Zone,*” and international markets are found on Multicultural Street at Ansan Station. Another well-known ethnic place is the Filipino Market at HyeHwa-Dong, Seoul, which is held every Sunday. It’s a street market called Little Manila. This place became popular with Filipinos, because the HyeHwa-Dong Catholic Church provides Filipino Mass in Tagalog every Sunday.
Summary

Among these newcomers, with respect to size, residential periods, and citizenship issues, the populations that draw the South Korean government’s attention are mainly marriage-immigrant women and foreign workers. However, the Korean government’s approaches to these two different groups of foreigners are very different. Briefly speaking, marriage-immigrant women are considered real or potential mothers of Korean children, contributing to an increase in Korea’s birth rate and its next generation; therefore, they are adequately supported legally by the government. Because foreign labor workers are regarded as sojourners, temporary residents, who must go back to their countries after a certain period, the government has developed a system of control for this segment of the population.

Immigrants’ Challenges Living in South Korea

Any person who migrates into a new culture faces a sudden barrage of cultural learning; in psychology, this change is called acculturation. Originally, the term was conceptualized in anthropology and referred to “those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups” (Redfield, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936, p. 149); for example, after contact with European invaders, the Cherokee underwent cultural changes. Later, the term was employed by psychological studies on immigrants (Thomas & Znaniecki, 1928), and the scope of change was modified from the socio-cultural level to the individual level.

Cultural learning or acculturation is a challenge; additionally, depending on the characteristics of a host culture, immigrants may have to face harder challenges (Berry,
1980, 1997). This section delineates immigrants’ general challenges regarding acculturation and Korea’s unique situations related to the acceptance of immigrants.

**General Challenges**

In most countries, immigrants face such challenges as language, employment, homesickness, parenting, and discrimination; immigrants in South Korea are not exceptions. Table 2.3 shows marriage-immigrants and naturalized citizens’ difficulties with living in South Korea.

**Language.** According to two longitudinal national surveys of immigrants, both foreign workers and marriage-immigrants responded that language was the most difficult challenge with living in South Korea. The National Surveys of Multicultural Families (Korea Institute for Health and Social Affairs, 2010; Korean Women's Development Institute, 2013, 2016), targeting entire families composed of a native Korean and his or her foreign-born spouse as well as families with a naturalized citizen, have been conducted every three years since 2009 and report that language is consistently one of the most difficult challenges. In 2009, 22.5% of the respondents reported having difficulties with the language; in 2012, 36.1% reported language as their greatest difficulty; and in 2015, 34.0% of the respondents rated language as the most difficult challenge. Women, from Southeast Asian countries, who were younger immigrants, had spent shorter lengths of time living in South Korea and were living more in rural areas than in metro areas, tended to report language proficiency as their biggest difficulty with living in South Korea (Korean Women's Development Institute, 2016).

Similar results were found in a 2013 national survey on the living conditions of foreign residents working in South Korea. Regardless of the length of years that the
Table 2.3

*Marriage-Immigrants and Naturalized Citizens’ Difficulties with Living in Korea*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009*</th>
<th>2012**</th>
<th>2015***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language skills</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The economy</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural differences</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The weather</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice and discrimination</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family conflicts</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting banks or public admin.</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difficulty</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target population (Response rate)</td>
<td>131,000*</td>
<td>15,001**</td>
<td>17,109***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Korea Institute for Health and Social Affairs, 2009, forced to choose one
** Source: Korean Women’s Development Institute, 2012, up to three choices allowed
*** Source: Korean Women’s Development Institute, 2016, up to three choices allowed
†: Population
††: Selected Sample

respondents had stayed in Korea, 36.6% of the total respondents rated the language issue as the most difficult challenge (Korea Immigration Service, 2013). In particular, 40.7% of the participating foreign workers who had stayed in South Korea for less than a year and 44.8% of the respondents who lived in Korea for a year reported language as their greatest difficulty.
Language is a significant factor that influences an individual’s successful acculturation into a new cultural setting (Berry, 1997). Numerous studies conducted in various international contexts have shown that language proficiency positively affects immigrants and sojourners’ psychological and socio-cultural adjustment by reducing their anxiety and social distance toward their new cultural settings (Ko & Kim, 2011; Li, 2008; Shaffer & Harrison, 2001; Ward & Kennedy, 1993). For example, Li (2008) revealed that Korean language proficiency had a statistically significant effect on Chinese (both Han-Chinese and ethnic-Korean Chinese) migrant workers’ adjustment in South Korea. Similarly, Ko and Kim (2011) studied Koryuin (고려인, ethnic Koreans from countries of the former Soviet Union), who relocated to South Korea, and reported that the group with the highest Korean-speaking ability showed a significantly higher psychological adaptation level than the other groups. Due to its importance in the acculturation process and the social issues raised by a lack of Korean proficiency, since 2005 and 2014 respectively, the Korean government has required foreign workers who apply for working visas through the Employment Permit System to take the TOPIK and marriage-immigrants who apply for a spouse visa (F6) to demonstrate their basic Korean proficiency.

According to the National Surveys of Multicultural Families (Korean Women's Development Institute, 2016), the average score of immigrants’ self-assessed Korean proficiency was 3.81 on a 5-point Likert scale throughout the four areas: speaking, listening, reading and writing. The score substantially increased as the length of the years living in South Korea were extended. Among the 304,516 marriage-immigrants and naturalized citizens who responded to the survey, 18.3% has taken the TOPIK (Test of
Proficiency in Korean) before; 22.1% of the test-takers achieved Level 1 or Level 2, 32.3% of them passed either Level 3 or Level 4, and the other 19.1% successfully passed Level 5 or Level 6. 26.4% the total test-takers could not pass the lowest level of Level 1.

Loneliness. Homesickness is a very common and natural phenomenon for immigrants, especially those immigrants who migrated to a new society by themselves to work or to marry. Marriage-immigrants and naturalized citizens reported loneliness as one of the biggest challenges (Korean Women's Development Institute, 2016), and foreign workers also identified loneliness as the second biggest challenge with living in Korea (Korea Immigration Service, 2013). Women tended to feel lonelier than men (Korean Women's Development Institute, 2016), and the loneliness level did not seem to change much regardless of the length of stay (Korea Immigration Service, 2013).

Homesickness or loneliness may fade as immigrants develop social networks in South Korea. Marriage-immigrants and naturalized citizens’ social networks could be indirectly inferred by their major source of advisement, help, and gathering. The National Surveys of Multicultural Families (Korean Women's Development Institute, 2016) revealed that, when immigrants need to discuss their difficulties or family issues, more than 60% of marriage-immigrants and naturalized citizens in Korea discuss them with either native Koreans or their own ethnic groups. One third of the respondents reported that they have social networks neither with native Koreans nor with the members of the same ethnic group whom they could rely on when they need advice regarding family issues, employment, and parenting or when they are in need of medical help. Immigrants from Vietnam, the Philippines, and other Southeast Asian countries tended to have closer social networks within their own ethnic groups, while they had the
lowest level of social networks with native Koreans. Marriage-immigrants and naturalized citizens reported that major deterrents to participating in social meetings, such as parent meetings, local community meetings, religious activities, or other non-governmental organizations, were their limited Korean proficiency and work.

Research on foreign workers more directly revealed the nature of their social networks. According to the Korea Immigration Service (2013), foreign workers in South Korea have an average of five close friends from their homeland in South Korea ($M = 5.31, SD=7.51$) and one close Korean friend in South Korea ($M = 1.35, SD =2.80$). The longer they lived in South Korea and the more educated they were, the more close Korean friends immigrant workers tended to have (the length, $F =2.35, p < .05$; education, $F =3.03, p < .05$). No significant differences in the number of same-ethnic friends associated with the length of stay in South Korea, age, or education were reported. Foreign workers from Nepal and the Philippines had more friends from the same country than foreign workers from other countries ($M_{Nepal} = 7.07, M_{Filipino} =6.63$). This tendency might be related to their religion and the country’s religious homogeneity.

**The economy.** Employment and the economy are challenges faced by immigrants throughout the world. It is always harder for immigrants who lack language proficiency and social networks to get a decent or stable job. Therefore, one third of marriage-immigrants and naturalized citizens living in Korea tended to experience this issue, and living in the country for longer periods of time seemed only to make this concern grow (Korean Women's Development Institute, 2016). This may be because of their age, marital status, and family events.
The employment rate of marriage-immigrants and naturalized citizens is 63.9%, which is higher than the general employment rate of Korea, 60% (Korean Women's Development Institute, 2016). However, immigrants are more likely to have lower-paying jobs in South Korea: general labor jobs (29%), service jobs (18.7%), and plant and machine operators and assemblers (14.6%). Three-fourths of immigrants work 36 hours or more per week; they are more likely to be part-time workers, and therefore, their employment stability is much lower than that of native Koreans.

Regarding monthly income, one-third of marriage-immigrant and naturalized citizen families earned between ₩2,000,000 and ₩3,000,000 (approximately $1,800 and $2,700); one-fourth of them earned between ₩1,000,000 (≈$900) and ₩2,000,000 (≈$1,800); and one-fifth of them earned between ₩3,000,000 (≈$2,700) and ₩4,000,000 (≈$3,600). The upper income limit for a family with four members to qualify to receive livelihood benefits under the National Basic Living Security Act, which is parallel to the Social Security Act in the USA, is ₩1,273,516 (≈$1,142) (Korean Ministry of Health & Welfare, 2015); 5.1% of the families with multicultural backgrounds were assisted by the act, while 3.2% of the whole Korean population qualified and were assisted by the program.

Foreign workers, however, are less concerned about the economy, because they are, in most cases, earning more money than they would have in their home countries. In contrast, these foreign workers have issues, such as unstable employment, unpaid work, unsafe or substandard working conditions, and illegal treatment. Foreign workers hired at manufacturer industries worked, on average, 9.8 hours a day, 23.7 days a month and earned ₩1,381,000 (≈$1,243) per month on average (Korea Immigration Service, 2013).
Parenting. There is a proverb that it takes a village to raise a child. Child rearing requires a great deal of effort for every parent, and assistance from various sources and networks is essential in the rearing of a child. Immigrants are, in general, lacking in family or community networks compared to native residents; therefore, parenting is always more challenging for immigrants. Families with foreign backgrounds in South Korea reported parenting as the fourth biggest challenge with living in South Korea in 2015 (Korean Women's Development Institute, 2016). Specifically, 77% of parents with children younger than five years old felt difficulty in rearing their children; teaching them Korean and finding help for babysitting were the top difficulties. Additionally, 76.8% of parents with school-grade or older children experienced difficulties with childcare; the biggest challenge stemmed from their lack of experience and knowledge regarding their children’s school system and subjects.

Immigrants’ difficulties with child rearing reported on the National Surveys of Multicultural Families (Korean Women's Development Institute, 2016) resonate with findings from research on marriage-immigrants in South Korea. In most studies, marriage-immigrant mothers’ insufficient Korean language proficiency was identified as the source of their difficulty. Although many immigrant mothers used both their own language and Korean (Kwon, 2013), mothers tended to believe that their children should be reared with pure Korean identities (Song, Jee, Cho, & Kim, 2008) and that, therefore, their main language should be Korean. Immigrant mothers promoted their children using Korean; however, when a child spoke Korean, the immigrant mothers passively reacted to their children’s ability to speak Korean, resulting in the mothers’ sense of guilt, because they felt that they were not being good mothers (Kwon, 2013; Oh & Kim, 2012).
Immigrant mothers’ low Korean proficiency caused higher levels of parenting stress than that experienced by Korean mothers (Lee & Choi, 2016; Lim & Lee, 2010) and made immigrant mothers feel limited in their parenting practices (Kang, Lee, Kim, Yun, Kim, & Doh, 2017). Additionally, a lack of Korean proficiency sometimes prevented immigrant mothers from disciplining their children in a timely and adequate manner (Kang et al., 2017; Oh & Kim, 2012) and, later, negatively influenced the quality of communications with their children (Oh, 2015) and ultimately their mother-child relationships. The parent-child relationship satisfaction level of children from families with foreign backgrounds was likely to decrease as the age of the children increased, and children with foreign backgrounds responded by spending less time having conversations with their parents than other Korean children do (Korean Women's Development Institute, 2016). This phenomenon could be related to dissonant acculturation (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001), the acculturational, cultural and linguistic gaps between parents with foreign backgrounds and their half-Korean children. This term was introduced to explain the phenomena related to the second generations of immigrants. After children enter the Korean educational system, their Korean language proficiency and their understanding of the Korean culture exceed that of their parents from foreign backgrounds. Korean language proficiency not only affects parents’ communication with their children but is also related to their parental authority.

Another factor that made parenting harder was family members: husbands and mothers-in-law. Korean husbands’ low or little participation in child rearing, stemming from the Korean patriarchal perspective on parenting, made it harder for these marriage-immigrant mothers to rear their children in Korea (Kang et al., 2017; Lee, Park, Kim, &
Park, 2014). On the contrary, the mother-in-law’s excessive interference with child rearing and the conflict over primary childcare authority between the marriage-immigrant woman and her mother-in-law were other hardships for marriage-immigrant mothers (Cho, 2012; Oh, 2015). Specifically, many marriage-immigrants lived with their in-law families; the mothers felt forced by their mothers-in-law to follow the Korean traditional postpartum treatment guidelines and to practice Korean ways of weaning and introducing solid food to children (Lee et al., 2014). The childcare conflicts in the home mainly originated from the different cultural perspectives on child rearing: given the inferior position of the immigrant’s culture in the home, marriage-immigrant mothers had to deal with another challenging cultural conflict (Lee et al., 2014; Oh, 2015; Song et al., 2008). Additionally, because marriage-immigrant mothers in Korea tend to get married and to become mothers at younger ages than Koreans and to have little knowledge or experience with child-rearing (Jeong et al., 2009), immigrant mothers sometimes felt a loss of parental control or authority given the mother-in-law’s interference (Oh, 2015).

School is another big challenge for marriage-immigrant mothers. This challenge deals with immigrant parents’ fear of unfamiliarity: an unfamiliar educational system that immigrants themselves have not experienced and the development of new relationships with teachers, school administrators, friends, and their families. Given the overheated competitive culture of schooling in Korea, with demanding school work and excessive pressure on academic achievement, immigrant mothers from different cultures first learn about a Korean mother’s perspectives on and attitudes toward how to be a better mother of a school-age child; coping with the Korean culture of education is challenging for immigrants. Although they negatively judge the perspectives and attitudes on education,
Some immigrant mothers still want their children to show good academic performance, believing that outstanding academic achievement will compensate for their being a minority and help them reach a higher position in the societal hierarchy through education (Kang et al., 2017; Lee et al., 2014; Song et al., 2008). However, immigrant mothers feel “limited” when performing the mother’s role in this competition due to their Korean language proficiency and the lack of information shared by Korean mothers.

The biggest fear about schooling originates from racism in South Korea. For mothers both with and without a school-age child, immigrant mothers worry about the possibility of their children being bullied by classmates because of their darker skin, foreign accent, appearance, or for having a mother from a foreign country (Kang et al., 2017; Oh & Kim, 2012; Song et al., 2008). In reality, 5% of children from multicultural backgrounds, aged between 9 and 24, reported that they had experienced verbal or physical violence at school by their peers; higher chances were reported if a child was younger, foreign-born, and from a family with a lower household income level (Korean Women's Development Institute, 2016). In 2015, according to the Korean Ministry of Education (2015), the school violence occurrence rate was 0.9% based on the annual national survey on school violence targeting all students between 4th and 11th grades (response rate: 94.6%). The gap between the national surveys from all students (0.9%) and students with foreign backgrounds (5%) clearly indicates that the immigrant mothers’ fears are not imaginary or exaggerated. Confronting and helping their children to face various types of racism is, therefore, one of the biggest concerns of immigrant mothers (Kang et al., 2017).
Prejudice and discrimination. Forty point seven percent of marriage-immigrants and naturalized citizens responding to the national survey reported that they had experienced social discrimination while living in South Korea; the intensity was highest in the workplace (2.69 on a 4-point Likert scale), followed by on one’s street and in one’s neighborhood (2.13), and in stores/restaurants/banks (2.10) (Korean Women's Development Institute, 2016). Although the intensity of discrimination was lower in public administration offices, such as municipal offices and police stations (1.76) and schools and daycares (1.82), the frequency of social discrimination experienced in these places was reported as 19.5% and 23.8% respectively. When an immigrant experienced social discrimination, three-fourths of them just tolerated the situation or the treatment; some discussed the situation with family and friends. Immigrants’ reactions to social discrimination turned out to be passive and remained at a personal level (Korean Women's Development Institute, 2016).

Immigrant workers showed similar results in terms of social discrimination experiences. According to the national survey on foreign workers’ conditions (Korea Immigration Service, 2013), one-third of foreign workers in South Korea responded that they had experienced social discrimination while living in South Korea; the workplace was the most popular place (2.32 on a 4-point Likert scale) where social discrimination occurred. On public transportation (1.90) and on one’s street and by one’s neighbors (1.87) were other frequent places where foreign workers experienced social discrimination. Only 38.4% of those who experienced social discrimination appealed and requested improvement (Korea Immigration Service, 2013).
Another national survey reported more specific and concrete experiences with foreign workers’ social discriminations. The National Human Rights Commission (2015) conducted research on human rights conditions of foreigners working in the construction industry. The research revealed that 32.6% of the foreigners working in the construction industry knew a colleague who had experienced threats or discrimination in their workplaces; one-third of them did not take any actions and simply tolerated the situation. One-fifth of legal workers and one-tenth of illegal workers reported and requested assistance from Korea’s Support Centers for Foreign Workers or non-government organizations. Nearly two-thirds of foreign workers in the construction industry reported that they had experienced verbal violence, and slightly more than one-fifth of them reported to have experienced physical violence at work. Although wage discrimination is illegal in South Korea, foreign workers in the field reported that many construction companies paid foreign workers differently from Korean workers (National Human Rights Commission, 2015).

Experiences with social discrimination seemed to be relevant to the race of the foreigners. Lim (2010) conducted research comparing foreign residents’ perspectives on Korea from various countries. A Q-factor analysis suggested three types of perspectives on Korea: pro-Korea, anti-Korea, and Korea-affirmative. More Western white people were found in the pro-Korea group, which perceived Korea as more positive, while more people of color, from Southeastern Asia or Africa, were found in the anti-Korea group, which views Korea in a negative way and criticizes Koreans’ ethnocentrism. Negative images of Korea could be strongly associated with their unfavorable experiences with
Koreans, as Jun and Ghil (2016) demonstrated that immigrants’ experiences with discrimination are negatively associated with social trust in South Korea.

Furthermore, racial discrimination is reported in studies with children. According to Jeong (2010), more than a half of the children from a family with foreign backgrounds experienced the following subcategories of discrimination: social exclusion, physical violence, prejudice, disrespect, threatening, rejection, and teasing. Children’s experience with discrimination was significantly different depending on the children’s skin color and Korean language proficiency; individuals with darker skin and lower Korean language proficiency had more discriminative experiences in each subcategory of discrimination. These children who had experienced discrimination would have higher stress levels and increased depression and anxiety levels (Kim, Won, & Choi, 2011). Although the Korean government has created various supports for children from families with foreign backgrounds through the public school system, the children still experience discrimination, and the emphasis on support for these children sometimes results in stigmatizing them instead (Cho & Song, 2011).

**Other struggles.** Immigrants additionally reported the following as difficulties with living in South Korea: cultural differences, food, the weather, family conflicts, and so on. Difficulties with cultural differences, food, and the weather seemed to decrease as individuals’ lengths of stay in South Korea were extended (Korea Immigration Service, 2013).

**Unique Challenges**

Berry (1997) expanded the theory of acculturation by denying the previous perspective that acculturation is equal to assimilation to the host culture and by taking the
natures of both the non-dominant group (immigrants) and dominant group (host society) into consideration. Berry suggested four acculturation strategies which a non-dominant group would choose when a dominant group does not impose their culture: integration, assimilation, separation/segregation, and marginalization. If a society is culturally open enough to accept different cultures as they are and the non-dominant group voluntarily chooses to assimilate into the society, it could be described as a Melting Pot. However, when migrating people are forced to be culturally assimilated to the host society, Berry describes this as a Pressure Cooker. Depending on the nature of the host culture, the possible acculturation strategies available to immigrants could be significantly different. In other words, the openness spectrum of a host culture plays a key role in explaining immigrants' choice of acculturation strategy. Therefore, to better understand immigrants' acculturation challenges in South Korea, it is also considerably important to review the Korean culture and Koreans' attitudes toward immigration and immigrants.

**Ethnocultural identity.** How do Koreans conceptualize a nation and nationhood? Koreans tend to believe that Korea has been ethnically homogeneous, although this belief would not be scientifically true. Contrary to this general belief, Korea has continuously had various forms of connections with nearby nations, such as wars, colonization, trade, and so on; therefore, there had been influxes of immigrants from China, Manchuria, Japan, and other overseas areas in the last millennia (Kang, 2010). Nevertheless, Korean blood-based ethnic identity is grounded in the Hongikingan ideology, originated from the Korean Creation myth. *Hongikingan* [홍익인간, Hong-eek-in-gan], meaning “broadly benefits human beings,” is acknowledged as the Lord of Heaven’s purpose for sending his son to earth. The myth was founded from *Samguk*
Yusa (삼국유사, Memorabilia of the Three Kingdoms) written at the end of the 13th century by the Buddhist monk, Ilyeon.

“Hwanin, the Lord of Heaven, had a son named Hwanung, who wanted to live on earth. Hwanung descended from Heaven at Taebaek, now known as Baekdu, the highest mountain on the Korean peninsula. There he founded a city named Sinsi, the City of God. A tiger and a bear prayed to Hwanung that he make them human, and Hwanung instructed them to remain in a cave for one hundred days, eating only garlic and mugwort. The tiger soon gave up, but the bear kept to the bargain and was transformed into a woman. Hwanung took her as his wife, and together they produced a son, Dangun. After becoming king, Dangun built a city named Asadal (near present-day Pyong-yang) and established the state of Gojoseon.” (Tudor, 2012, p. 12)

This ideology, despite various alternative interpretations and arguments, has provided the bases of the belief that Korean ethnic oneness originates from the same descendants of one blood, Dangun. This belief has been recalled when the country was threatened by other countries, for example, the Mongol invasions of Korea in the 13th century and the Japanese invasion of Korea in 1592. That is, the Dangun and Hongikingan ideology played the role of a spiritual focal point in uniting and mobilizing Koreans against the external enemy.

However, the mythology of Dangun had not been related to the modern concept of nation until Korean historian Chaeho Shin (1908) defined and articulated the concept of minjok, Korean ethnicity and the Korean nation, in the early 20th century (Kang, 2010). When Japanese imperial expansion was rapidly growing in the Korean peninsula, Shin
(1908) wrote a theory of Korean ethnic history, how Korean minjok (ethnicity) had been formulated since the birth of Dangun, focusing on racial and cultural boundaries rather than geographical boundaries or kingdom changes on the Korean peninsula, ultimately promoting Korean nationalism against the Japanese invasion. Shin’s theory of Korean ethnicity provided a historical and spiritual establishment of ethnic identity for the Korean independence movement from Japan, representing resistance nationalism.

Shin’s (1908) notion of minjok was similar to the German idea of nationhood (Brubaker, 1990): an ethnocultural unity. From a comparison of the conception of nationhood and during the process of modern nation formation in France and Germany, Brubaker argued that “this pre-political German nation, this nation in search of a state, was conceived … as an organic, cultural, linguistic, or racial community” (p. 386), rather than a political unity. Therefore, Koreans’ way of perceiving their nationhood is manifestly different from the nationhood perceived by citizens of such countries as the USA or Canada, which are predominantly composed of immigrants.

This ethnocultural nation identity based on the Hongikingan ideology (Kang, 2010) has been strengthened by the Korean government. This philosophy was officially acknowledged as the national principle of the Republic of Korea and as its educational principle. This ideology identifies Koreans as the blood descendants of Dangun who first established the country; furthermore, Korean ethnic nationalism or collective oneness has been considered a significant factor in the economic development of modern Korean society.

**Korean national identity.** Although racial homogeneity may be an ideological fantasy (Kang, 2010), the belief in Korean oneness is deeply embedded in Koreans’ daily
lives. Survey results on national identity are representative examples for showing this tendency. Compared to citizens in countries with longer histories of immigration, Koreans’ notion of nationhood or nation identity basically relies on the ethnic factor over a civic factor (Chung & Lee, 2011; Chung, Lee, Kim, Lee, & Park, 2010; Korean Women’s Development institute, 2012; Korean Women’s Development institute, 2015). In 2011, the International Social Survey Program results revealed that nearly nine out of ten Koreans agreed with the statement that having Korean ancestry is very or fairly important to be truly Korean (Korean Women’s Development institute, 2012); this score was ranked 3rd among the 36 countries who participated in the same research survey. Furthermore, among the eight indicators of national identity (to have been born in Korea; to have Korean citizenship; to have lived in Korea for most of one’s life; to be able to speak Korean; to follow Confucian teaching; to respect Korean institutions and laws; to feel Korean; and to have Korean ancestry), Koreans have continuously rated to feel Korean, to have Korean citizenship, and to be able to speak Korean as the most important factors to truly being Korean (Chung, Park, Park, & Hyun, 2016). A tendency was found that older Koreans with a lower family income, lower level of national pride, and more conservative political perspectives considered the ethnic factor more significantly than the civic factor in terms of national identity (Chung et al., 2016).

Koreans’ perceptions about national identity, however, seem to have gradually changed in recent years. Although the significance of the ethnic component still remains relatively stronger than the world average, since the ratio of civic factors over ethnic factors for all 31 countries was 1.20 in 2003, whereas the ratio for Korea in 2010 was 1.18, the agreement ratio on civic factors has been steadily increasing over recent decades.
Specifically, Chung et al. (2010) reported that the ethnic factors decreased from 3.08 to 2.97 between 2003 and 2010, while the civic factors increased from 3.25 to 3.37 during the same period. Similarly, the research reported that the approval rates for both *jus soli* (Latin: right of the soil) and *jus sanguinis* (Latin: right of blood) principles have increased, with a higher rate of increase for the *jus soli* principle. This result may indicate that Koreans are gradually expanding beyond the traditional definition of Korean nationhood.

Another recent triannual national survey measuring multicultural acceptability also indicated similar results; both adults and youth rated self-identified national identity (*to feel Korean*) as the most important factor that determines whether one is truly Korean, and the agreement rate on having Korean ancestry has dropped from 86.6% in 2011 to 73.3% in 2015 (Korean Women’s Development Institute, 2015). In this survey, Koreans responded that *to respect and obey Korean politics, culture, law, and policies* (adults: 90.0%, youth: 76.1% agreement) is as important as *to feel Korean* (adults: 90.5%, youth: 83.7% agreement) (Korean Women’s Development Institute, 2015). It could be concluded that given the increasing influx of immigrants in Korea and Koreans’ quantitative expansion of international migration in various forms, Koreans’ perceptions of elements that make up the Korean identity has changed.

**Koreans’ attitudes toward foreigners and immigrants.** Korean scholars have researched Koreans’ attitudes, social distance, and acceptability toward minorities, foreigners, and ethnic stereotypes (Chung et al., 2010; Kim, 2004; Lee & Kim, 2012; Seo, 2011). Seo (2011) conducted a comparative study of citizens’ attitudes toward foreign workers and immigrants in South Korea, China, and the U.S. using the 1995,
2000, and 2005 World Values Surveys. This study measured attitudes toward immigrants and foreigners with an item asking whether or not one would like to have immigrants/foreign workers as neighbors as a dependent variable and revealed that throughout all the survey points, South Koreans showed the least favorable attitude toward immigrants and foreigners: 61.5% were favorable in 1995, 53.2% favorable in 2000, 63.3% in 2005, and 59.0% on average. Americans’ attitudes were measured as 89.0% on average, and the attitudes of Chinese citizens were reported as 80.7% on average; the differences among countries were statistically significant at the .05 alpha level. Although South Koreans’ attitudes toward immigrants and foreign workers were ranked lowest among these three countries, Seo (2011) pointed out that South Koreans’ scores have increased throughout the survey years, while scores from the other countries were stable or declined over the years. Despite limitations of the research, which was based on fairly old data sets to reflect recent trends and in which the dependent variable was dichotomously measured by only one item, this study statistically showed how unfavorable South Koreans’ attitudes toward foreigners were as compared with those of the Chinese and Americans, whose countries are relatively diverse in terms of ethnicities.

Next, Chung et al. (2010) also collected data regarding the social distance toward other ethnicities, based on the sum of the positive responses received for seven categories (foreigners as visitors, citizens, co-workers, neighbors, friends, spouses of one’s children, and spouses of one’s own). The possible score ranged from 0 to 7 with higher scores representing the closer the participants felt towards these ethnicities. The findings showed that Koreans feel the most comfortable with Americans (4.70), followed by Europeans (4.57), North Korean defectors (4.53), Korean-Chinese (4.42), Japanese
(4.21), Southeast Asian (4.12) and Chinese (3.93). Also, the results indicated that males, younger individuals, and individuals with higher educational attainment levels and with higher income levels felt relatively closer to foreigners and immigrants. Finally, their attitudes toward the increase in different ethnic groups turned out differently. Koreans showed a positive reaction to an increase in foreign entrepreneurs and investors (80.3%) and foreign students (73.1%), while a lower level of agreement was observed for an increase in non-professional foreign workers (31.5%), North Korean defectors (33.9%), and Korean-Chinese (25.0%).

**Koreans’ perspectives on the influx of foreigners and immigration policies.**

Beyond the attitudes toward individual immigrants, Koreans’ perspectives on immigration as a phenomenon and the acceptance of multiculturalism has been measured and traced. The KMCI (Korean Multiculturalism Inventory) and KMCI-A (KMCI for adolescents) measuring Koreans’ multicultural acceptability using 35 items were developed in 2010 with funding from the Korean Ministry of Gender Equality and Family; responses were collected in 2012 and 2015 from both general adults and youth (Korean Women’s Development institute, 2012; Korean Women’s Development institute, 2015). The 2015 survey results revealed that Korean adults’ average score on multicultural acceptability had increased to 53.95 from 51.17 as measured in 2012. Factors like being younger, having more education, having a higher family income, traveling more internationally, and having longer sojourn experiences abroad determined a higher multicultural acceptability score on the 2015 survey. In particular, people who had participated in various educational programs promoting multiculturalism or in multicultural-related activities or who have foreign friends, immigrant friends, and
foreign colleagues or classmates showed noticeably higher scores on multicultural acceptability. However, only 5.5% of the total adult respondents had experienced multicultural education.

Contrary to the increased overall openness toward immigrants, a retrogressive phenomenon was also found in the survey (Korean Women’s Development institute, 2015). The first backlash was found in the responses to the subconstruct of *Expectations to Immigrants’ Assimilation*. While each of the seven subconstructs of the KMAI had increased in 2015 compared to the 2012 results, implying an improvement in multicultural acceptability, the respondents’ expectations toward immigrants to adjust their cultural practices according to Korean cultural standards had also increased in 2015. In other words, more Koreans have come to believe that immigrants should abandon their own cultural practices, follow Korean cultural norms, and learn the Korean language while living in South Korea. In fact, foreigners seem to accept this idea as well, because 58.1% of immigrants agreed with the statement that in order for foreigners to live in South Korea, foreigners should abandon their own cultural practices and follow the Korean culture and traditions (Korean Women's Development Institute, 2016). This tendency in favor of assimilative acculturation was more likely to be found in older immigrants who had lived in Korea for a longer period.

Secondly, the level of perceived threats by immigrants has increased in 2015. The perceived threats were measured by respondents’ opinions on immigrants’ influence on deprivation of employment, economic loss, increased crime rates, and the public budget constraint. The scores on each item of economic loss, the increased crime rates, and the public budget constraint due to immigration have increased by approximately
10% compared to the 2011 results. The tendency was stronger if the respondent was male, older, less educated, a non-professional worker, earned less, and had immigrants as neighbors, as they might be more likely to compete with immigrants for jobs. Additionally, respondents more favorably responded to the idea that an influx of immigrants would negatively impact the ethnic cohesion of Korea and Korean ethnic pride in 2015 than they did in 2011 (Korean Women’s Development institute, 2015).

In another study, the Korean identity survey (Asiatic Research Institute & East Asia Institute, 2010) reported that 60.6% of Koreans agreed with Korea moving toward a multicultural society and multicultural nationality, while 37.1% of those surveyed still thought that South Korea should maintain its homogenous ethnicity and culture. Overall, although Korean adults seemed to acknowledge immigrants’ contributions to economic development and agree with the general directionality toward multiculturalism, a noticeable increase in the immigrant population may bring about psychological resistance.

For example, in the General Election in 2012, the major conservative party nominated a marriage-immigrant woman from the Philippines for the 17th proportional representation candidate of the National Assembly, and Ms. Jasmine Lee became a member of the National Assembly. Her becoming the first immigrant congressperson was an indicator showing both the promoted status of immigrants in South Korea and the subsequent backlash of native Koreans’ public opinion. She actively worked as the first congressperson in South Korea who achieved Korean citizenship though naturalization; however, many native Koreans revealed their negative feelings towards her election as a congressperson. Furthermore, the government’s increasing financial input in
multicultural-related projects is criticized by many Korean people who argue that the limited budget should be allocated to poor native Koreans, such as Korean children in low-income families and disadvantaged people who do not receive enough support from the government. No congressperson with a foreign background was elected or nominated in the following General Election in 2016.

Citing Jones’ (2011) typology of xenophobia—exclusive xenophobia, possessive xenophobia, and toxic xenophobia, depending on the levels, Y.S. Kim (2012) contented that the xenophobic actions happening in South Korea seemed to be in transit from exclusive xenophobia, a type of imagined-nationalism, to possessive xenophobia, which includes the feeling of economic deprivation because of immigrants, thereby showing prejudice and discrimination towards immigrants. This change may remain at the economic level; however, Kim (2012) warned that recent issues related to multiculturalism, for example, race-discriminative online debates with regard to Ms. Jasmine Lee and creations of various anti-multicultural and patriotic organizations, indicate that xenophobia in South Korea could easily be transformed to the compounded-aggravative type, the toxic xenophobia.

In contrast, progressive scholars point out that immigration to Korean society should not assume cultural assimilation to Korean traditions. Kang (2010) criticized that the Korean government’s multicultural policies assume assimilation as an ideal outcome of acculturation and that education for global citizenship in a multicultural society is required from a lifelong education perspective. Jung and Jo (2012) also argued that current multicultural education in South Korea made immigrants passive by limiting multicultural education to providing welfare under the assumption that immigrants are
not active agents but objects that only need support and marginalize their own cultural competence rather than empower their multicultural competency and integrate it with Korean society.

In short, the Korean society is facing critics on both sides: cultural conservatives and liberals. Given the Koreans’ attitudes toward foreigners and immigrants, the government’s multicultural education not only refers to education for immigrants but also contains endeavors for promoting multicultural awareness among native Koreans and increasing their acceptability of ethnic and cultural diversity.

**Summary**

Immigrants’ challenges living in South Korea were reviewed; their general challenges as immigrants included language, psychological isolation, the economy, parenting, and prejudice and discrimination. The unique challenges originating from the nature of Korean society were also reviewed. Koreans’ ethnocultural identity that developed and strengthened during the Japanese colonization has been succeeded by Korean nationhood after the Republic of Korea was established, and this Korean nationhood was eventually distorted by the Korean government by implementing patriotic nationalism for economy development in the 1970s and thereafter. Korean patriotism, strongly reliant on ethnocultural identity, had not been questioned until the influx of immigrants reached a noticeable extent in recent years.

Because of this belief in Korean ethnic oneness, native Koreans tend to advocate nationalism and ethnocentrism; consequently, they are more likely to take it for granted when foreigners are forced to accept the Korean culture while living in Korea. This tendency defines the Korean society as a *Pressure Cooker* (Berry, 1997) in terms of a
host culture to acculturation. Although Koreans are gradually accepting immigrants and the country’s directionality to multiculturalism, contradictory perspectives toward immigration and foreign residents exist.

**Support System for Adult Immigrants**

As discussed above, the need for a support system for immigrants is evidenced. Since major legislations on resident foreigners and immigrants were enacted in 2008, the Korean government has begun putting earnest effort into developing a better support system for immigrants and promoting multiculturalism among native Koreans.

Regarding adult immigrants, the major support systems are provided by two ministries in particular: the Ministry of Justice (MOJ), based on the *Immigration Control Act* and the *Act on the Treatment of Foreigners in Korea*, and the Ministry of Gender Equality and Family (MOGEF), based on the *Multicultural Families Support Act*. The MOJ is mainly involved with immigrants’ legal status, and the MOGEF is mainly concerned with marriage-immigrants’ daily lives. More specifically, the MOJ provides two major educational programs for general immigrants: *Korean Immigration and Integration Program (KIIP)* and *Happy Start Program*. Completion of these programs provides the participants with incentives regarding their visa and legal status. The MOGEF provides various educational and counseling services for marriage-immigrants and their families through 211 local Multicultural Family Support Centers (MFS Centers). This section provides details on government-sponsored Korean language education programs and other educational services for adult immigrants.
Korean Language Education

Immigrants can find various types of Korean language education programs sponsored by the Korean government. They can access online Korean education programs or attend Korean classes nearby at local MFS centers. Among the various opportunities, three Korean language learning opportunities are delineated in this section.

KIIP. This program intends to elevate immigrants’ Korean language abilities and to provide a better understanding of Korean society; as a result, immigrants can integrate into Korean society more smoothly. The program, provided by the MOJ, is not mandatory for all immigrants; however, given the benefits of the completion of the program, immigrants are encouraged to complete the program. The major benefits of completing this program, in addition to the Social Integration Program Korean Language Ability Test (KIIP-KLT) Certificate and the Korea Immigration and Naturalization Conformity Test (KINAT) Certificate are a) exemption from having to take a naturalization written test and an interview when they apply for naturalization and b) exemption from providing the required Korean language test results when applying for a visa transfer for general permanent residence, a professional worker's visa, a permanent residence for marriage-immigrants and their under-age children, and a long term foreigner's residence visa. To participate in KIIP, applicants must first participate in a preliminary assessment of their Korean language proficiency, and then, they are placed at a level appropriate to their results.

KIIP has six levels; the first five levels include Korean language programs, and the final level of the program concerns understanding Korean society (Table 2.4). KIIP provides programs through 300 local centers comprised of the Multicultural Family
Support Centers and other accredited educational institutions. In 2016, there were 30,515 participants in KIIP (Ministry of Justice, 2017). Details are found in Table 2.5. The programs and textbooks are all free once an immigrant individual registers.

All instructors who intend to teach any level of courses through KIIP must have a Korean Language Teaching Certificate or meet the alternative eligibility requirement of 500-hour of experience teaching Korean. Also, they must be registered as multicultural instructors with the Korea Immigration Service. Additionally, the government established a credentialing program called the Multicultural Society Specialist Certificate.

Table 2.4

*Curriculum and the Levels of KIIP*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Level 0</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korean language</td>
<td>Understanding Korean society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Beginner 1</td>
<td>Beginner 2</td>
<td>Intermediate 1</td>
<td>Intermediate 2</td>
<td>Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Hours</td>
<td>15 hrs.</td>
<td>100 hrs.</td>
<td>100 hrs.</td>
<td>100 hrs.</td>
<td>100 hrs.</td>
<td>50 hrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.5

*Participation in KIIP in 2016*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residency Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30,515</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage-immigrants</td>
<td>16,563</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Immigrants</td>
<td>13,952</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korea Immigration Service, 2017 (unit: persons)
for KIIP instructors; those who intend to teach the Level 5 course of KIIP, the Understanding the Korean Society course, must complete this accreditation program.

The Ministry of Justice, in conjunction with the National Institute of the Korean Language, developed five-stage Korean language textbooks for KIIP and books about understanding Korean society for immigrants and foreigners.

**Korean classes at the MFS centers.** The local MFS centers provide a four-level Korean language education program free for marriage-immigrants and their foreign-born children, which has been the most popular and accessible program among immigrants. Each level consists of 100 hours of Korean language education and an immigrant’s individual level is decided by his or her placement test results. Once an immigrant completes the four levels of Korean education at a MFS center, the individual can take a mid-term evaluation test administered by KIIP and, if he or she passes, attend the Level 5 class offered by KIIP.

The MOGEF has developed textbooks titled *Korean Language for Marriage-Immigrants 1 through 4*; in class, both the textbooks developed by the MOJ and MOGEF are officially utilized. Regarding the instructor’s certificate, the same eligibility is applied to the instructors teaching at the MFS centers.

In addition to the four-level Korean language courses, the MFS centers provide special level Korean courses for which the content varies depending on the local center’s availability and needs – for example, job preparation classes and cooking classes. Including marriage-immigrants’ foreign born children, 30,206 marriage-immigrants and their families enrolled in the five levels of Korean language classes in 2016 (Korean Institute for Healthy Family, 2017a).
Visiting education service: Korean language education. For marriage-immigrants who have been in Korea less than five years, the MFS centers provide an in-home Korean education service for free. A trained Korean language instructor, who has passed the Korean language instructor eligibility for KIIP and is teaching at an MFS center, visits individual marriage-immigrants’ homes and teaches the assigned level of Korean language using the same textbooks used at the local MFS centers. The level system is consistent with the in-class Korean language education at the MFS centers, and immigrants who pass Level 4 are eligible to apply for the KIIP mid-term to take the KIIP Level 5 classes. The pass rate of each level is 92.9%, 92.2%, 88.2%, and 90.5% respectively. In 2016, 957 visiting Korean education instructors taught 5,329 marriage-immigrants and 178 of their foreign-born children (Korean Institute for Healthy Family, 2017b).

Other Supporting Projects

In addition to Korean language education, other supports exist for assisting immigrants in their daily lives.

The Initial Adjustment Support Program. The MOJ provides another education program for immigrants called the Happy Start program. This is a one-time, three-hour-long program specially designed for the orientation of new foreign residents who enter the country and was first introduced in 2009. The program was extended to all new foreign residents in 2014: international students, foreign-born children of foreign workers and marriage-immigrants, oversea Koreans holding H2 visas for work and other foreign residents. The completion of the program is mandatory for those oversea Koreans holding H2 visas; it is voluntary for marriage-immigrants and others. The
program is composed of explanations about legal issues related to their visas, introduction of support systems for immigrants, and meetings with senior immigrants.

**Interpretation and translation.** Local MFS centers provide interpretation and translation services for marriage-immigrants and their families. Each local MFS center has one to four trained interpreters assigned. The nine languages of the countries with large immigrant populations in South Korea are provided: Vietnamese, Chinese, Filipino-Tagalog, Mongolian, Japanese, Cambodian, Russian, Thai, and Nepalese. To be interpreters and translators working at MFS centers, an immigrant should have lived in South Korea for more than two years and demonstrate Korean language proficiency higher than TOPIK Level 3. Their tasks involve interpreting and translating for immigrants’ using MFS centers (44%), educational purposes (29%), support in daily life (17%), legal issues (6%), and medical issues (3%) (Korean Institute for Healthy Family, 2017c).

**The visiting education service: Parenting education.** A marriage-immigrant parent can benefit from a visiting parenting education service three times, once in each of the following periods of a baby’s development, up to 15 months in total: the pregnancy and infancy period (pregnancy to 12 months), toddler period (12 months to 48 months), and childhood period (48 months to 12 years old). A certified social worker visits the enrolled immigrant’s house and teaches the parent about basic parenting, developing child-parent relationships, nutrition and health management, schooling in Korea, and other child-rearing related lessons. In 2016, the total number of immigrants who registered for the service was 5,081; their satisfaction level was measured at 4.88 out of
5-points on a face-to-face survey and 4.81 out of 5-points on a phone survey (Korean Institute for Healthy Family, 2017b).

Other services for adult marriage-immigrants provided by local MFS centers include counseling and case management (psychological evaluation, legal counseling, emergency support for families at risk, and third-party referencing for the familial wellbeing of multicultural families), social training and occupational training, family education (couple counseling, familial relation improvement programs, and parenting programs), and bilingual environments for multicultural families (MOGEF, 2017).

**Studies on Deterrents to Educational Participation**

In early studies on deterrents to participation in adult education (e.g., Carp, Peterson, & Roelfs, 1973; Cross, 1981; Darkenwald & Merriam, 1982; Johnstone & Rivera, 1965), scholars investigated *barriers* of participation; then, the term *barrier* was gradually replaced by the term *deterrent* to participation (Valentine & Darkenwald, 1990). Some scholars still use the terms barriers and deterrents interchangeably (e.g., McDonald, 2003); however, these terms deliver two different meanings. A barrier to participation stops or hinders one from participation; therefore, there is no possibility that one can participate in education without removing the barrier. In contrast, a deterrent still allows the possibility that one could participate in learning, even though it is sometimes very hard to make it happen. In other words, although the two terms have similar meanings in terms of indicating obstacles of participation, they imply different consequences. A deterrent “suggests a more dynamic and less conclusive force, one that works largely in combination with other forces, both positive and negative, in affecting the participation decision” (Valentine & Darkenwald, 1990, p. 30). For this reason, the
term deterrent was employed in this study, unless the original authors referred to barriers. A deterrent to participation is defined as a reason or a related group of reasons that discourages an adult immigrant from engaging in educational activities.

**Theory of Margin and Immigrants**

Adults’ life situations often deter adult learners from participating in education; McClusky (1973) argued that adult learners’ educational participation may occur when they have a margin in their lives. Margin is determined by the ratio of power (resources) over loads (responsibilities). When an adult has a high level of family and work responsibilities and low support from family or social networks, the person would not have enough margin in his or her life for studying a foreign language. The theory was introduced to conceptualize the relationship between adults’ needs and conditions in various life stages and their participation in education, because conditions that influence adults’ educational activities are different from those that influence children’s.

Adult immigrants who moved from their home country to a foreign country with or without family usually have unfavorable life conditions for participation in education. If an individual migrated to Korea to financially support their family in their homeland as a non-professional worker, he or she would have a considerable amount of job responsibilities in Korea and would prefer to work for money instead of spending the time learning a foreign language. If a woman migrated to marry a Korean man, she may not have support from family or access to a social network for babysitting; this may prevent her from participating in learning Korean. Immigrants generally have less margin in their lives for education, because they have more responsibilities and less power in a new country.
Early Studies: The Biggest Barrier of Participation and Typology

In those early studies on deterrents to education participation, the focus was to identify the biggest constraints of participation, and studies on deterrents were accompanied by studies on motivation and reasons for learning (e.g., Apt, 1978; Carp et al., 1973; Johnson & Rivera, 1965). For example, in Johnson and Rivera’s (1965) study on barriers to participation, the researchers asked potential adult learners whether or not each of the ten listed reasons was applied to their decision not to attend adult education courses. These ten non-participation reasons represented five external or situational barriers, four internal or dispositional barriers, and one unsorted item. The results showed how each of the reasons worked differently in various demographic groups, and a further factor analysis revealed that younger adults and women cited more situational barriers, while older adults and men reported more dispositional barriers as constraints to participation in education.

Carp et al. (1973) also conducted a survey on 24 nonparticipation reasons and reported that “cost” and “not enough time” were generally the biggest obstacles across various demographic groups. Later, Cross (1981) classified these 24 items into three categories: situational, institutional, and dispositional barriers. The typology of barriers to education was popularly accepted by many scholars; Green (1998) adapted this 24-item deterrent survey to a 30-item questionnaire with a Likert-type scale; the reliability coefficient for each of the three subscales was reported as .68 for situational barriers, .79 for institutional barriers, and .84 for dispositional barriers. McDonald (2003) used the questionnaire to identify deterrents to participation in education for first-time enrolling freshmen in higher education and reported an acceptable set of reliability
coefficients: .80, .79, and .73, respectively. McDonald conducted a confirmatory factor analysis and confirmed the three-factor model based on acceptable factor loadings; however, the author suggested performing an exploratory factor analysis, because “several items seemed to overlap and could have been moved to another subscale” (McDonald, 2003, p. 101).

The typology of deterrents was further developed by Darkenwald and Merriam (1982); based on Cross’s (1981) work, the authors modified the typology by adding the informational barrier category and changing the dispositional barriers to psychological barriers as a more inclusive term. As McDonald (2003) pointed out, these categorization works were arbitrary; Cross’s (1981) placement of 24 items (Carp et al., 1973) into the three types of barriers was not based on a statistical analysis. Darkenwald and Merriam’s four categorization model of deterrents to education was not statistically tested if the four sub-constructs existed.

**Empirical Approaches: Deterrents to Participation Scale Development**

An empirical approach to understanding deterrents to adults’ education participation and generating typology of deterrents emerged in the 1980s. These scholars (e.g., Darkenwald & Hayes, 1988; Darkenwald & Valentine, 1985; Hayes, 1989; Scanlan & Darkenwald, 1984; Valentine & Darkenwald, 1990) argued that previous approaches to typology of deterrents to participation and analysis of differences based on respondents’ demographics had a limited value and that “[t]he most useful approach is to identify groups based on their perception of deterrents and then to describe the groups in terms of available background information” (Hayes, 1989, p. 50). Accordingly, Scanlan
and Darkenwald (1984) developed the original Deterrents to Participation Scale (DPS) with 40 items that was distributed to health professionals.

Then, Darkenwald and Valentine (1985) further developed the instrument into a 32-item DPS-G, which was designed for the general public; based on empirical data from the DPS-G, six underlying factors of deterrents were identified: lack of confidence, lack of course relevance, time constraints, low personal priority, cost, and personal problems. Darkenwald and Valentine pointed out that these six factors were substantially different from the original DPS factors (Scanlan & Darkenwald, 1984) except for one, the cost factor. Additionally, the researchers stressed that the underlying structure from the statistical analysis was greatly inconsistent with Cross’s (1981) “intuitive conceptualization” (Darkenwald & Valentine, 1985, p. 187). Valentine and Darkenwald (1990) later preformed the cluster analysis of the same data and generated a typology of five groups of people who were deterred by each of the deterrent factors except for time constraints.

Hayes (Hayes, 1988; Hayes & Darkenwald, 1988), who agreed with the empirical and participant-customized approach to deterrent study, developed the DPS for low-literate people (DPS-LL). The DPS-LL is rated on a 3-point Likert scale and includes 32 discrete deterrents, which were identified from literature, interviews with low-literate adult basic education students, and interviews with teachers in the field and their aides. This study revealed five factors: low self-confidence, social disapproval, situational barriers, attitude about classes, and low-personal priority. Hayes (1989) translated the instrument to Spanish for Hispanic ESL students (DPS-LLS) and reported four underlying factors from exploratory factor analysis; the four-factor solution was selected
with regards to the greatest interpretability of the models. The factors from the DPS-LLS are self/school incongruence, low self-confidence, lack of access to classes, and situational constraints. A cluster analysis of socio-demographic characteristics yielded five groups of ESL Hispanic students who were deterred from participation in ESL classes because of different primary deterrent factors.

Adopting a similar approach to scale construction, Beder (1990) developed a "reasons for non-participation" survey. The 32 items were derived from interviews with 21 high school dropouts, and the survey was administered to 129 adults who were eligible for adult basic education and agreed to participate in the survey. The factor analysis resulted in four interpretable factors: low perception of need, perceived effort, dislike for school, and situational barriers.

Blais, Duquette, and Painchaud (1989) adapted and translated DPS for the use of understanding diploma nurses' deterrents to educational activities in Quebec, Canada. The researcher used 38 deterrent items from the original DPS and added 12 more deterrent items that were suggested by nursing continuing education specialists. The factor analysis suggested five interpretable factors: low priority for work-related activities, absence of external incentives, incidental costs, irrelevance of additional formal education for professional practice, and lack of affective support.

Recent Trend of Studies on Deterrents

More recent studies on deterrents (Cuts & Chandler, 2000; Irias, 2011; Malicky & Norman, 1994; Porras-Hernández & Salinas-Amescua, 2012; Ziegahn, 1992) employed a qualitative approach to collecting and analyzing data and reported similar but more contemporary themes of deterrents. For example, Irias (2011) interviewed adult ESL
students who both enrolled and dropped out of a course; the author discovered nine sub-themes related to deterrents to participation in ESL programs (e.g., lack of need, fear of being deported, time, money, and inaccessible class schedules) and 11 themes of deterrents to retention in ESL programs such as psychological fear, changing work schedule, family commitments, lack of motivational practices, and lack of bilingual instruction.

On the other hand, Henry and Basile (1994) paid attention to the differences between participants and nonparticipants and the variables that may affect their decision towards participation and nonparticipation. The research participants were those who enrolled in adult education courses in a university and those who showed interest in the courses by calling the university but never actually enrolled. Logistic regression analysis revealed five variables that indicated the greatest differences between participants and nonparticipants: three motivation-related variables, one deterrent variable-cost, one source of information variable, and the institutional factor as the cumulative effect of all institution-related variables. The study contributed to the field by revealing the differences between participants and nonparticipants, while previous research included either participants or nonparticipants. Additionally, the authors attempted to develop a comprehensive model of adults’ participation in education. This model may not be biased by socially desirable responses, which concerned many scholars in previous studies (Carp et al., 1973; Merriam & Darkenwald, 1982).

This study described above represents a stream of deterrent studies aiming to predict participation and persistence patterns using demographics and dispositional factors (Apt, 1978; Hall & Donaldson, 1997; Van Tilburg Norland, 1992; Ziegler, Bain,
Bell, McCallum, & Brian, 2006). In these studies, the ultimate research purpose is slightly different from the purpose of the studies presented above that focused on non-participation reasons by developing a scale and typology based on underlying factor structures of deterrents; the former pays more attention to identifying variables that can predict participation by separating and comparing participants from nonparticipants, while the latter focuses on understanding nonparticipants based on their types of deterrents. For example, Henry and Basile (1994) reported that participants were more likely to have a college degree than nonparticipants, and the people with the highest education, graduate degrees, were less likely to participate in adult education courses at the university. This result, the statistical difference in education between participants and nonparticipants, is an important finding of this study; however, the educational attainment level itself is not a deterrent or a cause of nonparticipation unless it is related to previous school experiences or nonparticipants’ confidence in learning.

Additionally, studies on deterrents to participation assume the demand and the necessity of participation in the given educational activity, such as in professional continuing education and adult basic education. In contrast, studies on predictors of participation tend to deal with more selective educational activities that cannot suppose this demand and necessity to be the case. Beder (1992) made a relevant argument that eligible ABE nonparticipants can be categorized into three groups: the motivated and not-constrained nonparticipants, the motivated but constrained nonparticipants, and the not-motivated “hard core” (Beder, 1992, p. 4), who would voluntarily not attend ABE education even if they have access to and information about free ABE education. In this sense, Quigley (1990, 1997) termed this group of ABE nonparticipants as “resisters” to
formal education (Quigley, 1997, p. 195), employing Giroux’s (1983) reproduction and resistance theory. Quigley (1997) suggested three types of resistance and discussed difference recruitment approaches to each type of resister: the personal/emotive resister, the ideological/cultural resister, and the older resister. The first two groups resist education due to past schooling experiences, which may have connections to substantiated factors such as a lack of confidence (Darkenwald & Valentine, 1985), self/school incongruence (Hayes, 1988), and dislike for school (Beder, 1990). The older resisters, “‘hard core’ nonparticipants” (Beder, 1992, p. 4), have no demand for education.

As discussed, whether or not an individual is willing to be engaged in learning activities has an influence on his/her decision not to participate in education. In other words, sometimes a deterrent can be the learner who voluntarily decides not to participate in any educational programs. Previous studies on motivation and deterrents tended to only focus on either learning motivations or reasons for deterrents; the reasons why an individual is not motivated to learn has not been specified enough, especially in deterrent scale development studies. In short, deterrents are related to motivation to some extent; however, in order to develop an integrated model to test the relationship between adult immigrants’ deterrents and motivation to take part in KSL programs, in-depth knowledge on these deterrents and motivations and relevant significant variables are required. Unfortunately, little is statistically known about immigrants’ deterrents to and motivations for educational participation in the 2010s in the Korean context.
Korean Studies on Deterrents to Participation

Regarding the Korean context, a number of quantitative studies have been conducted in Korea to identify adult learners’ deterrents to education participation in various learning programs (e.g., Choi, 2006; Jeon & Choi, 2007; Lee & Gi, 2009). For example, in Choi’s (2006) study about characteristics and patterns of adult learners’ participation in lifelong education, the researcher reported that nonparticipants attributed lack of time (59.9%) as the major reason for not being able to participate in lifelong education programs; this result is consistent with the results from national surveys on lifelong education participation conducted over the last 30 years in Korea (KEDI, 1982, 1999, 2009, 2011, 2013). These national surveys provided five to ten nonparticipation reasons and asked survey respondents to choose a major reason for not participating in each “wannabe” (previously-considered) education program. However, these studies reported only the descriptive statistics of each reason for nonparticipation, without further analysis of underlying factor structures. Moreover, the results from these surveys represent only native Koreans’ nonparticipation reasons, and the educational programs in these surveys refer to all lifelong education programs, including professional development education, recreational programs, adult literacy programs, etc. Therefore, these studies have only limited implications for this study, which aims to understand immigrants, a very special group of people in Korea, and their deterrents to participating in KSL programs.

Nevertheless, a few recent studies began delving into understanding adult immigrants’ educational participation. For example, Park and Choi (2012) conducted a satisfaction survey for marriage-immigrant women’s participation experiences at KIIP; as
a result, 62 immigrants out of 226 respondents living in rural areas in Jella-do (province) reported that they did not attend any KIIP or other government-sponsored programs, and the major reason for their nonparticipation was “no need to participate” (31 responses, 49%). A majority of this group had lived in Korea for more than four years, so they were less in need of KSL education. Additionally, 18 respondents chose “family’s disapproval” as the major reason for not participating. Additionally, Choi and Han (2012) conducted a qualitative interview study about marriage-immigrants’ experiences with participating in KIIP. Regarding the difficulties with participating in KIIP, six themes emerged: 1) understanding the content (Korean language), 2) worrying about the comprehensive evaluation, 3) feeling too old to learn, 4) family responsibility, 5) conflict with job responsibility, and 6) long distance travel to institutes.

Summary

Previous studies on adults’ deterrents to educational participation, mostly published in the U.S. and South Korea, were reviewed, and three implications for this study were drawn from the literature review. First, a quantitative empirical approach is required to deeply understand adult immigrants’ nonparticipation reasons and to utilize the findings for improving KIIP. If the program aims to maximize benefitting adult immigrants in Korea, a statistical, generalizable knowledge on immigrants’ deterrents to participation is necessary.

Second, a deterrent scale that is carefully tailored to adult immigrants in Korean contexts in the 2010s is needed. Deterrent scales that have been developed in the U.S. and Korea provide valuable information for understanding immigrants’ deterrents; however, as demonstrated in the many studies reviewed, the underlying factor structure
of deterrents significantly varies depending on the groups of research participants. Additionally, immigrants commonly have different life patterns from native residents; therefore, it is expected, based on the margin theory (McClusky, 1973), that results from native residents would have limited implications for immigrants to some extent. Consequently, the modification of previous deterrent scales is required, particularly considering current immigrants’ contexts in Korea when creating the instrument items.

Finally, an extended concept of deterrents needs to be employed in the scale’s development. Specifically, the scale needs to include items that can reflect resisters’ genuine reasons for not participating in KSL programs: both if an immigrant is not motivated to learn Korean and if an immigrant is motivated not to learn. For example, during the researcher’s interview with a Filipina marriage-immigrant, who had lived in Korea for more than ten years, she told the researcher that she had intentionally not learned Korean to avoid direct conversations with her Korean mother-in-law, who was oppressive to her. Previous scales lack inclusion of this type of deterrent, which may be practically crucial in improving immigrants’ participation rates.
CHAPTER 3
ADULT IMMIGRANTS’ DETERRENTS TO PARTICIPATION IN KOREAN AS A SECOND LANGUAGE COURSES

This chapter describes a questionnaire-based study on adult immigrants’ deterrents to participating in Korean language programs in South Korea. The chapter begins with an introduction, which delineates the importance of language in acculturation, language learning opportunities for immigrants in Korea, the purpose of the study and the research problem, followed by a brief review of the literature on studies on adults’ deterrents to educational participation. Then, the research method section explained the instrument development process, sample, data collection, and data analysis. The sections providing findings, discussion and conclusions of the study follow.

Introduction
International migration is not a historically new phenomenon; however, the number of people moving from country to country and the patterns of migration have dramatically and continuously changed in this globalized era. The Republic of Korea (hereafter South Korea) has recently experienced rapid changes in demographics due to immigrant populations. Migration, in particular, international migration, requires various kinds of learning for immigrants; language is a significant factor that influences an individual’s successful acculturation into a new cultural setting (Berry, 1997). Numerous studies conducted in various international contexts have shown that language proficiency positively affects immigrants’ and sojourners’ psychological and socio-cultural
adjustment by reducing their anxiety and social distance toward new cultural settings (Ko & Kim, 2011; Li, 2008; Shaffer & Harrison, 2001; Ward & Kennedy, 1993). For example, Li (2008) revealed that Korean language proficiency had a statistically significant effect on Chinese (both Han-Chinese and ethnic-Korean Chinese) migrant workers’ adjustment in South Korea. Similarly, Ko and Kim (2011) studied Koryuin (고려인, ethnic Koreans from countries of the former Soviet Union) who relocated to South Korea and reported that the group with the highest Korean-speaking ability showed a psychological adaptation level significantly higher than that of other groups.

With regard to the importance of language proficiency in acculturation, immigrants in Korea rated communication and language issues as being the most difficult followed by economic issues in the National Survey of Multicultural Families (Korean Women's Development Institute, 2016). Ahn (2012) administered a quantitative survey to 500 randomly selected women who are immigrants by marriage (i.e., marriage-immigrant wives or marriage-immigrant women) regarding their online education needs; the author found that regardless of the marriage-immigrant wives’ original nationality, 72.5% of the total participants responded that they would like to take Korean language classes if they were available online.

**Problem Statement**

To respond to these needs and demands, for several years the Korean government has provided Korean as a second language (KSL) programs for immigrants. The MOJ, in conjunction with the MOGEF, provides free KSL programs, called Korea Immigration and Integration Program (KIIP), which is interconnected with immigration laws, through MFS Centers and other accredited institutes for the program, such as churches and public
libraries. The program consists of two parts: five levels of KSL and a final level, which deals with understanding Korean society. The program is not mandatory for immigrants; however, the government has set up some crucial incentives for completing the program. The major benefits for immigrants completing this program include exemption from a naturalization written test and an interview and a significantly reduced waiting period when they apply for naturalization or exemption from proving their Korean language ability when they apply for permanent residency or other visas that require proof of Korean proficiency.

According to the Korea Immigration Service (2017), there were 30,515 immigrants who enrolled in the 300 accredited KIIP classes in fiscal year 2016. A majority of the participants (54.3%) were marriage-immigrants; 45.7% of them were other types of immigrants, including workers who held non-professional working visas. The Ministry of Justice has allocated approximately 6.5 billion Korean Won (approximately 5.8 million USD) for the operation of KIIP in 2017, an amount which has been continuously increasing. However, according to the National Survey of Multicultural Families (Korean Women's Development Institute, 2013), only 27% of marriage-immigrants and other naturalized immigrants reported that they had participated in any Korean language education programs or in the initial adjustment support program; this number excludes immigrants like nonprofessional workers, the largest population of foreigners in South Korea, and international students.

In short, despite the importance of Korean language proficiency in immigrants’ successful acculturation in Korean society and given the Korean government’s efforts to provide immigrants with suitable educational opportunities, thereby improving their
Korean language ability and adjustment process in Korea, only a limited number of immigrants in Korea have benefitted from this opportunity. This low participation rate in Korean language programs may stem from the nature of immigrants’ lives, including high demands from family and work, or it may be due to inadequately designed course schedules or a lack of immigrants’ awareness of the program. Consequently, to better assist immigrants’ successful acculturation and to maximize the usefulness of KIIP, it is essential to understand why many immigrants do not or cannot participate in KSL programs. However, scholars’ increasing attention has focused on the KIIP’s curriculum and immigrants’ experiences in acculturation, while few studies have provided a sophisticated examination of nonparticipation reasons or deterrents to retention in the programs. In this sense, this study aimed to investigate adult immigrants’ deterrents to participating in KSL programs.

**Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

This research represents an attempt to understand adult immigrants' deterrents to participating in KSL programs for adult immigrants in Korea and to identify the underlying structure of these deterrents to participation. The following research questions guided this study:

1. What reasons deter adult immigrants in Korea from participating in KSL education programs?
2. Are these identified deterrent variables interrelated enough to form a conceptually meaningful underlying structural pattern?
3. What types of immigrants exist with respect to the empirical dimensions of deterrents to participation in KSL programs?
Deterrent scales that have been developed in the U.S. and Korea provide valuable information for understanding immigrants’ deterrents; however, the underlying factor structure of deterrents significantly varies depending on the groups of research participants. Additionally, immigrants commonly have different life patterns from native residents; therefore, it is expected, based on the margin theory (McClusky, 1973), that results from native residents would have limited implications for immigrants to some extent. Consequently, the modification of previous deterrent scales is required, particularly considering current immigrants’ contexts in Korea when creating the instrument items.

**Literature Review**

Adults’ life situations often deter adult learners from participating in education; McClusky (1973) argued that adult learners’ educational participation may occur when they have a margin in their lives. A margin is determined by the ratio of power (resources) over loads (responsibilities). When an adult has a high level of family and work responsibilities and low support from family or social networks, the person would not have enough margin in his or her life for studying a foreign language. According to this theory, adult immigrants who moved from their home countries to a foreign country with or without family usually have unfavorable life conditions for taking advantage of educational opportunities. If an individual migrated to Korea to financially support his or her family in his or her homeland as a non-professional worker, he or she would have a considerable amount of job responsibilities in Korea and would prefer to work for money instead of spending the time learning a foreign language. If a woman migrated to marry a Korean man, she may not have support from her family or access to a social network for
babysitting; this may prevent her from participating in learning Korean. Immigrants generally have less margin in their lives for education, because they have more responsibilities and less power in a new country.

In early studies on deterrents to educational participation, the focus was on identifying the biggest constraints of participation, and studies on deterrents were accompanied by studies on motivation and reasons for learning (e.g., Apt, 1978; Carp et al., 1973; Johnson & Rivera, 1965). For example, in Johnson and Rivera’s (1965) study on barriers to participation, the researchers asked potential adult learners whether or not each of the ten listed reasons was applied to their decisions not to attend adult education courses. Carp et al. (1973) also conducted a survey on 24 nonparticipation reasons and reported that “cost” and “not enough time” were generally the biggest obstacles across various demographic groups. Later, Cross (1981) classified these 24 items into three categories: situational, institutional, and dispositional barriers.

An empirical approach to understanding deterrents to adults’ education participation and to generating a typology of deterrents emerged in the 1980s. These scholars (e.g., Darkenwald & Valentine, 1985; Hayes, 1989; Hayes & Darkenwald, 1988; Scanlan & Darkenwald, 1984; Valentine & Darkenwald, 1990) argued that previous approaches to the typology of deterrents to participation and the analysis of differences based on respondents’ demographics had limited value and that “[t]he most useful approach is to identify groups based on their perception of deterrents and then to describe the groups in terms of available background information” (Hayes, 1989, p. 50). Accordingly, Scanlan and Darkenwald (1984) developed the original Deterrents to Participation Scale (DPS) with 40 items, which was distributed to health professionals.
Then, Darkenwald and Valentine (1985) further developed the instrument into a 32-item DPS-G, which was designed for the general public; based on the empirical data from the DPS-G, six underlying factors of deterrents were identified: lack of confidence, lack of course relevance, time constraints, low personal priority, cost, and personal problems.

Additionally, studies on deterrents to participation assume the demand and the necessity of participation in a given educational activity, such as in professional continuing education and adult basic education. In contrast, studies on predictors of participation tend to deal with more selective educational activities that cannot suppose this demand and necessity to be the case. Beder (1992) made a relevant argument that eligible ABE nonparticipants can be categorized into three groups: the motivated and not-constrained nonparticipants, the motivated but constrained nonparticipants, and the not-motivated “hard core” (Beder, 1992, p. 4), who would voluntarily not attend ABE education even if they had access to and information about free ABE education. In this sense, Quigley (1990, 1997) termed this group of ABE nonparticipants as “resisters” to formal education (Quigley, 1997, p. 195), employing Giroux’s (1983) reproduction and resistance theory. Quigley (1997) suggested three types of resistance and discussed different recruitment approaches for each type of resister: the personal/emotive resister, the ideological/cultural resister, and the older resister. The first two groups resist education due to past schooling experiences, which may have connections to substantiated factors such as a lack of confidence (Darkenwald & Valentine, 1985), self/school incongruence (Hayes, 1988), and dislike for school (Beder, 1990). The older resisters, “‘hard core’ nonparticipants” (Beder, 1992, p. 4), have no demand for education.
Regarding the Korean context, a number of quantitative studies have been conducted in Korea to identify adult learners’ deterrents to education participation in various learning programs (e.g., Choi, 2006; Jeon & Choi, 2007; Lee & Gi, 2009). For example, in Choi’s (2006) study about characteristics and patterns of adult learners’ participation in lifelong education, the researcher reported that nonparticipants attributed lack of time (59.9%) as the major reason for not being able to participate in lifelong education programs; this result is consistent with the results from national surveys on lifelong education participation conducted over the last 30 years in Korea (KEDI, 1982, 1999, 2009, 2011, 2013).

Aiming to understand adult immigrants’ educational participation, Park and Choi (2012) conducted a satisfaction survey for marriage-immigrant women’s participation experiences with KIIP; as a result, 62 immigrants out of 226 respondents living in rural areas in Jeolla-do (province) reported that they did not attend KIIP or any other government-sponsored programs. The major reason for their nonparticipation was “no need to participate” (31 responses, 49%), a response which could be attributed to the longer length of their stay in South Korea. The second reason for nonparticipation was “family’s disapproval.” Additionally, Choi and Han (2012) conducted a qualitative interview study about marriage-immigrants’ experiences participating in KIIP and reported the following six reasons that made their retention in KIIP difficult: (1) understanding the content (Korean language), (2) worrying about the comprehensive evaluation, (3) feeling too old to learn, (4) family responsibility, (5) conflict with job responsibility, and (6) long distance travel to institutes.
Previous studies on adults’ deterrents to educational participation provided limited knowledge about immigrants’ deterrents to language education programs in South Korea in that (1) the features of recent immigration and immigrants in Korean contexts were not taken into consideration, (2) the life patterns of native residents could be very different from those of immigrants, and (3) previous research on deterrent to participation scales lack an inclusion of broader concepts of deterrents, such as resistance or a motivation not to learn.

**Method**

This study employed a quantitative survey method for understanding the research questions. The survey utilized a web-based interface, in addition to traditional paper surveys, and the development and distribution of the surveys were guided by Dillman, Smyth, and Christian’s (2009) tailored design method approach for survey implementation. The following sections delineate each part, including the instrumentation, the sample, data collection, the description of the respondents, and data analysis.

**Instrumentation**

The literature review suggested a new development of a customized instrument measuring adult immigrants’ deterrents to participating in KSL programs in South Korea. In order to design a new instrument of deterrents to participation, first, the concept of *deterrents to participation*, assuming a unidimensional construct, was defined as a reason or a related group of reasons that discourages an adult immigrant from participating in KSL programs.
The development and refinement of the DPS item pool. Three major sources were then utilized in the item generation stage: the previous DPS instrument items, qualitative themes emerging from previous studies about adult immigrants’ education, and the researcher’s interviews with 20 Filipina marriage-immigrants in Korea. The number of deterrent items and factors from each study are attached in Appendix A. In total, 697 deterrents were drawn from previous instruments, qualitative themes, and the interviews. Semantically equivalent items were grouped, resulting in 61 deterrent themes: examples include schedule, cost, work responsibility, location, disapproval from family, eligibility, dislike of the teacher, no need to learn, and so on. Selecting at least one item from each deterrent theme, 98 items were pulled for a cultural critique session.

The cultural critique session was held with six Koreans: the researcher, four doctoral students at the University of Georgia, whose research is related to adult education or multicultural education, and one professor from Korea with ample experience with survey research in education. During the cultural critique session, items that would not be culturally adequate or applicable were discussed, and items that could possibly deliver an equivalent meaning from a respondent’s point of view were also pointed out by the panel. After the critique session, the researcher and her major advisor removed those items from the list.

After the cultural critique session and following decisions made by the researcher and her major advisor, 60 items remained for the practitioners’ review. Two KSL instructors who had taught for KIIP or other KSL programs for adults were recruited and asked to review the questionnaire. For their convenience, the practitioners received an electronic copy of the pretesting questionnaire and individually provided their opinions to
the researcher via email and on the phone. They received both Korean and English versions, and their feedback was accordingly reflected in the instrument.

Additionally, the four Korean doctoral students invited to the cultural critique session and two of the Filipinas living in Korea who were interviewed for another study by the researcher provided feedback on the online pretesting survey. They received an online link to the pretesting questionnaire and participated in and reviewed the online survey. Subsequently, 21 items that were judged to be too similar, too specific, or only relevant to special cases were removed, resulting in the final 39 items that were used in both the pilot survey and the full implementation. Table 3.1 depicts the item reduction process.

**Structure of the survey.** The survey consisted of four parts: eligibility screening questions, a deterrent scale, a self-assessed language proficiency scale, and demographics. The five eligibility questions were asked at the beginning of the survey to screen for Filipino or Vietnamese adults who had lived in Korea for more than three months and had not attended KIIP in the last 6 months or completed the program before. A three-month residency period was set to screen out foreign visitors with visa exemptions or tourist visas, which allow visitors to stay up to 90 days in South Korea.

As part of the deterrent scale, participants were asked to indicate the extent to which each of the 39 deterrents makes it difficult to attend KSL programs using a 5-point Likert scale, from “not at all” to “extremely.” In addition to the 39 deterrent items drawn from the item pooling procedure, an open-ended question was included that asked
the participants to leave a message if there was another reason that was not listed on the scale.

Third, respondents’ self-assessed language proficiency and demographics were collected. The language proficiency of each respondent was self-assessed for Korean and English. Finally, the demographics part included age, gender, education, initial purpose and the year of entry into South Korea, the expected length of further stay in South Korea, employment status, monthly income, the number of hours working, the number of people living in the household, the number of children in Korea, marital status and ethnicity of spouse, financial responsibility in the homeland, the frequency of communication with native Koreans, the satisfaction level with living in Korea,

Table 3.1

*Item Pool Development and Refinement Process*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th># of items</th>
<th>Cumulative # of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step I</td>
<td>Previous DPS instrument items</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative themes emerging from previous studies</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step II</td>
<td>Deletion of semantically equivalent items and selection of at least one item from each group of the 61 deterrent themes</td>
<td>-599</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step III</td>
<td>Cultural critique session and the follow-up decisions by Kim and Valentine</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step IV</td>
<td>Review of a prototype online survey by expert practitioners, doctoral students, and marriage-immigrants</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step V</td>
<td>Pilot implementation and follow-up decisions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
evaluation of interaction experiences with native Koreans, and their city and county address in Korea. Table 3.2 displays the construct of the survey and the number of items in each section.

**Table 3.2**

*Structure of the Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Screening questions</td>
<td>4 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. DPS</td>
<td>40 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Self-assessed language proficiency (Korean and English)</td>
<td>8 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Demographics</td>
<td>15 items and 6 follow-up items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Comments</td>
<td>1 item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>74 items</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pilot test implementation. For the pilot implementation, the instrument was translated from English to Filipino-Tagalog; the process of creating this translation is further detailed in a later section. An IRB-approved invitation was sent to 56 Filipinos whose contact information the researcher had obtained during the development of the survey or while conducting the other research. The invitation was sent through a text message, an email, a Facebook message, and/or Kakaotalk (a mobile application for texting) between the 19th and 21st of July 2015. Responses were collected online from the 19th to the 24th of July 2015.

Among the 56 Filipino participants, 42 out of 48 who visited the survey completed the initial screening questions; 30 participants passed the five screening tests and became eligible for full survey participation. The response rate for eligible
participants was 53.6%. Among these participants, 17 participants completed the survey and provided their mobile numbers, receiving the promised electronic gift card of ₩3,000 (approximately $2.60) within 48 hours of their completion of the survey.

Among the 30 eligible respondents for the survey, eight respondents were removed from the analysis as they insufficiently responded to the deterrent scale. Two additional responses were removed from the analysis, because it was suspected that they had been submitted by the same individuals based on their mobile phone numbers and other responses provided; as a result, the preliminary survey analysis was based on the data from 20 unique participants who completed or mostly completed the pilot survey.

From an analysis of the pilot survey implementation, the deterrent of time-related items was reexamined. There was an item that stated, “I do not have enough free time to attend the Korean classes”; respondents tended not to differentiate between time and free time. Consequently, the possibility of modifying or removing the question from the scale was discussed with the researcher’s major advisor. Although the research purpose was to identify the reasons for the lack of time, it was decided that the item would remain on the instrument as it was, because the item still elicited very important information.

As mentioned above, a ₩3,000 (approximately $2.70) electronic gift card that could be claimed at various convenience stores was provided. It was suspected that two participants had completed the survey more than once, since the mobile phone numbers they provided at the end of the survey were the same. Even though multiple submissions (or cheating) seemed to be possible, affecting the quality of the collected responses, ironically, it was demonstrated that the incentive could promote participation in the
survey. In order to avoid possible resubmission, the incentive was advertised to be received when the survey was closed.

The pilot test and analysis of the pilot results ensured that the data collection method would work and that the selected deterrent items adequately addressed immigrants’ reasons for not participating in language programs. All 39 deterrent items remained in the final survey. Two demographic questions were modified; an additional choice option of an initial purpose for entry into Korea was created according to the responses, and the question asking the expected length of further staying in South Korea was simplified for easier and clearer responses. Finally, the structure of the survey remained the same in the final implementation. A prototype of the final instrument in English is attached in Appendix D.

Target Population

According to the Statistics of Korea, the major ethnic group of immigrants in Korea is Chinese followed by Vietnamese, Thais, and Filipinos. The Chinese immigrants consist of two groups: Ethnic Han Chinese and Ethnic Korean Chinese. The latter are ethnically Korean, but their nationality is Chinese; most of them migrated from Korea to China during Japan’s colonization of Korea and did not come back after the occupation was over. However, because they reside in a special district for ethnic Koreans in China, culturally and linguistically, they are very familiar with the Korean culture and language.

Therefore, in order to know more about deterrents to immigrants participating in Korean as a second language courses, this study included adult immigrants from Vietnam and the Philippines based on its population size and the researcher’s accessibility to the population. Accordingly, the instrument was translated into Tagalog and in Vietnamese.
Immigrants were recruited regardless of their visa status, whether or not they were marriage-immigrants or professional workers and whether or not they were documented or undocumented.

**Translation: Tagalog and Vietnamese**

The instrument was translated from English to Filipino-Tagalog. The back-translation method (Brislin, 1970) was employed to ensure the quality of the equivalence between the original English version and each of the translated versions. The back-translation strategy, which is commonly used in cross-cultural and cross-language studies, is useful in detecting possible problems caused by translation and in evaluating the quality of a translated instrument (Brislin, 1970).

Each translation process adhered to the following procedures. First, a bilingual speaker of English and the target language translated the English version to the target language. Each translated instrument was then back-translated into English by two more bilinguals. The original translated version and the two back-translated versions of each target language were carefully compared by the researcher; if a discrepancy was found among the three versions, the following aspects were carefully evaluated by the researcher and the translators of each language: the equivalency of content, nuance, and function (Harkness, Pennell, & Schoua-Glusberg, 2004). The original translation was accordingly modified until an acceptable degree of agreement between the original translation and the two back-translations was reached.

Specifically, for the Filipino-Tagalog version (Appendix D), the English version was translated into Filipino-Tagalog by a native Filipino-Tagalog speaker from the Philippines who holds a master’s degree in teaching English and currently teaches
English at a four-year college in South Korea. Afterwards, two Filipinas who live in South Korea and are fluent in English translated this Filipino-Tagalog version back into English; one of the back-translators previously worked for the U.S. Army, and the other translator was an English instructor in Korea. The original English version was compared with the two back-translated English versions (see Appendix E); the discrepancies found in the three English versions were reviewed by the researcher and discussed with the Filipino-Tagalog translator. The translator revised the original Filipino-Tagalog translation as needed. The English translators then reviewed the updated Filipino-Tagalog version and revised their back-translations accordingly. Then, again, the original English version was compared with the updated back-translated English versions; little difference was found between the three English versions in terms of the meanings of the scale items. This updated Filipino-Tagalog version was used for the pilot survey distribution. The modification on the survey after pilot implementation was accordingly reflected in the final Filipino-Tagalog version by the original translator.

The Vietnamese version (Appendix D) was translated and back-translated following the same procedure. A Vietnamese doctoral student majoring in Korean language and literature at a prestigious university in South Korea, who is also very fluent in English, translated the English version into a Vietnamese version. Then, the Vietnamese version was back-translated by two UGA students: a graduate student from Vietnam who completed his bachelor’s degree in Vietnam and a second-generation immigrant from Vietnam who had lived in the U.S. for 12 years and had some experience with Vietnamese-English translation.
Sample size

Regarding the sample size for an exploratory factor analysis, a range of guidelines has been proposed by psychometric scholars. Guilford (1954), for example, argued that the minimum sample size for a factor analysis should be 200, and Cattell (1978) introduced the concept of the $N$ (sample size): $p$ (the number of variables) with the recommendation that the ratio should be in the range of 3 to 6. More recently, McCallum, Widaman, Zhang, and Hong (1999) argued that the necessary sample size is influenced greatly by the level of the communality of the variables, the number of factors, and the number of items per factor. Because the level of communality and the number of items per factor cannot be identified or predicted before data collection, the results from the DPS-G instrument (Darkenwald & Valentine, 1985) were referenced to determine the minimum sample size. No study, however, reported the communalities of each item or the entire factor loading table, so the communalities were very roughly calculated by squaring only the reported 31 factor loading values, resulting in an average of .43. McCallum et al. (1999) recommended around 200 as a sufficient sample size when communalities are lower than .5, but only if the factors are highly determined—6 to 7 items per factor. Based on this recommendation and the statistics from the DPS-G, at least 200 responses were the aim regardless of the participants’ ethnicity.

Data Collection

After the survey development, pilot testing, and final IRB approval (Appendix B), the researcher administered the full instrument between January 28th and February 17th, 2016 using the Tagalog and Vietnamese versions through an online survey tool, Qualtrics, and paper copies.
On the first page of the online survey, respondents were informed about the study and survey, and then, they acknowledged that they gave their consent by clicking the "continue" button at the bottom of the page. No signatures were collected. The online survey consisted of five sections: 1) five screening questions about eligibility, 2) a deterrent to participation scale, 3) self-assessed language proficiency, 4) demographics, and 5) incentive information. Screening questions were asked to determine their eligibility, which included:

- being an adult, over the age of 18;
- identifying as Filipino or Vietnamese;
- living in Korea for more than three months, and;
- not having participated in KSL programs in the last six months or not having completed the six-level program before.

If a respondent passed the first five questions, then the full instrument was given; otherwise, an ineligibility message was given. After completion of the DPS scale, language proficiency scale, and demographics, respondents were directed to an incentive information page.

It was advertised that the first 200 participants who completed the full survey would receive a W3,000 (approximately $2.70) electronic gift card that could be claimed at various convenience stores, online shopping malls, bookstores, movie theaters and so on, if they left their mobile numbers in the appropriate section. In Korea, the Culture Gift Card (the Moon-Hwa Gift Card) is a widely-used gift card that was originally developed for buying books and participating in cultural activities and became more widely accepted for other purchases, including online shopping malls, convenience stores and
grocery stores. An electronic gift card could be sent to their mobile phones as a text message with an 18-digit PIN number required to claim it.

Recruitment of the survey participants was conducted in various ways. A flyer (Appendix C) with the survey link was posted on Facebook group pages, where many Filipinos or Vietnamese visit upon the website gatekeepers' permission. The researcher sent the online survey link to her Filipino and Vietnamese acquaintances, encouraging participation in and distribution of the survey. At the end of the survey, respondents were solicited to share the online survey link with their friends by providing a customized link to the survey through social media, such as Facebook, Tweeter, Google Plus, and email. Additionally, the researcher distributed flyers in churches and immigrants' public meetings upon permission beforehand, because the survey period included the Lunar New Year holidays in South Korea, and there were many religious or ethnic meetings for Filipinos and Vietnamese. For their convenience, paper-copies of the survey were also provided so that they could complete the survey on the spot if they preferred to do so. The flyer and printed survey forms were handed to leaders of the meetings and collected at the end of each meeting. Then, the completed survey forms were coded into the online system by the researcher.

The survey site was closed on February 17th, 2016 as had been advertised, since the total number of submitted responses reached 247 regardless of the quality of each response. In total, 160 respondents who voluntarily left their mobile numbers received the promised gift card.
Data Preparation

From the full implementation of the survey, 247 respondents passed the screening questions and partially or fully completed the survey. No recoding or reverse-coding was conducted for the DPS or language-proficiency scales.

Age was newly calculated and coded by subtracting the year they were born from 2016, and the number of years living in Korea was calculated using the same method. For the educational attainment variable, because the grading system in the Philippines used to be composed of six years of elementary education and four years of high school education when current adult Filipinos attended school, Filipinos’ responses to the educational attainment question was recoded to match the coded number and information consistent with the educational attainment information from the Vietnamese responses. Basically, Filipino’s high school completion was regarded as the completion of one’s secondary education and, respectively, of one’s subsequent upper level education, although Filipinos were usually 15 years old when they finished high school.

Because no DPS items were omitted or altered from the pilot testing, 20 responses from pilot testing that were deemed of good quality were included in the final analysis. Regarding the quality of the deterrent scale, 23 responses with no variances in the total 39 DPS items were removed from the analyses; 74 responses with any missing values were also removed from the analyses. Consequently, 170 responses were used for the analyses with the deterrent scale.

Among 39 DPS items, 37 items showed normal distributions; the skewness statistics were less than |2| (see Table 3.3). Responses to two items, Item 17 (family disapproval of participation) and Item 28 (personal health problem or disability), were
Table 3.3

Descriptive and Distribution Statistics of DPS Items (N = 170)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The standard error of skewness was .19. The standard error of kurtosis was .37.
nonnormally distributed—right-skewed. The two items were the two lowest scored items. Because exploratory factor analysis does not require variable normality, no further actions were made. However, in regard to the difficulty factor issue (Bandalos, 2010), the factor analysis results were carefully examined, and no issue was found.

Based on the largest Mahalanobis distances analysis, 30 outliers were identified at the .05 alpha level; however, none of them included a typo error. Therefore, they all remained in the data. As for the missing data treatment, a complete case approach was used, based on a listwise deletion. In terms of reliability, the Cronbach’s alpha estimates in the present study were .924 for the full scale.

**Description of the Respondents**

The total number of respondents was 267, including the 20 pilot testing respondents; after deleting any responses with missing values on the DPS scale, 170 usable responses remained for the analysis. A summary of demographic information of the 170 respondents is presented in Table 3.4. The total respondents included slightly more females (52.7%) than males (47.3%). The average age of the respondents was 35.21 (SD = 8.4). In terms of educational attainment, one third (32.5%) graduated after some college or after getting a 2-year degree; slightly more than one third (37.4%) held Bachelor’s degrees; more than a quarter of them (28.2%) were high school graduates. 80.6% of the respondents were Filipinos, and the others were Vietnamese.

Two-thirds of the respondents visited South Korea with the initial purpose of working (66.5%), and more than a quarter of the respondents came to live with their Korean or non-Korean spouses (28.0%). The average number of years living in Korea was reported as 6.1 years (SD = 5.7), ranging from 0 to 24 years.
Table 3.4

**Demographic Information of the Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency / Mean</th>
<th>Percent (%) / SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduates</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or 2-year college degree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college degree (Bachelor’s degree)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree or higher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipinos</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Purpose for Coming to Korea</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To live with spouse and family</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To work</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Number of Years in South Korea</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 Years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 21 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency / Mean</th>
<th>Percent (%) / SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected Number of Years in South Korea</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No plan to leave Korea</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monthly Household Income ($1 = ₩1,136)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $880</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$880 to $1,760</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,760– $2,640</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,640 and more</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed or other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, never married</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Living together</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/Divorced/Widowed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spouse 's/Partner 's Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino/a or Vietnamese</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Responsibility for Family in Homeland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Half of the respondents (51.9%) earned ₩1,000,000 to ₩1,999,999 (approximately $880 to $1,760) a month. Less than a quarter of the respondents (22.2%) earned less than ₩1,000,000 (approximately $880) a month. Regarding employment status, 78.1% of the respondents were employed in various ways; their average number of working hours per week was 44.9 hours, ranging from 8 to 122 hours. Two-thirds of the respondents (65.6%) were married; among those who reported their spouses’ ethnicities, 63.3% of them married someone of the same ethnicity as themselves, and 35.8% of them married a Korean. Four out of ten respondents lived with a number of children, and 29.4% of the respondents lived with a number of adult native Korean speakers. Nearly 70% of the total respondents reported that they communicated with native Koreans every day or almost every day.

Respondents’ language proficiency in Korean and English was self-assessed using a 5-point Likert scale in four areas: speaking, understanding, reading, and writing. On average, respondents’ Korean proficiency was self-evaluated as 9.75, with reading considered slightly better than writing. English proficiency was more highly rated at 12.88, with higher scores on reading and writing (Table 3.5). The better proficiency in English is undoubtedly related to the fact that 80% of the respondents are Filipinos, and many Filipinos are able to speak English because of the former U.S. occupation of the Philippines.

Data Analysis

Various analyses were conducted, using IBM SPSS 24, in order to answer the following three research questions:
1. What reasons deter adult immigrants in Korea from participating in KSL education programs?

2. Are these identified deterrent variables interrelated enough to form a conceptually meaningful underlying structural pattern?

3. What types of immigrants exist with respect to the empirical dimensions of deterrents to participation in KSL programs?

To answer the first research question, the means and standard deviations of each deterrent item were calculated, and the rank order is presented in the finding section to identify the biggest deterrents to participation in the KSL programs.

Table 3.5

Self-Assessed Language Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Not well</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessed Korean Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Means)</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-assessed English Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Not well</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Means)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding the second research question, exploratory factor analysis – more specifically, a principal-axis factor (PAF) analysis – was performed to investigate latent factors of the deterrents for adult immigrants’ participation in KSL programs. PAF analysis was appropriate regarding the purposes of the study based on Widaman’s (1993) recommendation to employ common factor analysis if the researcher is interested in interpreting “the patterns of observed covariation among variables as arising from latent variables or factors” (p. 308) in psychological and social scientific fields, as common factor analysis, compared to principal component analysis, aims to reduce the number of variables and assumes the uniqueness of the variables. Although the 39 DPS items were thoroughly extracted from the literature and other sources, realistically in social science studies, it is hardly assumed that a scale can measure the entire component of a latent factor. Consequently, this research employed PAF, the most common method of common factor analysis.

To measure how amenable the items in the correlation matrix are to factoring, the Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was computed. The KMO statistic should be close to 1.0 to show that the correlations among items are sufficiently high to make factor analysis suitable. For this study, the KMO measure computed was .861, which is meritorious to factoring (Kaiser, 1974). Bartlett’s test of sphericity was also conducted to test whether the items were completely uncorrelated with each other, resulting in a significant amount of correlation among items, $\chi^2 (741) = 3011 \ (p = .000)$.

Several criteria were used to determine the number of factors to retain. First of all, the K1 rule suggested four factors (39.6% of the total variance explained). In
addition, the scree plot test also suggested four factors, despite its ambiguity. However, a parallel analysis, which is a statistics-based guideline for determining the number of factors to retain (Kann, 2006), suggested the retention of six factors; nevertheless, there was sufficient evidence of overfactoring: one factor included no high loadings greater than .50, and three factors had fewer than three items with loadings greater than .50. More importantly, in terms of interpretability, the six-factor solution provided no meaningful explanation of the immigrants’ deterrents to participation. Bandalos and Finney (2010) recommended using theory or previous research in addition to those statistical methods when researchers decide on the number of factors to be retained. Therefore, the number of factors chosen in this study was rather high, relying on the interpretability of the factors. All possible solutions, from three factors to eight factors, were reviewed and compared in terms of interpretability; as a result, the three-factor solution suggested the most interpretable and clear factor structure.

A cluster analysis was conducted to answer the third research question, “What types of immigrants exist with respect to the empirical dimensions of deterrents to participation in KSL programs?” The cluster analysis method, which segments the respondents into subgroups depending on their patterns of deterring factors, instead of differentiating one group from another by their sociodemographic variables, would draw more meaningful results and implications for further development of KIIP. Cluster analysis is a statistical technique to differentiate one group from another by maximizing within group similarities and between group differences (Tan, Steinbach & Kumar, 2005).
To cluster the sample, first, factor scores from each of the three factors were calculated using regression estimates. Then, the $k$-means clustering procedure, “a prototype-based, partitional clustering technique” (Tan, Steinbach & Kumar, 2005, p. 495), was chosen among three different clustering procedures available in SPSS, because the procedure is suitable for a moderately sized data set, and this data set only includes continuous variables (Norušis, 2011). Before running the cluster analysis, outliers were identified by a Mahalanobis distances analysis; as a result, nine cases were removed from the analysis (alpha < .05).

Because “The SPSS $k$-means cluster procedure (QUICK CLUSTER command) appears to be very sensitive to case order” (IBM Support, 2016, para 1), in order to minimize the order effect, several sets of random numbers were assigned and sorted by the given sets of random numbers. For each set of random numbers, three to eight clusters models were examined.

The five-cluster model was chosen among various number models, because the five-cluster model yielded the most informative sets of deterrent factors. Among slightly different results from the data sets sorted in various ways, the ones with the minimum average distance to cluster centers were selected to present. It is worthy to note that those results from different data sorting showed insignificantly different results in the patterns of deterrent factors. Additionally, a post-hoc ANOVA analysis was performed for such continuous independent variables as age, income level, and life satisfaction level, and chi-square tests were examined for categorical variables to check the statistical differences among the five groups, choosing the Bonferroni-adjusted $p$-value of .1. Table 3.6 displays the statistics used for each research question.


Limitations of the Study

The sampling used in this study was a non-random convenience-based sampling of Filipino and Vietnamese immigrants in South Korea. The respondents had to have access to the Internet to participate in the online survey or happened to be present at the meetings the researcher attended to distribute the paper-copy of the survey. This indicates that the sampling could be biased in a way; therefore, generalizations of the findings beyond this study could be flawed.

The sample size of the data set used in the final exploratory factor analysis was 170, although the researcher aimed to collect 200 complete responses as recommended by measurement experts (McCallum et al., 1999). However, a minimum sample size for an exploratory factor analysis hasn’t been determined by popular agreement yet, and de Winter, Dodou, and Wieringa (2009) proved that if data are well conditioned, a data set of less than 50 could produce reliable results from exploratory factor analysis. Despite

Table 3.6

*Summary of Data Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What reasons deter adult immigrants in Korea from participating in KSL education programs?</td>
<td><em>Frequency, Mean, S.D., Rank</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are these identified deterrent variables interrelated enough to form a conceptually meaningful underlying structural pattern?</td>
<td>Exploratory Factor Analysis (Principal-axis Factor Analysis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is there a meaningful relationship between sociodemographic variables and the factors identified as deterring participation?</td>
<td>Cluster Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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the fact that the sample size was smaller than recommended, this would not critically
discourage the reliability of this study or findings from this study, although a larger
sample size would have been more desirable.

**Findings**

The purpose of this study is to understand adult immigrants’ deterrents to
participation in KSL programs in South Korea. In this findings section, the results from
the various statistical analyses described in the previous section are presented in relation
to the three research questions guiding this study:

1. What reasons deter adult immigrants in Korea from participating in KSL
   education programs?
2. Are these identified deterrent variables interrelated enough to form a
   conceptually meaningful underlying structural pattern?
3. What types of immigrants exist with respect to the empirical dimensions
   of deterrents to participation in KSL programs?

**Findings Related to Research Question #1**

In order to answer the first research question, descriptive results of the mean and
standard deviation of each deterrent item were calculated and are presented in Table 3.7.
The response scale was a 5-point scale; the minimum and maximum values of each item
were 1 and 5 respectively. The means of the 39 DPS items ranged from 1.36 to 3.13.
Only one DPS item exceeded 3.0, and four DPS items rated below 1.5.

The top five deterrents were due to external reasons: lack of free time, the
difficulty of the Korean language, household responsibilities, institution location, and
class schedule. These reasons for nonparticipation are popularly found in studies on
Table 3.7

Descriptive Statistics of DPS (Rank Order, N = 170)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>DPS Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I do not have enough free time to attend the Korean classes.</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>The Korean language is too difficult to master.</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>I have too many household responsibilities to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>The Korean classes were held in a location too far away.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The classes were held at times I could not go.</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>I believe it would take too long time to complete the program.</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>I prefer to learn Korean in my own way.</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>I did not think I could attend Korean classes regularly.</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I am too tired to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I was too worried about taking tests.</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Available transportation to the Korean classes was inconvenient.</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>I did not know that there were Korean classes available for immigrants/foreigners.</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.7 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>DPS Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>I had no friends who could attend Korean classes with me.</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>I could not afford expenses for Korean classes.</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>The registration process was difficult.</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>I was afraid to go to an unfamiliar place.</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I feel I am too old to learn Korean.</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I thought it would be hard to get along with the other students in the class.</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>My Korean is already good enough.</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am not interested in learning Korean.</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I do not believe they allowed me to take the class because of my legal status.</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>I am not confident in my learning ability.</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>I tried to start classes but they were already full or I missed the registration period.</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>I do not like going outside due to native Koreans' disrespectful attitudes toward me.</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>DPS Items</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Frequency (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Attending Korean classes would not improve my life in Korea.</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>I am afraid to begin learning something new.</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>I did not want to sit in a formal classroom to learn Korean.</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>The program content probably would not be relevant to my needs.</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>I had to take care of my child(ren). (Note: If you do not have a child, select “1”).</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>I do not enjoy studying.</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>My previous experiences with Korean classes did not meet my expectation. (Note: If you have no previous experience with Korean classes, please select “1”).</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>The incentives for completing the government-sponsored Korean language program is not important to me.</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>I was afraid to take public transportation alone to attend the Korean classes.</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>I had family problems that made it difficult to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.7 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>DPS Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Some what</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>I do not need to know Korean.</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I tend to feel guilty when I have to leave home to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>I heard that the Korean classes were not very good.</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>My family did not like the idea of my attending Korean classes.</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>I have a personal health problem or disability that made me difficult to attend the Korean classes.</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
deterrents to participation. The next five top-rated items are related to negative or doubtful attitudes toward institutionalized learning except one item: *it would take too long time to complete the program* (Item 20), *I prefer to learn Korean in my own way* (Item 22), *I did not think I could attend Korean classes regularly* (Item 21), and *I was too worried about taking tests* (Item 3). The excluded item is *I am too tired to attend Korean classes* (Item 30).

**Findings Related to Research Question #2**

A principal-axis factor (PAF) analysis was performed to investigate latent factors of the deterrents for adult immigrants’ participation in KSL programs. The three-factor model was chosen, accounting for 36.1% of the variance in the 39 items (Table 3.8). The factors were rotated to approximate a simple structure using a varimax rotation. The correlation matrix, the item communalities, and the pattern matrix from the varimax rotation are attached in Appendices. A high criterion of .45 was used to determine loadings that should be retained for interpretation. One cross-loading item was found (Item 39) in Factor I and Factor II; the item was located in Factor I, which was highly loaded and more interpretable. Fourteen items were not loaded on any of the factors based on the salient loading of .45. Table 3.9 presents the 14 items unloaded on any factors. Factor I is composed of 11 items and labeled Negative Attitudes. Factor II is defined by eight items related to Social Isolation, whereas the six items loaded on Factor III are characterized by Competing Demands. Details of each factor and related statistics are provided in the following sections.

**Factor I: Negative Attitudes.** Factor I explained 15.6% of the total variance extracted and rotated, and the factor loadings are presented in Table 3.10. This factor
Table 3.8  

**Total Variance Explained**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>28.71</td>
<td>28.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>35.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.9  

**Unloaded DPS Items by Highest Factor Loading**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Loading Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The classes were held at times I could not go.</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am not interested in learning Korean.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I was too worried about taking tests.</td>
<td>I, III</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I do not believe they allowed me to take the class because of my legal status.</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I am not confident in my learning ability.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I could not afford expenses for Korean classes.</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I had to take care of my child(ren).</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I prefer to learn Korean in my own way.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I had no friends who could attend Korean classes with me.</td>
<td>I, III</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>My previous experiences with Korean classes did not meet my expectation.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I had family problems that made it difficult to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>The Korean language is too difficult to master.</td>
<td>I, III</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>The registration process was difficult.</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>My Korean is already good enough.</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consisted of 11 DPS items and includes immigrants’ negative and passive attitudes toward learning, learning in a formal setting, such as in school, learning Korean and their own ability to learn. Factor loadings ranged from .78 to .45. The cross-loaded Item 39, *the program content probably would not be relevant to my needs*, was placed in this factor. The loading value for this item is .58.

This factor consists of relatively low-scoring items. The top-rated item in this factor is ranked 17th, and the lowest-rated item in this factor is the lowest rated item among the 39 DPS items. Regarding the loading values, the item with the highest
loading value is I do not enjoy studying (Item 23), and the second one is I did not want to sit in a formal classroom to learn Korean (Item 31). Both items clearly show negative attitudes toward learning and institutionalized learning. The following items are related to negative opinions about KIIP: The incentives for completing the government-sponsored Korean language program is not important to me (Item 32), the program content probably would not be relevant to my needs (Item 39), attending Korean classes would not improve my life in Korea (Item 33), and I heard that the Korean classes were not very good (Item 26). A passive attitude toward learning is also included in the factor: I don’t need to learn Korean (Item 38) and I feel too old to learn Korean (Item 4).

**Factor II: Social Isolation.** This factor is made up of eight DPS items related to the lack of social interaction or information and explains 11.85% of the total variance extracted. Table 3.11 provides item loadings, means, and the rank of the items loaded on this factor. This factor consists of middle-scoring items.

Items in this factor are related to fear of social interactions and psychological resistance to unfamiliarity: I do not like going outside due to native Koreans’ disrespectful attitudes toward me (Item 14), I thought it would be hard to get along with the other students in the class (Item 6), I was afraid to take public transportation alone to attend the Korean classes (Item 13), and I was afraid to go to an unfamiliar place (Item 25). Furthermore, the other items are associated with external reasons limiting their choices: Available transportation to the Korean classes was inconvenient (Item 16), I did not know that there were Korean classes available for immigrants/foreigners (Item 19), I tried to start classes, but they were already full or I missed the registration period (Item
Table 3.11

*Factor II: Social Isolation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I do not like going outside due to native Koreans’ disrespectful attitudes toward me.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I thought it would be hard to get along with the other students in the class.</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I was afraid to take public transportation alone to attend the Korean classes.</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Available transportation to the Korean classes was inconvenient.</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I did not know that there were Korean classes available for immigrants/foreigners.</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>My family did not like the idea of my attending Korean classes.</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I was afraid to go to an unfamiliar place.</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I tried to start classes but they were already full or I missed the registration period.</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.12

*Factor III: Competing Demands*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I did not think I could attend Korean classes regularly.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I believe it would take too long time to complete the program.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I am too tired to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I do not have enough free time to attend the Korean classes.</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I have too many household responsibilities to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The Korean classes were held in a location too far away.</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18), and *my family did not like the idea of my attending Korean classes* (Item 17).

**Factor III: Competing Demands.** The six DPS items with primary loading on Factor III consisted of reasons of nonparticipation related to time and other priorities. This factor accounted for 8.68% of the total variance extracted, and Table 3.12 provides item loadings and the means for Factor III. This factor includes many highly-rated items.

The items in this factor are relevant to time constraint: *I believe it would take too long time to complete the program* (Item 20), *I do not have enough free time to attend the Korean classes* (Item 9), and *the Korean classes were held in a location too far away* (Item 15). Items related to other priorities over learning Korean were also included in this factor: *I did not think I could attend Korean classes regularly* (Item 21), *I am too tired to attend Korean classes* (Item 30), and *I have too many household responsibilities to attend Korean classes* (Item 11).

**Descriptive statistics of the three factors.** Table 3.13 provides the descriptive statistics of the three factors. To compare the mean of the factors, mean-item means were calculated; Factor III, Competing Demands, showed the highest score, indicating the most compelling deterring factor to participation in KSL programs. The factors showed normal distribution.

**Relation of factors to sociodemographic variables.** A secondary analysis was conducted to test the relation of the factors to sociodemographic variables, using standardized factor scores, with a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1, estimated by the regression method. The Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to evaluate the relationships between each of the three factors and the following 12 continuous variables: (a) age, (b) the number of years in South Korea, (c) the income level, (d) Korean
Table 3.13

Key Statistics of the Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor #</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean-Item Means</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor I</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor II</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.64</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor III</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

language proficiency, (e) English language proficiency, (f) the number of working hours per week, (g) the number of people living together, (h) the number of children living together, (i) the number of adult native Korean speakers living together, (j) the frequency of communication with native Korean speakers, (k) the satisfaction level of living in South Korea, and (l) the overall experience level with native Koreans. The correlation coefficient \( r \) and the significance level \( p \) of the 12 independent variables are presented in Table 3.14.

As can be seen, three relationships were found to be statistically significant at the .05 significance level. Specifically, there was a negative relationship between Factor I and the frequency of communication with native Korean speakers \( [r = .194, n = 153, p = .016] \) and another negative correlation between Factor I and the satisfaction level of living in South Korea \( [r = .191, n = 153, p = .018] \). That is, increases in the frequency of communication with native Korean speakers and increases in the satisfaction level of living in South Korea were significantly associated with decreases in immigrants’ negative attitudes toward learning the Korean language. The final significant relationship is between Factor II, social isolation, and the number of adult native Korean speakers.
Table 3.14

*Correlation between Factor Scores and Sociodemographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Attitudes</td>
<td>Social Isolation</td>
<td>Competing Demands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Age (n = 160)</td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) The Number of Years in South Korea (n = 151)</td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) The Income Level (n = 158)</td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Korean Language Proficiency (n = 165)</td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) English Language Proficiency (n = 167)</td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) The Number of Working Hours Per Week (n = 112)</td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) The Number of People Living Together (n = 132)</td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) The Number of Children Living Together (n = 69)</td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>-.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) The Number of Adult Native Korean Speakers Living Together (n = 50)</td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.425**</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Frequency of Communication with Native Korean Speaker† (n = 153)</td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>-.194*</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>-.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) The Satisfaction Level of Living in South Korea (n = 153)</td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>-.191*</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) The Overall Experience Level with Native Koreans (n = 153)</td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>-.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).**

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).**

†Reversely coded.
living together \[ r = .425, n = 50, p = .002 \]. A greater number of Koreans living together was significantly correlated to a higher level of social isolation in South Korea.

A series of one-way ANOVAs was conducted to compare the effect of each of the following categorical variables on each of the three factors: gender, ethnicity, education, initial purpose for coming to Korea, employment status, marital status, spouse’s ethnicity, and financial responsibility. The factor scores of the three factors were dependent variables, and the eight demographic variables were independent variables. The results of the ANOVAs indicated no significant relationship between each of the three factors and all the independent variables except for ethnicity and education on Factor I. There was a significant difference on negative attitudes depending on the respondents’ ethnicity at the \( p < .05 \) level \( [F (1, 168) = 5.48, p = 0.02] \); Vietnamese respondents tended to possess significantly less negative attitudes toward learning the Korean language in an institution \( (M = -.33, SD = .69) \) than Filipinos \( (M = .08, SD = .96) \). Additionally, the respondents hold significantly different levels of negative attitudes depending on their educational attainment level \( [F (2, 160) = 3.82, p = .02] \). Post-hoc comparisons using the Bonferroni correction indicated that the respondents with a bachelor’s degree \( (M = .14, SD = 1.03) \) tended to have significantly more negative attitudes with regard to learning and learning Korean than the respondents with or without high school diplomas \( (M = -.31, SD = .61) \). However, the other pairwise comparisons were not significantly different at the \( p < .05 \) level.

**Findings Related to Research Question #3**

A cluster analysis was performed to answer the third research question, which concerned developing a typology of immigrants with respect to the empirical dimensions
of deterrents to participation in KSL programs. Standardized factor scores using regression estimates were computed from the 3-factor solution used to address the second research question. The covariance matrix of the factor score is presented in Table 3.17. Nine cases determined to be outliers were removed from the data; 161 responses were used in the final cluster analysis. The $K$-means method was employed, and the data were
randomly reorganized to minimize the ordering effect of the method. Solutions of three
to eight clusters were calculated and examined; the five-cluster model with the minimum
average distance to cluster centers was chosen based on its conceptual clarity. The factor
scores of each cluster are represented in Table 3.1 and Figure 3.1.

The five clusters were labeled in relation to their demographic characteristics and
defining factors: Active Young Workers, Income-oriented Temporary Workers, Isolated
Long-term Resisters, Integrated Professional Immigrants, and Married Residents.
Detailed information, deterring factors, and the demographics of each type of immigrant
are illustrated below.

**Cluster I: Active Young Workers.** This cluster’s members, constituting 19% of
the respondents, are too busy to attend Korean language programs, although they are
eager to learn Korean. This group exhibits the highest score on the Competing Demands
factor ($z = .94$) and the lowest score on the Negative Attitudes factor of deterrents ($z =
- .83$) among the five groups.
### Table 3.18

*Cluster Analysis Results: Final Cluster Centers and the Number of Cases (N=161)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Negative Attitudes*</th>
<th>Social Isolation*</th>
<th>Competing Demands*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Active Young Workers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Income-Oriented Temporary Workers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Isolated Long-Term Resisters</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Integrated Professionals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Married Residents</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: z-scores

![Figure 3.1](factor_scores.png)

Figure 3.1 *Factor Scores of the Cluster Centers*
The immigrants in this group tend to be young males, employed, and Vietnamese. They are 33.03 years old on average, the youngest group among the five groups ranging in age from 20 to 47 years old, and have lived in Korea less than 5 years on average. In other words, they are relatively young and newcomers to Korea. The number of never-married singles is highest in this group, and the satisfaction level of living in Korea ($M = 3.97$) is, statistically speaking, significantly higher than that of immigrants in Cluster III ($M_{diff} = .64, p = .026$). They work more than the other immigrants, working 51.4 hours per week on average, while others work 44.50 hours on average; however, their monthly income level was reported second lowest among the five groups. This may indicate that they are nonprofessional workers.

Their self-assessed Korean language proficiency was highest among the five groups of immigrants; this would be related to the fact that recent foreign workers with working visas must take the TOPIK test. Their self-assessed English language proficiency was the lowest, which could be associated with the higher proportion of Vietnamese compared to other groups.

**Cluster II: Income-oriented Temporary Workers.** These immigrants make up 22% of the study’s population. Immigrants in this group are averagely constrained from participating in Korean language courses because of Negative Attitudes ($z = -.03$) and Competing Demands ($z = .11$); particularly, they are greatly undeterred with regard to the Social Isolation factor ($z= -.79$).

What makes this group of immigrants considerably different from other group members is their age, their period of time in Korea, their income level, their financial responsibility, and the number of years that they expect to reside in Korea. They are the
oldest group among the five; their average age is 38.0, and their average number of years in Korea is 7.25 years. They came to Korea to work and have lived in Korea longer than the others. They tend to be married (63.3%) to spouses of the same ethnicity (70.8%), but their spouses are more likely not to be in Korea (58.3%). This tendency would be relevant to the result that they are more likely to be financially responsible for their families in the home country than other groups (87.9%, average: 78.8%). They indicated the lowest level in their response to “no plan to leave Korea”; one quarter of them would like to leave Korea in three to five years, and another quarter hopes to leave Korea in five to ten years. This tendency caused this group to be labeled temporary, because although they have lived in South Korea longer than other immigrants, they ultimately plan to go back to their home country; therefore, they are less willing to learn Korean, even though their self-assessed Korean proficiency is the lowest. More than half of this group (53.1%) earned between $1,000 and $1,999 a month, and one fourth of the group (25.0%) earned less than $1,000 per month, which implies the lowest income level.

**Cluster III: Isolated Long-term Resisters.** This immigrant group consists of 21% of the survey participants and is highly deterred from Korean language education because of their Negative Attitudes ($z = 1.04$) and Social Isolation ($z = 1.19$). They are labeled Isolated Long-term Resisters due to their deterrent profile and sociodemographic features described below.

The immigrants in this group have lived in Korea for 6.07 years on average, which is similar to the total mean. They are both male and female, came to Korea to work—being financially responsible for their families in their homeland, and have a spouse of the same ethnicity as their own and a number of children. If they are married,
their spouse is more likely not to be in Korea (65.2%). This description of the Cluster III immigrants would not be very distinguishable from the Cluster II immigrants.

What distinguishes this group of immigrants is, however, that they have the lowest frequency of communication with native Korean speakers and least favorable experiences with Koreans among the five types of immigrants. Although they are more educated – 84.4% of them hold some college or higher degrees, they earn more than the average, and they have better (self-assessed) English proficiency, their satisfaction level with living in South Korea is lower than other immigrant groups, and their overall experiences with native Koreans were the least pleasant. Particularly, compared to Cluster V, immigrants in this group are significantly less happy with their previous experiences with native Koreans at the $p < .05$ level ($M_{diff} = .53, p = .044$). Almost one third of immigrants in this group (30.0%) responded that they communicate with native Korean speakers 3 to 4 times a week in their daily lives, while the immigrants in Clusters I and V responded that they communicate with native Korean speakers every day (55.2%, 54.3% respectively). Their lowest frequency of contact with native Korean speakers may be related to their high factor score on the Social Isolation factor.

**Cluster IV: Integrated Professional Immigrants.** The immigrants in this group consist of only 4% of the survey participants; yet, the group appeared in any number of cluster models tested. Although specific numerical descriptions of the group that appeared in the various cluster models would be somewhat different, the group is defined by its extremely high scores on the Negative Attitude factor ($z = 2.05$) and the Competing Demands factor ($z = 1.16$) and a much lower score on the Social Isolation factor ($z = -1.61$). In other words, immigrants in this group are highly deterred from pursuing a
Korean language education by their negative attitudes toward obtaining a formal education or learning Korean and by other competing demands. In contrast, the group is highly undeterred by Social Isolation, which may indicate that they have an adequate social network and sufficient resources in Korea.

The distinctive characteristics of this group are as follows:

• the immigrants in this group tend to be slightly older women who had lived in Korea longer than the other groups had ($M = 7.57$ years), with relatively fluent English proficiency ($M = 15.00$);

• they are well-educated—all but one person held bachelor’s or higher degrees;

• they are less likely to leave Korea than the immigrants in the other groups, yet they are less satisfied with their lives in Korea ($M = 3.29$);

• they tend to earn more than the immigrants in the other groups, in particular, significantly more than the immigrants in Cluster I, Young Active Workers ($M_{diff} = 1.69$, $p = .085$), in Cluster II, the Income-oriented Temporary Workers ($M_{diff} = 1.79$, $p = .051$), and in Cluster V, Married Residents ($M_{diff} = 1.64$, $p = .079$) at the .10 Bonferroni-adjusted alpha level; and,

• although they have relatively fewer occasions for communication in Korean than other immigrants, they have had the most favorable experiences with native Koreans ($M = 3.86$). Half of the group came to Korea for marriage, and the other half came to work, and they are less likely to be financially responsible for their families in the home country than other groups (57.1%).

**Cluster V: Married Residents.** This cluster represents recent marriage-immigrants and other foreign workers living with their families in Korea. They are
averagely deterred from participation in Korean language programs by Negative Attitudes \( (z = -.39) \) and Social Isolation factors \( (z = -.13) \) and greatly undeterred by the Competing Demands factor \( (z = -.90) \), which would indicate that they have enough time to participate in Korean classes.

This group composes 34\% of the survey participants in the analysis; there are slightly more women (57.4\%). They tend to be married (71.4\%); their spouses’ ethnicities could be the same (47.1\%) or Korean (50\%). Either way, their spouses are more likely to live in South Korea (61.8\%). They most frequently communicate with native Korean speakers \[ F(4, 140) = 2.08, p = .087 \]; 80\% of them communicate with native Korean speakers every day or almost every day. This frequency level of communication with native Koreans is significantly higher than immigrants in Cluster III \( (M_{diff} = 1.49, p = .067) \). One third of the people in this group do not have plans to leave Korea. They work less compared to other groups of immigrants \( (M = 38.24 \text{ hours}) \); therefore, their income level is relatively lower than other groups. Their educational attainment level is lowest; 43.4\% of them completed high school or less. Their self-assessed Korean proficiency score is the lowest.

**Secondary analysis.** The demographic statistics of the five clusters are summarized in Table 3.19 and Table 3.20. A one-way ANOVA was performed to test any differences among the five clusters on each of the following 12 continuous variables: age, the number of years in South Korea, income level, Korean language proficiency, English language proficiency, the number of working hours per week, the number of people living together, the number of children living together, the number of adult native Korean speakers living together, the frequency of communication with native Korean
speakers, the satisfaction level with living in South Korea, and the overall experience level with native Koreans. The cluster variable was an independent variable, and the 12 demographic variables were dependent variables.

The results revealed that there are significant differences among the five clusters for their satisfaction level with living in South Korea \([F (4, 140) = 2.67, p = .035]\) and overall experience level with native Koreans \([F (4, 140) = 3.27, p = .014]\) at the .05 significance level; additionally, there are significant differences among the clusters on their income level \([F (4, 145) = 2.38, p = .054]\) and the frequency level of communication with native Korean speakers \([F (4, 140) = 2.08, p = .087]\) at the .10 significance level (Table 3.21).

Post-hoc tests with a Bonferroni adjustment showed that the satisfaction level with living in South Korea of Cluster Ⅰ \((M = 3.97, SD = .68)\) was significantly higher than Cluster Ⅲ \((M = 3.33, SD = .84)\) \((p = .026)\). The overall experiences level with native Koreans of Cluster Ⅲ \((M = 3.10, SD = .61)\) was significantly lower than Cluster Ⅴ \((M = 3.63, SD = .80)\) \((p = .044)\). That is, the immigrants in Cluster Ⅲ tend to have worse experiences with native Koreans compared to people in Cluster Ⅰ, thereby being less happy with living in Korea than the people in Cluster Ⅴ. At the .10 alpha level, the income level of Cluster Ⅳ was significantly higher than Clusters I \((p = .085)\), II \((p = .051)\), and V \((p = .079)\), and the immigrants in Cluster Ⅴ tended to frequently communicate with native Korean speakers, more than the people in Cluster Ⅲ do \((p = .067)\).

The Pearson's chi-squared test was additionally conducted to evaluate the differences among the five clusters for the following ten categorical variables: gender,
Table 3.19

Descriptive Statistics of the Clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33.03</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37.97</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37.43</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34.16</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>35.26</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Number of Years in Korea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Household Income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Language Proficiency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Proficiency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.32</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.03</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Number of Working Hours per</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51.39</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47.89</td>
<td>19.99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38.24</td>
<td>24.78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.19 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Number of People Living Together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.66</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.14</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Number of Children Living Together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.06</strong></td>
<td><strong>.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Number of Adult Native Korean Speakers Living Together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.53</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.06</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Frequency of Communication with Native Korean Speaker†</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>145</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4.85</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.34</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Satisfaction Level of Living in South Korea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>145</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.61</strong></td>
<td><strong>.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Overall Experience Level with Native Koreans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>145</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.43</strong></td>
<td><strong>.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†. Reversely coded.
Table 3.20

*Frequency Statistics of the Clusters*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or lower</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-year college</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Purpose for Coming to Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Number of Years in Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No plan to leave Korea</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than W1M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1-2M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2-3M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3-4M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4M and more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.20 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>25 83.3</td>
<td>26 78.8</td>
<td>23 76.7</td>
<td>5 71.4</td>
<td>35 74.5</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>1 3.3</td>
<td>4 12.1</td>
<td>3 10</td>
<td>1 14.3</td>
<td>8 17.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed/Others</td>
<td>4 13.3</td>
<td>3 9.1</td>
<td>4 13.3</td>
<td>1 14.3</td>
<td>4 8.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30 100</td>
<td>33 100</td>
<td>30 100</td>
<td>7 100</td>
<td>47 100</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>10 38.5</td>
<td>8 26.7</td>
<td>7 24.1</td>
<td>2 28.6</td>
<td>8 19.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>15 57.7</td>
<td>19 63.3</td>
<td>20 69.0</td>
<td>4 57.1</td>
<td>30 71.4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1 3.8</td>
<td>3 10.0</td>
<td>2 6.9</td>
<td>1 14.3</td>
<td>4 9.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26 100</td>
<td>30 100</td>
<td>29 100</td>
<td>7 100</td>
<td>42 100</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spouse’s Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino/a or Vietnamese</td>
<td>12 70.6</td>
<td>17 70.8</td>
<td>18 78.3</td>
<td>2 40</td>
<td>16 47.1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>5 29.4</td>
<td>7 29.2</td>
<td>5 21.7</td>
<td>3 60</td>
<td>17 50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17 100</td>
<td>24 100</td>
<td>23 100</td>
<td>5 100</td>
<td>34 100</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spouse Living in Korea</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12 66.7</td>
<td>10 41.7</td>
<td>8 34.8</td>
<td>4 80</td>
<td>21 61.8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6 33.3</td>
<td>14 58.3</td>
<td>15 65.2</td>
<td>1 20</td>
<td>13 38.2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18 100</td>
<td>24 100</td>
<td>23 100</td>
<td>5 100</td>
<td>34 100</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23 82.1</td>
<td>29 87.9</td>
<td>24 80</td>
<td>4 57.1</td>
<td>35 72.9</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 17.9</td>
<td>4 12.1</td>
<td>6 20</td>
<td>3 42.9</td>
<td>13 27.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28 100</td>
<td>33 100</td>
<td>30 100</td>
<td>7 100</td>
<td>48 100</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Frequency of Communication with Native Korean Speaker</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td>16 55.2</td>
<td>11 33.3</td>
<td>8 26.7</td>
<td>2 28.6</td>
<td>25 54.3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost everyday</td>
<td>4 13.8</td>
<td>14 42.4</td>
<td>6 20</td>
<td>2 28.6</td>
<td>12 26.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 times in a week</td>
<td>5 17.2</td>
<td>3 9.1</td>
<td>9 30</td>
<td>2 28.6</td>
<td>3 6.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times in a week</td>
<td>2 6.9</td>
<td>2 6.1</td>
<td>4 13.3</td>
<td>1 14.3</td>
<td>4 8.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 times in a month</td>
<td>2 6.9</td>
<td>1 3.0</td>
<td>2 6.7</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 2.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less 10 times in a year</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 3.0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 3.0</td>
<td>1 3.3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29 100</td>
<td>33 100</td>
<td>30 100</td>
<td>7 100</td>
<td>46 100</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.21

*One-way Analysis of Variance Results on the Clusters*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Overall Experience Level with Native Koreans</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.996</td>
<td>3.267</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>85.51</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93.49</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Satisfaction Level of Living in South Korea</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.674</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>87.90</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94.59</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Household Income</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>21.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.437</td>
<td>2.382</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>330.89</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2.282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>352.64</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Frequency of Communication with Native Korean Speaker</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>44.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.082</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>746.33</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>5.331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>790.66</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ethnicity, education, initial purpose in Korea, employment status, marital status, spouse’s ethnicity, spouse’s living in Korea, expected number of years in Korea, and financial responsibility. However, given the insufficient sample size of Cluster IV, the results were not interpretable; therefore, the test results were not reported.

**Conclusions**

This study addressed three research questions in regard to adult immigrants’ deterrents to participation in KSL programs and answered the questions by developing an instrument measuring deterrents and analyzing the collected responses from 267 immigrant respondents. The major findings of the study are summarized and discussed in
the following. Implications for practice and research in adult education for immigrants are considered and suggested.

Summary of the Findings

The purpose of this study was to understand immigrants’ deterrents for participation in Korean language programs, to identify the underlying structure of these deterrents to participation, and to investigate the types of immigrants depending on their reasons for nonparticipation. Specifically, the following research questions guided the study.

1. What reasons deter adult immigrants in Korea from participating in KSL education programs?

2. Are these identified deterrent variables interrelated enough to form a conceptually meaningful underlying structural pattern?

3. What types of immigrants exist with respect to the empirical dimensions of deterrents to participation in KSL programs?

To respond to these inquiries, first, an instrument that measures adult immigrants’ deterrents to participation in South Korea was developed; 697 scale items were pooled from previous DPSs, themes from qualitative research on nonparticipation, and interviews with immigrants in South Korea. The final scale consisted of eligibility screening questions, the 39 DPS items, Korean and English language proficiency measures, and sociodemographic questions. The original instrument written in English was translated into Filipino-Tagalog and Vietnamese. After a pilot implementation of the survey, the survey was administered both online and face-to-face; in total, 267 responses were collected, and 170 complete useable responses were analyzed.
A series of statistical analyses were conducted: descriptive statistics, exploratory factor analysis, and cluster analysis. First, the results of rank on deterrents to participation in KSL programs found that the most compelling reasons for nonparticipation was a lack of free time, followed by learning difficulties with the Korean language. In the top five items, more external reasons were listed; the following five items were related to negative attitudes toward institutionalized learning. The least rated deterrent for nonparticipation was personal health problems. The means of 39 DPS items ranged from 1.36 to 3.13 on the 5-point Likert response scale.

Second, in order to answer the second research question, a PAF analysis using the Varimax rotation method was conducted and resulted in three latent dimensions of deterrents to participation: Negative Attitudes, Social Isolation, and Competing Demands, explaining 36.13% of the total variances in the 39 items. Factor I, labelled Negative Attitudes, consisted of 11 DPS items related to resistance to institutionalized learning and KIIP programs. Factor II, named Social Isolation, consisted of eight DPS items related to fear of social interactions and psychological resistance to unfamiliarity. Factor III, Competing Demands, was made up of six DPS items associated with time constraints and other priorities.

Finally, a cluster analysis using the factor scores of the three dimensions of deterrents was performed to identify distinctive clusters of the survey participants. Nine outlier cases were removed from the analysis, and responses were randomly reordered to minimize the order effect. The $K$-means method identified five types of immigrants in terms of their deterrent to KSL program participation: (1) Active Young Workers, (2)

Cluster I, Active Young Workers, was defined by its high scores on the Competing Demands factor and low scores on the Negative Attitudes factor, making up 19% of the sample. Cluster II, Income-oriented Temporary Workers, exhibited a much lower score on the Social Isolation factor and consisted of 22% of the sample. Cluster III was named Isolated Long-term Resisters based on their much higher level of Social Isolation and Negative Attitudes. They made up 21% of the sample. Cluster IV, with only seven respondents, was labelled Integrated Professional Immigrants. Finally, Cluster V was defined by its lowest score on Competing Demands; they were named Married Residents given their demographic information, and 34% of the sample was assigned to this group.

Discussion of the Findings

The major findings of each of the three research questions are discussed in this section.

Related to Research Question #1. Reviewing the rank order of the DPS items, the biggest constraint of participating in KSL programs was the lack of free time. This result is consistent with previous studies on nonparticipation (Carp et al., 1973; Choi, 2006; KEDI, 1982, 1999, 2009, 2011, 2013). Time constraint was determined to be “a serious and nearly universal deterrent to participation in adult education” (Valentine & Darkenwald, 1990, pp. 39-40). In most studies exploring underlying factors of the deterrents or barriers to participation, time was one of the major situational factors unless
it was extracted as a factor by itself (Apt, 1978; Beder, 1989; Darkenwald & Valentine, 1985; Ellsworth, 1991; Green, 1998; Hayes, 1989; McDonald, 2003).

The difficulty of Korean language learning was rated as the second strongest reason for discouraging participation. The top five deterrents—lack of time, difficulty of the Korean language, household responsibilities, location, and class schedule—were all external reasons, which would be easier to attribute to their nonparticipation by respondents.

Immigrants’ fear of learning the new language and psychological burdens are reflected on their highly-rated responses on the items, *I believe it would take too long time to complete the program* (Item 20) and *I was too worried about taking tests* (Item 3). The lack of information on KIIP, *I did not know that there were Korean classes available for immigrants/foreigners* (Item 19), was rated as 2.05 and ranked 12th out of 39 items; this was relatively a high ranking and indicates that much effort is needed in terms of promotion and awareness of the program. Although KIIP does not charge for registration and textbooks, the cost variable was still rated 1.99, being the 14th biggest constraint to participation.

Thirteen items showed greater than 2.0 points out of the 5-point Likert scale; the other 26 items were rated below 2.0, and the average standard deviation of the 39 items was 1.09. This response pattern resulted in right-skewed distributions of the responses. A couple of interpretations would be possible on this low score pattern; however, it would be reasonable to conclude that, overall, the respondents have less deterring circumstances to participation in KSL programs. If the desire to attend KSL programs is greater and some circumstances prevent an immigrant from attending, the scores on the
relevant deterrents would be higher. Although the 39 items include some motivation-related items, such as *I am not interested in learning Korean* (Item 2), the respondents’ level of motivation for learning the Korean language is not thoroughly measured in this study. Immigrants’ low motivation for learning Korean is one possible explanation for this response pattern. Further investigation on the right-skewed response distribution would provide a deeper understanding of immigrants’ deterrents to participation and could suggest insight for promotion and recruitment for KIIP.

**Related to Research Question #2.** Three latent factors of deterrents to participation were found from the exploratory factor analysis: Negative Attitudes, Social Isolation, and Competing Demands. First, Negative Attitudes have been reported in many previous studies in terms of lack of confidence (Darkenwald & Valentine, 1985), low self-confidence and attitude to classes (Darkenwald & Hayes, 1988), self/school incongruence and low self-confidence (Hayes, 1988), and low perception of need and dislike for school (Beder, 1990). These attitudes may stem from low-expectancy, dispositional reasons, or putting less value on education and learning.

Next, Factor II, Social Isolation, is an interesting result from this research, because the aspect of deterrent to participation was rarely found in previous research. Social Isolation may be related to the characteristics of the sample of this study—immigrants, showing the difference in deterrents between literacy learners (ABE learners) and second language learners (ESL immigrant learners). This important deterrent factor for immigrants is related to their fear of being away from their “secure” areas or familiar spaces; their anxiety at being situated in an unfamiliar social setting among unfamiliar people; and other external reasons limiting their access to information.
and resources. According to McClusky (1973), this factor is the result of immigrants’ low nominator-power (resources).

Finally, Factor III, Competing Demands, is a time-related factor; for example, it includes such items as being short of time and other priorities, which are the most commonly found factors in previous research. For example, two of the six underlying factors found in DPS-G (Darkenwald & Valentine, 1985) were labelled *time constraints* and *low personal priority*; similar factors were found in Hayes’ (1988) study with adult ESL students. Recent studies using qualitative approaches to understand the deterrents to participation in education provide the same result: lack of time due to other competing demands such as family and work commitments (Irias, 2011; Oh, 2013). This factor supports McClusky’s theory of margin (1973): high overloads (responsibilities) resulting in a low margin.

The factor scores estimated from the regression method was calculated and yielded further analysis of comparisons depending on the sociodemographic variables. From the results, a strong positive relationship between the number of native Koreans living together and the Social Isolation factor was found. This high correlation between the two variables may indicate that living with more Koreans in the house would be associated with immigrants’ higher Social Isolation. Despite the fact that the sample size is too small to generalize the results, this correlation may describe the lives of some marriage-immigrants, whose daily interactions are, with or without anyone’s intention, limited to their Korean spouses and in-laws.

Three underlying dimensions of deterrents to participation in KSL programs were identified. Table 3.22 summarizes the deterrent factors previously reported from
exploratory factor analysis, excluding results from confirmatory factor analysis. The three factors found in this study have overlaps with the deterrent factors previously reported, for example, Negative Attitudes and Competing Demands. However, the factor Social Isolation is distinctively extracted in this study and reveals a characteristic of immigrants in South Korea. The most similar factor to Social Isolation was Lack of

Table 3.22

Previously Reported Factors of Deterrents to Participation in Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Factors Reported</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beder (1989)</td>
<td>▪ Dislike for School</td>
<td>ABE target population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Low Perception of Need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Perceived Effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Situational Barriers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darkenward &amp; Valentine (1985)</td>
<td>▪ Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS-G</td>
<td>▪ Lack of Confidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Lack of Course Relevance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Low Personal Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Personal Problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Time Constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes (1989)</td>
<td>▪ Lack of Access to Classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS-LLS</td>
<td>▪ Low Self-Confidence</td>
<td>Adult Hispanics in ESL programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Situational Constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Self/School Incongruence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes &amp; Darkenwald (1988)</td>
<td>▪ Low Self-Confidence</td>
<td>Low-literate adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS-LL</td>
<td>▪ Social Disapproval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Situational Barriers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Negative Attitude to Classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Low Personal Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS</td>
<td>▪ Disengagement</td>
<td>Health professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Family Constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Lack of Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Lack of Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Work Constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Access to Classes (Hayes, 1989); an interesting point is that this study was also conducted for an ESL population, which may imply the lives of immigrants in the U.S. This finding confirms the necessity of a modified development of a DPS instrument that is specially tailored for subpopulations (Darkenward & Valentine, 1985).

Compared to Cross’s (1981) conceptual classification of barriers to participation, the factors found in this study represent more concrete and specific contents of the barriers to participation. For example, the Negative Attitude factor is one aspect of dispositional barriers; the empirical data revealed that among various aspects of dispositional barriers that might be related to immigrants’ participation in educational activities, the psychological resistance toward learning Korean and institutionalized learning is an important facet of the dispositional barriers to participation from the conceptual classification (Cross, 1981). Similarly, Social Isolation could be included as a situational barrier to participation; more importantly, this study proved that the socially isolated situation is a factor that mattered to immigrants’ participation in education.

**Related to Research Question #3.** Cluster analysis using K-means resulted in five subsets of the sample. According to their sociodemographic and deterrent profiles, they are labelled as follows: (1) Active Young Workers, (2) Income-oriented Temporary Workers, (3) Isolated Long-term Resisters, (4) Integrated Professional Immigrants, and (5) Married Residents. The subsets of the immigrants are distinctively representing groups of immigrants with different reasons for nonparticipation and sociodemographic backgrounds.

The first group of immigrants are active young workers. These immigrants consist of men and women who came to Korea in recent years to work. They are in the
process of integrating into Korean society and are very content with living in Korea. They have few psychological barriers to attending Korean classes; however, they seem to be too busy to attend these classes because of their jobs. This group of immigrants would be a good target population for recruitment for KIIP, because they have an increased potential to attend KSL classes if their barriers to participation are removed.

The second group of immigrants represents income-oriented workers who are heads of the household and who came to a foreign country to earn money and, thereby, financially support their family in their homeland. They have lived in South Korea long enough to establish their own social network and to integrate into the society to the extent to which they need. Therefore, they might have little or no need to learn Korean; nevertheless, they would have enough information and access to resources if they chose to learn Korean.

Based on the demographic features, Cluster III immigrants would be prototyped as long-term resisters who are not willing to integrate themselves in Korean society and have less information or access to learning resources because of their limited networks, resulting in social alienation from Korean society. This population would be hard to reach from the native Koreans’ end; insiders’ assistance would be helpful and effective.

The fourth group of immigrants are Integrated Professional Immigrants. This group of people practically does not need to learn the Korean language. They have enough networks to recruit any help that is required related to the Korean language, and they have enough social networks. They have lived in Korea long enough to have built relationships with native Koreans or Filipinos. They have a higher proficiency in English, which makes it easier for them to communicate with Koreans. They have high incomes,
which indicates more professional jobs and results in communicating with more educated Korean citizens. From an institutional perspective, these people are the hardest population to reach out to, because they do not need to learn or want to learn and have very negative attitudes towards participating in educational activities.

The last group is Married Residents. Given the demographics, this group would be families with marriage-immigrant women and their children or immigrant families consisting of parents and children. They tend to have a long-term plan to reside in South Korea; however, for some reasons, they do not attend KSL programs, even though their self-assessed Korean language proficiency is lower. It merits mention that low scores on self-assessed Korean language proficiency does not necessarily indicate a lessor ability to communicate in Korean. Sometimes, some immigrants who have to use Korean more frequently would feel much less confident in their Korean proficiency as they are situated in a broader variety of conditions and, thereby, need to be more comprehensively fluent in Korean. This group of immigrants could be another great potential group for promotion, because although their educational attainment level is lower than others, they do not hold strong negative attitudes toward school or learning and seem not to have many other priorities according to their response pattern.

**Implications for Practice and Policy**

This study suggests practical implications for the further development of adult education programs for immigrants, especially in terms of recruitment and instructions. First of all, the newly developed instrument, DPS, demonstrated its usefulness and effectiveness by showing highly reliable statistics and successfully revealed the dimensions of underlying factors of nonparticipation. The instrument could be further
used in understanding the KSL learners, thereby recruitment and retention of the KSL learners.

Regarding the deterrent factors found in this study, the following implications for practitioners are suggested. First, given the awareness of the negative attitudes toward education, educators and administrators should consider crafting promotional materials and providing an initial orientation to diminish learners’ psychological resistance. Second, because some immigrants socially isolate themselves from the mainstream Korean culture, educators and administrators need to develop alternate channels for recruitment (e.g., through diaspora and ethnic churches); general promotion would not work effectively to reach out to these learners. Finally, given the immigrants’ competing demands, more flexible scheduling and various alternatives and access to learning materials would be helpful to recruit more immigrant learners.

In addition to the discovery of the concrete latent factors of deterrent to participation, this study provided the profiles of potential target groups of immigrants as learners. Segmentation of the potential target groups of KIIP revealed the more urgent populations in need of learning the Korean language and distinguished the groups deterred by external situations from the groups deterred by their own motivations to learning Korean. This is a considerably important differentiation of the immigrants as potential learners of KIIP. More effective and practical advertisement and recruitment would be possible if a local institution specifies its target types of KSL learners and plans customized schedules and curriculums for the group. As shown in the comparison between the Filipino sample and Vietnamese sample, different ethnic groups develop different settlement processes and different immigration cultures. In order to access such
populations as the long-term resisters, it may require the assistance of cultural insiders to spread information about the learning opportunities.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

The significance of this study is the empirically discovered multidimensional factors of deterrents to participation in KSL programs in South Korea. However, as mentioned in earlier sections, the underlying dimensions of deterrents are to some extent dependent on the sample and subgroups of the populations. To obtain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon related to immigrants and broader perspectives on nonparticipation, comparison and contrasts of the results from larger empirical data with various subpopulations of immigrants are necessary.
CHAPTER 4  
MARRIAGE-IMMIGRANT FILIPINAS’ ACCULTURATION AND LEARNING EXPERIENCES IN SOUTH KOREA

This chapter describes an interview-based qualitative study on marriage-immigrant Filipinas’ acculturation and learning experiences in South Korea. The introduction provides backgrounds of international marriage and marriage-immigrant women in South Korea. Theoretical frameworks that guided the research are explained in the literature review, and the following section describes details of the methodology: the selection of the sample, data collection procedures, and analysis of the interview data. Stories of each interviewee are described, followed by findings, discussions, and the conclusion.

Introduction

Since the middle of the 1990s, international marriages, particularly between foreign women from third world countries in Asia and older Korean bachelors, have dramatically increased in Korea. As seen in Figure 4.1, the ratio of international marriages compared to the total number of marriages in Korea peaked at 13.5% in 2005, continued at approximately 10% until 2010, and has been gradually decreasing to 7% (Statistics Korea, 2017). Meanwhile, the total number of international marriage-immigrants who hold marriage visas or have naturalized Korean citizenships by marriage reached 305,446 in 2015, and their children are reported to be 207,693 (Korean Institute for Healthy Family, 2017a). Among this increased number of international marriages,
84.3% are marriages between Korean males and foreign brides, and a considerable number of these cases could be regarded as so-called mail-order brides who are found with the assistance of religious agencies or international marriage brokers. Historic trends of international marriage are shown in Figure 4.2.
A couple of concepts exist to describe the marriage between native Koreans and their foreign spouses; international marriage and interracial marriage are two such terms. In regards to their nationality and ethnicity, both terms are literally accurate in describing these marriages; however, these terms do not imply the unequal relationship embedded in brokered marriages or reveal the disadvantaged position of a foreign spouse as a minority in South Korea. Simply, the terms ignore a key factor shaping the foreign spouses’ lives and disregard the discrimination that these foreign spouses likely have to face in South Korea. Even though not all marriages between Korean husbands and foreign brides are brokered marriages, given the fact that a considerable number of recent international marriages between Korean husbands and foreign brides from economically underprivileged countries could be regarded as brokered marriages, or mail-order brides, a more specific term would more accurately depict the population than the neutral terms international marriage and interracial marriage that would be more applicable in a multicultural country like the U.S.A. and Canada.

In contrast, framing these women as mail-order brides excludes the cases of love marriages and perpetuates the stereotype that they are Korean dream chasers who want to achieve a kind of quick and easy success through marriage. Also, this framework certainly has a negative impression and stigmatizes these women. Therefore, in Korea, a less pejorative term, marriage-immigrant woman, has been suggested and is popularly used in government documents, newspapers, and scholarship to distinguish these women from native Korean women or immigrant workers. This study uses the term marriage-immigrant women to prevent the perpetuation of stigmas and to correctly represent their social situation.
These marriage-immigrants’ changing experiences while living in South Korea can be understood as the acculturation process. The term, acculturation, means changes in behavior, attitudes, and beliefs that take place as a result of the exchange with different cultures. Research on acculturation mostly deals with immigrants’ changes after they enter into and live in receiving societies (Berry, 2005). These changes could be psychological and cultural and occur at individual and group levels and are believed to happen to both an individual entering a new society and the receiving society; the change on the society level could be minimal or subtle, while the individual changes can be more significant, although the degree would vary depending on the person.

The acculturation process is naturally and intrinsically educational in that the process necessarily requires observation, reflection, and behavioral, attitudinal, and psychological changes. That is, immigrants constantly observe native people and try to understand an unfamiliar culture. They formally and informally learn the new culture, including the language, gestures, adequate social interactions, and so on. However, efforts to understand the educational component of learning in the acculturation experience are missing (Rudmin, 2009). Rudmin (2009) argued that acculturative learning has been understudied in acculturation literature and suggested a new model of acculturation, which includes the acculturative learning component in the second stage of acculturation in terms of information, instruction, imitation, and mentors. Including Rudmin, psychology scholars’ approaches to understanding the educational component in acculturation (e.g., Masgoret & Ward, 2006) perceives the host culture and language as learning content, i.e., curriculum that needs to be transmitted to and acquired by immigrants.
On the other hand, in adult education, experience has received much attention as a source of adult learning and the reflective nature of adults’ meaning-making process (e.g., Boud & Miller, 1996; Fenwick, 2003; Jarvis, 1987; Kolb, 1984; Mezirow, 2000; Usher, Bryant & Johnston, 1997). Jarvis (1987) maintained that “all learning begins with experience” (p. 16), and Boud and Miller (1996) stated, “experience is the foundation of, and stimulus for, learning” and “every experience is potentially an opportunity for learning” (p. 9). Acculturation is, by nature, a selected set of an immigrant’s experiences in a different culture from the individual’s home or familiar culture; being situated in a new culture, therefore, necessarily indicates that the immigrant, i.e., the learner, is learning. In this perspective, learning in acculturation is not the transmission of the knowledge and language of one culture to its new members but a constructive process of an immigrant’s meaning-making on his or her situated experiences in the new culture.

**Problem Statement**

International immigration, or more specifically, women’s international immigration through marriage, is not a new phenomenon in a globalized society; there have been many cases and studies about this population. However, in addition to the cultural and linguistic difficulties that immigrants usually experience, marriage-immigrant women’s experiences of acculturation tend to differ from the previously reported acculturation processes of immigrants as described in American literature in two significant ways. First, the bride migrates to the foreign country by herself without her family—unlike familial migrations that are more typical in North America and Europe, and second, the homogeneity of Korean society creates a unique set of challenges for the marriage-immigrant women.
In South Korea, this marriage-immigrant population is a most pressing focus for researchers who work in a number of academic disciplines. Since the 2000s, 17 new scholarly journals, whose titles reflect multiculturalism, have commenced publication, and five of them are Korean Citation Index (KCI) accredited journals in 2017: *Multicultural Education Studies, OMNES: The Journal of Multicultural Society, The Journal of Multicultural Society, Damunwha Contents Yeongu [Multicultural Contents Studies], and Multiculture & Peace*. When the term damunwha [multicultural] was input, the KCI search tool found nearly 8,000 articles published since 2000; the number of articles dramatically increased in 2007 through 2009 and continued the volume. Regarding the interest in migrant women, the search tool resulted in 1,713 scholarly articles that included migrant women in its titles or keywords; however, only a dozen of them studied the marriage-immigrant women’s own acculturative experiences in South Korea, rather than their child-rearing experiences as a parent, marriage satisfaction and acculturative stress as a foreign wife, or policy and discourse about them. Efforts to understand their acculturative experiences as learning are lacking in the literature published in South Korea.

In short, the following gaps were found in the literature. First, marriage-immigrant women’s own acculturation experience, which differs from that of an immigrant family, has not been adequately studied. Second, despite the fact that acculturation is a suitable adult education topic that could reveal how experience and adult learning are intertwined and operate in practice, previous research on marriage-immigrant women in South Korea paid little attention to understanding the educational
component of learning in the acculturation experience. That is, immigrants as emerging learners in South Korea are understudied, in particular, in the field of education.

**Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

The purpose of this study was to understand the experiences of the marriage-immigrant women’s acculturation process and analyze their acculturative experiences from the lens of adult learning. Specifically, the research questions that guided this study included the following:

1. What are the life narratives of marriage-immigrant women living in South Korea with their Korean husbands?
2. What are common acculturative experiences of marriage-immigrant women?

**Literature Review**

Acculturation, originally conceptualized in anthropology, refers to “those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups” (Redfield, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936, p. 149); for example, after contact with European invaders, Cherokees underwent cultural changes. Later, the term was employed by psychological studies on immigrants (Thomas & Znaniecki, 1928), and the scope of change was modified from the socio-cultural level to the individual level.

Among various frameworks of psychological acculturation, the most well-known theory of acculturation is Berry’s models of acculturation (1980, 1997). Unlike initial perspectives on acculturation, which viewed acculturation as assimilation, Berry (1980, 1997) developed a multi-dimensional model of acculturation that explained different forms of acculturation: integration, assimilation, separation/segregation, and
marginalization, which depend on whether immigrants maintain their homeland identity and whether they build relationships with the host or larger society. Berry’s theory of acculturation is the most cited theoretical framework in the field of psychological acculturation (Chirkov, 2009).

Acculturation studies in psychology, however, tend to focus only on immigrants or sometimes temporary residents. Little research has been done on marriage-immigrants whose home as well as the dominant society is a place of acculturation; instead, home still tends to be regarded as a place where family immigrants continue their native cultural practices. Also, Berry’s acculturation model (1997) is based on the assumption that non-dominant groups, marriage-immigrant women in this study, “have the freedom to choose how they want to acculturate” (p. 10). As described earlier in this paper, Korean society can be described as a “Pressure Cooker” (Berry, 1997), which forces non-dominant individuals to assimilate their cultural identity with the Korean identity. Additionally, in the case of marriage-immigrant women, the option of separation strategy is most likely not available, because they must live with their Korean husbands.

An extended model of Berry’s theory is the Interactive Acculturation Model (IAM) (Bourhis, Moise, Perreault & Senecal, 1997). The IAM considers both immigrants’ perspectives and strategies of acculturation and host culture individuals’ perspectives and attitudes toward immigration. This model assumes that state policies reflect the host societies’ ideologies that shape integration policies towards immigrants and suggest four clusters of ideologies: the pluralism ideology, the civic ideology, the assimilation ideology, and the ethnist ideology. The Korean society may be located in the ethnist ideology cluster based on its Dangun ideology and belief in blood oneness. In
addition to an extended consideration of the features of the host society, Bourhis et al. (1997) refined the marginalization strategy (Berry, 1997) into two immigrant orientations: exclusion and individualism. This model provides this study with a base for theorizing an integrative acculturation model of marriage-immigrant women’s experiences. However, due to the characteristics of Korean society, which can hardly be described as multicultural at this time, this study considered these acculturation theories, but did not limit the exploration or analysis to these acculturation models.

Previous research on acculturation in the United States typically focuses on family immigration, because that is the most common type of immigration in North America. In the case of family immigration, immigrants often continue their own cultural practices at home, and acculturation mainly occurs outside the home. However, for marriage-immigrant women, acculturation takes place not only outside the home but also inside the home.

What makes the present study different from the previous research that has been published in the western countries and South Korea is: a) the population of the study are women who immigrated to a new country independently and live with native Koreans, b) the country to which immigrants need to acculturate has a long history of ethnic homogeneity and a strong belief of Korean Oneness, c) the researcher, as another sojourner in a non-homeland country, did not assume immigrants’ integration as their acceptance of Korean values and beliefs or an assimilation process, and d) this study focuses on learning aspects of acculturation.
More research on understanding their acculturation experiences, educational needs, and obstacles is required to improve the lives of these marriage-immigrant women in South Korea in order to build better immigration models.

**Methodology**

This study employed an interview-based qualitative methodology; qualitative research methods are a good fit for this research, because each marriage-immigrant woman has her own acculturation process, and each woman’s unique experience of acculturation is worthy of research. Also, the nature of this population, although in theory large enough for a survey study, is a diverse population that is scattered throughout the country, so no single mailing list or uniform language exists, which precludes the use of a survey. However, even more importantly, the benefits of interviews in which marriage-immigrant women can tell their stories in their own terms with detailed descriptions and the surrounding contexts can provide a more rigorous and deeper understanding about marriage-immigrant adult learners.

**Participant Selection**

Marriage-immigrant women are defined as foreign women who came to South Korea to live with their Korean husbands without residential experience in South Korea before their marriages. According to the Korea Immigration Service (2017), marriage-immigrant women are Vietnamese (31.5%), Chinese (24.0%), Korean-Chinese (11.2%), Japan (9.3%), Filipina (8.8%), and Cambodian (3.4%). Although these women have their marriages to Korean men in common as well as the fact that they live in South Korea, their experiences vary widely depending on their native culture. Therefore, focusing on
women from one cultural background may result in more meaningful outcomes in terms of interpretation and the future utilization of the research findings.

For cultural and linguistic reasons, I selected marriage-immigrant women from the Philippines. Unlike Korean-Chinese or Chinese, Filipinas do not share the Northeast Asian Confucian culture, and many Filipinas are able to speak English, because English is one of the official languages that is used by the government and educational system in the Philippines. Marriage-immigrant women from other countries were excluded because of the researcher’s lack of linguistic ability in Chinese and Vietnamese.

**Data Collection**

Upon IRB-approval (Appendix H) on January 21, 2014, participants were recruited by network sampling (Roulston, 2010) in January and February 2014. Through the researchers’ personal network, a Filipino priest, Fr. Mosqueda, was introduced to the researcher, and he helped recruit research participants. For example, Fr. Mosqueda brought me to another Filipino priest who offered Mass for Filipinos in Seoul; he made an announcement about my research and recruitment after Mass. Additionally, whenever he had an opportunity to meet Filipinas who were married to Koreans, Fr. Mosqueda handed them a research flyer (Appendix I), and upon their consent, he shared their contact information with me. He also shared contact information of leaders of the local Filipino communities, so I could contact them and request assistance.

Also, the first interviewee introduced a Facebook page to the researcher that was widely used by marriage-immigrant Filipinas in South Korea; the researcher asked the page administrator to post a research flyer, and she posted the flyer twice on the page. Additionally, after each interview, participants were asked if they could recommend other
Filipinas for my research, and they shared their friends’ contact information upon gaining their friends’ permission. Interviews were conducted in cafés and in participants’ homes.

Each interviewee signed two paper copies of the IRB-approved consent form and took one of the signed consent forms (Appendix J). Interviews were semi-structured with, but not limited to, the several interview guide questions presented in Table 4.1.

Most participants were interviewed once; however, four participants were interviewed twice. Each interview took 40 minutes to three hours. The interviews were primarily conducted in English; for some participants who preferred to use Korean, the interview was conducted in Korean. Some participants, however, freely switched between languages during the interview. Because they live in Korea, many Korean proper nouns and Korean expressions were also used. For example, when they referred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Interview Guide Questions</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Guide Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Please tell me about yourself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tell me about your experiences before you came to South Korea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tell me about your experiences since you began living in South Korea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tell me about your learning experiences in formal and informal settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If you were the president of South Korea, in order to help future immigrants, what kind of educational programs could make their lives here in Korea easier?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to their mothers-in-law, many of them used the Korean word, “si-eo-meon-i” (mother-in-law in Korean). Interviews that were partially conducted in Korean were first transcribed into Korean and then translated into English.

At the beginning or the end of each interview, the participants received a gift card, which was worth ₩10,000 (approximately $9), that could be used in their nearby grocery stores. Detailed descriptions of each interview are provided with their stories in the following section.

Data Analysis

The researcher interviewed 23 Filipinas until no new ideas or themes emerged, which made the researcher consider that saturation (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) had been achieved. However, during the analysis, I decided to exclude eight interviews for the following reasons: (1) two participants originally entered Korea as immigrant workers, and therefore, the manner in which they became acculturated differed from that of the marriage-immigrants; (2) two participants had lived in Korea for approximately one year or less, and one participant had lived with her husband for less than six months, which made me conclude that the amount of time that they had lived in Korea or been married was insufficient; (3) the cases of two participants were too unique and exceptional to be included; and (4) one interviewee lacked sufficient proficiency in English and Korean to be understood, causing the interview to be removed. As a result, interviews with 15 participants were included in the final analysis.

All interviews were recorded, transcribed, and then analyzed. The total recorded time for the 15 interviewees was 26 hours and 34 minutes; the average interview duration was one hour and 46 minutes. Initial transcription was conducted by professional
transcribers; then, the researcher made edits and inserts as needed on the transcriptions while listening to the recorded interviews several times. After polishing the transcripts, the total amount of interview transcriptions was 444 letter-size pages long with 13,274 lines.

The constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) guided the researcher in finding reoccurring themes and to code them accordingly. First, the printed copy of the transcripts was examined by the researcher with regards to any meaningful incidents and actions. Some themes and codes were created from this examination. Referencing these rough categories and based on each participant’s storytelling, the researcher wrote narratives about each participant that is presented in the following section.

Then, the analysis was partially assisted by Atlas.ti (Version 6.28) software. By comparing and contrasting one participant’s transcript with the other participants’ transcripts, the researcher labeled those codes into the transcripts using Atlas.ti; a number of categories and, then, a number of themes emerged. The researcher inductively grouped similar themes and reorganized the themes in response to the research questions.

Participants’ names are replaced with pseudonyms; geographical proper nouns, such as city names, were replaced with alphabet letters to protect the participants’ identity. However, in order to deliver contextual information about the geographical regions, the same city was referred to using the same letter of the alphabet each time, and some information, such as population size, was noted.

**Subjectivity Statement**

In qualitative approaches, the researcher is an instrument that takes information about and from participants and processes and reproduces the information in a format that
can be shared with other researchers. Therefore, the subjectivity of the researcher, i.e., my possible bias, is worth reporting to improve the validity of the study. My research interest in education for immigrants originally stemmed from my interest in adult literacy education in my master’s program. While studying and working with educational minorities, such as high school drop-outs, older literacy learners, and foreign labor union leaders, my academic interests were broadened to various types of educationally underserved people in South Korea. Then, being an international student in the United States and working for the Georgia Office of Adult Education, my interests became more concrete, focusing on adult education for immigrants in South Korea and immigrants’ acculturation experiences in South Korea.

I had lived in the United States as an international student for six years when I interviewed the participants. My being an alien in the United States made it easier for me to sympathize with the participants’ experiences of being foreigners in South Korea and being away from their families in their home country. Also, being away from South Korea for six years, I was able to familiarize myself with perceptions of the Korean culture from a foreigner’s perspective and to compare different cultures. Because the Filipino culture is relatively closer to the Western culture to some extent than other eastern Asian countries, given the long history of colonization by Spain and the U.S. and its religious background, it was not very difficult for me to understand their cultural complaints and difficulties with the Korean culture.

I am married to a Korean man and have in-laws in South Korea. My being married and having a Korean husband, thereby Korean in-laws, seemed to make some participants feel closer to me; some participants expressed their curiosity in my marital
status, and when they were told I was married to a Korean man, some of them explicitly expressed sympathy.

I am a graduate of Seoul National University (SNU), which is the most prestigious university in South Korea, and am pursuing the highest-level degree in the United States. Naturally, the participants knew that I was in a doctoral program in the United States, and some of the participants asked me what university I attended. If asked, I answered that I finished my bachelor’s and master’s degrees from SNU; some of them seemed surprised. Some interviewees called me ‘teacher’ in Korean, which is a polite way of addressing others in South Korea, although they were older than me, and I asked them to speak Korean with a friendly tone, instead of a polite tone. A few interviewees expressed their expectations toward me that I would be able to voice for them in the future as a scholar and a public figure. Even though I am not sure how my possible prestigious position influenced my relationships with the interviewees, it seemed apparent that the interview participants showed great respect toward me in various ways.

I was born a feminist; I am a second daughter of three children. While criticizing my parents’ favoritism toward my younger brother and maintaining equal and fair treatment, I grasped the basic ideas of feminism. In college, I learned that what I had experienced as a young woman was much easier compared to what I would experience in the future, as a woman. Feminism taught me to understand that all my mother’s complaints about her brothers’ wives were not because my uncles’ wives were all, described by my mother and her sisters as “bitches,” but because the Korean patriarchy is not completed without a daughter-in-law’s sacrifice; my mother’s position was as an attacker on her family’s side and a victim on my father’s family’s side, at the same time,
in the given social structure. Because I knew that if I married, I had to give up my prestigious position of a single woman without having in-laws in the Korean patriarchy structure, although I would be protected as a married woman in the system, I was reluctant to marry when I was proposed to by my boyfriend. I married almost three years after my boyfriend started mentioning marriage; during the three years, I continued explaining what I would have to experience and how I would feel with the possible contexts, up to a very concrete level. When I felt that he and I were on the same page with regard to the meaning of getting married to a woman in South Korea and he gradually demonstrated that he would be a reliable partner, I stopped resisting and started thinking how to co-build a good marriage and life with him. Nevertheless, the last five years of being married made me realize the limitations of one person, as agent, against the social structure.

My feminist basis and thoughts on marriage surely influenced my research, my relationship with the participants, my view on the participants, my analysis on the interviews and so on. Honestly, even though I did my best not to judge my participants in any way, some of the participants’ decisions to marry without love was beyond my understanding, and I had great sympathy for those Filipinas who married their Korean boyfriends without knowing much about Korean patriarchy. Their unfair treatment by their in-laws made me emotional, and their passive tolerance of the traditional Korean patriarchal oppression made me angry, even though I tried not to reveal much of my emotions or anger. At the same time, I believe that my being a feminist provided analytic insight for deeper understandings of the situation and research problems.
Meanwhile, I also need to divulge that I had prejudices and assumptions about marriage-immigrant women; I unconsciously assumed that marriage-immigrant women had brokered marriages, and they are victimized by their Korean families in some ways. Before coming to the U.S. in January 2008, I traveled to Southern Vietnam by myself and had the opportunity to observe newlywed couples, Korean grooms and Vietnamese brides, having a kind of honeymoon, taking a half day tour of the Cu Chi Tunnels. Of the three couples I observed, one male seemed to be developmentally disabled, and the other two males seemed to be in their late 40s at least, while the three beautiful Vietnamese females looked to be in their early 20s, at most. The scene was probably engraved on my brain. Therefore, I was confused by meeting and perplexed to meet a number of Filipinas consecutively who married for love, at the beginning of the interviews. When I talked about my research thus far with my friend, whose major was ethnography, she told me that they were a part of marriage-immigrant women, and it would be worthwhile to present this underrepresented group of marriage-immigrants. My bafflement made me realize my bias and assumptions about the population and my research. Later, I further realized that those marriage-immigrant women, who were seriously suffering due to their husbands or in-laws, would not have had such opportunities to participate in casual interviews and that I interviewed the right people who could tell me about their acculturative experiences, rather than victimization experiences.

I believe that my findings and the presentation of the findings are a form of knowledge construction. Marriage-immigrants’ lives can be described, analyzed, and interpreted in many other different ways; I understand that the other forms of illustrations of their lives are as meaningful and as truthful as mine.
Limitations of the Study

Three limitations are worth noting in terms of methodology. First, the sample interview participants are very biased compared to the marriage-immigrant population in South Korea, particularly in terms of types of marriage. In this research, five out of 15 cases were love marriages (33.3%), while the statistics of Filipino marriage-immigrants indicated that 7.4% in a 2009 survey (Korea Institute for Health and Social Affairs, 2010), 10.8% in a 2012 survey (Korean Women's Development Institute, 2013), and 14.2% in a 2015 survey (Korean Women's Development Institute, 2016) responded that they met their Korean spouses themselves, without any assistance or intervention from a marriage broker, religious agency, family, friends, or acquaintances. Furthermore, while a higher ratio than 19% of marriages through a marriage broker or an agency was reported among Filipinos in the three surveys, only one interview participant confessed that her marriage was negotiated by a marriage agent. The ratio of brokered marriages is significantly higher in marriage-immigrant women from other countries; for instance, the ratio is 56.9% for marriage-immigrants from Vietnam.

This biased sampling is partially due to the nature of a qualitative approach—generalization is not the purpose of the research; however, this originated more from the tendency that those Filipinas who had married for love seemed to be more confident and volunteered to tell me stories about their marriages and families. An interviewee who had married for love notified me at the end of the interview that she intentionally volunteered for the research participation in order to let people know that not all marriage-immigrants’ marriages are brokered; she resisted the popular portrait of a
marriage-immigrant from an Asian country in the media. Their active participation and their intentions would influence the interview contents.

Additionally, because the recruitment and the interviews were mostly done in English; the participants were biased in a way that many interviewees were English teachers at the time of interviews, and their household income level, therefore, was probably higher than the average of families with foreign backgrounds. Kim and Un (2007) reported marriage-immigrant Filipinas’ English proficiency and higher educational attainment levels as their strengthening life elements in South Korea. It would be reasonable to speculate that those marriage-immigrant women who have decent jobs and beloved husbands in South Korea have a relatively favorable life in South Korea compared to those marriage-immigrants who do not.

For any reasons of biased sampling, the findings of this study should not be generalized; this study aims to present a possible portrait of marriage-immigrant women and to broaden the description and analysis of their acculturation experiences.

Secondly, English is not my mother tongue nor the participants’. Given the choice between having an interpreter during the interviews and directly communicating with interviewees in English as a second language, I chose the latter. Both options had costs and limitations; I chose to possibly lose deeper meanings of our communication to some extent instead of losing the opportunity to directly communicate with the interviewees and, thereby, failed to catch their nonverbal languages in a timely way. Most interviewees were very fluent in speaking in English, and some were fluent in Korean enough to communicate in Korean. However, some interviewees were not fluent in English nor Korean; as a result, one interview had to be dropped from the analysis,
although I was able to “communicate” during the interview assisted by various communication methods, such as a dictionary and body language. Other interviews also had to be superficial to some extent because of their and my language limitations. I still believe that it was the right choice to directly communicate with the interview participants; however, I have to admit that it would have been different if I were able to communicate with them in our own mother tongues.

Finally, I have to point out the cultural limitations. Beside language, cultural differences played a role in my communication with the interviewees. I did not realize the influence during the interview; however, while listening to the recorded interviews again and again, I became curious if some answers were literally true or their humble reactions. A different culture has different underlying meanings and hidden messages in addition to individual variations. I, the interviewer, was born and raised in South Korea and had spent six years in the United States at the time of the interviews; the interviewees were born in the Philippines and had spent years in South Korea. Most of them were raised Catholic. We both are familiar and unfamiliar with Korean culture to some extent; I was not familiar with Filipino culture, which seemed to consist of indigenous cultures of each island, a Spanish influence, a Catholic influence, and an American influence. My lack of understanding or limited ability to understand and capture the interviewees’ culture would impact my capacity to analyze the interviews. This limitation would be partially diluted, however, by the large number of interviewees and rigorous and rich data.
Marriage-Immigrant Filipinas' Stories

This section presents the findings related to the first research question: What are the life narratives of marriage-immigrant women living in South Korea with their Korean husbands? Detailed descriptions of each interview process and the demographics and narratives of the 15 research participants are provided in alphabetic order, which matches the interview order. Pseudonyms were assigned using the most popular Filipina names in Tagalog in order to keep the identities of the research participants confidential. The same alphabet letters were used for cities and towns to provide such contextual information as the size of the city or the characteristics of the town. Each story consists of two parts: a detailed description of the data collection procedures and the woman’s narrative of her life. Table 4.2 shows the brief demographics of the 15 participants.

Each of the 15 participants married in the Philippines and entered Korea as the bride of a Korean man, holding a marriage visa. The marriages were either love marriages or arranged marriages negotiated by an agency, acquaintances, or a religious agent. The participants had lived in Korea from three to 20 years. They had one or two child(ren), except for two participants who had no children. Two participants were widowed; one was separated; and one was divorced; and the others lived with their husbands. Six of the participants lived with their parent(s)-in-law at the time of the interview. Detailed descriptions of each of the interview participants are summarized in Table 4.3.

**Analyn**

Analyn was introduced to the researcher by Lena, who volunteered for the interview after hearing about the research through her Catholic church and then,
Table 4.2

Participants’ Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name*</th>
<th>Age**</th>
<th>Husband’s Age**</th>
<th>The Year Entered in South Korea</th>
<th>Marriage Type/Status Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analyn</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Love marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chona</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Love marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divina</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Introduced by acquaintance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imelda</td>
<td>Late 20s</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Love marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jovelyn</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Marriage broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lailani</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Introduced by cousin (Widowed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liezel</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Love marriage (Divorced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilibeth</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Introduced by cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liwayway</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Unification Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaya</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Introduced by acquaintance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirasol</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Love marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nenita</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Unification Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riza</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Unification Church (Separated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutchel</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10-year older</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Introduced by acquaintance (Widowed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tala</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Unification Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Pseudonyms
** At the time of interview, Jan.-Feb., 2014
Table 4.3

**Detailed Descriptions of the Participants and Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Previous Career</th>
<th>Current Career</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th># of Children (age)</th>
<th>Co-residents*</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Interview Language</th>
<th>Interview Length (h:mm:ss)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analyn</td>
<td>B.A. in English</td>
<td>English teacher</td>
<td>English teacher</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>PIL, H, C</td>
<td>B metropolitan city</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>3:16:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chona</td>
<td>B.A. in Hotel and Restaurant Management</td>
<td>Hotel manager</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>PIL, H, C</td>
<td>K city</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>2:10:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divina</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Worked in a resort</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>PIL, H, C</td>
<td>L city</td>
<td>English &amp; some Korean</td>
<td>4:47:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jovelyn</td>
<td>Some College, incomplete</td>
<td>Worked in a mall maid, housewife</td>
<td>Hotel maid, housewife</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M island</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1:14:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lailani</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Nursery teacher</td>
<td>English teacher</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2 (11)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A metropolitan city</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1:15:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liezel</td>
<td>Master’s Degree, incomplete</td>
<td>Master student</td>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>1 (19)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A metropolitan city</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>0:39:38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PIL: Parents-in-law, H: Husband, C: Child(ren), MIL: Mother-in-law
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Previous Career</th>
<th>Current Career</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th># of Children (age)</th>
<th>Co-residents*</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Interview Language</th>
<th>Interview Length (h:mm:ss)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lilibeth</td>
<td>Law School, incomplete</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>English teacher</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>MIL, H</td>
<td>G city</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1:57:06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liwayway</td>
<td>4-years of college</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>English teacher</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2 (11 &amp; 9)</td>
<td>H, C</td>
<td>C metropolitan city</td>
<td>English &amp; some Korean</td>
<td>1:06:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaya</td>
<td>B. A. in Elementary Education</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>English teacher</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>2 (4 &amp; 1)</td>
<td>MIL, H, C</td>
<td>B metropolitan city</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1:10:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirasol</td>
<td>4-years of college</td>
<td>Chemical engineering researcher</td>
<td>English teacher</td>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>1 (15)</td>
<td>H, C</td>
<td>E county</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>2:35:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nenita</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>Cook in daycare</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>H, C</td>
<td>C metropolitan city</td>
<td>English &amp; Korean</td>
<td>1:36:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tala</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Worked in Hong Kong</td>
<td>Hotel maid</td>
<td>Unification Church</td>
<td>2 (9 &amp; 8)</td>
<td>MIL, H, C</td>
<td>B metropolitan city</td>
<td>English &amp; Korean</td>
<td>0:59:24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* PIL: Parents-in-law, H: Husband, C: Child(ren), MIL: Mother-in-law
unfortunately, cancelled her interview. Lena told me that her husband disliked her being interviewed by a Korean researcher, talking about her life in Korea, while she told Analyn that her English was not good enough for an hour-long interview. Still, Lena wanted to help me recruit research participants and, so, introduced her Filipina friend to me.

I met Analyn at her church near her house. Because it was a day before Lunar New Year’s Day – a holiday period, the church was empty. We moved to a franchise café closer to her home and started the interview. Analyn was a bright, cheerful woman in her early 30s and was very humble when talking about herself, especially when she talked about her accomplishments. The interview was conducted in English on January 29, 2014 and lasted approximately two hours. Because the interview with Analyn was my first interview for this study, I had a follow-up interview with Analyn three weeks after the first interview. The second interview was conducted in the same café and lasted one and a half hours on February 17, 2014.

Narrative. Analyn was from a big family with seven siblings and her parents. She was an English teacher in a huge English language school with hundreds of Korean students in the Philippines; her husband was working as a manager at the language school when she met him. After two years of dating, he went back to Korea, but they continued their long-distance relationship, and after a couple of months, he proposed to her. At that time, she was 28 years old, and he was 30 years old.

His parents were educated middle-aged Protestants. When they were told that their son was dating a Filipina girl, an English teacher, they said, “she is different from those marriage-immigrant Filipinas, because she is a professional.” Then, they only asked
if Analyn was a Protestant. Because both her family and her in-laws are Protestants, Analyn was easily accepted by his family.

To process documents for her marriage visa, he came back to the Philippines, and they had a civil wedding and a small wedding reception. Because Analyn was the second youngest in her family, her elder sisters and mother cried due to the fact that she was leaving the country. After the wedding, her husband came back to Korea, although she had to stay in the Philippines for another month to attend a series of seminars held by the Commission on Filipinos Overseas (CFO) that aims to educate Filipinos about cultural differences in overseas countries and to investigate brokered marriages. Attendance of these seminars is mandatory for all Filipina brides who marry a foreigner to obtain a departure passport stamp, which is required before leaving the Philippines. During the seminars, the agents kept stressing how hard living in Korea would be and asking about her boyfriend, the history of their relationship, and so on. Analyn was proud to tell them about her boyfriend, because hers was a marriage for love, and she had no reason to make up any stories otherwise.

She came to Korea in September of 2010. At the airport, Analyn first met her parents-in-law face-to-face; they genuinely welcomed her with flowers. She started living with them. Although her parents-in-law are decent people, different from her Filipina friends’ in-laws, living with her parents-in-law was not easy, either. Analyn and her husband lived on the third floor in two rooms, and his parents lived on the fourth floor in two rooms, but because there was no kitchen on the third floor, she had to go upstairs frequently to use the kitchen. Because Analyn’s parents-in-law work, she does not have to spend the whole day with them. However, her mother-in-law’s personality is
very oppressive according to Analyn; her mother-in-law is a perfectionist and pushes Analyn to be seen as perfect – based on her mother-in-law’s opinion - at church. Additionally, Analyn has had some conflicts with her mother-in-law regarding her postpartum rest and recovery and parenting. In any case, Analyn’s husband is supportive and defends Analyn. But, regarding living with his parents, her husband has not kept his word. He previously promised that they would move out after two years of living with them; it had been three years at this point, however, and they were still living with her husband’s parents, partially due to the exorbitant housing prices in B City.

With respect to the Korean culture, Analyn was familiar with Korean food and culture to some extent, because not only had she dated him for two years, but she had also spent many years with Korean students, living with them in the language school dormitory. Additionally, because all of her in-laws, including her mother- and brother-in-law, can speak English, communication was less of a problem initially; that was until her daughter was born. Analyn was told by both native Koreans and Filipinos that if she could not speak Korean well, her daughter would not be fluent in Korean either, thereby creating a higher chance of her daughter being bullied in school. Analyn was studying Korean diligently in order to both get a Korean language certificate that is required for naturalization and to be able to communicate with her daughter in Korean. But, at the same time, she and her husband agreed to raise their daughter bilingual to be able to communicate with her relatives in the Philippines; Analyn speaks in English to her daughter, and her husband speaks in Korean. Analyn had received the Korean visiting tutor service and finished up to Level 3 of KIIP; she will register for the Level 4 Korean class this upcoming spring semester at a local multicultural center.
Analyn works as an English teacher in Korea. She started working when her husband changed jobs to become an officer manager at their church, which paid less but was also less stressful than his previous job. She quit her job after having her daughter, but the language school principal kept asking her to come back, and her mother-in-law forced her to resume working. Analyn resumed working last year, sending her eight-month-old baby to a daycare (daycare is free in Korea). She believes this decision will help her daughter learn Korean better.

At the end of the second interview, Analyn told me that, initially, she was not willing to participate in this interview. But, she decided to participate in the research, because she wanted to tell the researcher that not all Filipina marriage-immigrants are the same, and she demonstrated that. She let me know about a Facebook page for Filipinos living in Korea, and the page significantly helped the researcher recruit more Filipinas for the study, especially those who had married for love and have relatively good lives in Korea.

Chona

Initially, Chona contacted me after reading my research flyer posted on the Facebook group page for Filipinos in Korea. I visited her town, a middle-sized suburban area located in the northern part of Korea. It was the Saturday after the Lunar New Year holidays. Because her husband was at home and could babysit their five-month-old baby, she was able to schedule an interview during the daytime.

I met Chona at a Starbucks coffee shop near her house. Chona was a young, beautiful woman with long black hair; she actively, but calmly, talked about her life during the interview. The interview was conducted on Saturday, February 1, 2014 at 2
pm and lasted approximately 80 minutes. Similar to the first interview of my study with Analyn, as Chona was the second interviewee, in order to follow-up on her first interview and to ask her more questions about themes that emerged from other interviewees, a second interview took place on Tuesday, February 18, 2014 at 9 am. She had to stay with her daughter that day, and since it was too cold to go outside with her baby, the interview, which lasted an hour, was conducted over the phone – using a voice talk application for smartphones. Both interviews were conducted in English.

**Narrative.** Chona was a 27-year-old mother of a five-month-old baby girl and a beloved wife of a 32-year-old Korean man, who was a civil engineer. She earned her Bachelor’s degree in Hotel and Restaurant Management and began her career at a large hotel in Manila. Working in the hotel was very intensive and demanding; she sometimes even slept at the hotel and resumed working during the week. On her off-days, she visited her family and spent time with her parents and younger sister. She did not have much time for dating or meeting friends. After working in the hotel for three years, she was offered a hotel manager’s job in a country in Southeast Asia (A country). Because she was tired of her current job, she accepted the offer and prepared to transfer.

Meanwhile, Chona was also one of many Filipinas who is fascinated by Korean popular music and dramas. Because she wanted to learn the Korean language and to hang out with friends online, she signed up for an online language exchange program. The program was designed to facilitate learning various languages, by having participants select their mother tongue and the language that they want to practice and linking up participants to chat online, talk on the phone, etc. with native speakers. When Chona first saw her husband’s profile picture, she thought he was a high school student and looked
very similar to her favorite Korean actor. Their online chatting became a regular occurrence; he would log into the program at Chona’s clock-out time and waited for her to log on. They continued their virtual meeting online for six months, and one day, he asked her if she would consider being his girlfriend. She did not take it seriously but said yes anyway. He wanted to visit Manila to meet her face-to-face, but she was about to move to A country. When Chona moved to A country, her husband visited her; by then, their relationship was already a committed relationship, and his visit served as a last confirmation before marriage. After one year of dating, they got married in the Philippines with both her family and her husband’s family attending.

Chona’s parents-in-law did not disagree strongly with their son marrying a Filipina; they accepted Chona as their daughter-in-law when they were told by their son that he loved her. After the wedding, because it was a Catholic marriage, the couple attended a series of Catholic marriage preparation classes in the Philippines. He stayed in the Philippines for two and a half months for the classes, and Chona stayed in the Philippines for three months for the classes and to obtain additional paper work. Looking back on that period of time now, Chona regrets that she did not spend more time with her family and left home so soon after the wedding, because, since college, she hadn’t been able to spend quality time with her beloved family due to work. She always had to stay away from home, in Manila, in A country and, now, in Korea.

In Korea, Chona lives with her in-laws. Chona argued that a married couple, as grown-ups, are supposed to live separately from their parents; however, her husband persuaded her by saying that it would only be two years, and Chona would need to learn about the Korean culture and language from his family. Living with in-laws is
uncomfortable due to privacy; whatever Chona does, they cannot help but know what she is doing in detail. Fortunately, because Chona’s father-in-law was an English teacher and her brother-in-law can speak English, Chona has little problem communicating with her father- and brother-in-law. Her mother-in-law barely understands English, though, and talking with her requires the use of body language or assistance from other family members. Her biggest problem with living with her parents-in-law is their nagging and treating her like a kid; her parents-in-law repeatedly correct her behavior or point out the same issues. For example, they repeatedly say that Chona needs to learn how to cook Korean food; otherwise, she will only prepare meals using Spam and junk sausage. Chona’s husband told her that they have always been like that, treating their grown-up children like kids, so it was just being passed on to her, too.

During the interview, Chona often mentioned how much she misses her family in the Philippines and how close her relationship with her family is. She talks with her mother every day using a smartphone messenger, and her whole family visited her in Korea last year before she delivered her baby. It was a complicated but fun time with both her family and her in-laws staying in one house. Still, she wishes that she were in the Philippines with her family, especially at holidays, like Christmas and New Year’s Day, and thinks that it would be perfect if she lived in the Philippines with her husband and daughter.

Chona evaluated that she has adapted to Korea about 75%. Her most helpful supporter during the last three years has been, of course, her husband. She has not been seriously concerned yet about raising her child in a foreign country; she somewhat worries about how to cope with Koreans’ excessive pressure on education and how to
help with her child’s assignments and other difficulties in school. Chona feels that she needs to advance her Korean for her child; but, at the same time, Chona and her husband agreed that Chona would speak to their child in English and Chona’s husband will teach her Korean.

At the end of the first interview, Chona showed her appreciation by saying “I should feel thankful, because you’re one of those people interested in us (marriage-immigrants), and you’re going to help us in the future.”

**Divina**

Divina was introduced by Analyn, the first interviewee. She lived in a small city in the northern part of South Korea. We met at a Dunkin Donuts near her home. Divina was very feminine, mellow, and somewhat shy, with a soft voice and smiling face; she was also a deliberate but talkative person. As with my interviews with Analyn and Chona, I had two interview sessions with Divina for following up on a few themes; the first one was conducted on Sunday, February 2, 2014 at 9:30 am and lasted for three hours. The second interview was conducted at the same place on Saturday, February 15, 2014 at 1 pm and lasted approximately two hours. The interview was mainly conducted in English; however, 5% of the conversation was in Korean, especially towards the end of each interview.

**Narrative.** Divina was a 28-year-old woman married to a 40-year-old Korean man, and they lived with her parents-in-law and her three-year-old daughter. She came to Korea in 2011 and, at the time of the interview, had been married for four years. According to her, Divina was from a “broken family.” Her mother passed away when she was eight years old. As a daughter without a mother, she did not have a good role model
or guide. Her father did not take care of his children, and he kept selling his properties to have money for drinking and playing cards. Even though she had two brothers and her uncle’s family lived close by, Divina felt alone. As soon as she graduated from high school, she left home and went to Manila to work.

In Manila, Divina initially worked as a nanny and, then, as a factory worker; she did not like either of those jobs. She was introduced by her friend to a Korean couple who ran a hotel and resort in the Philippines. Divina worked for them for four years, picking up Korean guests at the airport, scheduling travelers, driving Korean guests from Manila to Boracay and so on. While working for this couple, she had a great deal of contact with Koreans and, thus, was able to speak simple Korean words. Divina became very close to her female boss, who was like a mother to her. One day, a friend of Divina’s boss visited the Philippines and asked Divina if she was interested in marrying a Korean. One of Divina’s dreams, early in life, was to marry an American guy, a foreigner. So, she had practiced English very hard in school for this reason. Her previous experiences with Korean travelers in their 40s and 50s was not favorable, so she refused to be introduced to the lady’s nephew at that time.

However, Divina’s boss persuaded Divina to meet the lady’s nephew, and Divina could not refuse her request. When Divina went to the airport to pick him up, she found not only the man, who eventually became her husband, but also his father and elder sister. Divina’s husband was wearing an “American-style suit,” and this made Divina think that he looked nice and handsome. Three months after meeting him in the Philippines, he called her and asked her to be his girlfriend. He visited the Philippines again and proposed to Divina with a ring at the airport. Although Divina was still hesitant to marry
or, more accurately, was afraid of getting married, she accepted his proposal. The next day, his sister and niece, who were able to speak English, joined them in the Philippines.

After their wedding in the Philippines, three months passed; Divina was still afraid of going to Korea where she barely knew anyone or anything. Her husband eventually persuaded her, though, and she finally came to Korea on a winter’s day. At the airport, when she finally located him after hectic incidents, she found that his whole family came to welcome her: his parents, sister, and the niece she had met in the Philippines. She spent a couple of weeks in H County where her husband’s job was; he was a very quiet person and barely spoke English. Her father-in-law had her move to L city and live with her parents-in-law, and her husband moved to L city later. Four months after being in Korea, Divina got pregnant.

Divina believes her parents-in-law are good parents-in-law and good people. Her father-in-law found a Filipina nun near H County and asked the sister to visit Divina while Divina stayed in H County. He usually gives her a ride if Divina needs to go somewhere farther away from their house, and sometimes, he accompanies Divina when her daughter has to go to the doctor. They suggested a monthly allowance of $300 for her; Divina refused to accept the money and, instead, told them to save the money for her daughter. Still, Divina told me that living with in-laws was not easy for her. There is little privacy for her at home. Whenever she left home, they asked her where she was going and when she would come back. Even though Divina could not cook any Korean food the first morning she came to live with them, she woke up early and showed up in the kitchen to help her mother-in-law prepare breakfast. Her mother-in-law told her to go back to her room and to get some more sleep as there was little for Divina to do, but
Divina felt that she had to do something to help her. When her mother-in-law went jogging every morning, Divina joined her.

One day, Divina’s mother-in-law did not feel well, and so, she skipped her morning jog. Divina, for the first time, went jogging by herself. On that day, she met a pastor serving in a nearby Baptist church. He informed her about their Korean language class and suggested that she visit the church. Divina started attending the worship service every Sunday with her parents-in-law. In fact, Divina is Catholic, and she was offered baptism into the church. However, she decided to remain Catholic. In her early days in Korea, when she was struggling with homesickness and loneliness, she prayed to God and relied a great deal on religion. She believed and confirmed it with a Filipina Sister in Korea that she, as a Catholic, could pray in any church and God would listen to her as long as she prays. She regularly attends a cell group meeting; but right after the worship meeting, Divina leaves the house, because she is less interested in joining the Korean “aunties” gossip talks.

Divina was eager to learn Korean; she had the visiting Korean tutor service before having her daughter and had attended several Korean language classes from a local multicultural center, church, and a prep-school for the Test of Proficiency in Korean (TOPIK). Her visiting tutor kept pointing out what was wrong and correcting her grammar, and although Divina achieved high scores on the listening and reading sections, she failed to pass her desired level because of a low score on the written section. Sometimes Divina was more motivated to learn Korean when Korean strangers talked to her and she could not understand them. However, Divina told me that as she learned
more about Korean, she got bored and less motivated about learning Korean, especially learning grammar in the classroom.

At the same time, her need to learn Korean was increasing. Divina sometimes had trouble reading the handwriting of her daughter’s daycare teacher on daily notes. She asked her husband to write them in print. When she attended the parents’ meeting by herself, Divina sat in front and audio-recorded what the principal and teachers said for better understanding later. She spoke in three languages with her daughter: English, Korean, and Tagalog; Divina hoped her daughter would be able to fluently speak all three languages, thereby being able to experience wider and more diverse worlds.

**Imelda**

Imelda was introduced by Susan, a research participant whose interview was not selected for the analysis; I visited Susan’s house in A City to interview her. When I contacted Susan to schedule a time for the interview, Susan told me that her Filipina friends would visit her, and she could ask them if they were interested in participating in the interviews. Imelda was the first person who visited Susan that day, and Imelda was willing to participate in my study. The interview took place in Susan’s living room, while Susan was preparing a meal for their lunch in the kitchen and Susan’s toddler daughter was playing around us.

Imelda was a small thin girl with wide beautiful eyes. She lived in another unit of the same apartments—which were very luxurious and high-end. The interview was conducted in English, lasted around an hour and a half, and was conducted on Friday, February 7, 2014 early in the afternoon around lunch time—while Imelda’s two children were in school.
Narrative. Imelda was from a poor family from a southern island in the Philippines. Imelda’s mother left her and her younger brother and sister when Imelda was six or seven years old. Her father, who was 40-years older than her mother, was a farmer and too old to take good care of three young children. Imelda’s three-month-old sister was adopted by her aunt, and Imelda, as the oldest among the three, had to take care of her three-year-old brother.

When Imelda reached 15 years of age, Imelda had been living with her 21-year-old boyfriend for a year. Imelda’s older stepsister did not like Imelda’s living with her boyfriend. To keep Imelda away from the man, her stepsister sent her to Manila for school. At that time, Imelda attempted suicide to resist her sister’s decision. However, Imelda was sent to Manila, an hour and a half flight from her hometown, and in Manila, she rented a small room, attended high school and started working. Her first job was as a maid, and then, she was introduced to an English academy for Korean students where she worked as an English conversation partner/tutor.

Imelda’s husband was one of her students she met at the academy; he was a 23-year-old college student, majoring in law, and was staying in Manila to study English for a while. He fell in love with her; after six months of being conversation partners and dating for a while, he asked Imelda to stop working. He wanted to have a committed relationship and wanted to pay her rent. When his parents in Korea learned their son was dating a Filipina girl, they stopped supporting him; they stopped sending any money to him. Although Imelda pushed him to give up on her and follow his parents’ wishes, he chose Imelda and moved into Imelda’s apartment instead of going back to Korea.
After a financially hard time, he went back to Korea, promising Imelda that he would come back to the Philippines within a month. Imelda did not believe him; she packed and moved back to her hometown. After one month, he came back to the Philippines, as he had promised, and shipped all his packages in Manila to Imelda’s home. In other words, he followed Imelda to her hometown on the southern island. Imelda continued attending high school in her hometown and was living in her stepsister’s house. When her husband came back, she had to find a new place to live with him. Imelda’s stepsister supported their relationship, because she believed that a Filipina should marry a foreigner, not a Filipino, to have a better future; “you will get nothing from a Filipino.” They ran a very small grocery store to make a living.

After two years of living together in her town, Imelda got pregnant with her first child. They decided to get married. No one from his family came to the wedding; only her family - her father, stepsister, and brother - attended their wedding, and it was especially supported by Imelda’s stepsister whose husband was American. When his mother heard the news about the wedding, she cried a lot; from that time, his mother slowly realized that she had to accept the situation as it was. After marriage, he started running his own business in the Philippines, supported by Imelda’s stepsister. They lived in the Philippines for five years with their son and daughter before they finally moved to South Korea in 2010.

Her father-in-law was a business man, and thus, he was from a very rich family. His father requested his son come back to Korea with his whole family and assist him with his business. Imelda’s family moved to B City, Korea in 2010. During her first five months in Korea, Imelda and her children lived in A City with her mother-in-law while
her husband lived in B City with his father, where the family business was located. Her mother-in-law was a very kind person and a responsible mother, but living with her was somewhat uncomfortable and didn’t allow for much privacy. Imelda followed all of her mother-in-law’s decisions, because Imelda had little experience in Korea. Additionally, regarding her children’s health, Imelda had no choice but follow her mother-in-law’s advice. For example, when her daughter was sick and vomiting, her mother-in-law stopped Imelda from feeding the baby and brought the baby to a Korean oriental medicine clinic. When Imelda called her husband and complained about the situation, he said “just follow her. She knows everything better than you.”

After five months, Imelda and her children moved to their own apartment in B City. They lived in B City for two years; then, they moved back to the Philippines for her husband’s business. However, Imelda’s husband was deceived by a Korean fraud and lost his business. Given this failure and the want for a better education for their children, they moved back to Korea in 2013, and it had been around six months since they had come back to Korea. Imelda’s husband worked in J City where he owned a fish farm. The trip to J City takes around four hours by car from A City where Imelda and her children live. Her husband came home once or twice a month.

When she was in B City three years ago, she had a visiting tutor for studying Korean, but she barely was able to learn Korean, because the tutor preferred speaking English to improve her own English. Instead, Imelda learned Korean characters, how to read and write, from her grandmother-in-law. Also, her husband and his family were very helpful in teaching her Korean. Recently, her mother-in-law enrolled her in a more
intensive Korean language program to learn both the Korean language and culture; the class would begin the upcoming March.

Since coming back to Korea, her children attended preschool and kindergarten; her son was going into first grade in March of 2014. As her children were growing and more involved in the Korean education system, Imelda was more in need of her mother-in-law’s help, because her husband couldn’t be with her due to work. She asked her mother-in-law to live with her. Because her mother-in-law had to take care of her own mother, who was in her 80s (or 90s), she could not live with them. However, she promised Imelda that she would visit her four times a week when her grandsons started school in March.

The most difficult thing in Korea was dealing with her children’s adjustment. One time, her son was bullied on the school bus; they teased him for not being fluent in Korean. Her son said, “My friends told me I am stupid, because I cannot speak Korean very well. I envy my friends, because they can read books very well, and I can’t!” And, one day, he asked her, “Mom, why can’t you be Korean?” Dealing with their language and identity has been most difficult for Imelda.

Another difficulty was related to her religion; Imelda was Mormon, and her mother-in-law was a devoted Catholic. Her mother-in-law didn’t force her religion on Imelda, but begged her, saying “That’s the only thing I’m asking you.” But, as she had been a Mormon since birth, Imelda could not simply convert to her mother-in-law’s religion; she decided not to go to either her own church or the Catholic church and stayed at home “to be fair.”
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Other than these two struggles, Imelda told me her life in Korea was very satisfying, and she felt she was lucky. Although her husband was away from her, she understood that he had to work, and their time apart would be no longer than 10 years. With his hard work, he not only supported Imelda and their children, but he also supported Imelda’s family in the Philippines. Imelda sent money to the Philippines for her brother and sister’s study and to her father. She had more than enough Filipina friends in Korea. She told me, “I’m not the best, but I’m doing my best to be a responsible wife and a mom for my kids. So, I’m just supporting my husband through emotional support. I am lucky.”

**Jovelyn**

Jovelyn volunteered to be interviewed after reading the research flyer posted on Facebook. Because she was living on M Island, where it was too expensive for the researcher to travel, the interview was conducted through Skype. Before and after the interview with Jovelyn, I had interviews with other Filipinas at Susan’s house, and I had to have the interview with Jovelyn at a coffee shop near Susan’s. Due to the slightly unstable Wi-Fi connection at the coffee shop and a technical issue from the voice recording software for Skype, I was disconnected four times. However, right after each disconnection, I reconnected with Jovelyn and continued the interview.

Jovelyn was alone in her house during the interview. During the interview, Jovelyn was very emotional; she cried during almost half of the interview and got angry when she talked about incidents related to her in-laws. At the end of the interview, Jovelyn kept apologizing about being emotional; I was almost the only one in Korea to
whom she was able to freely talk about her life, a friendly stranger who was ready to listen to her, like a counselor.

The entire interview took approximately one and a half hours; the recorded interview time was 76 minutes. The interview was conducted in English on Friday, February 7, 2014 at 3:30 pm.

**Narrative.** Jovelyn is from a family that was “not-rich,” consisted of her parents, a sister, and a brother. She was the “spoiled” youngest, being exempt from all house chores when she was young. When Jovelyn finished two years of vocational college, majoring in Hotel and Restaurant Management, her father retired, and the family experienced financial problems. Jovelyn quit college and began working in a mall to financially help her parents although the salary was meager.

Jovelyn identified herself as a mail-order bride. With naïve curiosity, Jovelyn joined a marriage-agency brokered meeting and met her husband there. She was 25 years old at that time, and he was 40 years old. Although she had little idea about Korea and literally did not know her husband, she decided to marry him, believing what the agency told her: “Korea is one of the richest countries, and your husband is very good man, and he has a lot of money.” Jovelyn’s first impression of him was good; he seemed to be good-looking and funny—she dreamed her life would dramatically change in Korea in an absolutely positive way, even though her husband was not able to speak English and she could not speak any Korean.

The wedding was significantly far from a normal wedding; it went very fast, and then, after a week or a month, her husband went back to Korea. Jovelyn stayed in the Philippines for a while to process the paperwork. Jovelyn’s mother reminded her, “You
need to spend thousand [in hours and thoughts] before you marry the man, and if not, it
doesn’t go very well.” However, Jovelyn was “hard-headed,” and she regretted that she
had not carefully listened to her mother.

Jovelyn came to Korea on a cold winter’s day in January 2010, and she was
excited to meet her husband and to live in Korea; at the airport, her husband and the
marriage-agency broker welcomed her. Then, she took another flight to M Island with her
husband. When she arrived at his mother’s house, Jovelyn learned that she would live
with his mother, his brother’s family with three children, and his aunt. Jovelyn was
shocked, but there was nothing she could do. She could not even cry, because Jovelyn
wanted to pretend to be all right, keeping her honest feelings inside.

Feeling like an alien from Mars, Jovelyn began living in Korea. Her husband
enrolled her in a local Korean language class, and Jovelyn met some Filipina friends in
the class. Her husband cared about her; over the last four years, he had mostly supported
her and stood by her.

Those who made Jovelyn’s life in Korea harder were her mother-in-law and her
sister-in-law, her husband’s elder brother’s wife. Her sister-in-law was mad at Jovelyn
almost every day, yelling at her and saying some bad words. She forced Jovelyn to wake
up and do house chores, provoking Jovelyn.

After a couple of months in Korea, Jovelyn started working in a hotel near her
house to earn money for her parents in the Philippines. Her father was in need of
financial assistance from her; however, Jovelyn did not want to ask her husband for help.
Knowing that Jovelyn was working part-time to send the money to the Philippines, her
mother-in-law got angry and had her quit her job. Although Jovelyn’s husband disagreed
with his mother, he had to obey his mother’s decision. This fight eventually made Jovelyn’s husband decide to live apart from his mother, and Jovelyn and her husband moved out of the house. This separation, however, made her mother-in-law hate Jovelyn even more, as her mother-in-law thought Jovelyn was the reason her son did not want to live with her. Even after the separation, Jovelyn’s husband continued sending half of his salary to his mother; Jovelyn did not know how much his salary was.

One day in September 2010, Jovelyn’s father passed away; before he died, he told his family that he wanted to see and hug his youngest daughter. Jovelyn also wanted to fly to the Philippines to see her father; Jovelyn’s husband did not allow her to go back the Philippines at that time and, instead, asked Jovelyn to help his family’s farming work. When they heard that her father had passed away, he sincerely apologized to her and begged her to visit the Philippines; however, Jovelyn already missed her last chance to hug her father and say goodbye. This incident remained a big scar in her heart. Whenever her mother asks how her life in Korea is, Jovelyn lies to her mother and says that she is doing very well with a good husband and in-laws. At the time of the interview, Jovelyn was living with her husband and had no children.

Jovelyn only attended the free Korean class for a couple of sessions because of the part-time work at the hotel. Four years had passed; her Korean was still poor, and so, Jovelyn will resume attending the Korean class the upcoming spring semester.

Although she had some Filipina friends in the area, Jovelyn felt too ashamed to share her stories with her friends. Hiding her real life from friends and family made Jovelyn lonelier and her life harder. When she heard from her friends about domestic
violence or more awful stories about marriage-immigrants, she felt lucky compared to
them.

**Lailani**

Lailani was also introduced by Susan, a research participant whose interview was not selected for the analysis. Lailani visited Susan’s house one evening. While Susan, her family, and other Filipina friends were having dinner and chatting after dinner in the kitchen, I interviewed Lailani in the living room.

Lailani was middle-aged, maybe in her 40s, and she seemed to be firm and strong. The interview was conducted on Friday, February 7, 2014, late at night (starting at 8:30 pm) and lasted around an hour and 20 minutes. The interview was conducted in English.

**Narrative.** Lailani was a kindergarten teacher for almost six years in the Philippines. Her cousin, who was married to a Korean, introduced a friend of her husband to Lailani. After a couple of conversations on the phone, Lailani’s husband sent an invitation to Lailani to visit Korea on a fiancée visa; due to the denial of this visa, he instead visited the Philippines, and they were married. He stayed in the Philippines for ten days after the wedding; a month after he left, Lailani received a visa and came to Korea in July of 2001.

The next month, she got pregnant with her eldest daughter. Due to nausea and being unable to eat anything due to her pregnancy, she stayed in the hospital for four months, taking dextrose every day. The same thing happened when she got pregnant with her second daughter two years later. Her husband was a kind hard-working person from a big family; he had four siblings. She didn’t have any problems with her in-laws, even though she barely spoke Korean. They lived in D City, which is a large industrial city in
southeast Korea. In August 2006, Lailani’s husband had a car accident and passed away. She was so saddened that she couldn’t stop crying, but she realized she had to be strong for her two daughters. She wanted to demonstrate to her husband’s family and the people who pitied her and said she would not be able to raise her children by herself that she could raise her two daughters successfully and even better than kids with both of their parents.

After losing her husband, she moved to A City with her daughters to get a job. She started her career as an English teacher, and she has worked as an English teacher in private tutoring academies and universities and as an individual tutor.

Lailani’s eldest daughter was her pride and joy; she was good in school, won a medal at a Tae Kwon Do competition, and received many certificates from school. Her homeroom teacher also told Lailani that she did not need to worry about her eldest daughter’s school life or academic performance. The younger daughter seemed to be bullied in school, because she is half-Filipina. Lailani told her daughters, “Study, study, study, then your classmates won’t bother (bully) you like that.” Lailani believed that the discrimination against her daughters would go away if their academic performance exceeded their native Korean classmates, which is generally consistent with native Koreans’ attitudes towards bullying.

Before her husband was in an accident, she used to send money to her family in the Philippines; however, after the tragedy, Lailani made her children her financial priority. Fortunately, Lailani’s family did not depend on her; her mother was a former kindergarten teacher and worked in a municipal office after retirement. Her brother also worked as a seaman. Lailani sent gifts or special allowances to her parents on their
birthdays and holidays. At these times, her mother would scold her, saying “Why? We don’t need allowance from you. You’d better save money for your kids.”

Lailani pointed out three major difficulties that she had while living in Korea for 13 years: the food, the language, and discrimination. Her problem with Korean food faded as she had lived in the country longer; now, she could cook different kinds of Korean food and liked some of them. However, language was still a problem. At first, she thought she did not need to learn Korean, because she could speak English very well. She learned how to read Korean from her nephew; at that time, there were few Korean language programs for foreigners in D City. She was gradually able to read and understand Korean. However, this problem got serious and significant when her daughter first entered elementary school. She registered for a Korean class immediately after she moved to A City, but after two months, she had to stop attending class because of work. She was a single mother, a foreigner who barely knew how to write in Korean. She regretted not having pushed herself to learn Korean harder when she had more of an opportunity.

Lailani had experienced various types of discrimination: against her ethnicity, against being a foreigner, and against single motherhood. When she was looking for an English teaching job, she found that Koreans preferred white American teachers. Her current boss told Lailani to dye her hair, because he believed that if her hair color was anything other than black, she would look more like a foreigner. While riding the subway, Lailani felt that people always looked her over from head to foot. Some rude people had even asked her daughter, who looked more like a native Korean, why she was being accompanied by Lailani. Her other daughter was teased by her classmates; “Your
mom is from Vietnam!” (Vietnam in this context, for young children, represents all children with marriage-immigrant mothers.) Lailani saw people react with surprise and stop disparaging her when she told them she was an English teacher, not a housewife. Because she knew that people pity her when she told them that her husband died, she instead told people that her husband was working in a foreign country or was a seaman. She learned from her own experiences that people would treat her better if she dressed up, wore full makeup, and fought back when she was underestimated, because she was a foreigner and a single mother in Korea who could easily be disrespected.

Nowadays, she has a very busy life between work and family. She enjoys helping Filipino newcomers by providing a free boarding house until they get a job and a good place to live. What she wants to hear from Koreans is “Great job in raising your kids.” Her youngest sister-in-law recently told her, “Thanks for raising our nieces to be very well disciplined.”

Liezel

Liezel was the last research participant whom I interviewed at Susan’s. Liezel visited Susan in the evening; after my interview with Lailani, other Filipinas at the house urged her to help me. She seemed to be somewhat reluctant to participate, so I asked her if she was willing to be interviewed and that it was absolutely fine and understandable if she did not want to participate. Liezel agreed to be interviewed and signed the consent form.

Liezel was a very calm and rational person; however, because her relationship with her ex-parents-in-law had been so unfavorable, she continued shedding tears when she talked about her life before she divorced. Because it was very late at night at Susan’s
house, almost 10:30 pm, and because I had to catch the last train for my hometown in Korea, in addition to her slightly reluctant attitude talking about her ex-husband’s family, I had to rapidly wrap up the interview after only 40 minutes. The interview was conducted in English and started at 9:40 pm on Friday, February 7, 2014.

**Narrative.** Liezel met her husband in the Philippines when she was a first-year master’s student at the best university in the Philippines and was working part-time as an English teacher. One day, she visited her student’s house and had the opportunity to meet him, because he was the student’s friend. This young couple got married without notifying either of their parents in 1994; Liezel was 24, and he was 25 years old. After their marriage, Liezel’s husband wanted to go back to Korea; Liezel told him, “Okay, just go ahead. I will finish my degree first, and in two years, I will follow you to Korea.” However, his angry parents refused to let her finish her degree or stay in the Philippines. When they were told that their precious son had married a Filipina, they forced him to immediately bring her to Korea.

Liezel described living with her parents-in-law as “real hell.” She, however, lived with them for 10 years. They disregarded Liezel, because she was from a poor country, although she was educated while they were not. During her second week in Korea, Liezel realized that it would be better to give up, and she seriously considered a divorce, even though she was already pregnant. Liezel described her mother-in-law as “a princess” who always needed her son’s devoted attention; her mother-in-law always said, “I am sick. I have pain.” to gain her son’s care and attention. Liezel called her father-in-law “a president,” because he was very conservative and stubborn; everything had to be done as he said. Liezel was not even allowed to go outside by herself. Because there
were only a few foreigners in A City in 1994, despite the fact that it was one of the biggest metropolitan areas in Korea, Liezel was unable to find other Filipinas who could provide her with emotional support in Korea.

After living with her parents-in-law for 10 years, Liezel’s parents-in-law moved out to a new apartment, which was located just below their previous apartment where Liezel and her son were staying after they left. Liezel still had to greet them before and after work; she has worked in a Filipino company in Korea since 2000: “I cannot start a day without seeing them; I cannot end my day without seeing them.” Since the time that her husband’s parents moved out, Liezel and her husband had been separated; he stayed with his parents in the new apartment, and Liezel stayed with her son in the old apartment. Liezel divorced him in 2011 when his girlfriend got pregnant, and they did not want the child to be illegitimate. This wedding was not welcomed by his family either; only his father attended the wedding, and his mother and sister did not have good relationships with their new in-law. His mother died in 2012; because his mother wanted to see Liezel before dying, his family begged Liezel to attend the funeral. However, Liezel sent her son to the funeral but did not personally attend.

Since filing for their “amicable” divorce, Liezel has maintained a good relationship with her ex-husband. On the day they submitted the divorce documents, they went shopping together to get her and her son a new house. He bought the apartment for her and sent her almost double the amount of money that he had agreed upon when they divorced. He fully acknowledged Liezel’s contribution to his family and his wealth. He sometimes visited her and his son.
Although she had lived in Korea for almost 20 years, Liezel was not good at speaking Korean. During her early years in Korea, she tried to teach herself Korean, but few resources existed at that time. More importantly, she had an emotional block toward learning Korean, because the Korean that she heard at that time was the yelling and cursing of her parents-in-law. Liezel had neither the motivation nor the need to learn Korean. Her husband was very good at English, she taught her son English, and she worked at a Filipino company. The Korean employees at the company were able to speak English, too. However, she thought that her relationship with her ex-parents-in-law might have been better if she had been able to understand them and talk to them in Korean.

Liezel was 44 years old, and her son was going to attend a university in March 2014. She still worked with the Filipino company and enjoyed her free time with her Filipina friends in A City. Being an atheist, she did not have a chance to meet Filipinos at church, but she got to know some Filipinas at work and then was introduced to other Filipinos by them.

**Lilibeth**

The interview with Lilibeth was conducted in a café in G City, the nearest city to where she was living. She was introduced to me by the Catholic priest; when the priest visited G City for a service, he asked her if she would be interested in being interviewed for my study. She agreed to share her contact information with me. Because she lived in G City, I drove almost 3 hours from my hometown to G City to meet with her.

Lilibeth was a very calm and mature woman, exceptionally fluent in English, and seemed to be extremely organized, not only in her behaviors but also in her words. The
interview, which was in English, lasted almost two hours, and it was conducted on February 8, 2014, Saturday, in the morning.

**Narrative.** Lilibeth was a 40-year-old Filipina at the time of the interview. She worked in a company as a bookkeeper for 10 years after graduating college. She married at the age of 30. Her parents died early, so she felt a great deal of responsibility for her four siblings. For example, Lilibeth had to help her youngest sister finish college. When her sister finished her nursing program, Lilibeth thought it was time to take care of herself and to have her own family.

Lilibeth prayed, starting at the age of 25, that she would be married by the time she was 30. In her 20s, she was very busy working seven days a week, ten hours a day. One day, her cousin, who had married a Korean and was living in Korea, called her and asked, “Do you want me to introduce you to someone?” Lilibeth answered, “Oh, okay! If he doesn’t smoke and doesn’t beat women, maybe we’ll try.” This call was made a month before her 30th birthday. Additionally, her close friend who was single and 10-year older than Lilibeth advised her to get married when Lilibeth had a chance. Lilibeth decided to marry, thereby giving up some final job interviews for better jobs in Qatar and Dubai. The marriage was set for July in the Catholic Church. Lilibeth’s husband had visited the Philippines and spent around 11 days there, which is part of the law in the Philippines. Because he knew a little English, they had talked on the phone and wrote letters to each other from March to July.

After living in Korea for more than nine years, her major difficulties included infertility, financial issues, and her loud in-laws. For nine years, Lilibeth and her husband had tried to have a baby, but their attempts had not been successful. After years,
her mother-in-law forced her to take a Korean herbal medicine for fertility, when she was already taking some other medications, including Clomiphene. This resulted in her being hospitalized for two weeks due to a weakened liver. After being discharged from the hospital, she declared to her husband that she would seek a divorce if his family kept pushing them to have a baby. Lilibeth’s husband said that he wanted to be with her, and he did not care about having a baby. Lilibeth said that his mother and sister seemed to still want them to try to have a baby, but her husband, the youngest in his family, did not care about having one. They were considering adoption, but they had not yet begun the process.

Before marriage, Lilibeth’s mother-in-law promised her that she would hand over the financial control of the family to Lilibeth after two years; however, it took five years before Lilibeth was able to gain control financially. During that time, Lilibeth’s allowance was only around $100 per month, so she began working as an English tutor in a government program after living in Korea for a year. When Lilibeth was able to take control over her family’s finances, her mother-in-law requested around $500 for her allowance each month; Lilibeth happily complied with her request, and her agreeable attitude surprised her mother-in-law.

Lilibeth was raised in an extremely quiet family; both her parents were teachers, and they and their five children enjoyed a calm and quiet living environment. In contrast, her husband’s family tended to be very boisterous, which made Lilibeth very nervous. In particular, her mother-in-law tended to scream, and Lilibeth told me that even if her mother-in-law was not shouting at her, hearing her loud high-pitched voice was often scary and uncomfortable for her.
Lilibeth had few complaints about her husband; he was helpful and cared deeply about her. Her only complaint about him was that even though Lilibeth spent a significant amount of time trying to learn about Korea and the Korean culture before marriage, her husband did not attempt to learn about the Filipino culture, and his family required her to adjust to the Korean culture.

In her early years in Korea, she tried to attend a Korean class held at the local Multicultural Center. However, she found that the class was not helpful for teaching her Korean, as the instructor only spoke Korean, and her classmates were from all over the world. After attending two sessions, she quit the class and started subscribing, instead, to Kumon-English learning materials targeting elementary students, as the materials had English and Korean subtitles. At home, where she, her husband, and her mother-in-law lived together, they spoke Korean.

She currently worked as an English tutor and volunteered at the Beautiful Store (a non-profit organization that helps indigent people by selling donated household items). A prevailing hobby of hers was writing letters to inmate pen-pals in America. Her husband and she agreed to visit the Philippines every other year; meanwhile, they often traveled to other nearby countries, like Japan.

**Liwayway**

I met Liwayway at a Catholic community center in C City. Because I was told by a Filipino informant that there would be an English mass that many foreign wives attended, including Filipinas, I visited the Catholic community center to recruit research participants on a Sunday. I was introduced by the director of the center after a parents’ meeting as a researcher who was looking to interview Filipina marriage-immigrants.
Liwayway was a calm but bright woman; she quietly approached me and handed me her phone number.

The interview with Liwayway took place in a café in downtown C City—one of the biggest metropolitan cities in Korea. Before the interview, we had a late lunch together, and then, because the restaurant was so loud with young people, we moved to a café near the restaurant and started the interview. Although the city was my hometown and I was familiar with the downtown area, it seemed that Liwayway was more familiar with the place; she had been in the city for 10 years, while I had not lived in the city for 13 years—since college. The interview was conducted 90% in English and 10% in Korean on Saturday, February 15, 2014, and lasted slightly over an hour.

**Narrative.** Liwayway was from a big family in the Philippines; she was the youngest with five brothers and two sisters. After graduating from college, Liwayway worked in a company in Manila as a secretary for two years. When she first met her husband, who was with his mother, Liwayway was 22 years old. She went on a blind date with her husband, which led to marriage, because she wanted to travel to Korea in order to work there. Their courtship was only three days: their blind date on the first day, shopping with him on the second day, and the wedding on the third day. The wedding was hosted and managed by the Unification Church.

After six days, he left for Korea, and after waiting a couple of months to complete the visa documentation process, Liwayway came to Korea. Initially and purposely, Liwayway did not tell her parents about the wedding; they were told that she went to Korea for work. After a few months, one of her sisters told their parents the truth; her parents did not want to see her until she delivered her second child. After having the
second child, Liwayway and her family—her husband and two children—visited her hometown in the Philippines. Liwayway’s father strongly insisted that she not go back to Korea. She stayed in the Philippines with her two kids for about 50 days. Then her son, the second child, got ill, and this made her decide to return to Korea. Since that time, Liwayway thought she needed to raise her children as Koreans, because they are Korean citizens.

Liwayway was almost always confined to her home for her first five years in Korea due to her inability to speak Korean. She lived with her parents-in-law for the first eight months in Korea. Her mother-in-law prevented her from going outside or answering the international phone calls from the Philippines because of money. Because Liwayway barely spoke Korean and because her husband barely spoke English, they communicated with dictionaries, which did not facilitate the development of their husband and wife relationship. Both her husband and father-in-law were heavy drinkers and often used swear words, which added to Liwayway’s difficulties. Liwayway had to have three abortions over ten years. As a Catholic, she did not want to have abortions, but her husband and her mother-in-law insisted, and she had to follow their decision.

Things changed after she learned Korean, resulting in her being able to communicate with her husband. Liwayway continued asking her husband not to smoke and not to swear, especially in front of their children, saying, “I know how to divorce in Korea now, because I know Korean.” At first, he only laughed but gradually accepted her request; he quit smoking three years ago and greatly reduced his usage of bad words. Because Liwayway’s husband had not had a job for five years—he worked part-time at the time of the interview—Liwayway established a rule that when she was working, he had
to take care of the children and to do chores. She told him, “You need to learn my culture, also!” Her mother-in-law disliked the manner in which Liwayway talked to her husband in Korean and their rules about babysitting and chores, because her mother-in-law believed that a husband should be respected as a king at home.

Since Liwayway gained the ability to communicate in Korean, not only her relationship with her husband, but also her personal life in Korea, had changed enormously. She started working and earning money. She was no longer afraid of going outside by herself, and she pointed out that her understanding of the Korean culture helped her understand her husband’s behaviors and attitudes.

Liwayway had been in Korea for 10 years at that time and lived with her husband, a 10-year-old daughter and a 9-year-old son. Liwayway felt that her two children made her stronger and stronger. Before, she thought only of the present, like many other Filipinos; however, Liwayway was actively preparing for the future, like Koreans, for a better future for her children.

Malyaya

Malyaya first contacted me after she learned about my research from a flyer posted on Facebook and showed her willingness to participate in the study via a text message. She lived in the northern part of B City, and the interview was conducted in a café near her house. It was a cold winter’s day; she brought her second child, who was about a year old. During the interview, she breastfed her baby. Because it was around 10 am on a weekday and the café was located in a residential area, there was no one except for us on the second floor; the cashier counter was on the first floor. At a table in the
corner of a large Starbucks coffee shop, we started the interview. The interview was conducted in English on Thursday, February 20, 2014 and lasted around 70 minutes.

**Narrative.** Malyaya was the eldest child from a big family; she had four sisters and one brother. She earned a Bachelor’s Degree in Elementary Education in the Philippines and served as a teacher in public and private schools for three years before she moved to Korea. Her co-teacher’s sister was in Korea and introduced Malyaya to her husband. Later, Malyaya learned that the person who introduced them was a kind of marriage broker or worked for an agency; Malyaya’s husband paid for the introduction.

Malyaya got married when she was 23, and her husband was 40 years old; Malyaya had quite a few relatives who were married to persons much older, so a 17-year age gap was not a big concern to her or her family. Instead, Malyaya’s mother was concerned about her moving to Korea; she had seen many Korean dramas and understood there were big gaps between the Korean and Filipino cultures. Malyaya thought it was her destiny.

Malyaya came to Korea in October, 2009. Unlike many other Filipinas, Malyaya had little problem eating Korean food; rather, because she liked her mother-in-law’s cooking so much, she gained weight. The cold weather in the winter somewhat bothered her. Except for her first month in Korea, she hadn’t been homesick much. Her only difficulty was with her mother-in-law.

Before she came to Korea, she was already told by her husband that they would live with his mother. Malyaya had had no problems dealing with or having relationships with elderly people in the Philippines. She thought it would not be any different in Korea. At the beginning, her mother-in-law seemed to be very nice. Even though her mother-in-
law was very talkative, because Malyaya could not understand what she was saying, it did not bother Malyaya at all. However, as Malyaya started understanding her words, Malyaya started experiencing stress. The problem was that Malyaya’s mother-in-law kept nagging her. However, thanks to her mother-in-law, Malyaya had been exempt from all household chores, such as washing dishes or clothes; instead, she focused on babysitting and working part-time. Malyaya was trying to be nicer to her mother-in-law as she was getting older – 77 years old, and because she recently had back surgery.

Malyaya’s husband was a really kind person and a hard-worker. During the first four years of their marriage, even though Malyaya did not have a job, he kept sending money to the Philippines, so her brother could finish his undergraduate degree. They recently stopped sending money to save more for their own children, and her brother got a job and began supporting the family instead. When Malyaya has had quarrels or arguments with her mother-in-law, since her husband knew his mother’s personality, he supported Malyaya and helped her end the arguments.

Malyaya had two children: a four-year-old son and a one-year-old daughter. Her son attended a daycare center. When she used to pick her son up from the center, sometimes, the teacher would talk about her son’s bad behavior within earshot of other parents waiting to pick up their children. Malyaya felt as if this was discrimination. She discussed this situation with her visiting Korean tutor, and the tutor called the daycare center and complained about this attitude on behalf of Malyaya. After the call, the teacher stopped targeting Malyaya and her son. Malyaya wanted to have closer relationships with other parents, but it seemed that being a foreigner had made parents of the other children keep their distance from her.
Malyaya heard that if half-Korean kids tended to be less fluent in Korean, this could make them an easy target for bullying in elementary schools. Due to this reason, Malyaya spoke only in Korean with her children and wanted to be better at Korean. Up to this point, she had no intention of teaching English or Tagalog to her kids. She used to have a visiting tutor teaching her Korean, but her mother-in-law disliked the teacher visiting the house when her son was sleeping during the daytime, because he worked the night shift. Malyaya asked her Filipina friends and their tutors if she could join them. Malyaya had been learning Korean in this way for a year and a half. The next month, she planned to register for a Korean class at the local multicultural center, because by then, she would be sending her second daughter to a daycare (for free in Korea).

Malyaya worked as an English teacher in a local tutoring academy. While she was pregnant with her second child, she had to quit for about a year. The principal of the academy kept asking her to come back, and she recently resumed working part-time. She considered that she would be able to work more starting the month after the interview, three days a week, because then, she was planning to send both of her children to daycare. Meanwhile, she obtained a seller’s permit from a local municipal office and sold Filipino cosmetics and other products online.

**Mirasol**

Marisol was introduced to me by Flordeliza whose interview was not selected for analysis; during my interview with Flordeliza, Marisol called Flordeliza, and when I had a chance, I asked if Marisol would be interested in being interviewed. Later, I contacted her and saved a date for an interview; the original interview date could not be kept due to a change in her son’s schedule, but I visited her town a week later on a Saturday morning.
E County, where the countryside town where she was living was located, is in the north-western part of South Gyeongsang Province in Korea and has a population of around 63,000 (2014).

Marisol was a tall, thin, and confident woman. She talked quite fast and was very fluent in English. The interview was conducted in a franchise café in the downtown area in E County. During the interview, she met a couple of acquaintances, and the interview had to be stopped for a minute to ten minutes for her to talk with these friends. During the interview, Marisol kept calm and mostly rational, rather than emotional, unlike many other interviewees. The interview was conducted in English and lasted two hours and six minutes – excluding the time in which she chatted with her acquaintances, and took place on February 21, 2014, in the morning in E County.

Narrative. Mirasol majored in Chemical Engineering in college and had worked in an exporting company as a researcher for five years before she moved to Korea. She first met her husband when he visited the Philippines as a member of a praise team from E Presbyterian Church. While the praise team was visiting the Philippines, they were invited to Mirasol’s mother’s birthday party. Even though there was no direct communication between Mirasol and her future husband that night, later, he contacted her with the assistance of his friend who could speak English fluently, and he visited the Philippines three more times to see her. They had dated for three years and finally married in October of 1996.

After the marriage, because she still hated leaving her job and home country and was afraid of moving to a foreign country, she did not move to Korea until March of 1997. At first, she lived with her husband and her calculating mother-in-law. When she
got pregnant, she was barely able to eat any food and required bedrest. She went back to
her home in the Philippines and stayed there until her son was two and a half years old.
However, she eventually brought him back to Korea so that he would have a closer
relationship with his father.

When Mirasol came back to Korea with her son, her mother-in-law’s aggressive
and deceitful attitudes toward Mirasol had not changed; for example, Mirasol’s mother-
in-law tried to eavesdrop on Mirasol’s communication with her friends and family on the
phone, even though she couldn’t understand what was being said, and told her son and
daughter that Mirasol acted very rude towards her and talked on the phone for hours and
hours. Finally, Mirasol forced her husband to choose between his mother or her and
argued that they needed to move out into their own place. Although it was a “painful”
decision for him, Mirasol’s husband chose to leave his mother, and they moved into their
own house.

When the family moved in the new home, Mirasol set the house rules; one of
them was to speak only in English at home. Mirasol wanted to raise her son to be
bilingual, English and Korean, so that he would be able to communicate with his family
and relatives in the Philippines. In contrast, this rule made it hard for Mirasol to learn
Korean. Most of her friends in E County were people who were able to speak English,
like English teachers, Filipinas, and a spouse of a native English speaker. In addition,
because her husband was very supportive, he always accompanied her or prepared her in
advance when she needed Korean language abilities, such as when visiting a bank and
municipal offices. For example, when he was not available to accompany her to get a
legal document, he called the municipal office in advance and explained everything
before she arrived, so she just needed to sign and pick up the documents. This was possible, because they lived in a small town, where he would personally know many of the residents. He never pushed her to learn Korean, and he defended her when his relatives and friends criticized Marisol for not being able to speak Korean after living in Korea for more than 10 years. Marisol understood a lot of what was being said in Korean, but she was less fluent when it came to speaking Korean; she thought her pronunciation was funny.

Marisol tried to instill both identities in her son, being half-Korean and half-Filipino. As a result, her son, a 15-year-old boy, grew up to openly say that his mom was Filipina without hesitation when he met new Korean friends. He was admitted to two international high schools in the Philippines and had not yet decided where to attend high school: in the Philippines or in Korea. Mirasol was running a private English language institution, and her husband worked at a major company as a car mechanic. They were Presbyterians.

Nenita

Nenita was one of the three participants whom I met at the Catholic community center in C City; another was Liwayway, and the third person canceled an interview later. Nenita volunteered and gave me her mobile numbers. Smiling, she loudly said in Korean, “I want a divorce! I am going to get divorced!”

I communicated with her via text and visited her house on the next Saturday afternoon. When I entered her apartment, her son was there; he went to his room when the interview started. Her husband was in the master bedroom, but he did not come out from the room or greet me. During the interview, on one occasion, he came out to get
something from the kitchen, but did not say anything to me. I stood up and nodded to him; he nodded back.

The interview was conducted in her living room. Although her son and husband were in the house, Nenita did not hesitate to speak her mind, even when she was criticizing her sister-in-law, in Korean. During the interview, Nenita very often got upset, became emotional, and shed tears. The interview was conducted 88% in English and 12% in Korean, lasted one hour and 36 minutes, and took place on February 22, 2014, in the afternoon, in C City.

**Narrative.** Nenita was a factory worker in the Philippines before marriage. She was 33 years old when she was introduced to her husband at a group blind date meeting in the Philippines. She was asked if she was interested in an international marriage by a coworker who had submitted an application to a marriage agency. Nenita followed her coworker to the group meeting, and her future husband showed an interest in her; her friend and the agency manager pushed her to say “yes.” Nenita was not earning enough money for herself or her parents, so Nenita decided to marry, thinking “this is my chance; if this marriage does not work after a couple of years, I can divorce.” She moved to Korea in 2003.

During the first couple of years, she lived with her mother-in-law in a rural area. She then moved to C City with her husband. When she was living with her mother-in-law, there was an incident in which she was accused of theft by a family member when her mother-in-law lost around $200 at home. It was a heart-breaking experience for Nenita. Then 3-4 years into her marriage, Nenita happened to learn that her husband had been married before. When the family members gathered together for an ancestral
memorial ceremony, her toddler son found a picture of his father at his grandmother’s house and brought it to Nenita, saying “Daddy, Daddy.” The picture was from an envelope with many pictures from her husband’s previous wedding. When she asked about the pictures, her husband did not even apologize; rather, his eldest sister yelled at Nenita and threw the picture in her face, saying “Okay, you keep it!” Given the distrust and poor treatment by the family, Nenita thought about divorce, an idea she had told herself she would consider if the marriage did not work out; however, she could not get divorced because of her young son.

In 2006, Nenita’s father died, but she could not go to the Philippines, because her sister-in-law, who controlled her husband’s income, did not allow her to attend the funeral or give her money for travel to the Philippines. The sister-in-law argued that, in Korea, if parents were divorced, the children do not need to attend the funeral of the parent with whom they did not live—which is not true. At that time, Nenita knew little about Korean culture and could not fight against her, so she gave up. Her first visit to the Philippines since she came to Korea in 2003 was in March 2010. Borrowing money from a friend, she was able to travel to the Philippines with her son to help her mother, who was having emergency eye surgery. Her husband was not helpful at all. In November of the same year that Nenita and her son visited her mother, Nenita’s mother passed away. This time, Nenita was able to go back to the Philippines for her mother’s funeral.

Regarding Nenita’s life in Korea, a visiting Korean teacher was very helpful. Nenita was visited by the visiting teacher for her Korean education. The teacher not only helped Nenita learn Korean, but she also helped Nenita in many other ways. For example, when Nenita’s son was four years old, the teacher helped persuade Nenita’s
husband that their son, Jaewoo, needed to attend a daycare center for the sake of his Korean proficiency. Then, since Jaewoo started attending the daycare, the teacher introduced Nenita to the director of the daycare, and Nenita was hired as a cook at the center. Nenita has worked in the daycare as a cook for five years. Additionally, the teacher was the one who pushed Nenita’s husband to apply for Nenita’s citizenship; after discovering that it was his second marriage and finding that his previous marriage did not appear on his marriage record, Nenita felt nervous and uneasy about her status. The teacher checked the husband’s family record certificate and confirmed that Nenita was listed as a wife; the teacher then pushed the husband to process Nenita’s naturalization.

The director of the daycare had also been very supportive of and helpful to Nenita. He trusted her and hired her after observing her making Korean food for the children over a three day trial period. When Nenita’s husband had an accident in his workplace and urgently needed Nenita’s signature on a surgery consent form, Nenita was not very willing to visit the hospital, because she was very upset about her situation and did not want to meet any of her in-laws at the hospital. However, the director persuaded Nenita by saying, “I know your in-laws are not good people, as your eldest sister-in-law called me one time and said that I should not hire you because you’re a thief. But, I did not trust them; instead, I know you are a good person, and your husband needs you.” After learning that the sister-in-law had even tried to stop her from working at the daycare, Nenita became even more disappointed to her in-laws and felt sad, but she agreed that Jaewoo’s father needed her.

According to Nenita, the “biggest enemy” in her life in Korea was her eldest sister-in-law. She not only did she control the income of Nenita’s husband’s, but she also
meddled in Nenita’s life and even tried to influence Nenita’s parenting decisions. For example, one day, Jaewoo, a second grader, did not come home after his Tae Kwon Do class. Nenita discovered that Jaewoo had a piano lesson. Nenita’s husband knew that his sister had sent Jaewoo to the piano lesson, but he had not discussed it with Nenita or even informed her of the decision. Two years earlier, Nenita had had a big fight with her sister-in-law and had left the house. Nenita’s neighbor on the same apartment floor helped her by allowing her to stay in her home for a while. In order to get help and thinking seriously about going back to the Philippines, Nenita called her sister in the Philippines, who gave her a phone number for the Philippines Embassy in Korea. A staff at the Embassy gave her the number of the Catholic community center in C City, and Nenita was helped by the center in many ways (e.g., counseling, Korean education, networking with other Filipinos near her and so on).

Nenita missed the Philippines, especially her family and the food. Nevertheless, she liked living in Korea, especially due to Korea’s safe and convenient public transportation, the health insurance and hospital system, and the speedy and transparent civil service. Nenita had obtained Korean citizenship.

**Riza**

Riza was introduced to me by the director of a Catholic learning center. The center provided Filipinas with many learning and networking opportunities as the center was very close to the Catholic church that provided a Tagalog mass every Sunday. The interview with Riza was conducted in her house, which was a one-bedroom and one-bathroom house, like a dormitory, with a small kitchen and no living room, that was provided by her boss and shared with her Filipina friend, Rubylyn. When I first met Riza
at the Catholic learning center, she asked me if the interview could take place in her house after her work, instead of at the learning center—the center was very far from her house. The following week, I visited her house at a quarter after seven in the evening, approximately the time she came back home from work.

Riza was a small, plump woman with smiling eyes. She spoke in Korean, and although she was not very proficient in Korean, she was able to communicate with the researcher. The interview was conducted 75% in Korean and 25% in English for an hour and 22 minutes on February 23, 2014, in B City.

Narrative. Before moving to Korea, Riza was a college student majoring in elementary education, hoping to become a teacher. When she was preparing documents for the Licensure Examination for Teachers (aka Teachers Board Exam) in the Philippines, she learned that her official name on her birth certificate included a typo, resulting in her being ineligible to take the exam. Unable to become a teacher, she began working in a tuna-canning factory. One day, her coworker asked her if she was interested in marrying a foreigner, the Korean friend of her coworker’s cousin. Riza was told that all costs for the marriage would be taken care of by the man and that she would not need to pay any. Because Riza was so exhausted from working in the factory and did not want to take the risk of potentially becoming the victim of fraudulent overseas recruitment agencies or international marriage agencies, she “grabbed the opportunity.” In 2006, Riza, a 24-year old woman, married a 41-year old Korean man and came to Korea. After the marriage, two unsavory facts were revealed: he was actually 47 years old, not 41, and he had previously been married—twice—to Thai women who both ran away right after their marriages with the assistance of the Unification Church.
In the first couple of years in Korea, her married life was fairly acceptable. Riza’s husband treated her well and continued working. After six months of living in Korea, she got pregnant and had a baby boy. The year she delivered her first son, she got pregnant again, and her husband insisted on an abortion. He did not want to have another baby; however, Riza was Catholic, and she could never abort the baby. Riza’s second child, a daughter, was born, and her marriage started collapsing. Her husband’s employment status was unstable, and he disliked her working. Because he did not give her any money, Riza was desperate to work; however, she had to take care of her babies. At that time, the daycare service fee was supported by the government only for low-income family. One day, Risa met a Korean neighbor, and she told Riza that the local municipal office might be able to help her financially so that she could send her kids to a daycare. This heroic woman helped Riza process documents in the local municipal office and find other Filipina friends in the neighborhood. Riza was eligible to receive governmental financial support for daycare service for low-income families. She sent her kids to a daycare center and started working in a small factory. The director of the daycare center was willing to help and cared about Riza’s family.

Two years ago, Riza’s husband had gallstone surgery and was not able to work. Because of some extracurricular activities at the daycare that were not supported by the government assistance, Riza asked her husband to babysit their kids at home. He refused to do so and did not take care of the kids, even though they were left at home. Riza decided to send her kids to the Philippines where her parents and sister could take care of them. Finally, her husband agreed with this decision and went to the airport with his family. However, when Riza and her husband had couple counseling due to his verbal
and physical abuse, he lied about the situation to the Korean counselor, saying that she had taken and hidden the kids from him. Riza was very upset and extremely disappointed in her husband. Due to both domestic violence and distrust, Riza left home.

Riza was, at the time of the interview, working in a family-run factory that was owned by her husband’s friend. Because her husband believed that she was in the Philippines with their kids, the owner of the factory, who trusted her more than he trusted her husband, actively helped her hide from her husband by providing housing and letting her know when her husband was around. Riza saw and talked with her kids through Skype. Riza was unable to obtain Korean citizenship, because her husband refused to sign the necessary documents; he believed that Riza would run away from him if she obtained citizenship, as had his two previous Thai wives. Riza’s visa was supposed to end in a year. She had not seen her kids for two years—since they were sent to the Philippines— as Riza was afraid that she might not be allowed to return to Korea after visiting the Philippines due to her visa status.

Even though Riza had lived in Korea for seven years, she had not had an opportunity to attend any formal Korean language courses until last year. One of her Korean acquaintances told her about the Catholic learning center, and she started attending a Korean class with her roommate. Although it took more than an hour for her to get to the center, she was very pleased with this learning and networking opportunity. Riza told me she loved Korea and Korean people, except for her husband: “I just hope that I can continue working in Korea and bring my kids back here someday.”
Rutchel

The interview with Rutchel was conducted in a small local café in front of her apartment. Right after the interview with Malaya, Malaya introduced me to her. When I contacted her to schedule an interview, she said, “Can we just do it today before I go to work?” I took a taxi to arrive at her apartment on time. Rutchel was a very calm and mature woman; the interview was somewhat interrupted by people chatting loudly in the café, but she continued the interview and was very focused. The interview, which lasted an hour and seven minutes, was conducted mainly in English on February 20, 2014.

Narrative. At the time of the interview, Rutchel was 48-years old and a single mother who lived with her two children: a son in the 7th grade and a daughter in the 5th grade. Rutchel was from a big family in the Philippines; she had five siblings and three step-siblings, because her father remarried after her mother’s death when she was a year old. She was a 33-year-old nursery teacher when she met her husband through the Unification Church. After observing her siblings’ difficult married lives, she was less interested in getting married, and by the age of 33, in 1999, she thought she was too old to get married. She and her friend decided to visit the Unification Church to get married: “We’re going there, because there are single Koreans who are looking for single Filipinas!”

Rutchel’s husband was 43-years-old at the time of their marriage and from a rural area in Korea. After staying several days in the Philippines, he and Rutchel came to Korea together and started their family life in his hometown, living with his mother. Her mother-in-law was a kind and caring woman. After one year of living with her husband’s mother, Rutchel and her husband moved to B City, where he worked as a welder. But,
his salary was not stable; he frequently drank alcohol and became weak and sick. Because only the “wild” boys drank a lot in the Philippines, it was very hard for her to understand his drinking habits, and Rutche was often afraid and cried a lot. However, Rutche tried to be patient and to understand him.

Given her husband’s unstable income, once Rutche achieved Korean citizenship after living five years in Korea, she started working. The local district office helped her find a job and get government financial aid for daycare.

During her first month in Korea, a volunteer teacher from the Unification Church visited her home and helped her learn Korean. After a month, Rutche self-studied the language. At that time, in 1999, there were no Korean language programs for immigrants, especially in the rural areas. She had to communicate with her husband using a dictionary, which was not easy and complicated. Rutche studied Korean harder for her children. One time, a friend of her husband told her, “It’s very difficult when your kids go to school, if you cannot speak Korean; maybe, they will become fools.” Two years ago, Rutche got to know about the free Korean language programs for immigrants at a nearby local community learning center. She immediately registered and has continued to enroll in the classes for two years, enhancing her Korean from Level 1 to Level 3. She could not enroll for the next term, though, due to her work schedule.

Rutche was helped a great deal by her many coworkers and other native Koreans. Informally, her co-workers helped her improve her Korean proficiency and understand the Korean culture. Additionally, her coworkers gave her good advice on her tough marriage, too; rather than suggesting a divorce, they, elder women, kept supporting her to remain patient and cheering her up: “You’re very brave. You’ve lived in a foreign
country. You’re strong.” When her husband died two years ago due to drinking and the related complications to his body, an officer at the local district office who had known her for years saw a woman on the rooftop and thought that person might be Rutchel; officers at the local district office worried that she might commit suicide, and they suggested counseling services. On the other hand, Rutchel also helped other Filipinas. She volunteered as a translator and counselor for other marriage-immigrant Filipinas at a community learning center. She advised young Filipina brides to be more patient with their husbands and to pursue longer marriage lives in Korea, “love your husband and obey your mother-in-law.” Her close Filipina friends in Korea considered her like a big sister.

Rutchel’s son sometimes had problems in school; one time, he was teased for looking like Obama, probably due to his darker skin color. He did not like his mother’s speaking in English outside of their home or others’ knowing his mother was from another country. Her daughter was fine with her speaking English outside of their home and her being a foreigner. Before her husband died, he took care of the children’s school-related work; now, it had become her responsibility to read and respond to the school documents. Sometimes, church people helped her understand the paperwork and what she was signing; sometimes, her Filipina friends’ husbands were helpful, too.

Tara

Tara was introduced by Malyaya. The interview with Tara was supposed to take place in a café near a busy subway station around clock-out time. She was coming from her work, and when she arrived, she and I found that the café was too noisy for conducting an interview. She suggested moving to her new apartment. To get to the
apartment, we needed to take a bus; she walked so fast to the bus stop that I had to run to catch up with her. It was a new empty apartment, which she was planning to move into shortly. Because the house in which Tara’s family used to live was located in this redevelopment area, the family was able to buy this brand-new apartment with three bedrooms at a very low interest rate. Tara proudly explained the new apartment to me, and we started the interview in the empty, resonating living room. Tara was a very active, amusing, emotional, and bright person. During the interview, she often showed her emotions and feelings through rich facial expressions, active hand gestures, crying, smiling, laughing, and so on. The interview, which lasted an hour, was conducted on February 23, 2014 in the evening in both English and Korean.

**Narrative.** Tara was a 40-year-old Filipina at the time of the interview; she had lived in Korea for 10 years with her 50-year-old Korean husband, 9-year-old son, 8-year-old daughter, and her mother-in-law. Tara was working in Hong Kong when she was introduced to her husband through the Unification Church. Her boss told her, “If you want to marry a Korean man, just tell me,” and she responded “Okay! I’m interested.” On the day she met her husband, she and her husband accepted a blessing. After the blessing, her husband left to go back to Korea, and she continued working in Hong Kong until she was told by her boss that she didn’t have any more work for her. Because Tara was not willing to go back to the Philippines, she decided to go to Korea. She contacted the church and processed her visa documentation. Meanwhile, she sometimes called her husband and said some simple Korean words, such as ‘hello’ and ‘I love you,’ and hung up the phone as she couldn’t understand her husband’s responses in Korean; her husband did not call her. Once the visa documentation process ended, she came to Korea and
spent three months in the Unification Church because of their marriage ritual/policy, then she moved in her husband’s house.

In the beginning, Tara did not know that she was going to be living with her mother-in-law. It was not easy at all for Tara to live with her mother-in-law. Her mother-in-law tended to get angry easily and to shout, which made Tara very uncomfortable, even though she barely understood Korean. As a meat-eater, it was not easy familiarizing herself with Korean food that mainly consists of many types of vegetables.

After 10 months of living in Korea, Tara got pregnant, and once she delivered her first son, life got tougher for her. Her mother-in-law and husband kept shouting and telling her how to raise her child. When she gave birth to her son, her allowance was only ₩100,000 ($880) per month. She was constantly running out of money for diapers, meat for her own diet and so on, but her mother-in-law would not buy more diapers until there were none left, and her husband lied to her, telling her “I don’t have money,” when Tara asked for money. Tara just endured the situation. Even worse, Tara got pregnant again right afterwards. She thought she couldn’t help but endure the situation as she didn’t have family in Korea.

She started earning money, secretly, by helping with her friend’s part-time work-from-home job (folding socks). When her second baby turned one-year-old, she told her mother-in-law that she wanted to work. Even though both her mother-in-law and her husband disagreed with her decision, she threatened them: “If you can’t babysit my kids, I will send them to the Philippines!” Tara started working part-time in a small factory, then as a private English tutor, and at the time of the interview, she worked in a hotel as a housekeeper after completing a government training program for the unemployed. On her
two off days, she also worked as a housecleaner in a Canadian’s house, which was kept secret from her husband and mother-in-law. Tara enjoyed working in the hotel with her coworkers – office managers and other housekeepers; she joked and helped their work as the youngest worker, though the work was pretty demanding.

Regarding her husband, Tara disliked his drinking habits, but he did not hit her and did not care that she said bad words to him in Korean, which made Tara feel pleased and comfortable with him. Once Tara got so angry with her husband’s drinking, she said, “When are you gonna die? Die soon.” He jokily responded, “You’ll be bored if I die.” “That’s fine. I have money. I’ll be fine.”

In her first three months in Korea, Tara learned Korean by subscribing to an at-home Korean tutoring program that was originally designed for children learning the Korean characters. Because it was too expensive to continue, she quit after three months. Then, she learned about the government-provided free Korean classes at a multicultural community center and registered for a class. After attending three months, she quit the class, because it was too difficult to learn Korean and to prepare for tests to advance to the next level. She, instead, learned Korean from watching music shows on TV, listening to music and reading subtitled lyrics. Neither her husband nor her mother-in-law was helpful or facilitated her in learning Korean.

Regarding parenting, one thing matters, teaching her children Korean. Tara’s two kids attended dol-bom-kyo-sil, a free after-school daycare service provided by the school and funded by the government, and were helped educationally by this service. Her son met a very good teacher who helped him complete his homework every day after school.
Tara was very pleased with her situation in Korea, in general. She overcame all of the struggles that she had to deal with at the beginning; her relationship with her Korean family was stable, and she had a full-time job that she liked. She loved Korea, because it was a country where, if one worked hard, one can earn enough to survive. She had visited her family (mother, sister, and brother) in the Philippines only once in the 10 years that she had been living in Korea, because she’d rather save the money for her children’s education and future.

Cross-Case Analysis

This section presents the findings in response to the second research question: What are common acculturative experiences of marriage-immigrant women? Three themes related to marriage-immigrant Filipinas’ common acculturative experiences emerged from a constant comparison across the 15 individual stories: being taught to be a good daughter-in-law, negotiating motherhood, and developing extrafamilial support. Subthemes of the three themes are summarized in Table 4.4. Some quotations that were originally made in Korean were translated into English by the researcher.

Theme 1: Being Taught to Be a “Good” Daughter-In-Law

The most striking acculturative experience that marriage-immigrant Filipinas had was related to their being daughters-in-law. Regardless whether their marriages were for love or not, participants had weddings in the Philippines and spent a couple of weeks to months in the Philippines processing their visa documentation. Meanwhile, their husbands usually left the Philippines ahead of them. When these Filipinas came to Korea as wives of Korean men, they began their married lives with their parents-in-law; in lieu of learning to be a good wife, the women were forced to learn how to be good daughters-
## Themes from the Cross-Case Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Subthemes and Simple Quotations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Marriage-immigrant Filipinas were taught to be “good” daughters-in-law.** | a) Marriage-immigrant Filipinas lived with their parents-in-law. “*We lived together with parents-in-law, and it was really hell.*”  
  b) Marriage-immigrant Filipinas were forced to assimilate to the Korean culture. “*You also need to learn about Korea from my parents.*”  
  c) Marriage-immigrant Filipinas had to endure unfair treatments from their in-laws. “*In-laws are outlaws.*”  
  d) Marriage-immigrant Filipinas were forced to accept the oppressed role of women in the Korean patriarchy system. “*He’s the king.*”  
  e) Marriage-immigrant Filipinas’ husbands offered minimum help. “*My husband is always in the middle.*” |
| **2. Marriage-immigrant Filipinas had to negotiate their motherhood.** | a) As mothers, marriage-immigrant Filipinas had to deal with their children’s cultural identities. “*Can’t you be a Korean?*”  
  b) Marriage-immigrant Filipinas’ parental authority was doubted and questioned. “*I cannot discipline my child on my own.*”  
  c) Marriage-immigrant Filipinas prepared their children for social discrimination and prejudice and fought for them when it happened. “*My boy was teased to look like Obama.*” |
| **3. Marriage-immigrant Filipinas developed extrafamilial support in South Korea.** | a) Marriage-immigrant Filipinas actively found their own ways of coping with the given difficulties.  
  b) Korean neighbors were helpful to marriage-immigrants in practical ways, such as for solving their issues.  
  c) Having a Filipino community in Korea was both practically and psychologically helpful for marriage-immigrants’ integration into the Korean society. |
in-law. Four subthemes emerged in relation to this theme; being taught to be good
daughters-in-law, in other words, learning about the traditional Korean patriarchy and
being situated in the system. The subthemes are as follows:

a) Marriage-immigrant Filipinas lived with their parents-in-law.

b) Marriage-immigrant Filipinas were forced to assimilate to the Korean culture.

c) Marriage-immigrant Filipinas had to endure unfair treatment from their in-
laws.

d) Marriage-immigrant Filipinas were forced to accept the oppressed role of
women in the Korean patriarchy system.

e) Marriage-immigrant Filipinas’ husbands offered minimum help.

Marriage-immigrant Filipinas lived with their parents-in-law. Many of the
participants had lived with their parents-in-law from several months to a number of years.
Sometimes, they still lived with them. Some of them were told before they came to
Korea that they would be living with their in-laws; others later realized that this was the
situation.

Jovelyn: ...then, at the airport, I saw my husband, the broker, and then, we went to the Island. Then, we went to his mom’s house. And, then, I’m shocked, because in his house, there are so many members of the family that I’m going to live with them. Oh, my gosh. His mom and his brother, and brother’s wife, and the three children, and then, his auntie. I was shocked. The situation was different from what I expected.

Analyn: I lived with my [mother-in-law]. My husband already told that we would live together for two years. So, two years.

Liezel: ...for 10 years we lived together with parents-in-law. And, it was really hell.

Divina: (I was living with my husband in H county) But my father-in-law told me one day, called that, “You should move here in P city. Since you don’t have a child yet, we must live together, because we are alone, too.”
At that time, I didn’t like (living) with them, because I wasn’t comfortable living with my in-laws.

Tara: So, after that (three months of staying at the Unification Church), (I have lived) together with my mother-in-law. Oh, it’s not easy! You’re Korean, you know about that, right? Ha-ha.

Living with elderly in-laws gave the participants little privacy. Their daily activities had to be exposed to their parents-in-law, and they were expected to share their schedules with their elderly co-residents.

Imelda: I was in A city with my kids, so I lived with my mother-in-law. It was maybe not comfortable, because you are living in one house, and anyway, she is not mumbling too much, but you don’t have your privacy.

Chona: I need to be careful of what I’m saying, what I’m doing, or even what I’m wearing. Sometimes, I’m wearing a skirt - it’s not short, it’s just above my knee - but my father-in-law said, “Isn’t it too short? It should be longer.”

Liezel: We were like prisoners. For 10 years we lived together. At that time, after dinner, we were not allowed to go out. You cannot go out of the house unless you say, “Oh, I’m going XX.” (If I don’t say, they would ask) “Where are you going?” Like that. Even my husband (had to report). They always (want) to be together. If somebody wants to go out of the house, the parents should know. And, then, they will be waiting (until) when you come home.

Living with their parents-in-law did not simply indicate that the women physically stayed in the same place with their parents-in-law; the women seemed to be treated as the children of their parents-in-law, rather than as married grown-ups. The parent-child family relationship was replicated in their houses in various ways. For example, Chona’s clothes were criticized by her father-in-law, and Liwayway could not go outside without her mother-in-law’s permission or help.

Chona: You can’t decide 100% for yourself. And, I also felt like I’m still a kid, because they always say, “Not like that. It should be like that. Not like that, like this.” But, they have a point, because they just want to teach me. But just, I’m already married. I should, you know, I can do this. I can do
this by myself. Of course, I will make a mistake sometimes. And, you know, old people are conservative, and they think I’m still a kid.

Liwayway: At that time, I couldn’t go outside. ... just because my mother-in-law and then my husband (said) “Don’t go outside, stay at home.” I don’t know, because they thought I was going to run away. So, within five years I didn’t have friends, just only house, house, house.

Tara, Nenita, Lilith, and some other participants did not have access to their husbands’ incomes. Their mothers-in-law, and sister-in-law in the case of Nenita, had control over the household budget, and only a limited amount of allowance was given to them.

Lilith: Before I came here, he [my husband] told me that my mother-in-law would handle our... [finances]... and I would be living with my mother-in-law. So, it’s alright with me. But, then, they told me that after two years, my husband’s salary would be given to me for safekeeping, and then, it (actually) took five years.

Nenita: And then, sometimes, of course, I need clothes. And, I ask my husband, “Can she [his elder sister] give me money?” “Why?” “I want to buy clothes.” She never gives me money. All the clothes of her, she gives me.

Tara: 우유도 기저귀도 시어머니가 사는데, 조금이라도 있으면 안 사. 저녁에 우유 먹으면 뭐 어쩌라고, 곧 떨어지는데 안 사줘 시어머니가. 너무 힘들어요. [Translation: My mother-in-law bought formula and diapers for my baby. Until there was nothing left, she wouldn’t buy anymore. Even if the formula would run out after the evening feeding or sooner, she would not buy any. It was too hard.]

Jovelyn: My husband’s salary, she [mother-in-law] is the one who budgets things. Because in the Philippines, if you’re a married one, you need to get financially, or the money through his wife. But, here in Korea, financially, the mother-in-law decides what she wants to buy.

In traditional Korean society, newlyweds were supposed to live with their parents-in-law, and the mothers-in-law held financial authority in the households, until the mothers-in-law decided that it was the time to hand over that duty to their daughters-in-
law, which can be figuratively described as “turning over the key to their grain warehouses.”

**Marriage-immigrant Filipinas were forced to assimilate to the Korean culture.** Some husbands tried to justify their living with the husbands’ parents, telling the women that they should learn about the Korean culture from their in-laws. With that justification, the women tended to be forced to assimilate to the Korean culture.

Chona: *I said, “Do you have a house? Where are we going to stay?”* He said, “In Korea, usually married couples - it’s okay to stay in the house of the parents,” like that. *I said, “Yeah, it’s okay with me, but we must have our own house, also.”* You know, we are married. Like that. But, he said “maybe, it will take two years, because you also need to learn about Korea before we go far apart from my parents, because they need to teach you what is Korean customs and cultures.” Like that.

Analyn: *(My mother-in-law is crazy about English. She even reads an English Bible.) ... But, she changed her style nowadays. She said, “You must speak in Korean, now, because you’ve been here for three years.” So, she changed it, and she keeps on talking to me in Korean, in a very difficult way. Suddenly, (she) changed. (I felt) just a little bit stuffy?*

Lilibeth: *(Before I came to Korea) I researched about their way of life, their personalities. The problem is, (my) husband didn’t study about our culture. The main problem in marriages, it’s like we [Filipinas] all have to adjust, but they [Koreans] don’t. I think that’s the main problem. “You are here, so you need to adjust.” It’s all the time, we hear it all the time. “You are here, so you should adjust in our culture.” Which shouldn’t be the case, right? Just maybe 20 portion, let you understand our culture, right? ... (my husband and mother-in-law say) “you should study Korean culture because you are here.” That’s the main problem.*

Korean in-laws were very diligent in delivering and explaining Korean culture to their new family member with a foreign background; but they were less interested in her culture. At the most favorable level, the Korean family enjoyed the Filipino food prepared by the Filipinas. But the Korean family’s interest in Filipino culture was seldom mentioned by the participants.
Rutchel: My 시어머니 [mother-in-law] is very kind. They served me well, cared for me. At the time (while I was living with my mother-in-law, I learned) only by looking. They taught me also; they showed me how to cook. I know all the Korean food, because my husband likes everything Korean food, many kinds of vegetables. You know, in Q county, they like boiling and mixing so many vegetables. Yeah. They always understand when I can’t catch what he or she are saying to me. They always explain the Korean to me. Like, everything for me every day.

Liwayway: And, so, because in my hometown, it’s level - girl or boy, wife or husband - is the same. So, before I came here in Korea, it was very hard for me to accept the culture, just because we are just … especially for the holidays, 제사 - so, the Chinese New Year, Thanksgiving Day. So..., at an ancestral memorial ceremony (Researcher: can you give me an example?) An example is if you celebrate the Chinese New Year, you should cook a lot, and the boy - the man - only see things [watches television]. “이거 가져와라.” (남자들은 그냥 앉아가지고, 우리가 그렇게 안 하잖아요. 남자들은 요리하고.) [translation: (the men say) “Bring this.” They are just sitting there (and let me do the work). In my country, we don’t do this. Men cook.] I didn’t want to complain to him, because it’s his culture, so I understand. And, it is not his fault, because I married without telling my mom, so… I understand every nation has their own culture.

Marriage-immigrant Filipinas had to endure unfair treatment from their in-laws. While living together, daughters-in-law experienced unfair treatment, such as their in-law’s nagging, shouting, jealousy, lies, and so on, and they had to endure the situations. For example, Chona and Malaya talked about their mothers-in-law’s continuous nagging, although they both told me that their parents-in-law are fairly good people and care about them. Liezel, Jovelyn, Lilibeth, and Tara commonly pointed out that it was hard to bear their in-laws’ shouting and speaking in high-pitched voices, even if the in-laws’ yelling was not at them, but at their husbands or other people in the family, because it was far from Filipino culture.

Liezel: In Filipino culture, we really don’t shout at another person, especially a friend or your family member. We will not really shout, because it’s an insult. It’s an insult to the person. The first time I heard my mother-in-law shout, I was really shocked. There’s this expression, “Your
heart got cold suddenly. " I experienced that for the first time in my life. There was ice here (pointing to her heart), when I heard her shout.

This verbal violence was rather minimal compared to other incidents that the marriage-immigrant women had to endure, even though none of the interviewees participating in my study reported apparent physical domestic violence. Liwayway was prohibited from using or answering the phone by her mother-in-law after she made an international call to her sister in the Philippines and was charged with a considerably expensive bill in her early months in South Korea. Jovelyn was harassed by her sister-in-law, the wife of her husband’s brother. Her sister-in-law forced Jovelyn to work and help her, nagging and fighting with Jovelyn if she was not satisfied with what Jovelyn did, even though Jovelyn was not able to speak Korean and did not understand what she meant. Nenita was accused of losing money by her mother-in-law, and Mirasol’s mother-in-law lied to her son and daughter, saying that Mirasol made an international call to the Philippines that lasted for hours and hours. Lilibeth who had been married for more than ten years and had no children was forced by her mother-in-law to take herbal medicine to improve her fertility until her liver suddenly got damaged. And, Liwayway was persuaded to abort her three unborn children.

Nenita: The thing I hate the most about my mother-in-law is that when she loses money, she thinks I’m the one who took the money. And, also, all the members of the family, they think I’m not... (researcher: trustworthy?) yeah! Also, my husband. That’s why he didn’t (trust me). They did not trust me to hold his salary. And, I just keep quiet, and this is not only (the day). I need to prove to all people that I’m not the 도둑 사람 [a thief].

Mirasol: There was even an incident (like): She got angry, she called my husband, and she was, “blabla blabla” (she said) all the stuff, I couldn’t understand. I was just so sensitive. You don’t understand that language. You’re just so sensitive; you’re just sensitive in actions. So, I was really wondering, “is this something that she is talking about me?” Right? I was so sensitive. So, what she said to my husband was, she talked to him, and this is when he was already at work, (she said to him that) I used a phone
card, calling in the Philippines for long-distance, for two hours. I am not that stupid! You know, in the 1990s, the long-distance rate was so expensive! Even up to now, I’m not that stupid, you know, enough to use the phone (for that long). She called my husband, then she lied. She told my husband that I turned on the heater in the house and didn’t turn it off. So, what I told my husband was, when he arrived home, “What did you do?” “What did your mom say? I don’t even know where the boiler is. What’s that for?” [laughs] Because it’s only (garbled), I don’t know “what’s the on and off!” Because I don’t know! How would I - I don’t know anything at all in the house. That’s why my mom said: “In-laws are outlaws.”

Lilibeth: I got sick, because my mother-in-law kept forcing me to go to the fertility clinic. And, then ... they gave me shots. I had to take a lot of medications that I wasn’t able to take. When I took it, suddenly, my liver was damaged. I was in the hospital for two weeks, because I had stomach pains at the time.

Liwayway: I got an abortion, three times? So, it’s very hard for me all the time, because in my home town, we don’t have abortions anymore. So, I was shocked when my husband told me there was the abortion here in the hospital. After my first child, I got an abortion. And, then, for my second child, I got two abortions. The first time, I wanted to be pregnant again, but my mother-in-law told me that “You need to abort that baby, because if you birth her, maybe someday, it will be very hard for you.” I can’t guarantee the future of that baby, because my husband is eldest. So, that’s why my second baby was a boy, so “고만해라, 애 더 있으면 안된다는.” [Stop delivering. No more kids.] my mother-in-law told me and, then, my husband.

After spending time struggling with their in-laws, Jovelyn’s and Mirasol’s husbands decided to move out to their own places, which made their mothers-in-law become even more angry with these women. During her pregnancy, because Mirasol needed bed rest to keep her baby safe, she flew back to the Philippines and raised her son in the Philippines until her son was two and a half years old. When she came back to Korea, she became more concerned about her son and could not bear her mother-in-law’s drinking habit and demanding attitude anymore. She forced her husband to choose either his mother or her and their son; they finally moved to their own house.
Jovelyn: (Because it was too hard for me to live with my mother-in-law and sister-in-law) Actually, my husband decided to live separately. At this moment, my mother-in-law gets deeply and thoroughly mad at it, because he, her son, wants to live separately. That’s why she’s (angry at me). “You’re the reason why my son doesn’t want to live with me!” I’m the one who was blamed. (But) My husband’s salary, she’s the one who manages. Despite (the fact) we separated, my mother-in-law still manages my husband’s salary.

Mirasol: I said, “Oh, my God. What can I do? I can’t stand. I can’t live with...” Then, I cried and cried. I told my husband, “This is too hard for me. The house is too big for both of us.” I already told my husband, it is OK for me to live in a small house with a living room, bedroom, kitchen - it’s okay. As long as it’s only us. Three of us! My husband, me and my son. “I don’t care even how small it is, as long as (there are) only us. Please.” That point, “Oh, God, I really can’t. I can’t stand anymore.” It was so hard. Like, she would also interfere with my son. [after explaining an incident between her mother-in-law and her son] When I told my husband about my side’s story, that’s the time when I said, “Who would you choose? Me and my son, or your mother? You have to choose now, because I won’t wait for another day for something to happen. If you would choose her, I would go right away, go back home to the Philippines.” I told him that. “I will bring my son. I will not give you forgiveness. I will never live with you.” And, he said, “We will just move (out) together.” [claps] Can you imagine how scared I was about my mother-in-law? … It’s better that we don’t see each other (everyday); we just went to see her once a month or something. The relationship was not healthy. Now, it’s not healthy, but it’s okay.

Unlike Mirasol, Liezel was not okay even after her parents-in-law moved to their own house; her parents-in-law purchased a new house near their previous apartment, and Liezel and her son were left in the old apartment. Since then, Liezel separated from her husband; however, her duty as a daughter-in-law did not disappear.

Liezel: (even after they moved) I cannot start a day without seeing them; I cannot end my day without seeing them. If I failed to greet them in the afternoon or morning, they really got angry. And, they were always angry with me. They were so demanding.

Marriage-immigrant Filipinas were forced to accept the oppressed role of women in the Korean patriarchy system. Marriage-immigrant women were taught that good Korean wives carefully serve their husbands and respect his parents. Compared to
their own Filipino culture in terms of gender and gender roles, marriage-immigrant Filipinas criticized the unfairness of the Korean culture; however, they could not help but accept the cultural practices and follow as they were expected. Analyn, Chona, and Liwayway pointed out how men behave with regard to cooking and preparing meals for holidays. Malaya’s mother-in-law seemed to think her son’s uninterrupted sleeping was more important than Malaya’s learning the Korean language. Jovelyn criticized the patriarchy and ageism that were dictated to her a part of the Korean culture.

Analyn: (In the Philippines) I just worked outside and gave money to my parents. “Here’s my share.” Like that. Even my father cooked for me. Here [in Korea], no. People [men], they never stand up to get plates, no. My 시어머니 [mother-in-law] is traditional Korean style. So, it was very difficult, really. At first, I was crying.

Chona: Maybe the 설날 and 추석 [Lunar New Year’s Day and Chuseok, Harvest holidays] and the big events here. Because I know how to - the table setting. I know what is here and what is there, and what to prepare. I am better than my husband and my brother-in-law; they don’t know what to do, because they are men. So, they don’t care about the kitchen stuff. I don’t know. So, I talked to my husband about it, “You should know it, because you are Korean. And, later on, you’ll need to do it.” He really doesn’t care. He just cares about eating.

Malaya: One more problem about learning Korean language is my husband works one week during the daytime and, then, a night shift. One week, alternate. So, my mother-in-law doesn’t want a visiting tutor; she doesn’t like it, because it may disturb my husband. I really wanted to learn Korean, so what I did is I just joined my neighbor.

Imelda: When we came to Korea and I lived with my 시어머니 [mother-in-law], my 시어머니 [mother-in-law] always told me, “Don’t stress your husband. Just let him work, because he’s working for a good future.”

Jovelyn: Here in Korea, you need to treat (men) - especially the elder - like a king. The men here, most of them are able to do some household chores, like washing the dishes. But (they don’t). In the Philippines, (the treatment is fair). Whether you’re a man or a woman, the treatment is very fair. But here (in Korea), the man is always the man. He’s the king. And then, I don’t know why the difference here. When you say woman, you’re supposed to be thinking of your child, you need to do some household...
chores, you need to cook food, you need to wash, you need, you know, different. Basically housekeeping. And then, you need to (serve) the elderly, especially your mother-in-law. You need to serve them, you need to treat them very kindly, and you...if (they do something to you), you are the one who will say “sorry.” And, it’s very awful for me. Awkward.

After learning Korean at an institution, Liwayway felt more confident in her relationship with her husband and started making requests of her husband, such as quitting smoking and sharing household chores; her changed attitude made her mother-in-law angry.

Liwayway: And, my mother-in-law got mad with me, because my husband is her oldest son. My mother-in-law is old-fashioned. “남자한테 왜 그렇게 말하냐. 대한민국에서 그나이 남자는 대장님이다. [Why, how dare you speak that way to your man. In Korea, men that age are the captains.]” “어머님, 이렇게 하면 안되죠. 서로 같이 살면서 같이 해야 해요. [Mother, that’s not appropriate. We should help each other while living together.]” (Researcher: So, your husband has changed.) Yes, but she can’t accept it.

**Marriage-immigrant Filipinas’ husbands offered minimum help.** While the marriage-immigrant women experienced hard times with their husbands’ families, the husbands offered their wives only minimal help in getting through the tough times. Most husbands accepted the situation as normal or inevitable and tried to take a neutral role between their mothers and their wives.

Liezel: *When I was with them, because my husband’s family were really conservative, and he was the only son. He just followed his parents.*

Analyn: *(My mother-in-law is a perfectionist, and she forced me to be, too.) Even today, I would like, when I met you, (she said) “You should wear makeup! You should put lipstick on!” “I should not, because I do not have time! I’ll be late. It will be fine” She even opened my bag and said, “Put lipstick on.” And, my husband was like, “엄마 하지마 왜 그러세요 [Mom, don’t do that. Why...?] {in a very soft voice}.” I’m really sorry about my husband; she is a rock, and she is like here; [he is in the] middle. ... He is always in the middle. When I want to say something to my mother-in-law, I say it to my husband first. And then, my husband keeps it and keeps it. And then, my mother-in-law says something about me to my
husband first, and my husband keeps it. He’s always in the middle, my husband. He’s always in the middle. I’m really sorry about that, too. Always, I’m like, “여보 미안해 미안해. [Honey, I am sorry; I am sorry.]” “괜찮아 괜찮아 [That will be fine. That will be fine]”. “엄마 왜 그래 [Mom, what’s wrong with you.]”

Divina: My husband also is youngest among the three brothers. So, what his father and his mother told him, he always, “Okay, okay.” No power. No freedom. So, “Okay (Divina will move to parent’s house.)”

With regard to a husband’s role and position between his wife and mother, however, Mirasol’s and Jovelyn’s husbands relatively actively helped their wives. Although Mirasol’s husband still expressed great sympathy for his mother, he decided to live separately from his mother, and he helps Mirasol’s in her daily life in a very sensitive manner. For example, he visits the municipal offices and explains the documents and so on in Korean ahead of Mirasol’s visit, so Mirasol does not get hassled, and he attends their son’s school parenting meetings alone to represent the family; he was always the only father that attended the parent meetings. Jovelyn’s husband, although he could not stand up to his parents, at least emotionally supported Jovelyn: “for me, he’s perfect, because he’s always at my side. He’s always emotionally there.”

**Theme 2: Negotiating Motherhood**

Being a mother in Korea is generally hard due to Korean culturally-based oppression; being an immigrant mother seems to make this worse. The interview participants expressed their concerns regarding their children: as mothers, as nurturers, and as educators. Their being mothers was not only related to their own relationships with their children, but it was also related to their relationships with their parents-in-law and their being foreigners; in each relationship, they had to negotiate their motherhood. Subthemes of this finding are summarized below.
a) As mothers, marriage-immigrant Filipinas had to deal with their children’s cultural identities.

b) Marriage-immigrant Filipinas’ parental authority was doubted and questioned.

c) Marriage-immigrant Filipinas prepared their children for social discrimination and prejudice and fought for them when it happened.

As mothers, marriage-immigrant Filipinas had to deal with their children’s cultural identities. When they became mothers, marriage-immigrant Filipinas started to face another phase of their acculturation. In addition to their own cultural identity and their adjustment in South Korea, they had to deal with their children’s cultural identity. Each couple, as parents, set different rules and standards for their children and childrearing policies, particularly in terms of language. For example, Analyn and Chona, mothers of infants, agreed with their husbands that they would speak in English and their husbands would use Korean with their children. Mirasol set a similar rule when she came back to Korea from the Philippines with their only child.

Analyn: My mom said, “You talk in English (to the baby), Analyn, okay? If you go to Philippines, and your baby is speaking Korean, we cannot talk.” We cannot have a conversation. My mom asked me before they left Korea, “Please talk to your baby in English.” Because we’re also Filipino; she is not only Korean.... They push her to speak Korean. My husband is very open about it. He said I should talk in English, and he will speak in Korean.

Chona: And, you know, I can talk to my husband well. We can understand each other well. And, when I go out, I don’t need to talk with other people. [Laughs] So, I think my knowledge is fine, but I know now I need to study more for my baby. But, for now, me and my husband decided that I will talk to my baby in English, and in our family (in the Philippines), just English. And, of course, all my family (in Korea) will talk to her in Korean.

Mirasol: It’s just like I made a rule already. Since I came back here, I made it a rule that we have to speak English in the house. My son, we should be three of us. We have to speak English. There was no other
chance that they could speak English outside home. So, at least, my son will grow up as a bilingual.

Because Mirasol’s child was already speaking at that time, she was more concretely involved in the situation. Given the expansive exposure to the Korean culture and the explicit and implicit enforcement of the Korean culture, Mirasol had a difficult time sticking to her plan.

Mirasol: She [her mother-in-law] is Korean. And, me, I’m a Filipina. So, as a mother - and I have a son. A Filipino-Korean son. As a mother, I’m trying to meet both cultures. The good. The good (sides). Trying to meet both cultures. I’m trying to teach my son both good cultures. But, it’s quite difficult for me, because she’s old. She’s old, and it’s just like, she wants this (Korean) way. And, me, I wanted to teach my son - I only wanted the cultures to be mixed. It’s quite hard.

Mirasol: Some people are… it hurts, though. And, they’ll say, “(Blah, blah, blah), for how many years (in Korea), and she still can’t speak Korean?’ like that. That’s okay! I accept that. It’s also true that I can’t speak Korean. But, it’s okay; I made myself a sacrifice for my son and for my husband. Because, in most cases, Jihyun, if I speak Korean well, my son and my husband I think - especially my son - cannot speak English fluently. And, I don’t want that my son cannot communicate with my family in the Philippines. I don’t want that to happen. They’re my family, too. And, with my parents, Boe is their only grandson, both sides - my husband and mine, only grandson. And, I don’t want my parents, my sisters and brother, to not be able to communicate with him. I don’t want that to happen. No. So, it’s okay, sacrifice myself, even though it’s hurting when people (talk badly about me) not being able to speak Korean; it’s okay.

Nevertheless, Mirasol’s teenage child was successfully raised as a bilingual with a balanced multicultural identity when I interviewed her. She proudly stated that her son “knows that he’s not the same as those pure Korean kids” and that he has been accepted by his friends as he is from kindergarten to middle school. Imelda’s children, who just came back from the Philippines to South Korea six months ago, in contrast, started to reveal inner conflicts related to their cultural identity development. Rutchel’s 6th grade
daughter and 5th grade son disliked their mother’s speaking in her own language outside of the home and other’s knowing their mother is a foreigner.

**Imelda:** I talk to them in Bisaya. They almost 100% understand, but they cannot speak that much. Maybe, they get confused, because they spoke Bisaya and English before, and now, they speak Korean. Because they are with friends (in school) every day. And, I experience also, the most difficult thing is that my son and daughter... [bursts out crying] sorry. I’m very weak in terms of my son and daughter; not to my husband: “You’re a strong wife, but you’re a weak mom.” (One day,) They got off from the (daycare) bus, and I wondered why they cried, because in the bus, their friends - I asked them why, and then, they said they got bullied, because they cannot speak Korean very well. And, they speak like, they say, “My friends tell me I am 바보 [stupid, an idiot], and I am stupid, because I cannot speak Korean very well.” And, my kids ask me, “Mom, why can’t you be a Korean?” [pause] My son asked me, not my daughter. They say, “My friends 씁겠다. [translation: I am envious of my friends.] [pause- shedding tears] They can read (Korean) books very well, and I cannot.” I explained, “Your mommy’s Filipina, and just give me time. Just give me time. Do you want your mom to become Korean, and your Filipina mom will be gone?” I give them no choice, also. They have no choice. That’s the most difficult thing.

**Rutchel:** He [my son] doesn’t like for me to speak in my own language outside. Even my English, they don’t like me to speak English outside. (Researcher: Outside, when there are people around?) Yeah, yeah. I don’t know (why). My son, he doesn’t like others to know that his mother is a foreigner. My daughter is okay when I speak in English.

As shown in other Filipinas’ cases, language was very closely related to their children’s cultural identity development. Liwayway’s children perceived themselves as pure Koreans; her son, once he started attending elementary school, identified himself as a Korean who speaks Korean and his mother as a Filipina who speaks English. However, after having time with their cousins in the Philippines, they realized the need to learn English to communicate with their cousins and to develop relationships with them.

**Liwayway:** At first - I spoke to them in Tagalog or English, but at the time, they were little and starting, three years old, four years old, they could speak a little bit. But, when they were in elementary, they told me: “Oh, 엄마 여기는 대한민국이다. 엄마를 알아야 한국말 해라”
Liwayway: When I visit again to my hometown in 2012 - I visited my hometown - with my kids - it was only three (of us), me and my two kids. So, 그때는 (애들이) 많이 컸잖아요. 갔다와보니가 “엄마, (나) 영어 배워야겠다!” 사촌동생들이랑 대화가 안 되어서. [translation: then, my kids were more grown up than before. After coming back, my kids said “Mom, I need to learn English. I can’t communicate with my cousins.”] So, that’s why they’re starting to learn English now and Tagalog.

Marriage-immigrant Filipinas’ parental authority was doubted and questioned. Marriage-immigrant Filipinas tended to believe that due to their low Korean language proficiency and the lack of schooling in South Korea, they could not offer the best for their children. Some participants began having their children attend daycare at early ages, mainly to help them learn Korean. Many of them pointed out that if a half-Korean child is less proficient in Korean, he or she would have a higher chance of being bullied in school, and the mothers were afraid of such situations. Therefore, in order to promote their children’s Korean education, some marriage-immigrant Filipinas voluntarily or forcefully chose to send their younger kids to daycare (daycare services are free in Korea except for voluntary extracurricular activity fees). For a similar reason, Liwayway sent her elementary-age children to a hagwon, also known as a cram school or a private supplementary afterschool institution, to compensate for her lack of Korean
language proficiency and knowledge about Korean education. Tara had difficulty helping her children do their dictation practices due to her Korean pronunciation and was blamed by her children. Imelda, whose first child was about to enter elementary school, desperately asked her mother-in-law to visit her more often and help her son with his school work.

Divina: 애기 돌 지나서 애기 집에만 있으면 엄마랑 한국말 못하니까 애기 한국말 안 들어요. 애기 한국에서 살아야 하나가 빨리 한국말 알아야 해요. 아야어 여 배우고 발음을 하고 받침 모음 알아야 해요.
[translation: After my baby’s first birthday, if she stays at home, she can’t learn Korean from her mother; her Korean wouldn’t improve. Because she is going to live in South Korea, she needs to know Korean, she needs to know the Korean alphabet, accurate pronunciation, and how to write.] I thought. So, I talked to my father-in-law. “I wanted to send Haeyoung to kindergarten [daycare] school, ....” (She was) 14 months (old) - one year and two months. ... I felt sorry for the baby, because at that age, the mother should care. So, my father-in-law (said), “Why? You don’t have work, so you should take care of the baby!” “Father-in-law, I don’t have work, yes[right]. But, I don’t know how to speak Korean, and the baby, also. So, the purpose why I’m sending her is because I want her to learn Korean. In school, she will have friends, and the teacher will teach her. And, I don’t know Korean, but I would teach (her Korean) differently from the school. So, I want to send her.” “Ah, okay, okay, okay.” So, at that time, my father-in-law went everywhere to search for a school [daycare]. ... (once she was sent to daycare) I also started to study (Korean).

Analyn: (When) my baby was just starting to lift her neck, (I) put her in daycare. (I lied to my mom: she doesn’t know that my baby attends daycare, and I resumed working) ... Actually, it’s another reason; if I put in daycare, if I let my baby enter daycare, she can learn Korean. (People say) “Because if she learns [Korean] from you, (because) your pronunciation is not good, (hers would not be good).” It’s another pressure on me.

Chona: And, maybe, one more thing that I’m worried about is, how can I teach her in her homework? I don’t know; maybe, her homework will be difficult for me! I don’t know. If it’s in English, there will be no problem. But, if it’s in Korean, I don’t know. I want to be the one teaching her, but that’s it.

Rutchel: Many people say if you don’t know Korean, your kids will be bullied. People said that, because I don’t know how to speak Korean! One
of the (men) who first came into my home said, “It’s very difficult when your kids go to school, if you cannot speak Korean; maybe, they will be [stupid].”

Liwayway: Just because I want them to learn a lot. 왜냐면 저는 한국인이 아니니까. 그래서 학원 보내면 더 나을 것 같다고 그래서. 안 보내면 학교수업 못 따라가요. 집에서 가르쳐 줄 수가 없으니까. 저는 한국 역사 자체를 잘 모르니까. 그래서. [translation: Because I am not a Korean. So, I thought it would be better to send my kids to a hagwon so that they can learn more. Otherwise, they can’t understand or catch up at school. They have to be helped at home, but I have no idea about, for example, Korean history. I don’t know Korean history. So, (I sent them to a hagwon).]

Tara: 한글만 어려워요. 예를 가르쳐 주는 거. 그거만 나의 problem. 학원 보내야 해. 어려워. 나 못 가르쳐 줄요. 한글은. (...) [translation: Teaching Korean, that’s my difficulty. That’s my problem. I have to send them to a hagwon. I can’t teach Korean.] That’s my problem, how to teach them Korean. You know 받아쓰기? 내가 받아쓰기 불러주면 틀리잖아요. 그러면 “엄마, 나 틀리는 거 엄마 때문에야” “알았어. 그럼 혼자 공부해.” [Do you know dictation tests? (While practicing the dictation tests at home) If I dictate Korean, she writes it wrong (due to my pronunciation). Then, “Mom, it’s because of you that I wrote down the wrong letters.” “I see. Do it by yourself. Teach yourself.”] The way I speak, it’s different. And then, my son, “(재중대는 말투로) 엄마!” “알았어 그럼 혼자 공부해.” [(with an annoying tone) Mom!” “OK. Then, you do it by yourself!”]

Imelda: Right now, one thing that’s the most difficult for me, it’s because I’m not living with my 시어머니 [mother-in-law]. I always, always, always asked my 시어머니 [mother-in-law] to live with me. Why? Because my husband is not around. And, I cannot give - I want, but I cannot give my whole support to my son, especially because he’ll be in elementary school. So, as a mother, if there is a homework - I can read 한글 [Korean alphabet letters], but I cannot fully understand all of them. So, I need my mother-in-law to help me! If there are some activities [at school], I am always late. I am always - like, if my son and daughter in school or day care, I have to give them gifts for some classmate’s birthday, and I cannot do that, because I didn’t know. So, that teacher sends some paper, and I don’t know what’s in there.
As Analyn was told by others about the importance of her Korean proficiency, marriage-immigrant Filipinas felt pressured to learn Korean for their children; in other words, they tried to demonstrate their eligibility for motherhood by mastering Korean.

Malaya: I’d like to study (Korean) for my kids. Well, there are documents needed to sign up. And, my husband is sometimes very busy. … I have a little concern about when the kids will be in the elementary. I heard something about coming from multicultural families and having difficulty speaking in Korean. So, I am very concerned about that, that maybe my kids will be bullied in elementary school. So, I need to teach them in Korean. So, how can I teach them (Korean) if I don’t learn Korean? So, I really want to learn Korean to teach my kids the proper way, so they will not be bullied in school. (Researcher: What language do you speak with them?) Pure Korean. I don’t speak English with them.

Analyn: So, I studied [Korean] hard because of my baby. Whenever I study, I’m not doing this because I want to talk with my 시어머니 [mother-in-law]. I’m not doing this because I want to talk to my husband. I’m doing this for my baby. I want to speak Korean very well, so I can talk to my baby, and my baby will not say, “ 엄마! [Mom!] Why do you keep saying 몰라 몰라 몰라! [I don’t know; I don’t know; I don’t know.]” Because one of my (Filipina) friend, Glenda, she told me about that. Because, before, someone said (to Glenda), “… because if you don’t study hard, your baby will say, “몰라몰라 만날몰라 엄마! [Mom, you don’t know anything. Why do you always say ‘I don’t know.’]” So, Glenda said, “Okay. I have a baby, so I have to study hard.” So, she told me, “Analyn, you have to study hard; if your baby can speak Korean and (you cannot), she will complain to you, ‘Why 몰라몰라 [I don’t know, no idea] every day.’” So, “Ah, okay.” Her friend told her, and then, she told me. … Glenda said, “You should study for your baby.”

Marriage-immigrant Filipinas’ parental authority is often ignored, especially by their parents-in-law. This aspect is related to Korean parents’ attitudes toward their children, not treating them as grown-ups; the parents believe they have a better understanding of childcare, particularly, the Korean way of childcare, and they tended to criticize their daughters-in-law’s decisions and insisted on their methods of child-rearing.

Chona: (As a mother of my child,) I’m just not comfortable, because I’m always thinking, ‘oh, there’s always eyes looking at me, what I’m doing.’ They’re always checking on me, “Oh, not like that!” {Laughs}
Malaya: My oldest son has this language interest. So, he can talk in Filipino - with my mom. “Lola” is “grandma.” I taught him just once, and then, he picked it up in Filipino, “Lola, Kamusta ka… Mahal kita” like basic language. Like “I love you” in Tagalog, or “how are you” in Tagalog, or everything - just basic. And, he always listens when I talk with my mom, then he mimics me. And then, in kindergarten, they already have English class. So, when he comes home, and then, “I learned this,” and my mother-in-law hears it, (she says) “Why do you teach weird language to your son?”

Divina: Living with in-laws and raising a kid is very difficult, because I want my child in a proper way how to discipline her, but my father-in-law and mother-in-law are against that. For example, I want this food for my baby, but my father-in-law, “Don’t give it like that.” Like, for example, if we go out, usually every day we go out for shopping to EMart with the baby and the in-laws. I want to go home, because she wanted to touch everything. I said, “No, do not touch - just watch,” but my mother-in-law said, “Okay, let her be. Just look wherever she goes, just look.” But she kept running, so I don’t want like that. I just lost my mind at how... (to handle her). (About) giving advice and giving discipline with a child with in-laws, I cannot win. All the time. Even though I do this one, and I want this for my kids, my mother-in-law is against. “She’s a little child; let her be!” But, I know it’s not good, and that’s not a proper way. But, my in-laws, “It’s okay, it’s okay.” So, I cannot discipline my child on my own.

Malaya: I live with my mother-in-law, and because he [my son] is a boy, he’s treated as a king. So, she gave everything, food [she feeds him]. He cannot eat alone, by himself. Always gave, yeah. My baby can’t dress by himself. So, everything my mother-in-law gave to him.

Nenita’s sister made key decisions on Nenita’s son, Jaewoo’s, education and so on. Because Nenita’s visited a Korean instructor who recommended sending Jaewoo to daycare, Nenita talked about it with her husband. Nenita’s husband discussed the issue with his sister and concluded not to send him.

Nenita: One time, my husband and 방문 선생님 [the visiting Korean instructor], they met. Then, my 선생님 [instructor] said to my husband, “재우 어린이집 가야해요. [Jaewoo needs to attend daycare]” Send him to nursery house, because first, I’m 외국인 사람. 말 못해 [a foreigner. I can’t teach him Korean.]. - my husband - 그냥 “네 뭐” [Just, “OK, OK”], my husband said to my sister-in-law, “No! He’ll go to a nursery house next year!” Then, I was so sad: “Why must my sister-in-law always make decisions for our family?”
Nenita had another incident in which her sister-in-law meddled with her parenthood. One day, Nenita’s son did not came back home when he was supposed to be at home after his Tae Kwon Do lesson. She called Tae Kwon Do and was told that her son was taking a piano lesson after Tae Kwon Do. It was Nenita’s sister-in-law, the elder sister of Nenita’s husband, who sent the boy to the piano lesson without letting Nenita know. Nenita’s sister-in-law, who was in control of Nenita’s husband’s household income, interfered with Nenita’s parenthood.

Nenita: (With this incident) I’m so angry to my sister-in-law. 재우를 그냥 맘대로 해, 그냥 나(한테) 말 안해요. 그냥 태권도 보내고, 피아노 레슨 보내고. [She sent Jaewoo to piano lessons without telling me.] Tae Kwon Do is 우리 부부 [our, as parents] decision. Already husband and wife decision, because Tae Kwon Do, he’ll need to know how to defend himself. And then, (one day) I shocked, because 재우, 어젯밤에 안 들어와. [Jaewoo did not come back home until 6 pm], and I called to the Tae Kwon Do, and then, Tae Kwon Do said, “Oh, 어머님 재우는 지금은 수업하고 있어요. [Jaewoo’s mother, Jaewoo is taking a class now.]” “무슨 수업? [What class?]” “피아노요. [Piano lessons]” “내가 왜 (언제) 피아노 학원을 보냈어? 재우 집에 보내주세요. [When did I send him to piano lessons? I didn’t. Let him come home.” 재우가 집에 와서] [When Jaewoo came home, he asked] “엄마 왜 [Mom, why?]? My aunt sent me to piano lessons.” And, I said to my husband, “Did you know that?” “Yeah.” “Oh, okay. Well, why you never told me? Why didn’t you ever tell me?” And, I asked him, “Who am I here, and what is my relation to you?” (Jaewoo’s dad tried to avoid conversation.) Very angry. But, it’s useless when I’m angry (it’s useless to be upset); it’s done already. I’m just only angry, because “Why didn’t you tell me? because of his schedule. 재우 이 때 눈높이 수업하고, 멘토링도 있어. [Jaewoo had Kumon and a mentoring meeting at that time.]” I understand this one is for Jaewoo. I just only, “why didn’t you ask me?” (I am angry) because of the (his twisted) schedule.”

Regardless whether one approach was better or more appropriate than the other, as with Nenita, Imelda eventually accepted the inferior position of her parental authority, and Analyn gave up arguing with her mother-in-law.
Imelda: You don’t have your privacy, and of course, you have to watch your moves every time, especially in terms of my kids. She [her mother-in-law] had to decide almost everything, yeah, because I didn’t have that experience here in Korea. So, she knows everything for my kids. For example, my kids are sick, and I want my kids to wear this, because my kids feel so cold. And, my mother said, “No, you cannot put it on when they have fever!” Then, my first time that my daughter was vomiting, and they brought her to a Korean oriental medicine clinic, not a western hospital. […] So, for me, I want to feed her, because I thought she was hungry, and they said, “You cannot, because the stomach still has a problem.” So, I just always follow her. It’s above my feelings, but I guess she knows what’s the best for the kids, of course. That’s her granddaughter, grandson. […] I’m a mother, but - I’m a mother, so I called my husband, but my husband said, “Just follow my mom, because my mom knows everything better than you.”

Analyn: There were some instances I had problems with 어린이집 [the daycare], because some baby bit my baby, because she’s quite chubby, fat. Her arm’s like this - like sausage! So, other babies try to bite her, and she goes home with a bite here. I really, really want to stop sending her to the 어린이집 [daycare]. But, it breaks my heart to see her coming home with a bite here and teeth marks, other babies’ marks. So, I was like, “Why?? Because my baby is foreigner?” I asked my husband. “No, they are just babies!” One time, the teacher said, “Hyunjung bit other baby.” I said, “Good job!” I said to my baby. “잘했어요 [You did the right thing!” And then, my mother-in-law turned in red. “What did you say??” And then, my mother-in-law said, “You should not say it like that!” I want to explain my part to my 시어머니 [mother-in-law] that my baby is not 100% Korean. Her mom is a foreigner. So, maybe, when she goes to elementary school, other Korean kids will bully her. “Oh, your mom is not Korean! You’re not Korean! Look at you!” I don’t want my baby to (be passive); I want my baby to be a fighter. I don’t want other people to let her down. So, that’s why I said, “Oh, good job!” when she bit a baby. This is my reason. I couldn’t explain to my mother-in-law. (Instead, I said “네. 네.” [I won’t. I won’t.]) “No. Don’t say it like that!” mother-in-law said. I wanted to express this idea and these feelings to my mother-in-law, but I couldn’t say (the words).

Lailani’s experience with childrearing is somewhat different from the other cases, because her husband died a few years ago, and therefore, she had to raise her two girls by herself. Her being a foreigner and a single mother made her in-laws and other Koreans concerned about her ability to raise her kids; their compliments on Lailani’s girls
ironically revealed their initial doubts about Lailani’s ability to be a mother. She demonstrated her ability to appropriately raise her kids as a single mom and a foreigner.

Lailani: The teacher of my daughter, I told her - because she also felt pity on me - I told her, “Don’t look pity on me. Don’t look pity on me. I’m stronger than them.” You must tell them, even though I’m a single mom, I take care of my kids better than other families. At that time, the teacher told me, “Okay, you’re right.” I can raise my kids. I’m always telling my kids, and especially my eldest daughter, “Even though you have your 큰아빠, 큰엄마 [your dad’s elder brother and his wife], I’m better than them. I can raise you, and you will be educated someday when you finish your schooling. Your cousin didn’t finish university. You need to finish university. You’re better than them someday.” I tell her that. “I am stronger than them.” I’m stronger than before. … When my husband passed away, I didn’t know what I was going to do. And, after that, I kept getting stronger. So, what I want from Korean is “[she put her thumbs up] 대단하다! [You did an amazing job in rearing your kids!]” Even though I’m a single mom, I can raise my kids. But, now, my youngest sister-in-law, she always says, “Thanks for raising our nieces.” (Researcher: In a good way?) Yeah. “Thank you so much.” They see how I raise my kids. “You’re raising them in a good way.” And, they are more disciplined than my nephews; they know this. One Korean told me that “대단하다 [you’re doing a great job in your parenting].” Even though they are good Koreans, they don’t do that (discipline their kids). That’s what I want to hear (from Koreans).

Marriage-immigrant Filipinas prepared their children for social discriminations and prejudice and fought for them when it happened. Marriage-immigrant Filipinas prepared themselves and their children for social discriminations and prejudice. As presented in the previous subtheme, some marriage-immigrant Filipinas studied Korean hard, so they could promote their children’s Korean proficiency. As mentioned by Analyn and Rutchel, many Koreans told them that if their children were not good enough at Korean, they would be bullied by their classmates.

Malaya: I have a little concern about when the kids will be in the elementary. I heard something about coming from multicultural families and having difficulty speaking in Korean. So, I am very concerned about that, that maybe my kids will be bullied in elementary school. So, I need to teach them in Korean. So, how can I teach them (Korean) if I don’t learn
Korean? So, I really want to learn Korean to teach my kids the proper way, so they will not be bullied in school.

Not only did they worry about their children being bullied, Divina didn’t want to be seen in the way she felt other marriage-immigrant women are portrayed in the media. Analyn prayed during her pregnancy for her child to look like her father, a Korean. They realized the discrimination toward foreigners and half-Korean children and wanted to minimize the influences.

Divina: I saw it on television, because their mom is Filipina or a foreigner - Vietnam, Cambodia. And, whenever I see their mom is a foreigner and the baby is half Korean, half another country, I feel sorry; they look pitiful, because mom looks like this and cannot say anything. I say, “Oh, looks pitiful!” But, if the mom can speak Korean and she can talk a lot, she can protect her baby, I think. So, whenever I see that situation, they don’t talk or say anything. I just look at the picture, and it looks pitiful, because the woman wants to speak - the wife wants to say something, but she just keeps quiet. So, looks pitiful.

Analyn: When I was pregnant, I prayed to God a lot of times, “Please make my baby look Korean! Please make my baby look Korean! Please, please!” I asked God many times, and I even asked, “Please make her eyes small! Please.” (…) Somehow, her face is Korean, a little. That is one of my worries - so, I wanted my baby to look (like a) Korean, so if she goes to elementary school, high school, university, I want her to mingle with other Koreans, and I want her to have a normal life. In my case, I cannot say my life here is normal, because whenever I go out, I cannot understand some people around me. What are they talking about? I feel like an alien. I don’t want my baby to feel the same way as me.

Meanwhile, a few participants attempted to overcome this worrisome situation by encouraging their children to excel at school.

Liwayway: Maybe, it’s because I want my kids to be first in everything. But, my daughter told me that, “엄마, 이 정도하면 훌륭하지.” [After taking a school test, “Mom, this score is fair enough, right? 80 out of 100 is good, right? Some of my friends scored 20, although their parents are both Korean.”] So, I said, “but it would be much better if you score 100.” (I want my kids to be
good at school), because I just want to give them a nice future, so they can get a nice job if they grow up.

Lailani: Because one of my friends and her son, he is in school. “Hey, your mom is a foreigner, right?” “Yes.” Then, his classmates are like, pointing “You, you, you.” And, not only him; one of my friends, she is Thai. Her mom is from Thailand. They’re always telling her “낙타” in school. Camel, yeah. So, she’s always quiet when she gets home, because her classmates bother her like that. My eldest daughter- (Researcher: That doesn’t happen to her) ... I told her, “Study, study, study, so that your classmates won’t bother you like that.” And, last time I went to school, her advisor-teacher, she introduced me to the parents. Oh, she’s Na-young’s mom, because of the (interview). Because whenever I ask my eldest daughter’s teacher about my elder daughter, they always tell me, “Don’t worry about your daughter. She’s smart, smart.” I don’t have a problem with my eldest daughter, but my youngest one, “Your mom is from Vietnam!” They all assume she’s a Vietnamese. My little one, she has big eyes, but she is, her skin is the same - she’s darker than me. But, my eldest one is the same with her dad. She is whiter. She looks like a Korean.

Lailani: And, sometimes, the problem was school, and the kids, the kids, sometimes, and their friends. Especially when they know that their mom or the dad is a foreigner here, sometimes they didn’t want to be friends with them. But, if they are smart, it’s okay. That’s what I always tell my daughter; “You need to study, study, study.”

When their children are actually bullied or harassed by other Korean children, these mothers have to fight against native Koreans’ discriminations against their children.

As other mothers would, marriage-immigrant mothers actively intervened in the situation and tried to prevent the situation from happening again.

Rutche: My kids... my son, it’s very (difficult) for him, even in the school, sometimes. He had an experience at a conference; (someone) said to my son, “Oh - you’re Obama. You look like Obama,” because maybe, it’s his skin? He always saying “It’s playing.” (Making fun of his color.)

Nenita: He [Jaewoo] told me one day that he didn’t want to go to Tae Kwon Do, because one of the students, he bullied him [my son]. ...One time, (I found a part of his toy was missing) “Why is this one destroyed?” “The boy at Tae Kwon Do.” And then, one time, we met him under road, and then, “엄마 엄마, 이리 와봐. 이 형이야, 이 형이야 [Mom, mom, come this way. That’s the boy; that’s the boy.] He destroyed my toys!” 야. 내가 가는 걸 잡아서 “나, 왜 동생 장난감 무셨는데? 너, 몇
“살이야? 너 동생은 몇 살이야?” [I caught him and asked, “Why did you destroy my son’s toy? “How old are you?”] “아, 몰라, 몰라 [I dunno, I dunno.]” He was very rude. Very, very rude. (This same boy put a scar on Jaewoo’s face a few days before the interview. Nenita was very upset; she met with the principal of the Tae Kwon Do school and threatened him that if such an event ever happened again, Jaewoo would be moved to another Tae Kwon Do school. The principal apologized for the incident.) After that time, my son was never afraid to go to Tae Kwon Do … After that [my request], he was never bullied again.

Imelda: They are being bullied in school. I called one of them [the kids who bullied my children]. I actually called and said, “Please tell your son not to bully (my children).” “Okay, I will. I’m sorry about that. They are (only) kids, and I will warn mine. I’m warning my son not to bully your kids.” My husband also called and complained (to the daycare teachers), because I called my husband and I cried, and I said, “My kids get bullied!” They get bullied inside the bus, not in the school.

**Theme 3: Developing extrafamilial support**

When they began living in South Korea, the participants tended to be less empowered due to their lack of knowledge about Korean society and linguistic limitations as described in above themes. However, as they had lived for longer times in South Korea, they expanded their understanding of their husbands, in-laws, neighbors and communities, and the Korean culture. Once they start expanding their understanding of their surroundings and possible resources, they actively made lives for themselves. In the process, what was helpful for the marriage-immigrants learning about Korean culture and coping with the Korean culture was both Koreans and Filipinos. Subthemes of their actively making lives for themselves in South Korea include the followings:

a) Marriage-immigrant Filipinas actively found their own ways of coping with the given difficulties.

b) Korean neighbors were helpful to marriage-immigrants in practical ways, such as for solving their issues.
c) Having a Filipino community in Korea was both practically and psychologically helpful for marriage-immigrants’ integration into the Korean society.

**Marriage-immigrant Filipinas actively found their own ways of coping with the given difficulties.** Besides in-laws and parenting issues, the interview participants had a number of difficulties living in South Korea; for example, most of them mentioned homesickness, the weather, food, and the Korean language. The participants experienced homesickness to some extent depending on their relationships with families both in the Philippines and in South Korea. The winters in Korea tended to be much colder than they expected, and Korean food was too spicy and included too many vegetables as Filipino food is more meat-based. Matters, such as these, were often resolved as time passed.

However, other struggles, such as finances, the Korean language, and discrimination were not easily or naturally resolved. Instead of passively enduring the situations, the participants actively tried to find possible solutions or seek alternative approaches to their given situations. For instance, Jovelyn, Nenita, and Tara had financial issues with their husbands; they were given a very small amount of monthly allowance and were not able to send money to their families in the Philippines regularly or occasionally. They solved the issues by getting jobs.

Jovelyn: *I didn’t ask my husband to financially support my family. My friends, Filipino migrant, ask their husband to support their family in the Philippines. Actually, if you have an emergency situation in the Philippines, I am not (going to get) my husband’s support (for) my family. (…) I need to work and to support my family, because of my father, my family in the Philippines. (So, I started) working in a hotel, near my house.*

Nenita: *Of course, I need clothes, and I ask my husband, “Can she [his sister] give me money?” “Why?” “I want to buy clothes.” She never gives me money. All the clothes of her, she gives me. I really don’t know. And then, “Okay. Never mind.” My friend tells me, “Just stay. When your son.*
is a big boy, you can go to work, and then, you can buy what you want.” Yeah! (now) I work as a cook in 어린이집 [a daycare]. Yeah, I work in 주방 [the kitchen].

Nenita: [When Nenita had an interview with the daycare principal] “Are you a good cook? Would you like to work at a 주방, in a kitchen?” “Okay, I’ll try.” And then, we went to the 어린이집 [daycare]. I asked 원장님 [the principal], “Give me one week as training. If my training is good, okay! Then, if you’re willing to hire me, then why not.” And then, 어린이집 원장님 [the daycare principal] said “okay,” she accepted me. And, now, I’ve worked there for almost five years.

Tara: 그 때 둘째 아직 안 낳아서 임신 중이잖아요. 내가 운동하는 선택하고 그거 양말접는 일. 친구 하는 일 도와주는 거야. 내가. 그 다음에 친구가 돈 받으면 나한테 돈 썼어요. 사이언더가 몰라요. 남편도 몰라요. 그냥 “어머니 나 운동갔다올께요” 거짓말하고 나오는거야. 거짓말 땐 나쁜 거짓말 아니잖아요. 돈 안 주니까 돈 벌어야 했어요 [translation: At that time, I was pregnant with my second child. Just instead of exercising, I helped my friend fold socks. When she was paid, she paid me. My mother-in-law or husband did not know about that. I just said, “I’m going to work outside the house.” I lied and got out of the house. It’s a lie, but not a bad lie, because they didn’t give me money (while I needed money for my kids). I had to earn money.]

Riza had a more complex situation with her husband. Her husband did not work at that time or babysit their two toddlers. After a great deal of trouble, they agreed to send their children to the Philippines where Riza’s parents and sister could babysit the children.

Riza: 신랑이 (그 때) 일 안 다녔잖아. 근데 나는 다 음식도 준비 했잖아. 그냥 얘기만 식사할 때 그렇게 먹이고 그렇게만 나 이렇게만 부탁했어 신랑한테. 근데 전짜 못 해요 신랑은. 그러니까 나는 전짜 너무 힘들어 나. 어. 그러니까 재가, 아, 자기 얘기 하면 살다섯 살, 재가 말라, 제가 필요해 보냈어요. 자기. 어. 그러니까 지금 2 년 동안 필요해있어 지금 애들. [Translation: At that time, my husband wasn’t working, but I still prepared all my children’s meals. I only asked him to help me by feeding them. Just feeding them. I begged him. But, he couldn’t. Didn’t. It was too hard for me. So, I sent my babies, 6 years old and 5 years old. I sent them to the Philippines. They have been there for two years.]
Social discrimination was another significant problem. Discrimination included verbal abuse or harassment in public places by strangers and racial discrimination in their workplaces. Because a Filipina's appearance is distinctively different from typical Korean facial traits, she is easily identifiable as a foreigner, a young foreign woman whose language is other than English. These women had to find their own ways of dealing with some Koreans’ disrespectful attitudes and discrimination.

Analyn: There was one time when I had this experience in the subway. My Filipina friend called me, and I had to speak in Tagalog. If I were to speak in English, my friend would say, “What the hell! Strange!” My voice was just moderate. It wasn’t that noisy. I didn’t want to shout. It was a simple conversation: Where am I? Am I coming or not? “I’m coming. I’m coming now, just wait.” I talked in Tagalog, and I didn’t notice there was a 아줌마 [middle-aged woman] near me. So, she said, “무슨 뜻이야! [what the hell does that mean?]” So, from that day, I was really embarrassed, because I heard that, and other people heard that, too. And, they copied my pronunciation – “Hong shallalla shallalla.” (Researcher: It was not a kid?) It was 아줌마 [a middle-aged woman]. 3-4 women. They said, “What are you talking about?” So, I hung up immediately. I really had a bad experience answering my phone in public places, even if my voice is very soft. So, I don’t want to get phone calls.

Chona: I experienced in the bus. Me and my friend were just talking, we were at the back of the bus. We were just talking in our language, and the people are not so many. It’s just that there’s a 아줌마 [middle-aged woman] in front of us, and she told us, “ shuts! 시끄러 [shh, Be quiet!],” like that. She told us like that. Like, “귀 아파. [It bothers my ears],” like that.

Malaya: (about discrimination) ...also the parents. When they found out that a mother is from another country, they’re a little aloof. Right? Aloof. “Maybe this person doesn’t know how to speak in Korean.” So, maybe, they distance themselves from me. I want to be friends with them, with my son and their kids. I want to be friends with them, but I feel the distance. So, like that.

Lailani: My eldest daughter, she doesn’t look like me: (she has) really, really small eyes. She looks more like her dad. ... We were in the subway. Then, a lady asked me why I was with these kids. “They’re my kids.” She didn’t believe me. She asked me if they are my kids, “Why? Why are you with these kids?” “Why? They’re my kids!” She was surprised and didn’t
believe me, and she asked my eldest daughter, “Is she your mom?” “Yes, she is.” She wouldn’t believe they were my kids. I don’t look like them.

Additionally, these women learned about native Koreans’ perceptions about Asian marriage-immigrants. Participants reacted to negative characterizations of marriage immigrant wives in different ways.

Lilibeth: ₩50,000 in a month. That’s quite small for me, because I was used to living ... I had my own money. It’s like I felt like, (I am a) somebody who came here to get their money. Actually, later, I realized that it’s not really their fault, because there are cases where foreigners get their Korean citizenship (through marriage) and, then, get divorced and snap their money. So, later, I realized that maybe they thought I was one of those, that I was one of those women, because most Filipinos who marry (Koreans) require a monthly stipend for their family in the Philippines. They have to send money every month. It’s like an agreement, agreement that they say, “You have to send $100 a month to my mother.” But, for me, my family didn’t require that, because they’re all working. So, I have no parents. Only in emergencies, like maybe somebody’s sick, emergencies, that’s the only cases. But, nothing monthly, or quarterly, no. I don’t send money.

Analyn: (there was news on a marriage-immigrant Vietnamese woman who killed herself with her baby) This situation is damaging our image and reputation about getting married with foreigners - with Koreans. Because, other people, they just watch that (TV shows) and, then, try to judge every woman - I mean Filipino - foreign wives. “They all the same” No! We’re not all the same; we’re different! We’re like colors! We’re different. So, whenever I go to public places and they look at me, I feel like, “I’m not like that - the one you watch on the television! I’m not like that! Please!” I want to say like that, because whenever they look at me, I feel they’re already making some stories about me. So, I feel like people are looking at me; maybe, they already made the story about me. Especially 어른들 [middle-aged women], I feel like that. So, whenever I watch some television and I turn on, there’s a bad situation, and there’s not-so-good family relationship, because Korean guy and Filipino woman, like that. I want to say, “We’re all different. We’re not the same.” They choose that way, because they had a hard time in the Philippines, so they chose this way. I want to say, “We’re not the same!”

Divina: Actually, if I am, if I have power, I don’t like agencies that help a Filipina marry with a Korean guy, because a lot of news I’ve heard and I read about the Filipina who married with Korean are just social climber? Or, a gold digger. That kind of such.... “Oh, Filipina is not good. They only use.” I don’t know why, but actually, I met some people who are
older (or whatever); I’ve heard come bad comments. Of course, I’m a
foreigner, so I feel uncomfortable. But, for many Filipina, actually it
doesn’t matter. Some Filipina, (people would think that) “Philippine
countries are poor. So, they got married to Korean men, then they used
their husband to send the money to their family in the Philippines. So,
Filipinas are not good. They are from a foreign country, and they want to
strangle their men in Korea.” So, I don’t like that comments.

Lailani: Once, when they [Koreans] looked at me from head to foot, I
looked at them like that, too, from head to foot. It’s unfair sometimes – the
American people, the white people, sometimes – they are very high person
[while we are not]. . . . Especially the old people, when they see foreigners
[they stare at us]. I think white skin foreigners are okay with them, but
like, you know, the Asians, they’re like that. So, I don’t know. I cannot
blame them because..., you know. I just maybe think they don’t have the
right knowledge yet. . . . It’s just their personal problem. It’s not my
problem anyway.

Lailani: If you don’t fight, they just look down on you. I learned once you
know how to speak Korean, you’ll not get behind them, and you need to
fight for that. If not, you will be looked down. You just need to fight.

**Their Korean neighbors were helpful to marriage-immigrants in practical
ways, such as for solving their issues.** In the process of solving their problems or
seeking alternatives, marriage-immigrant women were helped a great deal by native
Koreans. One major source of assistance was their visiting and onsite Korean instructors.
The Korean government provides a visiting instructor service for marriage-immigrants:
Korean instructors and parenting instructors. If a marriage-immigrant is eligible for the
service, the instructors visit the immigrants’ home and teach them either the Korean
language or about childrearing. Also, the instructors at the local multicultural centers
were helpful for their solving immediate problems. For example, Analyn was able to
expand her understanding of mothers-in-law in Korea and related Korean culture and
history; Malaya was able to complain about the daycare teachers’ careless behavior with
her child; and Jovelyn was able to communicate with her mother-in-law. More
significantly, Nenita was able to obtain Korean citizenship thanks to her instructor’s effort.

Analyn: They are really good, and they have a very warm heart when it comes to teaching foreigners. Really, I’ve never met a bad teacher in Korea. Also, aside from their skills, they have really warm hearts. Whenever I talk to them, whenever we open up our sentiments, our problems, our feelings about our mother-in-laws, our relationship with husband or Korean culture, they give us very good information and ideas. How to handle this situation. And, then, even, because some Korean mother-in-laws -- I heard from my friends and my Filipina friends, Thailand friends -- I have a lot of many, you know. I like many. I like Cambodia; I like Vietnam. You know, I like many different kinds of cultures. There is only one problem with mother-in-laws: they are very, very thrifty. They handle money for you. Very thrifty. (...) Whenever I meet my friends, one of the topics we always have is mother-in-laws are very thrifty when it comes to money. So, we open this to our teachers. We asked, “Why mother-in-laws, when it comes to money, they are very thrifty? They are very strict when it comes to handling money?” So, I got the answer from my home school teacher, my home teacher who comes home. (Researcher: How did she explain it?) She explained very well. I totally understand. According to her, a long, long time ago Korea was a very poor country. (...) It was long, long time ago, but now, mother-in-laws mind didn’t change. So, they want to push their daughter-in-law ....

Analyn: She was really great. She is very warm; her heart is very warm. If I had some problem, I always cried in front of her. She was like mom to me.

Malaya: She [the visiting Korean instructor] focuses on reading, writing, and like that. Then, sometimes, when I feel down, I can also tell her what I’m feeling. She’s like sister, a counselor and a friend. So, we always request her to be our visiting tutor.

Malaya: (talking about her child’s daycare teacher) When the teacher got inside and the mothers were waiting outside, and they always told about the bad side of my kid, with the other parents hearing it. So, I felt very discriminated against. My son is only doing the bad thing? He doesn’t have any good side? Like that. So, I told the visiting instructor, multicultural teacher about it, and I think she called the kindergarten and told them about it. So, nowadays, she [the teacher] doesn’t say anything about it.
Jovelyn: Yes, the teachers were very helpful. My (garbled), like for example, if you had a problem in your home with your mother-in-law or your husband’s relatives, they helped them with advice; they gave some advice to what to do. And, then, what you’re able to do, how to encounter your problem. That did help, not financially, but emotionally. And then, sometimes, the teachers were available in our house, in our home. They spoke to my mother-in-law, and then, they gave some ideas how to encounter or something (garbled).

Nenita: My 방문선생님 [visiting Korean instructor] have a great heart, because she pushed my husband to let me have a Korean citizen.

Neighbors, both strangers and acquaintances, were another supportive group of Koreans for marriage-immigrant Filipinas. Divina was talked to by a church pastor and began learning Korean; Nenita gained a great deal of understanding from Korean society and emotional support from the principal of the daycare where she worked as a cook.

Riza was helped by a neighbor that she wasn’t initially acquainted with to be acknowledged for daycare fee support for low-income families, for which she was eligible and needed in order to work. Nenita’s neighbor in the same apartment provided her a place to hide from her sister-in-law.

Malaya: Korean people who attend church are very kind, very accommodating. So, they always accommodate me and teach me about Korea culture, and everything.

Analyn: So, I learned from my church members. We visit other church members’ houses. Like house to house prayer meetings, something like that. They don’t teach me directly; I just try to look around and try to think, “Oh, it’s like this.” I try to think over what their actions are.

Nenita: One time, my sister-in-law and my were fighting, 진짜, physically. And I ran away. And then my neighbor made me - And I went to my neighbor’s house, and then she helped me. Door number six. And then she helped me.

Nenita: (When Nenita’s husband needed to take a surgery and she was reluctant to visit the hospital for signature due to her sister-in-law’s presence at the hospital, the principal told Nenita.) Before I got (a job) at the 어린이집[daycare], she (sister-in-law) told 원장님한테 나 도둑사람이라고 [the principal that Nenita is a thief]. She gave him a
warning that I'm not good, like that. And then “You must be careful,” like that. It’s true, 원장님 [the principal] told me (about that). When my mother-in-law 이십만원 잃어버렸는데 (그 범인이 나타고 원장님한테 말한거야) [lost money at home, the incident. 원장님 [the principal] told me “ 제호엄마 (Nenita), Your sister-in-law told me that your husband needs an operation. You need to go to the hospital and sign the application form for the operation, because you are the wife.” “원장님, 나 싫어요, 원장님.” [No, ma’am. I hate going.]

Risa: 한국 여자 제가 만났어, 저를 많이 도와줬어요. 내, 저기 동네, 같은 동네요 XX 1 동 거기 살아요 우리. 지난, 신랑 같이 저번에도 여기 왔어요. (그 분이) 동사무소 가면 저희 신랑이 일 없어도, we were in the lower class, 동사무소 많이 도와준다고, 이런, 이런 가족 없으니까 그러니까 신랑도 집이 얼마나 안이… 돈 나온거 그렇게 어, 100% 할 수 있어요 어린이집이, 공짜라고, “어 진짜로?” 그러니까 나는 “아 이거 진짜나 아 하나님 아버지 되게 감사합니다” 그렇게 이 사람, Yes. She’s my hero. 그러니까 나는 계속, I’m still hoping that someday 나는 진짜 잘 할거야 그렇게, 저기 여자 그러니까 신랑도, 만났어요 “제가 신랑 만날게요 제가 이야기할게” 근데 신랑은 진짜 고집 세요. (…) 신랑은 “그렇게가 도와주고 도와주고 그렇게는 안 해요.”… 저기 여자, 저 도와준 여자, “여보 지금 너무 힘들어 얘기 또 있다가 나올 텐데 어떻게 해, 얘기도 빠리 한국말 배워야 해.” (그 아줌마가 그렇게 말했어요.) 어머니가 신랑, 그러니까 신랑이 그렇게 같이 갔어요. [Translation] I met a lady; she lives near me, and she helped me a lot. She let me know that there were some services for people with lower incomes at the municipal office; the municipal office could help me. She told me that daycare could be free for my babies. “Wow, really? Thank God!” She is my heroine. I still hope that, someday, I can repay her favor. She met my husband; “I’ll meet and talk to him. I’ll explain it.” But, my husband was really stubborn; he argued and said why would the government help me. She said to him, “Your wife is having a hard time. She’s pregnant, and you’re going to have another baby soon. Your babies need to learn Korean (at the daycare), too.” She said. Then, my husband went to the municipal office to submit the application.
Having a Filipino community in Korea was both practically and psychologically helpful for marriage-immigrants’ integration into Korean society. The Filipino community in Korea was a great source for learning about the Korean culture, getting a variety of information for surviving in Korea, and making Filipinas’ lives in Korean sustainable. Analyn introduced me to a Filipino Facebook page for Filipinos in South Korea: KKKSK, representing Kahirapan, Kabuhayan, Kasarapan sa Korea.

Analyn: There is a community called KKKSK. It means, Kahirapan -- it means difficulty, kabuhayan is life, means lifestyle. And then, Kasarapan is for “set up happiness.” It’s a Filipino community on Facebook, and it has a lot of members. Thousands of members, they’ve gotten married with Koreans. Korean guy. So, whenever I open this Filipino community, they have a lot of complaints! [Laughs] But, one thing I always read is about getting citizenship is really hard, some documents. And, next is their mother-in-laws and their husband. ... It has 7,993 (members), and it’s all about living in Korea.... Because, in this page, they sell second-hand things. For example, me - I want to sell these clothes here, because their husband doesn’t give much money, so they want to make money. Every day here, in this community, they post what is happening in Korea. And, if you have questions, you can post here. So, here, the number one problem is citizenship, the next problem is mother-in-laws, and the third problem is probably husbands - husbands’ age gap. So, they are all in Tagalog, but there’s English here sometimes.

Besides this online community, many marriage-immigrant Filipinas had close relationships with Filipinas that lived nearby. In the recruitment process, their close and tight relationships were confirmed by the researcher: Analyn introduced me another Filipina who lived just a walking distance from her, and in fact, she participated in the interviews, but her interview was not chosen for analysis. When I visited Analyn’s friend, there were already two more Filipinas chatting in the living room. They told me their English was not good enough to be interviewed and refused participation.
Furthermore, after the interview with Malaya, she contacted her Filipina friends who lived nearby, and I was able to get two more interview participants: Rutche and Tara.

Analyn: Meeting with Filipina friends, we have many ideas. It’s a great way to learn about surviving Korea. Because of them, I learned how to not be bored and not get stressed, because compared to me, they spent more time. They are already 5 years, 10 years. I’m just 3 years - turning 4 years this September. But, they are experienced here in Korea. They tried to explain, “Korea is like this; it’s like this. You should be like this,” and they advised me on how to handle difficult situations…. learning how to get mother-in-law’s heart. Cook delicious food for mother-in-law! They said. And also, always say polite words to mother-in-laws.

Malaya: Actually, I have a very neat neighbor; we meet every day, because our kids are the same age and are both in the same kindergarten. So, we always meet, and sometimes, that friend doesn’t eat Korean. She is also four years in Korean, but doesn’t eat Korean food; so always cooks Filipino food. And, the husband is working in the province, so she always calls me. “Come in the house, and I will cook Filipino food, and then, we’ll eat together.” Always like that. And, other friends, for example, there are special occasions, like birthdays. We have meetings together. About 10 (Filipinas nearby). My friend introduces, then another friend will introduce - like that. Or, on Facebook, social media, you will see there: “From Seoul, Korea. Where are you?” and, then, start chatting. “I just came from OO district.” “Oh! You’re near my place! Let’s meet!” “Let’s meet!” So, that’s how we meet. My relationship with them is okay. I feel like, they always call me Ate. You know Ate? Ate in Tagalog is 언니 [elder-sister] in Korean. (…) When we meet, we speak in Tagalog and share our experiences in the house; for example, I don’t like me mother-in-law. Sometimes, we talk about that. My husband, like that. About what happened during those days when we didn’t meet. For example, for one month, we didn’t meet, and there was a special occasion, so, “Oh! I’m pregnant!” “Oh, how are you now?” And, they will tell something about what happened during those days.

Discussion and Implications

This study aimed to represent the marriage-immigrant Filipinas’ acculturative experiences in South Korea by presenting their individual stories and common themes across the 15 cases, like a tapestry with warped and weft threads. The specific research questions guiding this study were: 1) what are the life narratives of marriage-immigrant
women living in South Korea with their Korean husbands? and 2) what are common acculturative experiences of marriage-immigrant women?

In order to explore marriage-immigrants’ acculturative experiences in South Korea, Filipinas who came to Korea to live with their Korean husbands and could speak English were recruited through the researcher’s personal networks and then through snowball sampling; as a result, 23 marriage-immigrant Filipinas were interviewed, and 15 Filipinas’ acculturative experiences were analyzed to answer the two research questions. With regards to the first research question, the narratives of the 15 Filipinas’ experiences about living in South Korea were constructed and presented based on the interviews. Then, to answer the second research question, common acculturative experiences across the 15 Filipinas’ cases were sought; consequently, three common themes and 11 subthemes were found using constant comparison analysis.

Marriage-immigrant Filipinas’ acculturative experiences are summarized as follows. First, marriage-immigrant Filipinas learned about the role and position of a daughter-in-law in South Korea; while living with their parents-in-law, they were forced to assimilate to the Korean culture and to accept the oppressed role of daughters-in-law in the traditional Korean patriarchy. They had to endure the in-laws’ unjust treatments; however, their husbands provided no or minimal help for their wives.

Secondly, as mothers with foreign backgrounds, marriage-immigrant Filipinas’ motherhood had to be negotiated; they had to manage their children’s cultural identity development and social discrimination when it came to their children. Meanwhile, their parental authority was often ignored or questioned by their in-laws and close acquaintances.
Finally, unlike their relatively marginalized positions within their homes, marriage-immigrant Filipinas actively engaged in developing the extrafamilial support in South Korea by expanding their horizons. They sometimes actively confronted their personal difficulties in South Korea and, sometimes, had to find their own ways of coping with their given struggles. Some Koreans were very helpful as they confronted and overcame their struggles; the Filipino community in Korea, as well, offered various survival tips, critical knowledge, and sympathy and support.

In this section, two points with regards to the findings are discussed, including the structure of Korean patriarchy in which the marriage-immigrant women are situated and positioned from a feminist point of view and marriage-immigrant women as adult learners and agents of their learning. Implications for theory and practice will follow.

**Structure of the Korean Patriarchy in Relation to Marriage-Immigrant Women**

Most of the research participants, or 13 participants out of the 15, were living with their parents-in-law or had lived with them at one time. Even though living with one’s parents after marriage was not very common in the Philippines and even though living with a husband’s parents is controversial among native Korean couples and it is less expected now than in the past, these Filipina immigrants accepted the fact that they needed to live with them. Therefore, the relationship with their in-laws became the most significant factor, making the lives of most of these research participants in Korea harder. Because parents have a certain status and the traditional right to meddle in their grown-up children’s lives, the participants typically experienced an unexpected level of intrusion. Participants learned from their husbands and parents-in-law about the role of daughters-in-law in Korea; given their lack of knowledge and information about the current family
model in Korea, they were encouraged to accept the same oppressed roles that many modern Korean women also find oppressive.

The mothers-in-law’s interference was made possible with the husbands’ collusion, because in traditional Korean society, children obey their parents even after they become adults. Also, in traditional Korean society, daughters-in-law are treated contemptuously as imported labor, and only their reproductive role is highlighted, which does not work in this era and is not expected among Koreans anymore. However, what these marriage-immigrant women experience in their homes, from the researcher’s perspective, who is a young married Korean woman, is obsolete traditional Korean patriarchy. Because these immigrants do not have enough understanding about current Korean relationships with in-laws at the onset of their lives in Korea and because they have little external support at the beginning, they felt compelled to accept the oppressive form of family as genuine Korean culture, which they believe they cannot help but accept and learn as it is. Because all burdens were imposed on daughters-in-law in the traditional family form that many modern Korean women reject, Korean women have resisted the traditional norms and have tried to develop a better family model. However, when this oppressed position of traditional daughter-in-law is replaced with a foreign wife who naturally accepts the system as Korean culture, the other family members, in other words, parents and husbands who benefit from the existing system, can continue their prestigious positions in the family.

Generally speaking, those who benefit from an existing system have little reason to initiate changes. Therefore, feminist movements in South Korea, as well as in other countries, have been initiated by women. In addition to these activists’ endeavors,
women’s social status has been promoted in South Korea by changes in the family structure. Resulting from the government’s promotion of population reduction in the 1970s and 1980s, the Korean family structure changed from an extended family, valuing sons as well as burdening them with responsibilities, to a nuclear family with one or two children regardless of their sex. In nuclear families, daughters are treated more equally and educated with sons, resulting in women’s popular social and economic participation.

Unfortunately, this rapid promotion of young women’s social status was not accompanied by the same progression within their families. Specifically, this younger generation of Korean women, especially those born in the 1980s and after, including the researcher, were rarely taught to be good traditional daughters-in-law. Rather, they were taught in school about an equal society, democracy, and gender equality, and in their families, they were treated fairly, if not equally, to their male siblings and educationally and financially supported by their parents. However, when they get married, with the absence or underdevelopment of a standard or ideal model of modern daughters-in-law, most daughters-in-law in Korea have to choose either to follow the traditional values or to fight against the oppressive expectations forced on them. In short, these daughters, who were raised as having equal status, are now expected to play the daughter-in-law role in very traditional ways. Due to this huge gap in expectations in each family role, Korean women have resisted the traditional norms and have tried to develop a better family model; therefore, a new model of in-law relationships is currently under development in South Korea.

Given this background, foreign daughters-in-law who entered this patriarchal system through marriage are situated in a significantly disadvantageous position. Due to
their lack of understanding about current Korean culture on in-law relationships, these women are compelled to accept this oppressive form of “traditional family” as genuine Korean culture, which they believe they cannot change, but must accept and learn how to tolerate. In other words, when this oppressed position of a traditional daughter-in-law is imposed upon a dislocated foreign wife, who has little choice but to accept the system as Korean culture, the other family members, including her husband and his parents, who will benefit from the existing system, claim their privileged positions in the family.

Another situation that makes marriage-immigrants’ family status more disempowered is the lack of support from their husbands and their husbands’ families. In many native Korean couples’ cases, the socioeconomic status of a woman’s family plays a considerable role in her relationship development with her husband’s family, by financially supporting her, physically helping her with childrearing, and assisting her resistance against traditional burdens. The woman’s parents and family, who raised her as equal to a man, contribute to promoting her position in her new family - her husband’s family. Compared to native Korean daughters-in-laws’ situations, marriage-immigrant women have little support from their families in their homelands. These women’s parents may physically reside overseas and be less informed about Korean society, where their daughter is situated. Worse, in many cases of marriage-immigrant women, these wives are financially dependent on their husbands, while their families in their homelands are financially dependent on these women. In conclusion, the lack of cultural understanding and the absence of homeland family supports result in situating the marriage-immigrant women in more oppressed and powerless situations.
Marriage-Immigrant Women as Learning Agents

Although the structure is firm and rigid, this does not necessarily mean that individuals in the structure had no freedom to act independently. Marriage-immigrant women, as their own learning agents, were engaged in their learning; however, the way they were involved was different depending on their relationships with the given structures. The three themes found from the cross-case analysis could be restated in the following way: the relationship with adult family members (their husbands and in-laws), the relationship with children, and the relationship with community. In each relationship, the characteristics of these adult learners reflected in different ways on marriage-immigrant women’s informal and nonformal learning.

Knowles (1973) explained the characteristics of an adult learner, compared to a child learner, in terms of the following four assumptions about adult learners: Self-concept, experiences, readiness to learn and orientation to learn. Later, two more assumptions were added: motivation to learn (Knowles, 1984) and inquiry as to why they would need to learn something (Knowles, 1990). Specifically, Knowles (1990) argued that adults, as learners, are independent and tend to be self-directed, whereas children are dependent on adults. In terms of experience, adults generally use life experiences as learning resources; in other words, life experiences are a significant learning resource for adult learners. In addition, adults’ learning readiness generally depends on their social roles, while children’s learning readiness is associated with their biological development and social pressure. Children tend to learn for the future; in contrast, adults generally learn for immediate application. Finally, children are motivated externally, and adults are usually motivated internally.
Based on the assumptions, Knowles (1975) further developed a model of adult learning: self-directed learning (SDL). Knowles (1975) defines self-directed learning as “a process in which individuals take the initiative, with or without the help of others, in designing their learning needs, formulating learning goals, identifying human and material resources of learning, choosing and implementing appropriate learning strategies, and evaluating learning outcomes” (p. 18). SDL is not a description of adults’ learning characteristics but a learning strategy for adults who are assumed to have the ability to guide their own learning by themselves. Despite critiques on the assumptions and Knowles’ theory of adult education (Elias, 1979), Knowles remains one of the most influential figures in adult education, and his theory continues to be significant (Rachal, 2002).

Marriage-immigrants’ learning in their relationships with their in-laws and husbands, however, would not reflect the characteristics of adult learners much, as described by Knowles (1973). For example, while learning about the role of daughters-in-law in Korea, the marriage-immigrant learners could not self-direct their own learning. Although their experiences were still their major sources of learning and they were open to learning the Korean language and culture, to the extent they were forced to assimilate to Korean culture, the marriage-immigrants were expected to learn what was given to them. The informal curriculum of cultural practices was insidiously and unconsciously chosen by the adult family members: their in-laws and husbands. For instance, Chona’s parents-in-law decided that Chona needed to learn how to cook Korean food; otherwise, they believed that Chona’s baby would only eat junk food, such as spam. Although the marriage-immigrant women were motivated to learn the Korean language and Korean
culture, their access to and recruitment of formal learning resources, such as Korean language programs, were limited without their Korean families’ help. Nenita had not known about Korean language courses provided at the local Catholic center until she had a critical incident with her sister-in-law and sought help from the Philippines embassy. Riza, after living in South Korea seven years, happened to learn about the free Korean language classes through her Korean acquaintances a year ago. In this unequal relationship between marriage-immigrant women and their adult family members, the Korean family members were in the position of instructors and gatekeepers of the immigrants’ formal and informal learning. However, as instructors of marriage-immigrants’ acculturative learning, the Korean family members transmitted and reproduced the knowledge and skills that were deemed important by them, instead of the marriage-immigrant women’s short-term and long-term learning goals. As gatekeepers of marriage-immigrant women’s acculturative learning, in many cases, they were negligent in guiding or carefully facilitating the women’s learning. In terms of self-direction, the marriage-immigrants’ acculturative learning was rather closer to children’s learning and pedagogical characteristics than adragological ones. Given the limited assistance from the Korean families and limited capacities of self-directness, marriage-immigrants’ acculturative experiences revolved around their relationships with their Korean family members.

As mothers, however, the marriage-immigrant women were placed in an ambivalent position. Due to language limitations, they could not always be self-driven in the process; however, the marriage migrants actively tried to learn as parents. Although their experiences with schooling and education in South Korea was limited, they wanted
to actively learn to support their children's schooling. The participants consistently stated that Filipinos’ education and attitudes toward education were very different from Koreans’; they independently evaluated the advantages and disadvantages of Korean education and actively adjusted their perspectives on education and accepted the values of Korean education for their children.

Finally, in their relationships with their communities, i.e., neighbors, both Korean and Filipino, they were self-directed and independent in their learning as Knowles (1988) described. Outside their homes, without being labelled as a daughter-in-law, a wife or a mother, marriage-immigrant women were relatively free agents of their own learning. In their community relationships, even though they were sometimes assisted by other community members, the relationship was not dependent but mutual and more equal.

In particular, the Filipino community seemed to operate similarly to a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). As an immigrant group, marriage-immigrant Filipinas shared their experiences in South Korea and, thereby, promoted acculturative learning among the members. While discussing their own experiences with their in-laws and husbands, they consciously and unconsciously tried to understand the Korean culture and Korean society, developed their own tacit knowledge, and shared their know-how in terms of surviving and living in South Korea.

In short, as opposed to common beliefs about adult education in which adult learners independently determine the goal and purpose of their learning and acquire knowledge and skills deemed important to them, thereby accepting responsibility for their own learning, the adultness of marriage-immigrant women was expressed differently depending on their situated learning contexts in relation to the nature of their
relationships. Conversely speaking, this may indicate that the marriage-immigrant women were not treated as adults in some contexts.

Implication for Theory: Acculturation, Experience, and Learning

This study aimed to understand the acculturative experiences in terms of adult learning. The key aspects that linked acculturation and learning were experience and change. Experience was the process of acculturation and the source of adult learning. Acculturation deals with an individual’s change in behavior, attitude, and mindset. In other words, the acculturated outcome is the concern of acculturation. How their cultural practices changed determines the type of acculturation: integrated, assimilated, separated, or marginalized. The change implies a shift from A to A'; thus, A’ is an acculturated or adjusted status. However, in adult education, the gap between A and A’ is the beginning point or the trigger of adult learning.

This gap, or disequilibrium, was labeled in many different ways; for example, Jarvis (2010) named it disjuncture, the “gap between what we expect to perceive when we have an experience of the world as a result of our previous learning and what we are actually confronted with” (p. 83). An immigrant’s original cultural knowledge and practices that construct their previous learning would not be consistent with what they actually experience in South Korea; as a result, learning occurs. From Mezirow’s (2000) transformative learning theory, this gap was labeled as a disorienting dilemma. According to Mezirow, learning is “the process of using a prior interpretation to construe a new or a revised interpretation of the meaning of one’s experience in order to guide future action” (p. 5), and transformative learning occurs with a given disorienting dilemma, which cannot be explained with one’s existing meaning structure.
Depending on how to deal with the gap, Jarvis (2010) suggested ten forms of learning: non-learning, non-consideration, rejection, ambivalence, pre-conscious knowledge learning (incidental learning), memorization, emotional learning, action learning, discovery learning, and contemplation (reflective). This type of learning has an excellent potential for explaining immigrants’ experiential learning and their acculturation. In other words, immigrants’ acculturation could be explained through the theory and terminology of adult learning. The link between acculturation and adult learning is acculturative experiences that lead to changes in immigrants’ behaviors, attitudes, and mindsets. If scholars paid more attention to adult learning and the innate nature of the educational component in the acculturation process, the further development of the acculturation theory would be possible. In other words, paying attention to immigrant learners’ acculturative experience in such special contexts could contribute to understanding adult learning and developing theories of adult learning.

**Implications for Practice**

This study provided more diverse aspects and lively narratives of marriage-immigrant women’s lives in South Korea. The participants’ acculturative struggles with regards to their relationships provide significant implications for policy makers and professional development for instructors and counselors who interact with marriage-immigrant women on a daily basis. First, the three themes of findings from this study could provide practical tips for newly married immigrant women if the content and how to prevent unfair treatments are taught in the initial adjustment programs. For example, improving the understanding of the current model of a good Korean daughter-in-law could empower the marriage-immigrant women in advance, and Korean families’
learning new models for Korean mothers-in-law and daughters-in-law would reduce the conflicts within the family with foreigners. Furthermore, understanding the nature of immigrants’ motherhood allows/enables adult educators and social workers to design customized courses that are more suitable to immigrant mothers’ needs. For example, the local MFS centers could offer courses for immigrant mothers that teach about the Korean education system and related information to substitute for their lack of schooling experience in South Korea. Finally, the diverse representation of marriage-immigrant women in this study would contribute to the development of educational programs promoting multicultural awareness among native Koreans by reducing prejudices against marriage-immigrant women from Southeast Asian countries.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

This dissertation aimed to understand adult immigrants’ learning in South Korea from the learners’ perspectives: specifically, adult immigrants’ deterrents to participation in Korean language education programs and marriage-immigrants’ acculturative and learning experiences. In this concluding chapter, the principal findings from each study that composed this dissertation are summarized and discussed. Then, overarching implications for policy and practice and suggestions for future research are mentioned at the end.

Principal Findings of the Studies

This dissertation consisted of two studies that were relevant to adult immigrants’ learning in South Korea. One study involved the general population of immigrants and their deterrents to participation in formal learning opportunities, in this case, Korean language courses; the other study investigated one specific subset of immigrants, marriage-immigrant Filipinas’ informal learning with acculturative experiences in South Korea. This construct aimed to provide a comprehensive understanding of the adult immigrants’ learning in various environments.

Two broad research objectives guided this dissertation:

1. To develop a questionnaire measuring immigrants’ deterrents to participating in current education programs for immigrants and to investigate the underlying structural pattern of the deterrents; and
2. To understand the acculturation experiences of immigrants living in South Korea with respect to their social learning process and its implications for adult education.

These two different angles helped provide an understanding of adult immigrants’ learning in South Korea, both on a larger scale from the general immigrant population and on a smaller scale from migrant individuals. The following important themes were found and further explored in the following section. Table 5.1 displays the principal findings from the two studies.

**Important Themes from the Quantitative Study**

The quantitative study entitled, “Adult Immigrants’ Deterrents to Participation in Korean As a Second Language Courses,” is a survey-based study aiming to understand the underlying factors of immigrants’ deterrent to participation and to develop a typology of immigrants depending on their reasons of nonparticipation. A new instrument from thorough investigation of previous literature and scales was developed; the survey included 39 deterrent items, Korean and English language proficiency measures, and sociodemographic questions. The original instrument written in English was translated into Filipino-Tagalog and Vietnamese. After a pilot implementation of the survey, the survey was administered both online and face-to-face; in total, 267 responses were collected, and 170 complete useable responses were analyzed. A series of statistical analyses revealed three underlying factors of immigrants’ deterrents to educational participation and five profiles of immigrants depending on the patterns of their nonparticipation.
Table 5.1

Principal Findings of the Two Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Concluding Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Quantitative Study | Theme 1: Three underlying factors of immigrants’ deterents to participation that are relevant but not identical to the previously reported deterents were discovered.  
Theme 2: Five profiles of immigrants depending on their reasons not to participate in Korean language education were generated.  
Theme 3: The newly developed instrument measuring immigrants’ deterents to participation in education successfully demonstrated its usefulness and effectiveness. |
| Qualitative Study  | Theme 4: Marriage-immigrant women’s major struggles with living in South Korea stemmed from their relationships with in-laws and husbands.  
Theme 5: Marriage-immigrant women tried to be engaged in the childrearing and education of their children despite their limitations.  
Theme 6: Marriage-immigrant women’s extrafamilial relationships promoted their acculturative learning in various ways. |

Theme 1: Three underlying factors of immigrants’ deterents to participation that are relevant but not identical to the previously reported deterents were discovered. Three latent factors of deterents to participation were found from the exploratory factor analysis: Negative Attitudes, Social Isolation, and Competing Demands. While both Negative Attitudes and Competing Demands, despite their subtle differences in labelling and definitions, were continuously reported in previous research on barriers to educational participation, Social Isolation was rarely
found in previous research. This interesting result from this study was related to the characteristics of the sample of this study and revealed immigrants’ fear of being away from their “secure” areas or familiar spaces; their anxiety of being situated in an unfamiliar social setting among unfamiliar people; and other external reasons limiting their access to information and resources. The factor was highly positively correlated with the number of native Koreans living together; this result may indicate that living with more Koreans in the house would be associated with immigrants’ higher Social Isolation.

**Theme 2: Five profiles of immigrants depending on their reasons not to participate in Korean language education were generated.** A cluster analysis using the factor scores of the three dimensions of deterrents was performed, and the analysis identified five types of immigrants in terms of their deterrent to KSL program participation: (1) Active Young Workers, (2) Income-oriented Temporary Workers, (3) Isolated Long-term Resisters, (4) Integrated Professional Immigrants, and (5) Married Residents. Among the five groups, Active Young Workers and Married Residents would be good target populations for the recruitment for and promotion of Korean language programs due to the young workers’ lower psychological barriers and married residents’ lower competing demands. While Income-oriented Temporary Workers and Integrated Professional Immigrants might have no or little need to learn the Korean language, Isolated Long-term Resisters did not seem to be willing to integrate themselves into Korean society.

**Theme 3: The newly developed instrument measuring immigrants’ deterrents to participation in education successfully demonstrated its usefulness and**
effectiveness. This study included the development of a new instrument that measured current immigrants’ deterents to participation (DPS) in Korean as second language education in South Korea. Previous DPS instruments had limitations due to the time and national contexts. This newly developed instrument demonstrated its usefulness and effectiveness by showing highly reliable statistics and successfully revealed the dimensions of underlying factors of nonparticipation. This result confirms the necessity of a modified development of a DPS instrument that is specifically tailored for subpopulations.

Important Themes from the Qualitative Study

This study, titled “Marriage-Immigrant Filipinas’ Acculturation and Learning Experiences in South Korea,” was an interview-based qualitative study that aimed to understand the acculturative experiences of marriage-immigrant women in South Korea from an adult learning perspective. Filipinas, who had Korean husbands, migrated to South Korea to live with their husbands and could speak English, were recruited for the research. Interviews with 15 Filipinas were analyzed; as a result, the stories of each of the research participants were reconstructed based on their interviews, and three common themes and 11 subthemes emerged from the constant comparison method as presented.

Theme 4: Marriage-immigrant women’s major struggles with living in South Korea stemmed from their relationships with in-laws and husbands. When the marriage-immigrant Filipinas participating in this study were asked about their lives in South Korea, most of these women spent a considerable amount of the interview talking about their in-laws. Most of them lived with their in-laws, and such unexpected experiences of living with their in-laws, from Filipinas’ perspectives on marriage,
brought much hardship for the marriage-immigrants. They were expected to play the role of daughters-in-law in the traditional Korean patriarchy, which was oppressive for the women. Except for only a few cases, the husbands provided minimal or no help to their wives. Given their limited access to the community without their Korean family’s help and the lack of other resources available to them in South Korea, especially at the beginning of their adjustment period in South Korea, they had more chance of taking the imposed form of married life and the roles of wives and daughters-in-law as genuine to the Korean culture and to accept these cultural practices.

Theme 5: Marriage-immigrant women tried to be engaged in childrearing and the education of their children despite their limitations. Marriage-immigrant women with children faced two ambivalent scenes while rearing their half Korean and half Filipino children in South Korea. On one hand, they defended their children from social discrimination and prejudice outside their homes; on the other hand, their parental authority was questioned and doubted at home. As mothers of mixed race children, marriage-immigrant Filipinas dealt with their children’s cultural identity issues. As nurturers, marriage-immigrant women had to decide how to adjust their own childrearing principles and ways of disciplining their children with their in-laws’ and Korean principles and childrearing culture. As educators, they sought information, knowledge, and help for their children’s schooling. They seemed to successfully manage the education system in South Korea; their biggest concern about their school-age children was being bullied at school due to their children being different.

Theme 6: Marriage-immigrant women’s extrafamilial relationships promoted their acculturative learning in various ways. Unlike their relationships with
in-laws, they found a great deal of help from outside their homes to support their successful acculturation in South Korea. Although they were marginalized to some extent, marriage-immigrant Filipinas found their own ways of coping with the given difficulties. Sometimes, Korean neighbors and teachers helped them in practical ways, and sometimes, the Filipino community in South Korea provided them with solutions and sympathy. Broadening their horizons in the Korean society by developing wider relationships within their community ultimately helped the marriage-immigrant women in gaining positive and integrative acculturation experiences.

**Discussions**

This dissertation was designed to understand the various means in which adult immigrants learn in different settings, including the reasons why adult immigrants do not participate in formal language learning and how marriage-immigrant women, a group of immigrants in South Korea, construct their acculturative experiences through informal learning. The increase in different ethnicities in South Korea will continue, and the influx of various types of immigrants is inevitable and necessary in South Korea; the significance of immigrant populations will become more emphasized in various aspects. Acculturation is ultimately a learning process that requires immigrants to make cultural adjustments in their relocated society. Immigrants’ successful integration into Korean society will eventually contribute to both the immigrants and South Korea. Therefore, understanding the immigrants’ learning experiences is crucial for developing a better educational system for immigrants and, thereby, ensuring smooth cultural adaptation. Three points are discussed in this section: bidimensional acculturation theories and
findings from the two studies, the importance of Koreans as gatekeepers, and diversity in terms of immigrant populations and learning.

**Acculturation: Structure of the Host Society vs. Immigrants’ Agency**

Since Berry (1997) suggested a bidimensional model of acculturation, an interest in the characteristics of a host society has received increasing attention. Berry’s (1997) analogies of a melting pot and pressure cooker to describe host society extended to four clusters of state ideologies related to immigration policies in Bourhis et al.’s (1997) IAM. According to Berry (1997), the Korean society would best fit in a pressure cooker category; based on IAM (Bourhis et al., 1997), the ethnist ideology would be the most compelling and working perspective in terms of immigration policies in South Korea in general. In this type of host society, the pressure from the rigid structure to keep the values of its own culture gives little agency to immigrants. In particular, the marriage-immigrant women situated in the Korean patriarchy as daughters-in-law and wives had relatively little power or agency to break the system or not to accept the system. They were pressured to accept Korean culture, and their own Filipino culture was disregarded by their husbands and in-laws. The theories clearly depict the marriage-immigrant women’s acculturation in South Korea, if only this aspect of their lives is highlighted.

As mothers of half-Korean children, however, their acculturational strategies and social status were found to be different from their being daughters-in-law and wives; in short, they had greater agency. Specifically, although their motherhood was doubted and questioned, they still had more room to negotiate as mothers of Korean children, instead of being unilaterally oppressed. In other words, when they became the mothers of Korean children, their social position changed from an immigrant to a mother of a
Korean, resulting in a promotion of their agency. Their ambiguous social and
immigrational status, not a typical immigrant nor a native Korean, creates difference in
the host society members’ attitudes toward immigrants and government policies for
marriage-immigrants. As briefly mentioned in Chapter 2, the Korean government
approaches marriage-immigrants and labor workers differently; basically, Korean
immigration policies for labor workers relate to regulations, and the policies for
marriage-immigrants involve support. In terms of marriage-immigrants, Korean
immigration policies seem to be closer to the pluralism ideology or the civic ideology
(Bourhis et al., 1997). The difference between the pluralism ideology and the ethnist
ideology is whether the state financially and socially supports minority groups’ private
activities or regulates or limits certain aspects of the private values of the minorities.
Given the Korean government’s promotion and support for marriage-immigrants,
including such things as bilingual environments for multicultural families, Korean
immigration policy reflects the pluralism ideology, although the society significantly
forces immigrants to culturally assimilate to the Korean culture. Nevertheless, the
underlying assumption of these policies is that the children of marriage-immigrants are
Korean, and the policies are ultimately for the children, aiming to raise them as Korean
with a multicultural capacity. The promotion and support from MFS centers are, in fact,
for the mothers of Korean children, rather than for immigrants. Still, as mothers of
Korean children, the marriage-immigrants had greater agency than they had as daughters-
in-law or wives.

In order to raise their children with dual citizenship and a half-Korean and half-
Filipino identity, the immigrant mothers’ acculturation orientation changed as well. A
mother who would have chosen to be separated from Korean culture might later change her mind about her participation in the culture and language, usually according to what she perceived as the educational and social needs of her child and his or her potential for success in Korean society. Lailani, for example, thought that she would not need to learn Korean, because she could communicate in English with Koreans; however, during the interview, she expressed her regret not having learned Korean, because her lack of Korean language proficiency limited her from supporting her daughters’ school work. Many of the research participants were able to successfully engage in society due to their fluent English proficiency; however, they were eager to master Korean to insure the success of their children. In short, due to their half-Korean children, marriage-immigrants came to express a willingness and need to integrate into Korean society. A comparison of these interviewees with Cluster III, the Isolated Long-term Resisters, shows this point more clearly. The long-term resisters tended not to have their same-ethnic spouse or children in South Korea; they had little reason to integrate into Korean society, thereby less reason or motivation to learn the Korean language. This unique pattern of immigration and the special position of marriage-immigrants, not only in South Korea but also in other countries having similar immigrant population, such as Taiwan, Japan, and Australia, create glitches in the existing acculturation theories that have been mainly developed in Western countries.

**Koreans as Gatekeepers of Immigrants’ Learning**

Immigrants need assistance from natives to some extent in their adjustment to their migrated societies. For workers, help could be recruited from Korean companies, Korean coworkers, and Korean immigration services; for marriage-immigrants, their
Korean families could be their main source of acculturative assistance. However, the two studies revealed that there are groups of isolated immigrants who had no or little contact with extrafamilial Koreans, although the Koreans near them could be a good source of educational opportunities as demonstrated in the qualitative study.

In the quantitative study, one major underlying factor of immigrants’ deterrents to participating in Korean as a second language learning was found to be Social Isolation. The eight items loaded on this factor included the statements “I don’t know about the Korean classes” and “My family did not like my attending Korean class.” Discovery of this factor is consistent with some marriage-immigrants’ lives in South Korea; for example, Nenita and Risa’s Korean family members were negligent in searching for proper educational opportunities for these women, and Malaya’s mother-in-law disliked her having the visiting Korean language instructor in their home. Social Isolation does not mean that they are physically trapped; rather, if an immigrant involuntarily has had a limited form of social interaction for a longer period, that is social isolation. Without appropriate and timely assistance regarding formal educational opportunities from their Korean families or other native Koreans who know and could share this information, some socially isolated immigrants’ difficulties with acculturation and language are extended.

The importance of Korean family members as gatekeepers of immigrants’ learning could be more emphasized in immigrants’ informal acculturative learning. Koreans with whom immigrants first have contact while living in South Korea are the direct transmitters of Korean cultural practices. In the qualitative study, the Korean family members intentionally and unintentionally showed and explained the Korean
culture to the marriage-immigrant women. They practiced a form of Korean culture; however, without extended experience in South Korea, immigrants would perceive the form as a whole, especially if they are socially isolated.

In short, Koreans living with or having daily contact with immigrants play such an important role in immigrants’ acculturation, and it is partially their responsibility not only to help immigrants learn the Korean culture but also to connect them with appropriate educational resources.

Diversity of the Immigrant Population and Their Learning

The quantitative study developed a typology of immigrants in South Korea in relation to their deterrents to participation in education. Five types of immigrants were described as: Active Young Workers, Income-oriented Temporary Workers, Isolated Long-term Resisters, Integrated Professional Immigrants, and Married Residents. This typology is one way of differentiating various types of immigrants and their educational conditions in South Korea.

In the qualitative study, it was revealed that unlike the researcher’s unconscious assumptions about marriage-immigrants – an international marriage agency’s involvement in brokered marriages between Korean husbands and Filipina wives – marriage-immigrant women were not one type. Each woman had her own story, and their situations were very different and varied in detail.

Immigrants in South Korea are becoming more diverse in terms of visas, purposes for visitation, lengths of stay, residential areas, family types, and so on. More attentive and careful approaches to the development of educational services are needed for the different groups of immigrants situated in various life conditions.
Implications for Policy and Practice

This dissertation research, consisting of two different studies, found many implications for policy makers and adult educators working with immigrants.

The implications from the quantitative study can be summarized as follows.

- Given the awareness of the negative attitudes toward education, educators and administrators should consider crafting promotional materials and providing an initial orientation to diminish learners’ psychological resistance.

- Because some immigrants socially isolate themselves from the mainstream Korean culture, educators and administrators need to develop alternate channels for recruitment, such as ethnic churches; general promotion would not work effectively to reach out to these learners.

- Given the immigrants’ competing demands, more flexible scheduling and various alternatives and access to learning materials would be helpful to recruit more immigrant learners.

- Segmentation of the potential target groups of KIIP could be effective in the recruitment of education participants by detecting the more urgent populations in need of learning the Korean language and distinguishing the groups deterred by external situations from the groups deterred by their own motivations.

- Given the fact that different ethnic groups develop different settlement processes and different immigration cultures, to access such populations as the long-term resisters, it may require the assistance of cultural insiders to spread information about the learning opportunities.
The qualitative research provided significant implications for policy makers, instructors and counselors who interact with marriage-immigrant women on a daily basis.

- The themes found in this study could provide practical tips for newly married immigrant women; conversely, how to prevent unfair treatment could be taught in the initial adjustment programs.
- Understanding the natures of immigrants’ motherhood enables adult educators and social workers to design customized courses that are more suitable to immigrant mothers’ needs.
- The diverse representation of marriage-immigrant women in this study could contribute to the development of educational programs promoting multicultural awareness among native Koreans by reducing the prejudice about marriage-immigrant women from Southeast Asian countries.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

Although this study contributed to improving our understanding of immigrants’ deterrents to participation in KSL programs and marriage-immigrants’ acculturative experiences in South Korea, there are still limitations to this dissertation that could be further investigated in future studies. One possible future investigation would be a more thorough and nationwide survey on immigrants’ deterrents to participation in education. In many nationwide surveys on the status and condition of immigrants in South Korea, linguistic difficulty is almost always reported; however, immigrants’ reasons why they cannot improve their Korean has not been investigated as much. Instead, the Korean government introduced policies that required proof of immigrants’ Korean language abilities. However, immigrants who have come to Korea with or without Korean...
language proficiency need further education on the Korean language for a better settlement experience. Furthermore, a nationwide survey on deterrents to participation could provide much rigorous information on those socially isolated immigrants in South Korea. Although the participants of this study were recruited from ethnic churches and other ethnic places, the survey participants were limited to Filipinos and Vietnamese who actively engaged in religious activities. If this limitation was improved by a nationwide survey, we would be able to know much more about immigrants’ deterrents to participation and how to better serve the population educationally, especially how to reach out to socially isolated immigrants.

Another possible future study is related to the marriage-immigrants’ acculturative learning. This study researched the foreign wives’ married lives in South Korea; some of their experiences were related to their being foreigners, while other experiences were more relevant to their married lives. By comparing the married lives of native Koreans, we would be able to contrast the experiences and investigate the core of marriage-immigrants’ acculturation experiences in Korean culture and, thereby, construct a more distinctive description of how acculturative learning operates in marriage-immigrants’ lives. For example, underestimated parental authority not only happened to the immigrant mothers in this study, but it also sometimes occurs with native Korean mothers, as well. Similarly, conflicts with in-laws are very common with native Korean daughters-in-law, although their resources and power in the same position would be different from marriage-immigrant women. An investigation on these similarities and differences between married Korean women and marriage-immigrant women would
conversely reveal the marriage-immigrants’ acculturative experiences and informal culture learning.
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APPENDIX A

DETERRENTS TO PARTICIPATION IDENTIFIED FROM PREVIOUS RESEARCH
### Deterrents to Participation Identified from Previous Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief Citation</th>
<th># of Deterrents</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Scale/Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apt (1978)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Adults in Iowa</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beder (1989)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>ABE students</td>
<td>3-pt-Likert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blais, Duquette, &amp; Painchaud (1989)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Women's work-related education</td>
<td>4-pt-Likert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carp, Peterson, &amp; Roelfs (1973)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Research Corporation (1980)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choi &amp; Han (2012)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Marriage-immigrant wives in Korea (KIIP participants)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choi (2006)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Korean adults</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutz &amp; Chandler (2000)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mayan adults</td>
<td>Qualitative (emic themes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darkenwald &amp; Valentine (1985)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>5-pt-Likert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellsworth (1991)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>College students</td>
<td>5-pt-Likert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher (1983)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>Open-ended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green (1998)/ McDonald (2003)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Non-traditional students /College students</td>
<td>5-pt-Likert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes (1989)/ Hayes &amp; Darkenwald (1988)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>ABE/ ESL (Hispanic Immigrants)</td>
<td>3-pt-Likert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry &amp; Basile (1994)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>A Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irias (2011)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ESL, Hispanic Immigrants</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeon &amp; Choi (2007)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Adults in museum education</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnstone &amp; Rivera (1965)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Citation</td>
<td># of Deterrents</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Scale/Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jung (2010)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Marriage-immigrant wives in Korea</td>
<td>5-pt-Likert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEDI (1982)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Korean Adults</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEDI (1999)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Korean Adults</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEDI (2009)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Korean Adults</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEDI (2011, 2013)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Korean Adults</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee &amp; Gi (2009)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Korean older adults</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicky &amp; Norman (1994)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Canadian adult drop-outs from adult literacy programs</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Household Education Survey (1991)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ABE &amp; ESL non-participants</td>
<td>Multiple-choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Household Education Survey (1995)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>ABE &amp; ESL non-participants</td>
<td>Multiple-choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh (2013)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Marriage-immigrant wives in Korea</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Choi (2012)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Marriage-immigrant wives in Korea</td>
<td>Multiple-choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perdue &amp; Valentine (2000)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Web-based continuing professional education participants</td>
<td>6-pt-Likert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose (1981)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Open-ended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubenson &amp; Desjardins (2009)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>European adults</td>
<td>Open-ended/Multiple choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanlan &amp; Darkenward (1984)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Health Professionals</td>
<td>7-pt-Likert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman (1990)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ABE nonparticipants</td>
<td>Open-ended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Citation</td>
<td># of Deterrents</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Scale/Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silva (2000)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nonparticipants in ABE or ESL</td>
<td>Agree/Neither/Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maj/Min/Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundet &amp; Galbraith (1991)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Adults in rural areas</td>
<td>5-pt-Likert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watt &amp; Boss (1987)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Adult students enrolled in an alternative school in Canada</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziegahn (1992)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ABE &amp; ESL target adult students</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with marriage-immigrant Filipinas</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Filipina immigrants in Korea</td>
<td>Qualitative interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total items (duplicate)</strong></td>
<td><strong>697</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IRB APPROVAL LETTER: THE DPS SURVEY
January 14, 2016

Dear Thomas Valentine:

On 6/24/2015, the IRB reviewed the following submission:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Review:</th>
<th>Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title of Study:</td>
<td>Adult Immigrants' Deterrents to Participation in Korea Immigration and Integration Program (KIIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator:</td>
<td>Thomas Valentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB ID:</td>
<td>MOD00002474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant ID:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IRB approved the protocol from 1/14/2016.

In conducting this study, you are required to follow the requirements listed in the Investigator Manual (HRP-103).

Sincerely,

Dr. Gerald E. Crites, MD, MEd
University of Georgia
Institutional Review Board Chairperson
APPENDIX C

RECRUITMENT FLYER OF THE DPS SURVEY

a. FILIPINO-TAGALOG VERSION IN ENGLISH

b. VIETNAMESE VERSION IN ENGLISH

c. FILIPINO-TAGALOG VERSION

d. VIETNAMESE VERSION
Filipinos are one of the major growing populations in South Korea. The current population of Filipinos living in Korea is almost 50,000, which is expected to grow. **We want to know more about your lives in Korea! Your participation in this survey will help to better assist other Filipinos in Korea.**

**Purpose:** To understand Filipinos’ reasons not to participate in Korean Language programs provided by the Korean Government

Participants: Adult Filipinos who live in Korea and have NOT participated in Korean Language Program in the last 6 or completed the program before

**Researcher:** Jihyun Kim  
Advanced Doctoral Candidate  
Phone: (070)-8246-7881 | E-mail: jhkim235@uga.edu.  
(Under the direction of **Dr. Thomas Valentine**, Professor in the Department of Lifelong Education, Policy and Administration at The University of Georgia.  
Phone: +1 (706)-542-4017 | E-mail: tvnj@uga.edu.)

Participate in 15-minute survey and receive ₩3,000**.

To participate in the survey,

- Visit the survey at [https://goo.gl/gB5a0T](https://goo.gl/gB5a0T)
- Use this QR code.
- Send me a text (070-8246-7881)
- Send me an email (jhkim235@uga.edu)

---

**Only for the first 200 participants.**
Vietnamese are one of the major growing populations in South Korea. The current population of Vietnamese living in Korea exceeds 120,000, which is expected to grow. We want to know more about your lives in Korea! Your participation in this survey will help to better assist other Vietnamese in Korea.

Purpose: To understand Vietnamese’ reasons not to participate in Korean Language programs provided by the Korean Government.

Participants: Adult Vietnamese who live in Korea and have NOT participated in Korean Language Programs in the last 6 months or completed the program before.

Researcher: Jihyun Kim
Advanced Doctoral Candidate
Phone: (070)-8246-7881 | E-mail: jhkim235@uga.edu.
(Under the direction of Dr. Thomas Valentine, Professor in the Department of Lifelong Education, Policy and Administration at The University of Georgia.
Phone: +1 (706)-542-4017 | E-mail: tvnj@uga.edu.)

Participate in 15-minute survey and receive ₩3,000.

To participate in the survey,

- Visit the survey at http://goo.gl/q0Uucc
- Use this QR code.
- Send me a text (070-8246-7881)
- Send me an email (jhkim235@uga.edu)

__________________________

2 Only for the first 200 participants.
Kinakailangan ng mga Filipinos: Mga Kalahok sa Pagsisisiyasat

Ang mga Filipino ay isa sa mga lumalaking populasyon ng mga imigrante sa South Korea. Sa kasulukyan, ang bilang ng mga Filipino ay tinitaasang umabot na sa humigit na 50,000—bilang na inaasahang mas lalaki pa sa mga susunod na taon. Ang pagsisisiyasat na ito ay naglalayon na aming matantong ang buhay ng mga Pilipino sa Korea. Ang inyong pakikisayat at pagsagot sa mga katunungan sa pagsisisiyasat na ito ay lubos na makatutulong upang mas higit pa namin matulungan ang inyong mga kababayan sa Korea.

Layunin: Ang pagsisisiyasat na ito ay naglalayon na maunawaan ang dahilan ng mga Filipino sa hindi nila pakikibahagi sa mga programa ng Korean Language na ipinagkakaloob ng gobyerno ng Korea.

Mga Kalahok: Ang mga kalahok sa pagsisisiyasat na ito ay kinabibilangan ng mga Pilipino na nasa sapat na gulang at naninirahan sa Korea. Sila ay ang mga Pilipino na HINDI nakilahok sa Korean Language Program sa nakalipas ng anim na buwan o HINDI NAKUMPLETO ang programa noon.

Panahon: 2016. 1.28 – 2016. 2.17

Mananaliksik: Jihyun Kim, Advanced Doctoral Candidate
Phone: +1 (706)-202-9160 | E-mail: jkim235@uga.edu.
(Sa pangangasiwa ni Dr. Thomas Valentine, Propesor sa Department of Lifelong Education, Policy, and Administration sa University of Georgia.
Phone: +1 (706)-542-4017 | E-mail: tvnj@uga.edu.)

Lumahok sa 45 minuto ng pagsisisiyasat at tumanggap ¥ 3000 (Tanging para lamang sa unang 200 kalahok.)

Upang makilahok sa pananaliksik na ito,
- Bisitahtin ang survey sa https://goo.gl/q8B6aUT
- Mag-email sa jhkim235@uga.edu
- Gamitin ang QR code na ito:
Cần tuyển người Việt Nam: Tham gia vào nghiên cứu khảo sát

“Những nguyên nhân vì sao người Việt Nam không muốn tham gia vào các chương trình học Tiếng Hàn Quốc được bảo trợ bởi chính phủ Hàn Quốc”

Người Việt Nam là một trong những cộng đồng dân cư đang tăng lên rất nhanh ở Hàn Quốc. Số người Việt Nam hiện đang cư trú ở Hàn Quốc vượt qua 120.000 người, và con số này dự kiến sẽ còn tiếp tục tăng lên. Chúng tôi muốn biết thêm về cuộc sống của các bạn ở Hàn Quốc! Việc tham gia của bạn vào bảng khảo sát này sẽ giúp ích cho việc hỗ trợ tốt hơn cho những người Việt Nam khác tại Hàn Quốc.

Mục đích khảo sát: Nhằm tìm hiểu những lý do vì sao người Việt Nam không tham gia vào các chương trình học tiếng Hàn Quốc do chính phủ Hàn Quốc tài trợ.

Đối tượng tham gia: Người Việt Nam trưởng thành đang sinh sống tại Hàn Quốc và CHUA TỪNG tham gia vào bất cứ chương trình tiếng Hàn Quốc nào trong vòng 6 tháng gần đây hoặc CHUA hoàn thành chương trình này trước đây

Thời gian: 2016. 1. 28 – 2016. 2. 17

Thực hiện nghiên cứu: JiHyun Kim, Nghiên cứu sinh cấp cao
Điện thoại: +1 (706)-202-9160 | E-mail: jhkim235@uga.edu
(Dưới sự hướng dẫn của TS. Thomas Valentine, Giáo sư thuộc Khoa Giáo dục, Chính sách và Hành chính Sự kiện, Đại học Georgia.
Điện thoại: +1 (706)-542-4017 | E-mail: tvni@uga.edu)

Tham gia vào phiếu khảo sát trong 15 phút và nhận W3.000 (Chỉ dành cho 200 người tham gia đầu tiên).

Để tham gia vào bảng khảo sát này

- Xem phiếu khảo sát tại http://goo.gl/q0Uucc
- Gửi email cho tôi theo địa chỉ jhkim235@uga.edu
- Sử dụng mã QR này.
APPENDIX D

INFORMED CONSENT AND QUESTIONNAIRE: THE DPS SURVEY

a. ENGLISH VERSION

b. FILIPINO-TAGALOG VERSION

c. VIETNAMESE VERSION
Immigrants’ Deterrents to Participation in Korean as Second Language (KSL) Programs Provided by the Korean Government

Welcome!

Immigrants are rapidly growing in South Korea. The current population of immigrants living in Korea is almost 1,500,000, which is expected to grow. **We want to know more about your lives in Korea! Your participation in this survey is very important to better assist other immigrants in Korea.** The findings from this research may provide information on adult immigrants’ participation in Korean language programs sponsored by the Korean government and provide implications for further development of the program.

**Purpose:** To understand adult immigrants’ deterrents to attending Korean language programs sponsored by the Korean government

**Participants:** Adult Filipinos or Vietnamese who have lived in Korean language programs provided by the Korean government in the last 6 months and have not completed the program before.

**Researcher:** Jihyun Kim, Advanced Doctoral Candidate, The University of Georgia
Phone: +1 (706)-202-9160, +82 (070)-8246-7881 | E-mail: jhkim235@uga.edu. (Under the direction of Dr. Thomas Valentine, Professor in the Department of Lifelong Education, Policy and Administration at The University of Georgia.)

**YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE STUDY IS VOLUNTARY.** Your participation will involve responding to an online survey. You may stop at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you decide to stop or withdraw from the study, the information/data collected up to the point of your withdrawal will be kept as part of the study and may continue to be analyzed. The approximate time to complete the survey is 15 minutes.

**ANY INFORMATION COLLECTED IN THIS STUDY IS CONFIDENTIAL.** Only researchers involved in this study will have access to your data. The data will be secured in the researcher's password-protected computer. Possible individual identifiers
that are voluntarily provided such as mobile numbers will be destroyed one month from
the completion of data collection.

A ₩3,000 ELECTRONIC GIFT CARD will be given for the pilot test participants, if you
leave your mobile numbers at the end of this survey. The gift card can be used in any
convenience stores, online shopping malls, bookstores and so on.

There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research. This research
involves the transmission of data over the Internet. Every reasonable effort has been
taken to ensure the effective use of available technology; however, confidentiality during
online communication cannot be guaranteed.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to contact the
researcher. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be
directed to The Chairperson, The University of Georgia Institutional Review Board, 629
Boyd GSRC, Athens, Georgia 30602, USA; telephone +1 (706) 542-3199; email address
irb@uga.edu.

By clicking “Continue”, you agree to participate in the above described research
project.

Thank you in advance for your participation!

Continue
Q1. Are you over the age of 18?

- Yes
- No

Q2. Are you Filipino or Vietnamese?

- Yes
- No

Q3. Have you lived in South Korea more than 3 months?

- Yes
- No

Q4. Have you attended any Korea Language Programs sponsored by the Korean Government in the last 6 months? (Korean classes held at Multicultural Family Support Centers (다문화센터) and KIIP are the government sponsored programs.)

- Yes
- No

Q5. Have you received a Korea Immigration and Integration Program (KIIP) completion certificate or equivalent?

- Yes
- No
Thank you for your interest and consideration!

Sorry! This survey is designed especially for adult Filipino or Vietnamese who have lived in Korea for more than 3 months, have not attended any Korean classes in the last six months, and have not received Korea Immigration and Integration Program (KIIP) completion certificate before.

If you know a Filipino or Vietnamese who meets these criteria, please share this survey with your friend through Facebook, Twitter, Google, Email, and text. Links are provided below.

If the links above do not work, please use this address: https://ugeorgia.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_8iwBlzOkHp5V8oZ
Start of Block: Section II. Deterrent Scale

Below you will find a list of reasons that explain why adult immigrants do not participate in Korean language classes. Please read each statement and indicate the extent to which each reason influenced your decision not to participate in any Korean language classes sponsored by the Korean government.

1 = Not at all
2 = Little
3 = Somewhat
4 = Very
5 = Extremely

(If any of the items that do not apply to you or your situation, please choose “1 = Not at all.”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The classes were held at times I could not go.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am not interested in learning Korean.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I was too worried about taking tests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel I am too old to learn Korean.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I do not believe they allowed me to take the class because of my legal status.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I thought it would be hard to get along with the other students in the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am not confident in my learning ability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I could not afford expenses for Korean classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I do not have enough free time to attend the Korean classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I tend to feel guilty when I have to leave home to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I have too many household responsibilities to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I had to take care of my child(ren). (Note: If you do not have a child, select “1”.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong></td>
<td>I was afraid to take public transportation alone to attend the Korean classes.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.</strong></td>
<td>I do not like going outside due to native Koreans’ disrespectful attitudes toward me.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15.</strong></td>
<td>The Korean classes were held in a location too far away.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.</strong></td>
<td>Available transportation to the Korean classes was inconvenient.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17.</strong></td>
<td>My family did not like the idea of my attending Korean classes.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18.</strong></td>
<td>I tried to start classes but they were already full or I missed the registration period.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19.</strong></td>
<td>I did not know that there were Korean classes available for immigrants/foreigners.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20.</strong></td>
<td>I believe it would take too long time to complete the program.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21.</strong></td>
<td>I did not think I could attend Korean classes regularly.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22.</strong></td>
<td>I prefer to learn Korean in my own way.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23.</strong></td>
<td>I do not enjoy studying.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24.</strong></td>
<td>I had no friends who could attend Korean classes with me.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25.</strong></td>
<td>I was afraid to go to an unfamiliar place.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.</strong></td>
<td>I heard that the Korean classes were not very good.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.</strong></td>
<td>My previous experiences with Korean classes did not meet my expectation. (Note: If you have no previous experience with Korean classes, please select “1”.)</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28.</strong></td>
<td>I have a personal health problem or disability that made me difficult to attend the Korean classes.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I had family problems that made it difficult to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I am too tired to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I did not want to sit in a formal classroom to learn Korean.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The incentives for completing the government-sponsored Korean language program is not important to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Attending Korean classes would not improve my life in Korea.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The Korean language is too difficult to master.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I am afraid to begin learning something new.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The registration process was difficult.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. My Korean is already good enough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I do not need to know Korean.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. The program content probably would not be relevant to my needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. If you have other reason that is not listed above, please specify below.

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

End of Block: Section II. Deterrent Scale
Please indicate your **Korean** language proficiency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not well</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. How well do you <strong>speak</strong> Korean?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. How well do you <strong>understand</strong> Korean?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. How well do you <strong>read</strong> Korean?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. How well do you <strong>write</strong> in Korean?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate your **English** language proficiency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not well</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Very well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5. How well do you <strong>speak</strong> English?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. How well do you <strong>understand</strong> English?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. How well do you <strong>read</strong> English?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. How well do you <strong>write</strong> in English?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section IV. Demographics

Q1. What year were you born?
   Year
   ▼ 1997 ... 1930

Q2. What is your gender?
   ○ Male
   ○ Female

Q3. What is the highest level of education you have COMPLETED?
   ○ Elementary school (paaralang elementarya)
   ○ High school (paaralang sekundarya)
   ○ Some College or 2-year College Degree (Associate’s Degree)
   ○ 4-year College Degree (Bachelor’s Degree)
   ○ Master’s Degree or higher

Q4. What was your initial purpose of coming to South Korea?
   ○ To marry a Korean
   ○ To work in Korea
   ○ To travel Korea (sightseeing/tour)
   ○ To study
   ○ To live with my non-Korean husband or family
   ○ Other (Please specify below.)
Q5. What year did you enter Korea?
Year
▼ 2015 ... Before 1985

Q6. How long do you expect to live in Korea?
- Less than 1 year
- 1-2 years
- 3-5 years
- 5-10 years
- 10-20 years
- I have no plan to leave Korea.
- Other (Please specify below.)

Q7. What is your combined MONTHLY household income in average? (Please answer with your best estimate if you are not sure.)
- Less than 1,000,000 won
- 1,000,000 – 1,999,999 won
- 2,000,000 – 2,999,999 won
- 3,000,000 – 3,999,999 won
- 4,000,000 – 4,999,999 won
- 5,000,000 – 5,999,999 won
- 6,000,000 – 6,999,999 won
- 7,000,000 – 7,999,999 won
- 8,000,000 – 8,999,999 won
- 9,000,000 – 9,999,999 won
- 10,000,000 won and more
Q8. What best describes your employment status?

- Employed
- A homemaker/ housewife
- A student
- Unemployed and looking for a job
- Unable to work for health reason
- Unable to work for legal issue
- Other (Please specify below)

Q8-1. How many HOURS do you work outside home in a WEEK?

Q9. How many people are currently living with you (excluding yourself)?

Number of People Living Together

\[ 0 \ldots 20 \]

Q9-1. How many of them are your children under 18 years old (including your step-children)?

Number of Children

\[ 0 \ldots 20 \]

Q9-2. How many of them are native Korean ADULTS over 18 years old?

Number of Korean Adults

\[ 0 \ldots 20 \]
Q10. What is your marital status?
- Single, never married
- Married/Living together
- Divorced
- Separated
- Widowed

Q10-1-1. What is your spouse’s/partner’s ethnicity?
- Filipino/a or Vietnamese
- Korean
- Other ethnicity

Q10-1-2. Does your spouse/partner live in Korea?
- Yes
- No

Q10-2. What was your ex-spouse’s ethnicity?
- Filipino/a or Vietnamese
- Korean
- Other ethnicity

Q11. Are you financially responsible for your family in the Philippines on a regular basis?
- Yes
- No
Q11-1. Who do you financially support? (Select ALL)

- My spouse
- My children
- My parents
- My parents-in-law
- My siblings and/or their families
- Other (Please specify.)

Q12. How often do you communicate with native Korean speakers in daily lives?

- Everyday
- Almost everyday
- 3-4 times in a week
- 1-2 times in a week
- 1-3 times in a month
- Less 10 times in a year
- Never

Q13. How much do you like living in Korea overall?

- Not at all
- Slightly
- Somewhat
- Very
- Extremely
Q14. How is your OVERALL experience with native Koreans while living in Korea?

- Very poor
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Very good

Q15. Where do you live in Korea?
Metropolitan/Province
Si/Gun/Gu

▼ Seoul/서울특별시 ... Jeju/제주도 ~ Seogwipo-si/서귀포시

Q16. Do you have other comments that you’d like to share with the researcher?
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

End of Block: Section IV. Demographics
Survey is done! Here’s your reward!
Thank you very much for your participation! Your participation will contribute to improving our understanding of immigrants in Korea.

If you would like to receive a ₩3,000 electronic gift card, please leave your mobile numbers below. The gift card can be used in any convenience stores, online shopping malls, bookstores and so on. Please note that the gift card will be given only for the FIRST 200 participants.

The gift card will be sent as a text message on Jan. 31, 2016 (subject to change), after checking invalid or duplicate mobile numbers. Your mobile numbers will not be used for any other purpose than to deliver the electronic gift card and will be destroyed one month from the completion of data collection. Thank you!

Your Mobile Numbers (Numbers ONLY)

Retype your mobile numbers (Numbers ONLY).

End of Block: Contact Information for Reward

Start of Block: Share This Survey!

Please share this survey with your friends through Facebook, Twitter, Google, Email, and text. Links are provided below.

End of Block: Share This Survey!
Immigrants' Deterrents to Participation in Korean as Second Language (KSL) Programs Provided by the Korean Government

Mabuhay!

Ang mga Pilipino ay isa sa mga lumalaking populasyon ng mga imigrante sa South Korea. Sa kasulukuyan, ang bilang ng mga Pilipino ay tinatayang umabot na sa humigit na 50,000 bilang na inaasahang mas lalaki pa sa mga susunod na taon. Ang pagsisiyasat na ito ay naglalayon na aming matuto ang buhay ng mga Pilipino sa Korea. Ang inyong pakikiisa at pagsagot sa mga katununan sa pagsisiyasat na ito ay lubos na makatutulong upang mas higit pa namin matulungan ang inyong mga kababayan sa Korea. Ang mga pagkatuklas mula sa pagsisiyasat na ito ay maaaring magbigay ng impormasyon ukol sa mga pakikipahok ng mga dayuhan sa mga programang Korean language na inisponsor ng gobyerno ng Korea at makapagbigay ng mga implikasyon upang higit pang mapa-unlad ng programa.

Layunin: Ang pagsisiyasat na ito ay naglalayon na maunawaan ang kahadlangan na kinaharap ng mga dayuhan na may sapat na gula ng upang dumalo sa mga programa ng Korean language na ibinigay ng gobyerno ng Korea.

Panahon: 2016. 1. 28 – 2016. 2. 17

Mga Kalahok: Mga Pilipinong may sapat na gulang at naninirahan sa Korea nang higit pa sa 3 buwan at hindi pa dumalo sa mga programa ng Korean language program na ibinigay ng gobyerno ng Korea sa nakalipas na anim na buwan o hindi nakumpleto ang pangwakas na antas ng programa ng Korean language na inisponsoran ng gobyerno ng Korea.

Mananaliksik: Jihyun Kim, Advanced Doctoral Candidate
Telepono: +1 (706)-202-9160 | E-mail: jhkim235@uga.edu.
(Sa pangangasiwa ni Dr. Thomas Valentine, Propesor sa Department of Lifelong Education, Policy, and Administration sa University of Georgia.
Telepono: +1 (706)-542-4017 | E-mail: tvnj@uga.edu.)

ANG PAKIKILAHOK SA PAGSISIYASAT NA ITO AY KUSANG-LOOB. Ang inyong

**ANUMANG DATOS ANG MAKAKALAP SA PAG-AARAL NG ITO AY MANANATILING KUMPIDENSYAL.** Tanging ang mga mananaliksik lamang ng pagsisiyasat na ito ang siyang magkakaroon ng access sa datos ukol sa inyo. Ang mga datos ay ligtas sa kompyuter na protektado ng password nap aari ng mananaliksik. Ang mga posibleng pangtukoy ay pang-indibidwal na kusang-loob na ibinahagi ng mga kalahok, gaya ng mga numero ng telepono, ay buburahin isang buwan matapos nang makumpleto ang pangangalap ng mga datos.

**Ang unang 200 kalahok ay makakatanggap ng ₩ 3000 electronic gift card kung inyong ibigay ang numero ng telepono sa dulo ng survey na ito.** Maaaring gamitin ang gift card sa anumang convenience stores, online shopping malls, bookstores, at iba pa.

Walang batid na panganib o balisa ang kaugnay sa pagsasali sa mga magagamit na teknolohiya subalit; gayunpaman, ang pagpapanatiling kumpidensyal sa panahon ng komunikasyon online ay hindi maigagarantiya.

Para sa mga katanungan at mga karagdagang kaalaman ukol sa pananaliksik na ito, huwag mag-atubiling makipag-ugnayan sa mananaliksik. Ang mga katanungan hinggil sa inyong karapatan bilang kalahok sa pananaliksik na ito ay maaaring ipagbigay-alam sa The Tagapangulo ng University of Georgia Institutional Review Board sa address na 609 Boyd GSRC, Athens, Georgia 30,602, USA; numero ng telepono +1 (706) 542-3199; email address irb@uga.edu.

I-click ang “Magpatuloy” para sa pagsang-ayon sa pakikilahok sa pananaliksik na ito. Salamat sa inyong pakikiisa.
Q1. Ikaw ba ay 18 taong gulang na o higit pa?
   - Oo
   - Hindi

Q2. Ikaw ba ay Pilipino?
   - Oo
   - Hindi

Q3. Ikaw ba ay nanirahan sa South Korea ng higit sa 3 buwan?
   - Oo
   - Hindi

Q4. Ikaw ba ay nakadalo na ng kahit anong Korean Language Program na ini-sponsor ng gobyerno ng Korea sa nakalipas na 6 na buwan? (Ang mga pag-aaral ng Korean language na ginanap sa Multicultural Family Support Centers (다문화센터) at KIIP ay mga programang ini-sponsor ng gobyerno.)
   - Oo
   - Hindi

Q5. Nakatanggap ka na ba ng certificate of completion (Level 6) o anuman na katumbas nito mula sa KIIP?
   - Oo
   - Hindi

End of Block: Unang Bahagi: Katanungan para sa Pag-i-screen
Salamat sa iyong interest at konsiderasyon!

Ipagpaumanhin! Ang survey na ito ay para sa mga Filipino may tamang gulang na nanirahan sa Korea nang higit pa sa 3 buwan, hindi pa nakadalo ng anumang pag-aaral ng wikang Korean sa nakalipas ng 6 na buwan, at hindi pa nakatanggap ng certificate of completion o anumang katumbas nito mula sa Korea Immigration and Integration Program (KIIP).

Kung may kaibigan o kakilala kayong Filipino o Vietnamese na nakatutugon sa mga pamantayan nabanggit, mahayag ibahagi ang survey na ito sa kanila sa pamamagitan ng Facebook, Google, LinkedIn, at Twitter. Ang mga links ay nakasaad sa ibaba. Kung ang mga links ay hindi gumana, mangyaring gamitin ang address na ito.

[Social media icons]

Kung hindi gumagana ang mga link sa itaas, maging maging gamitin ang address na ito: goo.gl/gB5a0T
Start of Block: Seksyon II. Deterrent Scale

Ang mga sumusunod ay listahan ng mga kadahilanan na nagpapaliwanag kung bakit ang mga migranteng may wastong gulang ay hindi nakikilahok sa mga pag-aaral ng wikang Korean. Mangyaring basahin ang bawat pangungusap at ipahiwatig kung ano ang saklaw ng iyong mga kadahilanan sa HINDI pakikilahok sa anumang programa ng Korean language na ibigay ng gobyerno ng Korea.

1 = Hindi (Not at all)
2 = Hindi gaano (Little)
3 = Medyo (Somewhat)
4 = Tunay (Very)
5 = Pinaka (Extremely)
(Kung ang pangungusap ay hindi naaangkop sa iyo o sa iyong sitwasyon, mangyaring piliin ang “1 = Hindi sa lahat.”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Hindi</th>
<th>Hindi gaano</th>
<th>Medyo</th>
<th>Tunay</th>
<th>Pinaka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ang mga klase ay ginanap sa oras kung kailan hindi ako makakadalo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Ako ay masyadong nag-alala sa pagkuha ng pagsusulit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Wala akong tiwala sa aking kakayanan na mag-aral.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hindi gaano</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>Medyo</td>
<td>Tunay</td>
<td>Pinaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Wala akong sapat na libreng oras upang dumalo sa pag-aaral ng wikang Korean.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Nakokonsensya ako kapag ako ay umaalis ng bahay upang dumalo sa pag-aaral ng wikang Korean.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Masyadong marami ang aking mga responsibilidad sa tahanan upang dumalo pa ng pag-aaral ng wikang Korean.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Ang magagamit na transportasyon patungo kung saan ginaganap ang pag-aaral ng Korean ay hindi kumbinyente.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Hindi gusto ng aking pamilya na ako ay dumalo sa mga pag-aaral ng wikang Korean.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Sinubukan kong simulan ang klase ngunit ang bilang ng mag-aaral ay kumpleto na o ako ay hindi na umabot sa panahon ng registration.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Hindi ko alam na may mga klase na na ginanap para sa wikang Koreano para sa mga imigrante/dayuhan.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Sa aking palagay masyadong mahaba ang oras upang makumpleto ang programa.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>Hindi gaano</td>
<td>Medyo</td>
<td>Tunay</td>
<td>Pinaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Wala akong mga kaibigan na maaaring makasama sa pagdalo ng pag-aaral ng wikang Korean.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Ako ay natakot na pumunta sa isang lugar na hindi ako pamilyar.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Sa aking karanasan noong nakaraan, ang pag-aaral ng wikang Korean ay hindi umayon sa aking pamantayan ng kalidad (Panuto: Kung ikaw ay walang mga nakaraang karanasan sa pag-aaral ng wikang Korean, piliin ang “1.”)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Ang mga insentibo para sa pagkumpleto ng Korean language program na ini-sponsor ng gobyerno ay hindi mahalaga sa akin.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
33. Ang pag-aaral ng wikang Korean ay hindi makakaulong upang mapagpabuti ng aking buhay sa Korea. | Hindi gaano | Hindi gaano | Medyo | Tunay | Pinaka |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Mahirap i-master ang wikang Korean. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

35. Natatakot akong magsimula na mag-aral ng isang bagong bagay. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

36. Ang proseso ng rehistrasyon ay mahirap. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

37. Sapat na ang aking abilidad sa wikang Korean. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

38. Hindi ko na kailangan pang alamin ang wikang Korean. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

39. Ang nilalaman ng programa ay hindi kaugnay sa aking mga pangangailangan. | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

40. Kung ikaw ay may iba pang mga kadahilanan na hindi nabanggit, mangyaring isulat sa ibaba.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

End of Block: Seksyon II. Deterrent Scale
### Seksyon III. Self-Assessed Language Proficiency

Mangyaring ipahiwatig ang iyong Korean kasanayan language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1. Gaano ka kahusay sa pagsasalin ng wikang Korean?</th>
<th>Walang alam</th>
<th>Hindi gaano</th>
<th>Tama lang</th>
<th>Mahusay</th>
<th>Napakahusay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Gaano ka kahusay sa pag-unawa ng wikang Korean?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Gaano ka kahusay sa pagbabasa ng wikang Korean?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Gaano ka kahusay sa pagsusulat sa wikang Korean?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mangyaring ipahiwatig ang iyong Ingles kasanayan language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q5. Gaano ka kahusay sa pagsasali ng wikang Ingles?</th>
<th>Walang alam</th>
<th>Hindi gaano</th>
<th>Tama lang</th>
<th>Mahusay</th>
<th>Napakahusay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6. Gaano ka kahusay sa pag-unawa ng wikang Ingles?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Gaano ka kahusay sa pagbabasa ng wikang Ingles?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. Gaano ka kahusay sa pagsusulat sa wikang Ingles?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1. Anong taon ka ipinanganak?
Taon
▼ 1997 ... 1930

Q2. Ano ang iyong kasarian?
○ Lalaki
○ Babae

Q3. Ano ang iyong pinakamataas na antas ng edukasyon?
○ Elementarya
○ Sekondarya/Hayskul
○ Vocational (2 Taon-Kurso)
○ Batsilyer (4 na Taong Kurso sa Kolehiyo o Unibersidad)
○ Masteral o higit pa

Q4. Ano ang iyong orihinal na layunin sa pagpunta sa South Korea?
○ Upang mag-asawa ng isang Korean
○ Upang magtrabaho sa Korea
○ Maglakbay Korea (sightseeing/tour)
○ Upang mag-aral
○ Upang manirahan kasama ang aking asawa na hindi Korean o pamilya
○ Iba pa (Mangyaring tukuyin sa sumusunod)

Q5. Anong taon ka dumating sa Korea?
Taon
▼ 2015 ... Before 1985
Q6. Gaano katagal ang inaasahan mong pagtira sa Korea?

- Wala pang 1 taon
- Mula 1 hangang 2 taon
- Mula 3 hanggang 5 taon
- Mula 5 hanggang 10 taon
- Mula 10 hanggang 20 taon
- Wala akong planong umalis ng Korea.
- Iba pa (Mangyaring tukuyin sa sumusunod)

Q7. Magkano ang katampatang pinagsamang buwanang kita ng inyong sambahayan?
(Piliin ang pinakamalapit na pagtanya kung hindi sigurado.)

- Mas mababa sa 1,000,000 won
- 1,000,000 – 1,999,999 won
- 2,000,000 – 2,999,999 won
- 3,000,000 – 3,999,999 won
- 4,000,000 – 4,999,999 won
- 5,000,000 – 5,999,999 won
- 6,000,000 – 6,999,999 won
- 7,000,000 – 7,999,999 won
- 8,000,000 – 8,999,999 won
- 9,000,000 – 9,999,999 won
- 10,000,000 won at higit pa
Q8. Alin sa mga sumusunod ang pinakamahusay na naglalarawan sa iyong kalagayan sa trabaho?

- May trabaho
- Maybahay
- Mag-aaral
- Walang trabaho subalit naghahanap ng trabaho
- Hindi makapagtrabaho dahil sa kalusugan
- Hindi makapagtrabaho dahil iligal na migrante
- Iba pa (Mangyaring tukuyin sa sumusunod)

Q8-1. Ilang oras ang iyong trabaho sa isang LINGGO?

Q9. Ilang tao ang kasalukuyang naninirahan sa iyong bahay (bukod sa iyong sarili)?

Bilang ng tao ▼ 0 ... 20

Q9-1. Ilan sa kanila ang iyong anak na may edad na mas mababa sa 18 taon (kasama ang iyong mga step-children)?

Bilang ng mga bata ▼ 0 ... 20

Q9-2. Ilan sa kanila ang mga native Korean adults?

Bilang ng tao ▼ 0 ... 20
Q10. Ano ang iyong marital status?
- Single, hindi pa naikakasal
- May Asawa/May Kinakasama
- Diborsiyado/Diborsyada
- Hiwalay sa Asawa
- Byudo/Byuda/Balo

Q10-1-1. Ano ang lahi ng iyong partner/iyong asawa?
- Pilipino/a
- Koreano/a
- Iba pang lahi

Q10-1-2. Ang iyo bang asawa/partner ay nakatira sa Korea?
- Oo
- Hindi

Q10-2. Ano ang lahi ng iyong dating asawa?
- Pilipino/a
- Koreano/a
- Iba pang lahi

Q11. Ikaw ba ang may regular na financial responsibility para sa iyong pamilya sa Pilipinas?
- Oo
- Hindi
Q11-1. Sino ang iyong sinusuportahan? (Piliin ang LAHAT)
- Ang aking asawa
- Ang aking anak/mga anak
- Ang aking mga magulang
- Ang aking mga biyenan
- Ang aking mga kapatid at kanilang pamilya
- Iba pa (Pakitukoy) ________________________________________________

Q12. Gaano kadalas ang iyong pakikipag-usap sa mga native Koreans?
- Araw-araw
- Halos araw-araw
- mula 3 hanggang 4 na beses sa loob ng isang linggo
- mula 1 hanggang 2 na beses sa loob ng isang linggo
- mula 1 hanggang 3 na beses sa loob ng isang buwan
- Wala pang 10 beses sa loob ng isang taon
- Hindi kailanman

Q13. Sa kabuuan, gaano ang iyong pagkagusto sa iyong pagtira sa Korea?
- Hindi
- Bahagya
- Medyo
- Labis
- Labis-labis
Q14. Sa kabuuan, kamusta ang iyong pangkalahatang karanasan sa mga Koreans habang ikaw ay naninirahan sa Korea?

- Sobrang hindi kaaya-aya
- Hindi kaaya-aya
- Tama lang
- Kanais-nais
- Labis na kanais-nais

Q15. Saan ka nakatira sa Korea?
Metropolitan/Province
Si/Gun/Gu

▼ Seoul/서울특별시 ... Jeju/제주도 ~ Seogwipo-si/서귀포시

Q16. Mayroon ka bang ibang komento na nais mong ibahagi sa mananaliksik?

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

End of Block: Seksyon IV. Demograpiya/Talasantauhan
Dito nagtatapos ang survey! Malugod naming ipinagkakaloob ang token para sa iyong pakikiisa.

Maraming salamat sa iyong pakikilahok. Ang iyong pakikilahok ay makatutulong sa pagpapabuti ng aming pag-unawa sa mga imigranteng Pilipino sa Korea.

Kung nais makatanggap ng electronic gift card na nagkakahalaga ng 3000 ₩, mangyaring isulat ang iyong mobile number sa ibaba. Ang electronic gift card ay maaaring gamitin sa anumang convenience stores, online shopping malls, bookstores, at iba pa.

Ang electronic gift card ay aming ipapadala bilang isang mensahe sa text sa Feb. 17, 2016, matapos matingan ang kawastuhan o pagkadoble ng iyong mobile number.

Ang numero ng iyong telepono ay hindi gagamitin sa iba pang layunin maliban sa pagpapadala ng electronic gift card at ito ay buburahin na isang buwan matapos ang pangangalap ng mga datos.

Maraming Salamat!

Numero ng Telepono (Numero Lamang)

________________________________________________________________

I-type muli ang Numero ng Telepono (Numero Lamang)

________________________________________________________________

Ibahagi ang survey na ito sa iyong mga kakilala at kaibigan!

Mangyaring ibahagi ang survey na ito sa iyong mga kakilala at kaibigan sa pamamagitan ng Facebook, Google, LinkedIn, at Twitter.

Kung hindi gumagana ang mga link sa itaas, mangyaring gamitin ang address na ito: goo.gl/gB5a0T

End of Block: Reward
Những cần trở trong việc tham gia vào các chương trình học tiếng Hàn như ngôn ngữ thứ hai được bảo trợ bởi chính phủ Hàn Quốc

Xin chào!

Công động người Việt là một trong những công động dân cư đang tăng lên rất nhanh ở Hàn Quốc. Hiện nay số người Việt Nam đang cư trú tại Hàn Quốc là 120.000 người và vẫn đang tiếp tục tăng lên. Chúng tôi muốn tìm hiểu thêm về cuộc sống của các bạn ở Hàn Quốc. Sự tham gia của bạn trong khảo sát này sẽ giúp chúng tôi trợ giúp các bạn tốt hơn khi cư trú tại Hàn Quốc và đưa ra nhiều gợi mở cho việc phát triển của chương trình trong tương lai.

Mục đích khảo sát: Nhận tìm hiểu những lý do vì sao người Việt Nam không tham gia vào các chương trình học tiếng Hàn Quốc do chính phủ Hàn Quốc tài trợ.

Đối tượng tham gia: Người Việt Nam trưởng thành đang sinh sống tại Hàn Quốc và CHUA TỪNG tham gia vào bất cứ chương trình tiếng Hàn Quốc nào trong vòng 6 tháng gần đây hoặc CHUA hoàn thành chương trình này trước đây.

Thời gian: 2016. 1. 28 – 2016. 2. 17

Người thực hiện nghiên cứu: Jihyun Kim, Nghiên cứu sinh cấp cao
Diễn thoại: +1 (706)-202-9160 | E-mail: jhkim235@uga.edu.
(Được sự hướng dẫn của TS. Thomas Valentine, Giáo sư thuộc Khoa Giáo dục, Chinh sách và Hành chính Suốt đời, Đại học Georgia.
Diễn thoại: +1 (706)-542-4017 | E-mail: tvnj@uga.edu.)

VIỆC THAM GIA CỦA BẠN VÀO NGHIÊN CỨU NÀY LÀ TỰ NGUYÊN. Để tham gia, bạn sẽ phải thực hiện việc trả lời cho một bảng khảo sát trên mạng. Bạn có thể ngừng tham gia bất kỳ lúc nào mà không phải chịu hình phạt hay mất mặt gì cho quyết định này. Nếu bạn quyết định dừng hoạt động hoặc rút khỏi nghiên cứu, những thông tin/dữ liệu thu thập được từ việc bạn rút lui sẽ được lưu lại như một phần của công trình nghiên cứu và có thể được sử dụng để tiếp tục phân tích. Thời gian dự kiến để hoàn thành bằng khảo sát là 15 phút.

MÔI THÔNG TIN THU THẤP ĐƯỢC TRONG NGHIÊN CỨU NÀY LÀ BÍ MẬT. Chỉ

Phiếu quà tặng điện từ trị giá 3000 Won sẽ được gửi tặng cho 200 người tham gia đầu tiên nếu bạn điện thoại di động của mình ở phần cuối của khảo sát. Phiếu quà tặng có thể sử dụng ở bất cứ cửa hàng tiện ích, trung tâm mua sắm online hoặc các hiệu sách v.v

Bạn sẽ không gặp bất kỳ nguy hiểm hay bất tiện nào khi tham gia vào nghiên cứu này. Công trình nghiên cứu này liên quan đến việc truyền tải dữ liệu qua mạng Internet. Chúng tôi cố gắng hết sức để đảm bảo cho việc sử dụng một cách hiệu quả những kỹ thuật có sẵn; tuy nhiên, tình bị mất trong quá trình trao đổi trực tuyến không thể được đảm bảo tuyệt đối.

Nếu có bất kỳ thắc mắc gì liên quan đến dự án nghiên cứu, xin vui lòng liên lạc với người nghiên cứu. Những câu hỏi hay quan tâm về quyền lợi của bạn trong quá trình tham gia nghiên cứu sẽ được gởi trực tiếp đến Chủ tịch Hội đồng Xét duyệt Định chế, trường Đại học Georgia, 609 Boyd GSRC, Athens, Georgia 30602, USA; SĐT: +1 (706) 542-3199; Email: irb@uga.edu.

Nhập chuột vào “Tiếp tục” tức là bạn đồng ý tham gia vào dự án nghiên cứu được đề cập ở trên.
Chân thành cảm ơn sự tham gia của bạn!
Start of Block: Phần I. Bảng câu hỏi khảo sát

Q1. Bạn đã trên 18 tuổi chưa?
   - Có
   - Không

Q2. Bạn có phải là người Việt Nam không?
   - Có
   - Không

Q3. Bạn đã sống ở Hàn Quốc hơn 03 tháng phải không?
   - Có
   - Không

Q4. Bạn đã bao giờ tham gia bất cứ chương trình tiếng Hàn nào được bảo trợ bởi chính phủ Hàn Quốc trong 6 tháng gần đây chưa (Các lớp học tiếng Hàn được tổ chức ở các trung tâm hỗ trợ gia đình đa văn hóa và KIIP là chương trình được chính phủ bảo trợ)?
   - Có
   - Không

Q5. Bạn đã bao giờ được nhận chứng chỉ hoàn thành chương trình hòa nhập và nhập cư Hàn Quốc (KIIP, Level 6) hay tương đương chưa?
   - Có
   - Không

End of Block: Phần I. Bảng câu hỏi khảo sát
Cảm ơn sự quan tâm của bạn với cuộc khảo sát!
Xin chân thành xin lỗi! Cuộc khảo sát này được thiết kế dành riêng cho người Việt Nam trưởng thành hoặc người Việt Nam đã sống tại Hàn Quốc trên 3 tháng, chưa từng tham gia bạt ki lôp học tiếng Hàn nào trong vòng 6 tháng gần đây và chưa nhận bất cứ chứng chỉ hòa nhập và nhập cư Hàn Quốc hay tương đương trước đó.

Nếu biết người Việt Nam hoặc người Việt Nam nào phù hợp với những tiêu chí trên, xin hãy chia sẻ nghiên cứu này với bạn của bạn thông qua Facebook, Twitter, Google, thư điện tử email hoặc qua tin nhắn. Đường link được cung cấp dưới đây. Nếu các đường link ở trên không hoạt động, xin hãy sử dụng địa chỉ sau:

Nếu liên kết ở trên không hiệu quả, vui lòng sử dụng địa chỉ này: goo.gl/q0Uucc

End of Block: Thông báo không đạt yêu cầu
Bạn sẽ thấy dưới đây một danh mục những lý do giải thích nguyên nhân vì sao những người nhập cư trưởng thành không tham gia vào các lớp học tiếng Hàn. Xin hãy đọc từng nội dung và chỉ ra mức độ mà mỗi lý do gây ảnh hưởng đến quyết định của bạn KHÔNG tham gia vào tất cả các học tiếng Hàn như ngôn ngữ thứ hai được bảo trợ bởi chính phủ Hàn Quốc.

1 = Hoàn toàn không
2 = Một chút
3 = Phân nào đó
4 = Rất lớn
5 = Vô cùng lớn
(Nếu có bất cứ nội dung nào tổng bảng khảo sát không phù hợp với hoàn cảnh của bạn. Xin hãy chọn 1 = Hoàn toàn không.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Số thứ tự</th>
<th>Mức độ ảnh hưởng</th>
<th>Hoàn toàn không</th>
<th>Một chút</th>
<th>Phân nào đó</th>
<th>Rất lớn</th>
<th>Vô cùng lớn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Các lớp học được tổ chức vào những thời gian không phù hợp với thời gian của tôi.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Tôi không thích học tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Tôi rất lo lắng khi làm các bài kiểm tra.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Tôi cảm thấy tôi đã quá lớn tuổi để học tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Tôi không tin rằng học cho phép tôi được tham gia lớp học với tình trạng pháp lý về nhập cư của mình.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Tôi đã nghỉ rạng nhóm có thể để hòa nhập và kết bạn với những bạn học khác trong lớp.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Tôi không tự tin với khả năng tiếp thu của tôi.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Tôi không đại thơ nỗi chi phí cho các lớp học tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Tôi không có đủ thời gian rảnh để tham gia các lớp học tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hoàn toàn không</td>
<td>Một chút</td>
<td>Phân nào đó</td>
<td>Rất lớn</td>
<td>Vô cùng lớn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Tôi cảm thấy có lỗi khi phải rời khỏi nhà để đến học các lớp tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tôi có quá nhiều việc nhà phải làm nên không thể tham gia các lớp tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Tôi phải chăm sóc con cái. (Lưu ý: Nếu bạn không có con, chọn mục “1”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Tôi đã sợ khi phải một mình đi phương tiện công cộng để đến các lớp học tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Các lớp dạy tiếng Hàn được tổ chức ở những điểm rất xa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Phương tiện giao thông đi đến các lớp tiếng Hàn khá bất tiện.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Gia đình tôi không thích việc tôi tham gia các lớp tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Tôi đã cố gắng thử đi học, nhưng các lớp thường đù đủ người học hoặc tôi chậm mất thời gian đăng ký.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Tôi đã không biết là có các lớp dạy tiếng Hàn dành cho người nhập cư hoặc người nước ngoài.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Tôi tin rằng phải mất thời gian rất lâu để hoàn thành chương trình.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Tôi không nghĩ rằng tôi có thể tham gia các lớp tiếng Hàn thường xuyên.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Tôi thích học tiếng Hàn theo cách của tôi hơn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Tôi không thích việc học.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Tôi không có bạn nào có thể cùng tham gia lớp tiếng Hàn với tôi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hoàn toàn không</td>
<td>Một chút</td>
<td>Phần nào đó</td>
<td>Rất lớn</td>
<td>Vô cùng lớn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Tôi sợ phải đi đến compose.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Tôi ngại nói các lớp tiếng Hàn đẩy không được tốt làm.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Từ những kinh nghiệm trước đó với các lớp học tiếng Hàn, tôi thấy các lớp học không được như tôi kì vọng (Lưu ý: Nếu bạn chưa từng đến các lớp tiếng Hàn trước đây, hãy chọn “1”)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Tôi có vấn đề sức khỏe hoặc bị tan tát nên tôi không có thể tham gia các lớp tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Tôi có những vấn đề gia đình khiến tôi không có thể tham gia các lớp tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Tôi quá mệt mỏi để tham gia vào các lớp tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Tôi không muốn phải ngồi trong một phòng học cùng nhau để học tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Những khó khăn và lợi ích để hoàn thành chương trình học tiếng Hàn do chính phủ tài trợ là không quan trọng với tôi.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Việc tham gia các lớp học tiếng Hàn không chắc có thể cải thiện được cuộc sống của tôi tại Hàn Quốc.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Quá khó để thông thạo được tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Tôi sợ khi phải bắt đầu học cái gì mới mẻ.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Quá trình đăng ký rất khó khăn.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Tiếng Hàn của tôi vừa đủ để sử dụng.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Tôi không cần phải biết tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoàn toàn không</th>
<th>Một chút</th>
<th>Phận nào đó</th>
<th>Rất lớn</th>
<th>Vô cùng lớn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Nếu có bất kì lý do nào khác mà không được liệt kê ở trên, xin hãy diễn chi tiết vào ô dưới đây.

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

End of Block: Phần II. Mức độ trở ngại
Xin vui lòng cho chúng tôi biết về kỹ năng **tiếng Hàn** của bạn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hoàn toàn không</th>
<th>Không tốt</th>
<th>Bình thường</th>
<th>Tốt</th>
<th>Rất tốt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Bạn <strong>nói</strong> tiếng Hàn tốt ở mức nào?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Bạn <strong>hiểu</strong> tiếng Hàn tốt ở mức nào?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Bạn <strong>đọc</strong> tiếng Hàn tốt ở mức nào?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Bạn <strong>viết</strong> tiếng Hàn tốt ở mức nào?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Xin vui lòng cho chúng tôi biết về kỹ năng **tiếng Anh** của bạn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hoàn toàn không</th>
<th>Không tốt</th>
<th>Bình thường</th>
<th>Tốt</th>
<th>Rất tốt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Bạn <strong>nói</strong> tiếng Anh tốt ở mức nào?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. Bạn <strong>hiểu</strong> tiếng Anh tốt ở mức nào?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Bạn <strong>đọc</strong> tiếng Anh tốt ở mức nào?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. Bạn <strong>viết</strong> tiếng Anh tốt ở mức nào?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phần IV. Thống kê dân số

Q1. Năm sinh của bạn?
Năm

▼ 1997 ... 1930

Q2. Giới tính của bạn?

☐ Nam
☐ Nữ

Q3. Trình độ học vấn cao nhất của bạn là gì?

☐ Tiểu học
☐ Trung học cơ sở
☐ Trung học phổ thông
☐ Cao đẳng
☐ Đại học chính quy
☐ Thạc sĩ hoặc cao hơn

Q4. Mục đích ban đầu của bạn khi tới Hàn Quốc là gì?

☐ Kết hôn với người Hàn Quốc
☐ Lao động hoặc làm việc tại Hàn Quốc
☐ Du lịch Hàn Quốc
☐ Du học
☐ Sinh sống cùng với chồng (không phải người Hàn Quốc) hoặc gia đình
☐ Lý do khác ____________________________________________________

Q5. Bạn đến Hàn Quốc năm nào?
Năm

▼ 2015 ... Before 1985
Q6. Bạn ki vong sống tại Hàn Quốc trong bao lâu?

- Đưới 1 năm
- 1 đến 2 năm
- 3 đến 5 năm
- 5 đến 10 năm
- 10 đến 20 năm
- Tôi không có ý định rời Hàn Quốc
- Lý do khác (Xin ghi chi tiết lý do ở dưới đây)

Q7. Tổng thu nhập bình quân hộ gia đình HÀNG THÁNG của bạn là bao nhiêu? (Nếu bạn không chắc chắn về câu trả lời, xin hãy dùng con số ước tính gần đúng nhất.)

- Thấp hơn 1.000.000 won
- 1,000,000 – 1,999,999 won
- 2,000,000 – 2,999,999 won
- 3,000,000 – 3,999,999 won
- 4,000,000 – 4,999,999 won
- 5,000,000 – 5,999,999 won
- 6,000,000 – 6,999,999 won
- 7,000,000 – 7,999,999 won
- 8,000,000 – 8,999,999 won
- 9,000,000 – 9,999,999 won
- 10.000.000 won và cao hơn
Q8. Câu trả lời nào dưới đây thể hiện rõ nhất tình trạng việc làm của bạn?

- Có việc làm
- Ở nhà/Nơi trở
- Sinh viên
- Thất nghiệp và đang tìm việc làm
- Không thể làm việc vì lý do sức khỏe
- Không thể làm việc vì vân đề liên quan đến tình trạng pháp lý
- Khác

Q8-1. Bạn ra ngoài đi làm bao nhiêu giờ một TUẦN?

________________________________________________________________

Q9. Có bao nhiêu người đang sống chung với bạn (không kể bạn thân)?

Số người

▼ 0 ... 20

Q9-1. Có bao nhiêu trong số họ là trẻ em dưới 18 tuổi (bao gồm cả con riêng của chồng(vợ) của bạn)?

Số trẻ em

▼ 0 ... 20

Q9-2. Có bao nhiêu trong số đó là người Hán bản địa trưởng thành?

Số người

▼ 0 ... 20
Q10. Tình trạng hôn nhân của bạn?
- Độc thân, chưa kết hôn
- Đã kết hôn/ Sống chung
- Ly hôn
- Ly thân
- Góa (chồng, vợ)

Q10-1-1. Bạn đối/dối tác của bạn thuộc dân tộc nào?
- Việt Nam
- Hàn Quốc
- Khác

Q10-1-2. Bạn đối/dối tác của bạn có sống ở Hàn Quốc không?
- Có
- Không

Q10-2. Người bạn đối trước đây của bạn thuộc dân tộc nào?
- Việt Nam
- Hàn Quốc
- Khác

Q11. Về cơ bản, bạn có phải chịu trách nhiệm về tài chính đối với gia đình bạn ở Việt Nam không?
- Có
- Không
Q11. Bạn hỗ trợ tài chính cho ai? (Chọn TẤT CẢ đáp án đúng với bạn)

☐ Bạn đời của tôi
☐ Con cái của tôi
☐ Cha mẹ của tôi
☐ Cha mẹ chồng của tôi
☐ Anh chị em cùng tôi và/hoặc gia đình của họ
☐ Khác (Vui lòng ghi cụ thể.)

______________________________

Q12. Trong đời sống hàng ngày, tần suất giao tiếp với người nói tiếng Hàn của bạn ở mức độ nào?

☐ Hàng ngày
☐ Gần như hàng ngày
☐ 3-4 lần một tuần
☐ 1-2 lần mỗi tuần
☐ 1-3 lần một tháng
☐ Ít hơn 10 lần một năm
☐ Không bao giờ giao tiếp

Q13. Bạn có thích được sống ở Hàn Quốc không?

☐ Hoàn toàn không
☐ Một chút
☐ Phân nào đó
☐ Rất thích
☐ Vô cùng thích
Q14. Trải nghiệm với người Hàn Quốc khi bạn sống ở Hàn Quốc nói chung là như thế nào?

- Rất tốt
- Tốt
- Bình thường
- Tờ
- Rất tốt

Q15. Bạn sống ở đâu tại Hàn Quốc?
Metropolitan/Province
Si/Gun/Gu

▼ Seoul/서울특별시 ... Jeju/제주도 ~ Seogwipo-si/서귀포시

Q16. Bạn có điều gì khác muốn chia sẻ với người nghiên cứu hay không?

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

End of Block: Phân IV. Thống kê dân số
Bảng khảo sát đã hoàn thành!
Đây là phần thưởng dành cho bạn!

Xin chân thành cảm ơn sự tham gia của bạn! Sự tham gia của bạn sẽ giúp chúng tôi cải thiện phần nào những hiệu biết về người Việt Nam nhập cư vào Hàn Quốc.

Nếu bạn muốn nhận ₩3,000 phiếu quà tặng điện tử, xin vui lòng để lại số điện thoại di động của bạn ở khung dưới đây. Phiếu quà tặng có thể sử dụng ở bất kỳ cửa hàng tiện ích, khu mua sắm trực tuyến, hiệu sách... nào. Vui lòng lưu ý rằng phiếu quà tặng chỉ được dành cho 200 người tham gia ĐÁU TIỆN.

Thẻ quà tặng sẽ được gửi thông qua tin nhắn vào ngày 17 tháng 2 năm 2016 sau khi kiểm tra hợp lệ và không trùng lập số điện thoại.

Số điện thoại của bạn sẽ không bao giờ được sử dụng vào bất kỳ mục đích nào khác ngoài gửi thẻ quà tặng điện tử và sẽ được hủy 1 tháng sau khi hoàn thành thu thập số liệu.

Xin cảm ơn!

Số điện thoại di động (Chi ghi số)

Nhập lại số điện thoại di động (Chi ghi số)

Hãy chia sẻ khảo sát này với các bạn của bạn!
Xin hãy chia sẻ bảng khảo sát này với bạn của bạn qua Facebook, Twitter, LikedIn, và Google.

Nếu liên kết ở trên không hiệu quả, vui lòng sử dụng địa chỉ này: goo.gl/q0Uucc

End of Block: Reward
APPENDIX E

COMPARISON CHART OF THE TRANSLATION AND BACK-TRANSLATION

a. FILIPINO-TAGALOG

b. VIETNAMESE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Original English version</th>
<th>Tagalog</th>
<th>Back-translation 1</th>
<th>Back-translation 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The classes were held at times I could not go.</td>
<td>Ang mga klase ay ginaapas oras kung kailan hindi ako makakadalo.</td>
<td>The classes are held whenever I cannot attend.</td>
<td>The classes are held whenever I am not available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I was too worried about taking tests.</td>
<td>Ako ay masyadong nag-alala sa pagkuha ng pagsusulit.</td>
<td>I am very concerned taking the Korean language exam.</td>
<td>I am very much concerned about taking the exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I feel I am too old to learn Korean.</td>
<td>Pakiramdam ko, ako ay masyado nang maedad upang mag-arl pa ng wikang Korean.</td>
<td>I feel, I was too elderly to study the Korean language.</td>
<td>I feel too old to study Korean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I do not believe they allowed me to take the class. (Tagalog: I believe I am not entitled to attend the KIIP courses because of my status)</td>
<td>Naniniwala akong hindi ako karapat-dapat dumalo dahil sa aking status.</td>
<td>Maybe, my employer will not allow that I would study the Korean language.</td>
<td>My employer might not allow me to study Korean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I thought it would be hard to get along with the other students in the class.</td>
<td>Inisip kong magiging mahirap ang aking pakikisalamuha sa ibang mga mag-arl sa klase.</td>
<td>I think it would be hard to socializing with other students in the class.</td>
<td>I think it would be hard for me to socialize with other students in the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Original English version</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>Back-translation 1</td>
<td>Back-translation 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I am not confident in my learning ability.</td>
<td>Wala akong tiwala sa aking kakayanan na mag-aral.</td>
<td>I have no confidence in my ability to learn the Korean language.</td>
<td>I do not have confidence in my ability to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I do not have enough free time to attend the Korean classes.</td>
<td>Wala akong sapat na bakante or libreng oras upang dumalo sa pag-aaral ng wikang Korean.</td>
<td>I do not have enough time to attend the Korean language class.</td>
<td>I do not have enough time to attend the Korean class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I tend to feel guilty when I have to leave home to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td>Nakokonsensya ako kapag ako ay umaalis ng bahay upang dumalo sa pag-aaral ng wikang Korean.</td>
<td>I felt guilty leaving in the house just to attend the Korean language class.</td>
<td>I feel guilty leaving the house to attend the Korean class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I have too many household responsibilities to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td>Masyadong marami ang aking mga responsibilidad sa tahanan upang dumalo pa ng pag-aaral ng wikang Korean.</td>
<td>I have many responsibilities at home to attend and learn the Korean language course.</td>
<td>I have too many responsibilities at home to attend the Korean class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I had to take care of my child(ren). (Note: If you do not have a child, select “1”.)</td>
<td>Kinailangangan kong alagaan ang aking (mga) anak. (Panuto: Kung walang anak, piliin ang “1”.)</td>
<td>I have to take care of my children (Note: If you do not have children, select &quot;1&quot;).</td>
<td>I had to take care of my child (ren). (Direction: If you do not have children, select &quot;1.&quot; )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I was afraid to take public transportsations alone to attend the Korean classes.</td>
<td>Natakot akong bumiyahe mag-isa sa mga pampublikong sasakyan upang dumalo sa pag-aaral ng wikang Korean.</td>
<td>I am afraid to travel alone to attend and study Korean language class.</td>
<td>I am afraid to travel alone to attend the Korean class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Original English version</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>Back-translation 1</td>
<td>Back-translation 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I do not like <strong>going outside</strong> due to native Koreans’ disrespectful attitudes toward me.</td>
<td>Hindi ko nais lumabas dahil sa hindi magalang na pag-uugali ng mga Koreans tungo sa akin.</td>
<td>I do not want to <strong>leave the house</strong> because I was not respected by the Koreans people.</td>
<td>I do not want to <strong>leave the house</strong> because Koreans don’t respect me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The Korean classes were held in a location too far away.</td>
<td>Napakalayo ng lugar kung saan ginaganap ang pag-aaral ng wikang Korean.</td>
<td>The Korean language learning center is too far from my place.</td>
<td>The place where the Korean classes are held is too far.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Available transportation to the Korean classes was inconvenient.</td>
<td>Ang magagamit na transportasyon patungo kung saan ginaganap ang pag-aaral ng Korean ay hindi kanais-nais.</td>
<td>I have difficult travel towards the place where the Korean language class located.</td>
<td>The place where the Korean classes are held is not accessible. (Transportation is difficult.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>My family did not like the idea of my attending Korean classes.</td>
<td>Hindi gusto ng aking pamilya na ako ay mag-aral ng wikang Korean.</td>
<td>My family cannot afford to pay if will study the Korean language.</td>
<td>It’s not okay with my family that I am learning Korean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I tried to start classes but they were already full or I missed the registration period.</td>
<td>Sinubukan kong simulan ang klase ngunit ang bilang ng mag-aaral ay kumpleto na o ako ay hindi na umabot sa panahon ng registration.</td>
<td>I tried to enroll the Korean language class but the number of students completely done Likewise, I would not be able to reach the time of registration.</td>
<td>I tried to start the class but the number of students was already completed or I missed the registration period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I did not know that there were Korean classes available for immigrants.</td>
<td>Hindi ko alam na may mga pag-aaral na ginaganap para sa mga imigranteng nais matuto ng wikang Korean.</td>
<td>I did not know that there’s free studies conducted for immigrants to learn the Korean language.</td>
<td>I did not know that there are Korean language courses/classes offered for immigrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Original English version</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>Back-translation 1</td>
<td>Back-translation 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I believe it would take too long time to complete the program.</td>
<td>Sa aking palagay masyadong mahaba ang oras upang makumpleto ang programa.</td>
<td>I think, it’s very long time to complete the program.</td>
<td>I think it takes a very long time to complete the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I did not think I could attend Korean classes regularly.</td>
<td>Hindi ko inisip na kaya kong dumalo ng regular ng pag-aaral ng Korean.</td>
<td>I think I cannot attend regular class to study the Korean language.</td>
<td>I think I cannot afford to attend the class regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I prefer to learn Korean in my own way.</td>
<td>Mas nais kong matuto ng wikang Korean sa aking sariling paraan.</td>
<td>I prefer to learn the Korean language in my own way.</td>
<td>I prefer to study Korean by myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I do not enjoy studying.</td>
<td>Hindi ako nasisiyahan na mag-aral.</td>
<td>I am not glad to learn Korean language.</td>
<td>I do not enjoy studying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I had no friends who could attend Korean classes with me.</td>
<td>Wala akong mga kaibigan na maaaring makasama sa pagdalo ng pag-aaral ng wikang Korean.</td>
<td>I have no friends attended the Korean language class.</td>
<td>I do not have friends who can attend the class with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I was afraid to go to an unfamiliar place.</td>
<td>Ako ay natakot na pumunta sa isang lugar na hindi ako pamiliyar.</td>
<td>I'm afraid to go to a place which is not familiar to me.</td>
<td>I am afraid to go to places I am not familiar with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I heard that the Korean classes were not very good.</td>
<td>Nalaman ko na ang mga pag-aaral ng wikang Korean ay hindi masyadong mabuti.</td>
<td>I had learned that studying Korean language is not good.</td>
<td>I found out that learning Korean is not very good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Original English version</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>Back-translation 1</td>
<td>Back-translation 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>My previous experiences with Korean classes were <strong>disappointing</strong>. (Note: If you have no previous experience with Korean classes, please select “1”.)</td>
<td>Sa aking karanasan noong nakaraan, ang pag-aaral ng wikang Korean ay nakakapanlumo. (Panuto: Kung ikaw ay walang mga nakaraang karanasan sa pag-aaral ng wikang Korean, piliin ang “1”.)</td>
<td>In my previous experiences, studying the Korean language is <strong>stressful</strong>. (Directions: If you have no previous experience in learning the Korean language, select &quot;1&quot;).</td>
<td>Based on my past experiences, studying Korean is <strong>stressful</strong>. (Direction: If you have no previous experience in learning Korean, select &quot;1&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I have a personal health problem or disability that made me difficult to attend the Korean classes.</td>
<td>Ako ay may problema sa kalusugan o kapansanan kung kaya mahirap para sa akin ang dumalo sa mga pag-aaral ng wikang Korean.</td>
<td>I have health problems or disabilities, that’s why it’s hard for me to attend the Korean language class.</td>
<td>I have health problems or disabilities so it’s hard for me to attend the Korean class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I <strong>had</strong> family problems that made it difficult to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td>Ako ay nagkaproblema sa aking pamilya kung kaya naging mahirap para sa akin ang dumalo sa mga pag-aaral ng wikang Korean.</td>
<td>I <strong>have</strong> problems with my family, so it’s difficult for me to attend the Korean language course.</td>
<td>I <strong>got</strong> some family issues so it became difficult for me to attend the Korean class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I <strong>am</strong> too tired to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td>Ako ay masyadong pagod na upang dumalo ng pag-aaral ng wikang Korean.</td>
<td>I <strong>was</strong> too tired to attend the Korean language class.</td>
<td>I <strong>am</strong> too tired to attend the Korean class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I <strong>did not</strong> want to sit in a formal classroom to learn Korean.</td>
<td>Hindi ko nais na umupo sa isang pormal na silid-aralan upang matuto ng wikang Korean.</td>
<td>I <strong>do not</strong> want to sit down in a formal classroom to learn the Korean language.</td>
<td>I <strong>do not</strong> want to sit in a formal classroom to learn Korean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Original English version</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>Back-translation 1</td>
<td>Back-translation 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>The incentives for completing KIIP is not important to me.</td>
<td>Ang mga insentibo para sa pagkumpleto ng KIIP ay hindi mahalaga sa akin.</td>
<td>The incentive for completing KIIP does not important to me.</td>
<td>The incentives for completing KIIP does not matter to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>The Korean language is too difficult to master.</td>
<td>Mahirap i-master ang wikang Korean.</td>
<td>The Korean language is too difficult to learn.</td>
<td>Korean is too difficult to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I am afraid to begin learning something new.</td>
<td>Natatakot akong magsimula na mag-aral ng isang bagong bagay.</td>
<td>I'm afraid to learn something new.</td>
<td>I am afraid to start learning something new.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>The registration process was difficult.</td>
<td>Ang proseso ng rehistrasyon ay mahirap.</td>
<td>The registration process is very difficult.</td>
<td>The registration process is very difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>My Korean is already good enough.</td>
<td>Sapat na ang aking abilidad sa wikang Korean.</td>
<td>I have enough ability to speak Korean language.</td>
<td>My Korean ability is enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I do not need to know Korean.</td>
<td>Hindi ko na kailangan pang alamin ang wikang Korean.</td>
<td>I don’t need to study the Korean language.</td>
<td>I do not need to study Korean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>The program content probably would not be relevant to my needs.</td>
<td>Ang nilalaman ng programa ay hindi kauugnay sa aking mga pangangailangan.</td>
<td>The content of the program is not relevant with my needs.</td>
<td>The content of the program is irrelevant to my needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Translation Comparison: Vietnamese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original English version</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Back-translation 1</th>
<th>Back-translation 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 The classes <strong>were</strong> held at times I could not go.</td>
<td>Các lớp học được tổ chức vào những thời gian không phù hợp với thời gian của tôi</td>
<td>The classes <strong>were</strong> opened at time I could not go.</td>
<td>The class schedule <strong>is</strong> not suitable for me to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I <strong>am not interested</strong> in learning Korean.</td>
<td>Tôi <strong>không thích</strong> học tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>I don’t <strong>like</strong> to learn Korean.</td>
<td>I do not <strong>like</strong> studying Korean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I was too worried about taking tests.</td>
<td>Tôi rất lo lắng khi làm các bài kiểm tra.</td>
<td>I am <strong>nervous</strong> before taking Korean exam.</td>
<td>I am <strong>anxious</strong> when doing tests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I feel I am too old to learn Korean.</td>
<td>Tôi cảm thấy tôi đã quá lớn tuổi để học tiếng Hàn</td>
<td>I feel like I am too old to learn Korean.</td>
<td>I feel I am too old to study Korean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I do not believe they allowed me to take the class because of my legal status.</td>
<td>Tôi <strong>không tin rằng</strong> họ cho phép tôi được tham gia lớp học với tình trạng pháp lý về nhập cư của mình</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I thought it would be hard to <strong>get along</strong> with the other students in the class.</td>
<td>Tôi nghĩ sẽ khó để <strong>kiêng</strong> những bạn học khác trong lớp.</td>
<td>I think it will be difficult for me to catch up with other students in class.</td>
<td>I think it will be difficult to catch up with others students in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I am not confident in my learning ability.</td>
<td>Tôi <strong>không tự tin</strong> với khả năng tiếp thu của tôi.</td>
<td>I am not confident in my learning ability.</td>
<td>I am not confident with my ability to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I <strong>could not afford</strong> expenses for Korean classes.</td>
<td>Tình hình tài chính không cho phép tôi chi trả cho các lớp tiếng Hàn</td>
<td>I do not <strong>have</strong> the financial ability for Korean class.</td>
<td>I cannot afford <strong>tuition fees</strong> for Korean classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original English version</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Back-translation 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I do not have <strong>enough free time</strong> to attend the Korean classes.</td>
<td>Tôi không có đủ thời gian rảnh rồi để tham gia các lớp học tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>I do not have enough time to join Korean class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I <strong>tend to feel</strong> guilty when I have to leave home to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td>Tôi cảm thấy có lỗi khi phải rời khỏi nhà để tham gia các lớp tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>I <strong>feel</strong> guilty for leaving the house to go to Korean class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I have too many household responsibilities to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td>Tôi có quá nhiều việc nhà phải làm nên không thể tham gia các lớp tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>I have too much housework so I cannot join Korean classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I <strong>had</strong> to take care of my child(ren). (Note: If you do not have a child, select “1”.)</td>
<td>Tôi phải chăm sóc con cái. (Lưu ý: Nếu bạn không có con, hãy chọn “1”.)</td>
<td>I <strong>have</strong> to take care of my children. (Note: If you do not have <strong>children</strong>, “1”.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I <strong>was</strong> afraid to take public transportation <strong>alone</strong> to attend the Korean classes.</td>
<td>Tôi rất sợ khi phải sử dụng phương tiện giao thông công cộng để đến các lớp tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>I <strong>have</strong> to use public transportation to go to Korean class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I do not like going outside due to native Koreans’ disrespectful attitudes toward me.</td>
<td>Tôi không thích đi ra ngoài do thái độ không tôn trọng của người Hàn danh cho mình.</td>
<td>I don’t like to go out because of the Korean disrespecting attitude toward me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The Korean classes <strong>were held</strong> in a location too far away.</td>
<td>Các lớp dạy tiếng Hàn được tổ chức ở những địa điểm quá xa.</td>
<td>The Korean class location is really far way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original English version</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Back-translation 1</td>
<td>Back-translation 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available transportation to the Korean classes was inconvenient.</td>
<td>Phương tiện giao thông không tiện để đến các lớp tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>Transportation to Korean class is very inconvenient</td>
<td>Public transportation to go to Korean classes is inconvenience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family did not like the idea of my attending Korean classes.</td>
<td>Gia đình tôi không thích việc tôi tham gia các lớp tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>My family do not like me to join the Korean class</td>
<td>My family don’t like me to go to Korean classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tried to start classes but they were already full or I missed the registration period.</td>
<td>Tôi đã cố gắng thử đi học, nhưng các lớp thường đã đủ người hoặc tôi chầm матч thời gian đăng ký.</td>
<td>I tried to go to classes, but they are usually full or I miss the registration deadline.</td>
<td>I tried to go to classes but these classes often already have enough students or I missed the registration deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not know that there were Korean classes available for immigrants/foreigners.</td>
<td>Tôi đã không biết là có các lớp dạy tiếng Hàn dành cho người nhập cư.</td>
<td>I don’t know there are Korean classes for Immigrants</td>
<td>I don’t know that there are Korean classes for immigrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe it would take too long time to complete the program.</td>
<td>Tôi tin rằng phải mất thời gian rất lâu để hoàn thành chương trình.</td>
<td>I believe it is going to take a long time to finish the program.</td>
<td>I believe that it takes long time to complete the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not think I could attend Korean classes regularly.</td>
<td>Tôi không nghĩ rằng tôi có thể tham gia các lớp tiếng Hàn thường xuyên.</td>
<td>I don’t think I can go to class often.</td>
<td>I don’t think that I can participate in Korean classes regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to learn Korean in my own way.</td>
<td>Tôi thích tự học tiếng Hàn theo cách của mình hon.</td>
<td>I like to learn Korean in my own way.</td>
<td>I prefer studying Korean by my own ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not enjoy studying.</td>
<td>Tôi không hưởng thú với việc học.</td>
<td>I don’t like to study.</td>
<td>I don’t like studying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original English version</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Back-translation 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I had no friends who could attend Korean classes with me.</td>
<td>Tôi không có bạn nào có thể cùng tham gia lớp tiếng Hàn với tôi.</td>
<td>I don’t have any friends to go to Korean class together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I was afraid to go to an unfamiliar place.</td>
<td>Tôi sợ phải đi đến chỗ lạ.</td>
<td>I am afraid to go to strange place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I heard that the Korean classes were not very good.</td>
<td>Tôi nghe nói các lớp tiếng Hàn không tốt lắm.</td>
<td>My Korean speaking and listening skill are limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My previous experiences with Korean classes did not meet my expectation. (Note: If you have no previous experience with Korean classes, please select “1”.)</td>
<td>Từ những kinh nghiệm trước đó với các lớp học tiếng Hàn, tôi thấy các lớp học không được như tôi kì vọng (Lưu ý: Nếu bạn chưa từng đến các lớp tiếng Hàn trước đây, hãy chọn “1”).</td>
<td>My prior experience with Korean class is disappointing. (Note: if you have not taken any Korean class choose “1”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I have a personal health problem or disability that made me difficult to attend the Korean classes.</td>
<td>Những vấn đề về sức khỏe hoặc khuyết tật gây khó khăn cho tôi khi tham gia vào các lớp học tiếng Hàn</td>
<td>I have health problems or disability so I cannot join Korean class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I had family problems that made it difficult to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td>Tôi có những vấn đề gia đình khiến tôi khó có thể tham gia các lớp tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>I have family problems that make it difficult for me to join Korean class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original English version</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Back-translation 1</td>
<td>Back-translation 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 I am too tired to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td>Tôi quá mệt mới để tham gia vào các lớp tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>I am too tired to join Korean class.</td>
<td>I’m too tired to participate in Korean classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 I did not want to sit in a formal classroom to learn Korean.</td>
<td>Tôi không muốn phải ngồi trong một phòng học cứng nhắc để học tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>I don’t want to sit in a boring class to study Korean</td>
<td>I don’t want to sit in a rigid classroom to learn Korean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 The incentives for completing the government-sponsored Korean language program is not important to me.</td>
<td>Những khích lệ và lợi ích để hoàn thành chương trình KIIP không quan trọng với tôi.</td>
<td>The benefit to complete KIIP is not important to me</td>
<td>Encouragements to complete KIIP are not important to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Attending Korean classes would not improve my life in Korea.</td>
<td>Việc tham gia các lớp học tiếng Hàn không cải thiện được cuộc sống của tôi tại Hàn Quốc.</td>
<td>Going to Korean class does not improve my quality of life in Korea</td>
<td>Participate in Korean classes does not improve my life quality in Korea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 The Korean language is too difficult to master.</td>
<td>Rất khó để có thể thông thạo được tiếng Hàn</td>
<td>It is very difficult to be fluent in Korean.</td>
<td>It is too difficult to be fluent in Korean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 I am afraid to begin learning something new.</td>
<td>Tôi sợ khi phải bắt đầu học cái gì mới mẻ.</td>
<td>I am afraid to learn new thing.</td>
<td>I am scared of learning something new.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 The registration process was difficult.</td>
<td>Quá trình đăng ký rất khó khăn.</td>
<td>The registration process is difficult.</td>
<td>The registration process is very difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 My Korean is already good enough.</td>
<td>Tiếng Hàn của tôi vừa đủ để sử dụng.</td>
<td>My Korean is good enough.</td>
<td>My Korean is enough to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 I do not need to know Korean.</td>
<td>Tôi không cần phải biết tiếng Hàn.</td>
<td>I don’t need to know Korean.</td>
<td>I don’t need to know Korean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original English version</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Back-translation 1</td>
<td>Back-translation 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program content probably would not be relevant to my needs.</td>
<td>Những nội dung trong chương trình không liên quan đến nhu cầu của tôi.</td>
<td>These reasons do not related to my specific case.</td>
<td>Program contents are not related to my needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

CORRELATION MATRIX
Correlation Matrix
Item
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

1
-.13
.11
.10
.11
-.12
.02
.15
.40
-.11
.29
.09
-.16
-.03
.07
-.01
.02
-.02
-.02
.05
.17
-.03
.02
.03
-.16
-.03
.14
.00
-.03
.20
.06
.05
.02
-.02
-.02
-.03
.02
-.07
.04

2
1
.42
.36
.26
.32
.30
.19
-.06
.33
.03
.11
.20
.35
.16
.23
.23
.14
.19
.22
.16
.20
.34
.19
.26
.34
.15
.21
.16
.11
.35
.34
.21
.20
.20
.12
.28
.43
.37

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1
.53
.30
.26
.27
.37
.14
.21
.23
.09
.30
.31
.34
.23
.17
.18
.20
.40
.30
.13
.42
.15
.25
.22
.36
.23
.14
.25
.41
.46
.27
.34
.33
.24
.15
.25
.35

1
.34
.40
.28
.26
.15
.32
.23
.09
.16
.30
.28
.27
.25
.24
.21
.25
.25
.15
.41
.21
.29
.40
.34
.40
.21
.24
.46
.53
.31
.28
.45
.27
.27
.45
.38

1
.29
.19
.33
.18
.20
.18
.18
.15
.33
.18
.19
.30
.33
.34
.32
.17
.07
.22
.09
.19
.25
.25
.25
.07
.25
.31
.22
.18
.00
.16
.27
.24
.22
.31

1
.45
.28
.05
.46
.21
.15
.47
.45
.21
.23
.36
.25
.33
.20
.22
.28
.39
.26
.39
.51
.32
.39
.37
.09
.37
.22
.30
.16
.35
.30
.36
.43
.41

1
.22
.02
.30
.14
.14
.27
.31
.24
.20
.27
.17
.25
.21
.27
.15
.29
.32
.18
.36
.26
.20
.21
.10
.36
.30
.32
.22
.31
.29
.30
.32
.41

1
.26
.17
.18
.03
.19
.33
.25
.18
.11
.31
.35
.24
.33
.01
.13
.17
.14
.27
.23
.18
.14
.14
.15
.14
.15
.19
.23
.34
.17
.15
.21

1
-.02
.43
-.06
-.07
.00
.26
.04
-.05
.03
.18
.17
.23
-.04
.05
.07
-.04
.02
.02
.06
-.04
.31
.03
.03
-.01
.01
.05
.13
.10
-.05
-.04

10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36

1
.07
.24
.27
.36
.21
.24
.36
.29
.14
.12
.17
.10
.39
.16
.39
.43
.39
.33
.41
.09
.42
.35
.29
.14
.34
.17
.28
.44
.50

1
.51
.51
.46
.29
.51
.39
.33
.29
.37
.42
.39
.47
.50

1
.14
.10
.08
.23
.21
.14
.20
.24
.28
.32
.09
.16
.23
.14
.12
.12
.19
.20
.35
.12
.16
.15
.13
.23
.25
.15
.02
.19

1
.22
.27
.09
.18
.37
.19
.11
.18
.10
.06
.13
.01
.16
.30
.37
.11
.30
.01
.23
.16
.21
.09
.14
.10
.32
.13
.27

1
.45
.20
.30
.32
.14
.29
.18
.22
.26
.22
.18
.54
.24
.28
.27
.35
.10
.31
.28
.34
.15
.29
.26
.26
.32
.35

1
.33
.34
.35
.28
.30
.28
.28
.21
.34
.15
.39
.43
.40
.34
.34
.08
.38
.32
.39
.13
.30
.28
.30
.35
.43

1
.58
.16
.27
.39
.40
.33
.10
.06
.20
.19
.23
.33
.12
.15
.29
.18
.26
.06
.23
.13
.36
.19
.18
.28

1
.26
.32
.29
.23
.18
.14
.10
.12
.30
.19
.29
.26
.20
.11
.23
.25
.28
.01
.16
.20
.19
.29
.34

1
.40
.37
.21
.19
.21
.36
.15
.26
.46
.37
.54
.40
.20
.43
.31
.32
.09
.37
.31
.31
.43
.44

1
.37
.27
.23
.09
.18
.21
.26
.35
.35
.39
.28
.23
.31
.28
.19
.13
.29
.35
.29
.33
.39

1
.45
.36
.24
.14
.19
.27
.32
.23
.31
.12
.26
.25
.22
.18
.22
.11
.55
.16
.32
.31

1
.57
.27
.31
.25
.21
.32
.41
.10
.17
.29
.33
.26
.16
.39
.15
.40
.15
.16
.32

362

1
.26
.30
.34
.20
.35
.40
.15
.15
.39
.32
.30
.16
.41
.29
.43
.30
.24
.41

1
.30
.22
.24
.26
.15
.09
.08
.33
.36
.23
.22
.18
.19
.25
.28
.25
.20

1
.26
.32
.62
.36
.48
.35
.32
.62
.58
.41
.33
.40
.25
.23
.48
.53

1
.36
.23
.08
.18
.10
.27
.25
.20
.24
.24
.19
.19
.25
.30
.34

1
.25
.15
.37
.26
.17
.42
.29
.29
.21
.33
.35
.39
.39
.40

1
.24
.38
.17
.45
.38
.35
.29
.40
.25
.29
.35
.48

1
.52
.30
.45
.46
.40
.09
.41
.30
.29
.56
.43

1
.10
.30
.33
.35
.14
.40
.21
.33
.41
.38

1
.28
.30
.03
.31
.16
.26
.15
.16
.21

1
.58
.57
.35
.46
.37
.34
.48
.59

1
.47
.38
.48
.32
.23
.51
.47

1
.24
.43
.23
.19
.48
.51

1
.32
.29
.14
.12
.21

37

38

39

1
.32 1
.34 .23 1
.48 .26 .34 1
.44 .34 .41 .55

1


APPENDIX G

COMMUNALITIES AND ROTATED FACTOR SOLUTION
### Communalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The classes were held at times I could not go.</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am not interested in learning Korean.</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I was too worried about taking tests.</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel I am too old to learn Korean.</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I do not believe they allowed me to take the class because of my legal status.</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I thought it would be hard to get along with the other students in the class.</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am not confident in my learning ability.</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I could not afford expenses for Korean classes.</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I do not have enough free time to attend the Korean classes.</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I tend to feel guilty when I have to leave home to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I have too many household responsibilities to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I had to take care of my child(ren). (Note: If you do not have a child, select “1”.)</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I was afraid to take public transportation alone to attend the Korean classes.</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I do not like going outside due to native Koreans’ disrespectful attitudes toward me.</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The Korean classes were held in a location too far away.</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Available transportation to the Korean classes was inconvenient.</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My family did not like the idea of my attending Korean classes.</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I tried to start classes but they were already full or I missed the registration period.</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I did not know that there were Korean classes available for immigrants/foreigners.</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I believe it would take too long time to complete the program.</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I did not think I could attend Korean classes regularly.</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communalities</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I prefer to learn Korean in my own way.</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I do not enjoy studying.</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I had no friends who could attend Korean classes with me.</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I was afraid to go to an unfamiliar place.</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I heard that the Korean classes were not very good.</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. My previous experiences with Korean classes did not meet my expectation. (Note: If you have no previous experience with Korean classes, please select “1”.)</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I have a personal health problem or disability that made me difficult to attend the Korean classes.</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I had family problems that made it difficult to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I am too tired to attend Korean classes.</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I did not want to sit in a formal classroom to learn Korean.</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The incentives for completing the government-sponsored Korean language program is not important to me.</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Attending Korean classes would not improve my life in Korea.</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The Korean language is too difficult to master.</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I am afraid to begin learning something new.</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The registration process was difficult.</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. My Korean is already good enough.</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I do not need to know Korean.</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. The program content probably would not be relevant to my needs.</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotated Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DPS1</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS2</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS3</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS4</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS5</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS6</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS7</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS8</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS9</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS10</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS13</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS14</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS15</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS17</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS18</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS20</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS21</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS22</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS23</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS24</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS25</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS26</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS27</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS28</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS29</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS30</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS31</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS32</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS33</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS34</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS35</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS36</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS37</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS38</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS39</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 16 iterations.
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IRB APPROVAL LETTER: THE INTERVIEW STUDY
January 21, 2014

Dear Thomas Valentine:

On 1/21/2014, the IRB reviewed the following submission:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Review:</th>
<th>Initial Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title of Study:</td>
<td>Marriage-Immigrant Women’s Acculturation and Learning Experiences in South Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator:</td>
<td>Thomas Valentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB ID:</td>
<td>STUDY00000552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant ID:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IRB approved the protocol from 1/21/2014.

To document consent, use the consent documents that were approved and stamped by the IRB. Go to the Documents tab to download them.

In conducting this study, you are required to follow the requirements listed in the Investigator Manual (HRP-103).

Sincerely,

Larry Nackerud, Ph.D.
University of Georgia
Institutional Review Board Chairperson
APPENDIX I

RECRUITMENT FLYER OF THE INTERVIEW STUDY

a. ENGLISH VERSION

b. KOREAN VERSION
Jihyun Kim, a Korean doctoral student at the University of Georgia in the United States, wants to learn about Filipinas’ immigration experiences in Korea for her dissertation. Research participation is always voluntary!

Who am I looking for?
This study might be a good fit for you, if you:
• have married to a Korean man;
• migrated to South Korea in order to marry him;
• currently live in South Korea; and
• are able to speak either English or Korean.

What would happen if you took part in the study?
• You will be asked to participate in two interviews talking about your experiences before and after immigration.
• Each face-to-face interview will take 1-2 hours.
• Upon your consent, interview will be audio-recorded.
• Recordings will be confidentially treated.

Your participation is really valued by native Koreans and international scholars studying immigrants to understand immigration experiences and to better help newcomers in South Korea.

In each interview session, a grocery market gift card valued at 10,000 won will be given as a token of appreciation.

To take part in this research study or for more information, please contact Jihyun Kim at 010-2947-7881 or jhkim235@uga.edu

The principal researcher for this study is Dr. Thomas Valentine at the University of Georgia (+1 (706)-542-4017 or tvnj@uga.edu)
안녕하세요? 저는 미국 조지아 대학교 (University of Georgia)에서 이민자들의 학습경험에 대해 공부하고 있는 박사과정 학생 김지현입니다. 한국에 계신 이민자들의 이주 경험에 대한 연구를 하고자 필리핀 결혼이주여성분들과 인터뷰를 하고자 합니다. 본 연구에 참여하기 위한 소중한 경험을 들려주시면 이주여성을 이해하고 도움을 주는 데에 귀중한 자료가 될 것입니다.

인터뷰 대상
- 한국인 남성과의 결혼을 통해 한국으로 온 필리핀 결혼이주여성
- 한국어 혹은 영어로 의사소통이 가능하신 분

연구 참여 과정
- 인터뷰는 2 번에 걸쳐 이루어지며 한국으로 오기 전과 오기 후의 경험들에 대한 질문들로 이루어집니다.
- 인터뷰는 참여자와 연구사 1:1로 진행되며 한번에 1-2시간 가량 소요됩니다.
- 참여자의 동의 하에 인터뷰는 녹음될 것입니다.
- 참여자의 신원은 절대로 비밀이 보장됩니다.

연구에 참여해 주신 분들께는 소정의 선물 (매 인터뷰 시 만원 상품권)을 드립니다.

연구에 참여를 원하시거나 연구와 관련하여 궁금한 점이 있으신 분은 010-2947-7881 혹은 jhkim235@uga.edu 로 연락주시기 바랍니다.

본 연구는 조지아대학교 토마스 발렌타인 교수의 지도 아래 진행됩니다.
(교수님 연락처: +1 (706)-542-4017 혹은 tvnj@uga.edu)
APPENDIX J

INFORMED CONSENT

c. ENGLISH VERSION

d. KOREAN VERSION
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
CONSENT FORM

MARRIAGE-IMMIGRANT WOMEN'S ACCULTURATION AND LEARNING EXPERIENCES IN SOUTH KOREA

Researcher's Statement
We are asking you to take part in a research study. Before you decide to participate in this study, it is important that you understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. This form is designed to give you information about the study, so you can decide whether to be in the study or not. Please take the time to read the following information carefully. Please ask the researcher if there is anything that is not clear or if you need more information. When all your questions have been answered, you can decide if you want to be in the study or not. This process is called “informed consent.” A copy of this form will be given to you.

Principal Investigator: Dr. Thomas Valentine
Department of Lifelong Education, Administration, and Policy
+1 (706)-542-4017 or tvnj@uga.edu

Co-Principal Investigator: Jihyun Kim, Ph. D Candidate
Department of Lifelong Education, Administration, and Policy
+82 (010)-2947-7881
+82 (070)-8246-7881
+1 (706)-202-9160 or jhkim235@uga.edu

Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this study is to understand the experiences of the marriage-immigrant women’s acculturation process. This study employs an interview-based qualitative methodology. Marriage-immigrant women are defined as women who list themselves in international mail-order bride services, either on Internet websites or through marriage brokers, as well as non-Korean women who were introduced to Korean men by friends, relatives, or religious agencies for the purpose of marriage. In order to accomplish the purpose of the study, marriage-immigrant Filipinas who currently live in South Korea and are willing to share their acculturation experiences in South Korea in either English or Korean are needed.

Study Procedures
If you agree to participate, you will be asked to participate in two face-to-face individual interviews talking about your immigration experiences in South Korea. I will be asked to make up a name and this pseudonym will be used during the interviews. The interview process should only take one to two hours per session and the total interview participation should take no more than four hours. Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate or to stop at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Five broad questions presented below, and follow-up questions, will be asked.

• Please tell me about yourself.

• Tell me about your experiences before you came to South Korea.
• Tell me about your experiences since you began living in South Korea.
• Tell me about your learning experiences in formal and informal settings.
• If you were the president of South Korea, in order to help future immigrants, what kind of educational programs could make their lives here in Korea easier?

Interviews will be audio-recorded and transcribed by the researcher(s) and/or a hired transcriptionist.

Risks and discomforts
There are some minimal risks or discomforts associated with this research. They may include emotional concerns about sharing your personal experiences with the researcher. However, you have the right to stop or decline to answer any question at any time. This study might involve a risk only in the case that the privacy of participants is accidentally disclosed. However, the researchers will use pseudonyms in any records, and transcripts will be stored in a password-protected computer. Only the researchers will have access to personally identifying information.

Benefits
The interview process will provide you with an opportunity to reflect on your life, which might help you gain insights into your future life. Also, this study will help you perceive your personal life in the larger context. Your story will assist future newcomers to envision their lives positively in South Korea.

Additionally, the findings from this study will provide a better understanding of marriage-immigrant women’s acculturation experiences in an ethnically homogeneous society of South Korea, of their educational needs, and the effectiveness of existing adult education programs for immigrant women in South Korea. Additionally, the findings will contribute to the understanding of administrative practitioners and researchers who assist immigrants not only in South Korea but also in other countries that face an influx of immigrants from varying cultures.

Incentives for participation
In each interview session, a grocery market gift card value at 10,000 won (the currency of South Korea, $9.34 USD) will be given to the participants as a token of my appreciation.

Audio/Video Recording
Digital audio recording devices will be used to record the interviews. Audio recording is necessary for the researchers to transcribe the interview and analyze interview contents. The audio files recorded in the digital recorder(s) will be immediately moved to the researcher’s password-protected computer after each interview, and the original files in the recorder(s) will be destroyed once the files are safely moved to the computer.

Privacy/Confidentiality
All individually identifiable information collected in this study will be held confidential. A pseudonym you suggest will be used during the interviews and on all research records, including transcriptions. The only people who will know that you are a research subject are the researcher and her major advisor. Researchers will not release identifiable results of the study to anyone.
other than individuals working on the project without your written consent, unless required by law.

The audio recordings will be transcribed, analyzed and then modified to eliminate the possibility that you could be identified. No real names will be used on transcripts. Any identifiers, such as city names and other proper nouns, will be removed from transcripts immediately following interviews or upon receipt of documents. Electronic files of audio recordings and transcriptions that do not include any individually identifiable information will be stored in the researcher’s password-protected computer and kept indefinitely.

A master list linking pseudonyms to your identity will be created as a password-protected electronic file only and saved in the researchers’ password-protected computer for a period of two years to allow the researcher to follow up on any research questions that may need clarification. After two years, the master identity list will be destroyed.

Names or specific affiliations will not be included in any report or publication of the study findings. Excerpts of interview transcripts may be used in the final reporting of the research project, but these excerpts will not be individually identifiable.

**Taking part is voluntary**

Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate or to stop at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you decide to withdraw from the study, the information that can be identified as yours will be kept as part of the study and may continue to be analyzed, unless you make a written request to remove, return, or destroy the information.

**If you have questions**

The main researchers conducting this study are Thomas Valentine, a professor; and Jihyun Kim, a doctoral student at the University of Georgia. Please ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you may contact Thomas Valentine at tvnj@uga.edu or Jihyun Kim at jhjim235@uga.edu or at (010)-2947-7881. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your rights as a research participant in this study, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) Chairperson at 706.542.3199 or irb@uga.edu.

**Research Subject’s Consent to Participate in Research:**

To voluntarily agree to take part in this study, you must sign on the line below. Your signature below indicates that you have read or had read to you this entire consent form, and have had all of your questions answered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Researcher</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Participant</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please sign both copies, keep one and return one to the researcher.
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연구참여 동의서

한국에 거주하는 결혼이주여성의 문화학습 경험에 관한 연구

동의서 안내
본 연구에 참여해 주시기를 간곡히 부탁드리며, 이 동의서는 연구참여를 결정하기 전에 본 연구에 관한 정보를 제공함으로써 의사결정을 도와드리고자 작성되었습니다. 연구에 참여한다는 것이 어떤 의미인지 잘 이해하시는 것은 매우 중요하며 따라서 이 동의서의 내용을 자세히 자세히 읽어보시기를 권합니다. 동의서에 관한 질문이나 불확실한 부분이 있으면 언제든지 연구자에게 질문해 주십시오. 모든 질문에 대한 답변이 이루어진 이후에 연구에 참여하지 않을 여부를 결정하시면 됩니다. 이 과정은 “동의서 숙지” 과정이라고 하며 동의서 사본은 가져가시면 됩니다.

연구자 지도교수: 토마스 발런타인 박사 (Dr. Thomas Valentine)
성인교육과 (Department of Lifelong Education, Administration, and Policy)
+1 (706)-542-4017 or tvnj@uga.edu

연구자 : 김지원 (박사수료생)
성인교육과 (Department of Lifelong Education, Administration, and Policy)
+82 (010)-2947-7881 +82 (070)-8246-7881
+1 (706)-202-9160 or jhkim235@uga.edu

연구목적
본 연구는 한국에 거주하는 결혼이주여성들의 문화학습 과정을 이해하고자 하는 것입니다. 본 연구는 인터뷰를 통한 질적연구방법으로 이루어질 것입니다. 결혼이주여성이라면, 국제결혼 웹사이트나 브로커, 종교기관 등의 도움을 받아 스스로 혹은 자녀의 사랑을 통해 한국남성과의 국제결혼을 한 후 한국에 거주하는 비한국 국적의 여성들을 말하며, 본 연구목적을 수행하기 위하여 영어 혹은 한국어로 한국에서의 문화학습을 공유해주시길 바라며, 본 연구목적을 수행하기 위해 영어 혹은 한국어로 한국에서의 문화학습을 공유해주시길 바랍니다.

연구 절차
본 연구는 한국에 거주하는 결혼이주여성들의 문화학습 과정을 이해하기 위한 단계입니다. 인터뷰는 한국어로 진행될 예정이며, 인터뷰 내용은 참여자분의 한국어로의 이해와 이해에 대한 것이 될 것입니다. 인터뷰 조사에 이름을익명으로 하여 참여자분의 이름이 인터뷰에서 사유될 것이며 참여자분의 개인정보를 적절히 보호할 예정입니다. 두 번째 인터뷰는 한국어로 진행될 예정입니다. 연구 참여자분은 참여자분의 자발적인 의사결정에 따라 참여자분의 의견을 존중할 것입니다. 본 연구의 참여자분은 본 연구의 결과를 공유하기 위한 동의를 해야합니다. 연구자는 전자우편으로 연구참여에 대해 연락드리며, 연구참여에 대한 문의사항은 연구진에 문의하시면 됩니다.
• 만약 본인이 한국의 대통령이라면, 미래의 이주민들을 위해 어떤 교육적 노력이 이루어져야 한다고 생각하시나요?
모든 인터뷰는 녹음될 것이며 녹취록으로 전시될 것입니다.

위험요소와 불편사항
본 연구에 참여하시는 과정에서 일어날 수 있는 위험요소의 평판사항에 대해 말씀드리고자 합니다. 첫째, 인터뷰를 위해 개인적 경험을 연구자와 공유하는 과정에서 약간의 심리적 불편함을 느낄 수 있습니다. 만약 질문이나 대화가 불편해 지시된 예외적인 경우를 겪으며 두려워하실 수 있습니다. 둘째, 아주 만약의 경우 참여하신 분의 신분이 사고로 노출될 수 있습니다. 이런 경우를 방지하기 위해 인터뷰는 익명으로 진행될 것이며 녹취록은 익명처리된 바이블번호가 설정된 컴퓨터에 저장될 것입니다. 개인적인 정보는 오직 연구자만이 접근할 수 있도록 할 것입니다.

연구 참여를 통한 혜택
인터넷에 참여하시게 되면, 인터뷰를 통해 본인의 지난 시간을 반추하고 성장할 수비로 약의 삶에 도움이 될만한 성찰적 교훈을 영수할 수 있습니다. 본인의 경험을 중 심의 맥락에서 바라볼 수 있게 함으로써 시야를 넓힐 수 있는 기회도 주어질 것입니다. 또한 본인의 경험을 공유함으로써 미래의 이주민들에게 도움을 줄 수도 있습니다. 또한, 본 연구의 결과는 한국과 같은 단일문화 국가에서 살고 있는 세계 각국의 이주민들의 문화 경험이 그들의 교육적 요구를 이해하는 데도 도움을 줄 수 있습니다. 한국에서 현재 시행되고 있는 문화교육이 효과를 이례하는 데도 도움이 될 수 있습니다. 마지막으로, 본 연구의 결과들은 한국의 이민정책 입안자들과 행정기관으로 하여금 이민자들의 삶을 이해하고 좀 더 현실적인 행정적 지원을 마련하는 데에 기여하게 하也将.

참여 인센티브
소정의 간사의 뜻으로 대 인터뷰 시 만 양 상당의 장부급을 드릴 것입니다.

녹음과 녹취(전시)
인터넷에 참여하는 모든 인터뷰가 녹음될 것입니다. 녹음된 내용은 연구분석을 위해 녹취록으로 전시될 것입니다. 인터뷰가 끝난 후 녹음기의 녹음파일은 바로 연구자의 바이블번호로 정한 컴퓨터에 옮겨질 것이며, 이후 녹음기의 원본파일은 삭제될 것입니다.

사생활 보호 및 비밀보장
연구를 통해 연구자가 수집받은 모든 개인정보는 비밀에 보장될 것입니다. 인터뷰 동안 익명(가짜 이름)을 사용할 것이며 녹취록에도 이 이름이 사용될 것입니다. 연구자와 연구자의 지도교수만이 참여자의 실명과 당연히 연구에 참여했다는 사실을 알고 레이블의 연구자들은 법적으로 요구되지 않는 한 연구 참여자의 개인정보와 주인이 가능한 인터뷰 내용을 유출하지 않을 것입니다.

녹취된 음성파일은 문서로 전시될 것이며 이후 개인적인 정보나 사생활을 침해할 수 있는 내용들은 녹취록에서 삭제되거나 다른 이름으로 대체될 것입니다. 녹취록은 실제가 사용되지 않을 것이며 도시어플과 기타 유가 가능한 내용들은 수정될 것입니다. 녹음파일과 녹취록은 연구자의 바이블번호가 설정된 컴퓨터에 보관될 것입니다.

주가 인터뷰와 혹사 또는 낙관이 필요할 수 있는 상황에 대비해, 연구자는 연구참여자의 실명과 인터뷰를 위한 어플을 연결하는 대조표를 만들 예정입니다. 대조표는 역시 바이블번호가 설정된 연구자의 컴퓨터에 3년 동안만 보관될 것입니다. 그 이후에는 유사해질 것입니다.
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연구결과가 포함한 출판물 어디에도 참여자의 신분을 알 수 있는 이름이나 기타 정보는 포함되지 않을 것입니다. 다만 일부 인터뷰 내용은 발췌하여 연구결과에 포함될 것입니다. 하지만 이 뿐이 적게 개인적인 정보나 유효 가능한 내용들은 포함되지 않을 것입니다.

연구 참여는 전적으로 자발적인 것임을 알겠다고 합니다.
이 연구에 참여하는 것은 전적으로 참여자의 자발적 의지에 의한 것임을 강조해드립니다. 참여를 중단하고 싶으시면 언제든지 연구자에게 참여 거부의사를 밝혀주시면 어떠한 불이익이나 피해 없이 연구참여를 그만두실 수 있습니다. 참여를 중단하신 경우라도, 서면으로 정보의 제공을 하지 않으시면, 그 이후까지 수집된 인터뷰 내용은 연구분석에 포함될 수 있습니다.

연구 참여관련 문의
본 연구는 조지아대학교의 토마스 발렌타인 (Thomas Valentine) 교수님의 지도 아래에 집행된 백사수료에 의해 이루어지고 있습니다. 질문이 있으면 지금 바로 연구자에게 질문하시십시오. 나중에라도 질문이 생기거나 연구와 관련해서 궁금한 점이 있으시면 발렌타인 교수님 (tvm@uga.edu) 혹은 연구자 (jhin235@uga.edu) 혹은 연구실 (irb@uga.edu)에 연락하시면 됩니다. 연구참여자로서의 권리를 위해 공급자나 연령이 있으면 조지아대학교 연구윤리위원회 (the Institutional Review Board, IRB)로 연락하시기 바랍니다(3-706-542-3199, irb@uga.edu).

본 연구에 참여하기에 대한 몰입
자발적으로 본 연구에 참여하시는 때에 동의하시면 아래의 서명을 해주신가 바쁘다. 아래 서명란에 서명하시면, 위 내용에 대해 충분히 숙지하였으며 연구 첫차와 참여에 동의하며 질문사항들이 모두 다 대답이 되었음을 의미합니다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>연구자 이름</th>
<th>서명</th>
<th>날짜</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>참여자 이름</td>
<td>서명</td>
<td>날짜</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

두 장에 서명하고 한장은 연구자가, 한장은 참여자가 낮 됩니다.