

The Development of Multiculturalism and Multicultural Education Policies in the UK and Their Societal Implications for Korea : A Social Justice-Oriented Perspective

Subin Sarah Yeo*

Abstract This study delves into the evolution of multiculturalism in the United Kingdom, focusing on the development of policies and public sentiments shaped by historical and socio-political factors. By analyzing government reports, official statements, and public discourse, the study examines the UK's multicultural policies across key periods: post-war labor migration in the 1940s-1960s, assimilationist approaches of the 1980s, the recognition of religious diversity in the 1990s, and the shift toward integrationist models in the 2000s. Despite proactive efforts to promote social cohesion and address discrimination, persistent challenges—such as rising anti-immigration sentiments and recurring social tensions—underscore the complexities of multicultural governance. Reflecting on the UK's experience, this study offers valuable perspectives for South Korea, which is experiencing significant demographic shifts due to foreign labor migration and increasing multicultural population. The study advocates for a transformative, justice-oriented multicultural framework that fosters systemic inclusivity and empowers diverse cultural identities to achieve sustainable social integration in the Korean context.

Keywords Multiculturalism, Social Justice-Oriented Perspective, Multicultural Anti-Immigration Sentiment, UK

This work was supported by 2023 Hannam University Research Fund.

* Hannam University, Linton Global School, Assistant Professor, sarah5430@hnu.kr

1. Introduction

Globalization has led to profound demographic transformations worldwide, compelling nations to reassess their approaches to cultural diversity through public policies. While multicultural frameworks have been implemented in various countries to foster inclusivity and social cohesion, they often encounter challenges in achieving their intended goals. In the United Kingdom, multicultural policies have evolved over decades in response to shifting migration patterns and social dynamics. However, despite efforts to promote diversity and integration, persistent anti-immigration sentiments and social tensions suggest ongoing struggles in balancing national identity with cultural pluralism. Incidents of anti-immigrant violence and unrest in regions such as England and Northern Ireland underscore the complexities of fostering unity within a multicultural society.

South Korea, traditionally characterized by ethnic homogeneity, is now undergoing significant demographic changes due to rising immigration, international marriages, and the expansion of multicultural households. Faced with a rapidly declining birth rate, South Korea has introduced policies aimed at incorporating diverse communities into society. However, public resistance to immigrant populations—exemplified by reactions to Afghan families in Ulsan, Yemeni refugees on Jeju Island, and Karen refugee communities—demonstrates the complexities of public sentiment and policy responses in South Korea. While these cases illustrate localized tensions, they also reveal deeper structural challenges in South Korea's approach to multicultural governance, particularly in areas of legal status, social inclusion, and long-term policy planning. These developments mirror global patterns, including those observed in the UK, where multiculturalism policies have often been met with mixed public responses.

This study critically analyzes the UK's multicultural policy trajectory to highlight the interplay between public sentiment, government actions, and socio-

political shifts. Rather than merely describing policy changes, this research evaluates the efficacy and shortcomings of these policies to inform South Korea's approach. Anti-immigration sentiment, defined here as negative attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors directed toward immigrants and immigration policies (Blinder 2015; Hainmueller and Hopkins 2014), is shaped by concerns over cultural identity, economic security, and social stability. These sentiments are not merely individual biases but are embedded within broader socio-political structures influenced by historical legacies, policy decisions, and economic conditions (Esses et al. 2013; Sides and Citrin 2007). Understanding the UK's experience with multiculturalism and public sentiment provides valuable insights into the challenges and opportunities South Korea may face as it navigates its evolving multicultural landscape.

Guided by a social justice-oriented perspective on multiculturalism (Torres and Tarozzi 2020), this study critically analyzes the UK's multicultural policies to explore potential pathways for South Korea's policy development. Specifically, it investigates the historical evolution of UK policies, the interplay between public sentiment and policy implementation, and the lessons South Korea can draw to foster a more inclusive and equitable multicultural society. Through an in-depth review of government reports, policy documents, and public discourse, this research aims to offer evidence-based recommendations that can inform South Korea's transition from an assimilationist approach to one that addresses structural inequalities and promotes social inclusion. By focusing on the UK's multicultural experience and its implications for South Korea, this study contributes to a broader understanding of multicultural policy development in the context of globalization and demographic change.

2. Theoretical Background

1) Multiculturalism and the Role of Education

Multiculturalism is a broad concept that encompasses policies and practices aimed at fostering the coexistence of diverse cultural, ethnic, and racial groups within a society. While multicultural frameworks are often framed as vehicles for inclusivity and social cohesion, they risk functioning as superficial policy tools that fail to dismantle entrenched inequalities. A critical assessment of the UK's multicultural education approach reveals that policies, despite their intent, have often reinforced existing socio-economic and racial hierarchies rather than fostering genuine integration. Multicultural education, drawing on various theoretical foundations, seeks to integrate cultural diversity into educational practices—ranging from superficial cultural recognition to transformative approaches that challenge systemic inequities (Torres and Tarozzi 2020). However, despite these theoretical developments, the implementation of multicultural education policies in the UK has often failed to establish strong connections between policy objectives and practical outcomes. The Swann Report (1985), for instance, emphasized inclusive education, yet its execution largely remained symbolic, focusing on cultural representation rather than addressing systemic barriers such as racial discrimination in schools or differential access to academic opportunities. Thus, the gap between theoretical discourse and actual policy execution remains a critical issue in the UK's multicultural education framework.

Several theoretical perspectives inform the discourse on multicultural education. Communitarianism, advanced by scholars such as Etzioni (1995), Sandel (1982), and Taylor (1992), underscores the importance of shared cultural identity and community. It advocates for educational practices that reinforce students' connections to their heritage through the preservation of local traditions, languages, and values—an approach that aligns with multicultural education's

objectives of fostering ethnic literacy and cultural pride.

On the other hand, critical pedagogy (Freire 1970; McLaren, 1997) presents a more transformative perspective, positioning education as a means to challenge oppressive systems and empower marginalized communities. Expanding upon this framework, critical race theory (Ladson-Billings 2004) and critical theory (Torres 1998; 2009) highlight how institutionalized racism and systemic power structures shape educational experiences. These perspectives call for curricula that address the historical roots of discrimination and equip students to become agents of social change (Banks and McGee Banks 1995; Nieto 1996).

Post-structuralist approaches (Sleeter and Grant 1999) further broaden the scope of multicultural education by conceptualizing cultural identities as fluid and intersectional rather than fixed. This perspective emphasizes the integration of diverse narratives into curricula to validate marginalized knowledge systems (Semali and Kincheloe 1999). Similarly, post-development theories (Escobar 2008) critique Western-centric educational paradigms and advocate for community-driven approaches that respect indigenous and local knowledge.

Finally, liberal educational theories, such as Dewey's (1916) emphasis on experiential learning and Rawls' (1971) focus on justice and fairness, provide valuable insights into the role of education in fostering democratic participation and social equity. These frameworks collectively inform contemporary discussions on multicultural education, highlighting its potential to promote social inclusion while addressing structural inequalities.

2) Social Justice-Oriented Multicultural Education and Critical Multiculturalism

Traditional multicultural education has often been criticized for focusing primarily on cultural representation while neglecting the systemic inequalities that marginalized communities face (Ladson-Billings 1995; Sleeter and Grant 2009). In response, social justice-oriented multicultural education has emerged

as a transformative framework that actively challenges systemic inequities and promotes a more inclusive society (Torres and Tarozzi 2020).

This approach goes beyond superficial acknowledgments of diversity and instead empowers students to critically examine societal structures—such as racism, classism, and other forms of discrimination—equipping them with the tools to challenge existing power imbalances (McLaren 1997). Social justice-oriented multicultural education envisions schools not just as spaces for cultural exchange, but as platforms for systemic change and advocacy for historically marginalized groups.

By rejecting assimilationist models, which often pressure minority communities to conform to dominant cultural norms, this framework promotes equity and inclusion by addressing core issues such as linguistic inequality, socio-economic disparities, and access to educational resources. In the UK, multicultural policies have evolved over time, yet ongoing challenges such as rising anti-immigration sentiments suggest that deeper structural reforms are required to achieve genuine inclusivity. South Korea, undergoing its own demographic transitions, can potentially benefit from adopting a more justice-oriented educational framework that fosters systemic inclusivity and cultural empowerment.

Through this lens, the study examines the historical development of multicultural policies in the UK, offering insights into how multicultural education can contribute to a more inclusive society in South Korea. A critical assessment of the UK's experience provides valuable perspectives on the potential of multicultural education as a tool for long-term social transformation and integration.

3. Development of Multiculturalism, Multicultural Education, and Public Sentiments in the UK

1) Post-War Period and the Emergence of Multiculturalism (1940s-1960s)

British multiculturalism has roots deeply intertwined with post-colonial migration and labor demands following World War II. In the post-war period, the UK encouraged migration from the Commonwealth, particularly from the Caribbean, India, and Pakistan, to address labor shortages (Gilroy 2004). Immigrants, known as the “Windrush generation,” arrived with an expectation of equal rights under British citizenship due to the Commonwealth’s legal framework. However, they encountered an assimilation approach that assumed cultural conformity as a condition for social acceptance. While their labor was valued, their cultural identities were often disregarded or expected to align with British norms, demonstrating a narrow interpretation of multiculturalism that emphasized assimilation over inclusion (Gilroy 2004; Modood 2005).

From the perspective of critical multiculturalism, this early phase of British multiculturalism failed to address the systemic barriers that marginalized these communities. The Race Relations Act of 1965, though pioneering in its intent to combat discrimination, focused primarily on reducing overt discrimination in public spaces without challenging the underlying social and institutional structures that perpetuated inequality (Solomos 2003; UK Parliament 1965). The Act laid the groundwork for future multicultural policies within a framework that prioritized racial equality over cultural pluralism, adhering to a predominantly assimilationist paradigm.

2) Institutionalization of Multicultural Policies (1970-1980s)

The 1970s marked a period of increased focus on racial inequalities in the

UK. As racial tensions culminated in events like the 1981 Brixton riots, these incidents revealed institutional biases, particularly within the police force, and reflected broader systemic racism embedded within British society. The Scarman Report (1981) acknowledged these issues and recommended reforms to promote fair treatment and trust between minority communities and law enforcement (Scarman 1981). This institutional recognition catalyzed a shift toward more explicit multicultural policies.

Building on the recognition of racial inequalities, the UK began to develop and institutionalize multicultural education policies, particularly as part of broader efforts to address these social tensions. The education sector became a critical platform for these policies, aiming to reflect the nation's growing cultural diversity in school curricula. However, these early policies largely operated within an assimilationist framework, with the primary aim being to maintain social harmony rather than to challenge systemic inequities.

The Swann Report (1985), officially titled *Education for All*, advocated for an inclusive education system that embraced cultural diversity and promoted equal educational opportunities for all students, regardless of racial or ethnic background (Swan 1985). It recommended incorporating elements of various cultures into the curriculum, especially to foster a sense of belonging among minority students. However, its actual implementation was inconsistent, with many schools adopting a superficial approach to multiculturalism. While cultural festivals and linguistic accommodations were introduced, these measures did not fundamentally alter the systemic inequalities that minority students faced, such as underrepresentation in higher education, structural bias in assessment systems, and limited access to academic advancement opportunities. The failure to link multicultural education policies with broader educational reforms meant that the report's recommendations had limited long-term impact in addressing structural inequities. Despite these intentions, while it acknowledged the need for cultural diversity, it did not adequately address the deeper structural issues that minority students faced, such as discrimination in educa-

tional access, under-representation in higher education pathways, and differential treatment based on racial or ethnic background. These early policies failed to address the roots of systemic inequality. By focusing primarily on cultural representation and intercultural understanding, policies like those proposed by the Swann Report did not confront the institutionalized racism and socioeconomic factors that disproportionately affected minority students. Instead, these policies emphasized rather short-term changes, such as cultural celebrations and language programs, which allowed schools to project an image of diversity while avoiding more transformative reforms. This limited scope often led to multicultural education practices that reinforced existing power structures, promoting a “tolerance” of diversity rather than a genuine integration of minority perspectives into the curriculum.

Multicultural education policies during this period did little to address the issue of power distribution within educational institutions. Schools continued to reflect broader societal hierarchies, where Eurocentric perspectives dominated the curriculum, and non-white students were frequently marginalized. While the 1970s and 1980s marked a significant shift towards acknowledging racial diversity within the UK’s educational policies, these policies fell short of fostering an environment where all cultural identities were not only recognized but genuinely valued as an integral part of the educational system. Instead, they primarily aimed to alleviate concerns over racial tensions without fundamentally transforming the educational system to ensure equity for all students.

3) Expansion of Multiculturalism and the Recognition of Ethno-Religious Diversity in Education (1990s)

During the 1990s, the UK expanded its multicultural policies to acknowledge religious as well as racial diversity. Advocacy from minority groups, particularly those identifying with Muslim, Hindu, and Sikh communities, influenced the development of policies that recognized the importance of reli-

gious identity. The Education Reform Act of 1988 marked a significant shift, allowing state funding for faith-based schools beyond the traditional Christian framework. While this change was intended to promote religious pluralism and cultural inclusivity, it also raised concerns regarding social integration and potential community segregation. Faith-based schools provided minority students with an environment aligned with their cultural and religious backgrounds, but critics argued that this model limited cross-cultural interactions and reinforced parallel educational structures rather than fostering social cohesion. Thus, while religious education policies in the UK evolved to reflect growing diversity, they also underscored the complex balance between cultural recognition and national integration, a challenge that remains relevant for multicultural education frameworks today. The Education Reform Act of 1988 exemplifies this shift by providing public funding for faith-based schools, thus promoting cultural and religious pluralism within the UK's multicultural framework (UK Parliament 1988).

The Parekh Report (2000), officially titled *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain*, advocated for a reimagined British identity, one that encompassed and celebrated the country's growing cultural and ethnic diversity. By proposing a "community of communities" model, the report challenged the prevailing notion of a monolithic British identity. Instead, it called for a pluralistic approach that respected the varied cultural backgrounds of British citizens, suggesting that true social cohesion required recognizing and embracing this diversity rather than enforcing cultural conformity. However, the report quickly became a focal point of controversy, facing significant backlash from those who argued that its recommendations threatened social cohesion and national unity. It sought to redefine British identity through a pluralistic lens, but its reception exposed the deep-rooted reluctance to move beyond assimilationist ideals. The backlash, often framed as a defense of national unity, reveals the structural resistance to recognizing minority voices as integral to British society rather than peripheral subjects of multicultural policy.

Critics perceive the Parekh Report as undermining British values by emphasizing cultural differences over shared national identity. They argued that a focus on diverse identities would lead to fragmentation and weaken the collective social fabric. As stated by Phillips (2005), this criticism was rooted in concerns that acknowledging distinct cultural communities within the national framework could lead to the creation of isolated “ghettoized” communities, which would foster separation rather than integration. Conservative politicians and media figures seized on these concerns, framing the report’s recommendations as a rejection of British heritage in favor of divisive multiculturalism.

The backlash against the Parekh Report illustrates the tension within British society regarding multiculturalism and the challenges of integrating diversity into a cohesive national identity. This reflects a reluctance to confront the power dynamics that underpin issues of integration and belonging. Instead of recognizing the systemic inequities that often exclude minority groups from full societal participation, critics focused on promoting an assimilationist model that prioritized national unity over cultural recognition. By resisting the report’s recommendations, detractors effectively reinforced the status quo, limiting the potential for transformative policies that would allow minority voices to be equally valued within the national narrative.

The Parekh Report remains a pivotal document in British multicultural discourse, as it questioned whether the UK’s approach to diversity truly accommodated the needs of all its citizens. From a critical multiculturalism lens, this report’s reception exemplifies the limitations of traditional multicultural policies, which often fail to address the structures of privilege and exclusion embedded in national frameworks. For meaningful social cohesion to occur, a move beyond symbolic inclusivity toward policies that actively dismantle these structures is necessary. The report’s vision - despite its controversy - highlighted the need for a more holistic and equitable approach to multiculturalism that extends beyond superficial acceptance and toward genuine integration.

4) Multiculturalism Under Scrutiny and the Rise of Integration Discourses (2000s-2010s)

Entering the 2000s, British multiculturalism faced growing scrutiny, especially after the 2001 race riots in northern England, which exposed socio-economic disparities and increasing segregation between ethnic minority communities and the white majority. The Cante Report (2001) - formally titled 'Community Cohesion' - was commissioned by the UK government in response to the 2001 Oldham riots which were the first of a series of major riots caused by ethnic conflicts followed in Bradford, Leeds and Burnley (Home Office Minister of State 2002). These disturbances exposed deep-seated racial and ethnic tensions between the white and South Asian communities in these areas. The Cante Report (2001) responded to these issues by advocating for inter-community dialogue and prioritizing integration over cultural recognition, suggesting that multiculturalism had fallen short of fostering true unity within British society (The Guardian 2001.12.11). This shift toward integrationist policies, however, exemplifies a critical limitation that the approach oversimplifies social cohesion by overlooking entrenched systemic issues, such as economic marginalization and institutional racism, which continue to undermine equitable social integration.

This sentiment was echoed a decade later during the 2011 England riots, which began in Tottenham following the police shooting of a young Black man, Mark Duggan. The riots quickly spread across major cities, illuminating widespread frustration not only over race relations but also over policing practices, youth unemployment, and socio-economic inequalities that affected marginalized communities. The riots highlighted the failures of integrationist policies to address the root causes of social exclusion and inequality. This, in turn, set the stage for Prime Minister David Cameron's 2011 declaration that "state multiculturalism" had failed (BBC News 2011.02.05). It was a reflection of the UK's struggle to move beyond surface-level cultural recognition to meaningful structural inclusion. This failure was not due to the presence of multicult-

tural policies themselves, but rather the lack of long-term integration strategies, economic inclusion, and systemic anti-discrimination measures. South Korea must take note of these limitations and design policies that address structural inequities from the outset to prevent similar backlash and social fragmentation. Cameron called for a new approach that emphasized shared national values and prioritized a cohesive identity over cultural diversity, reflecting a broader European sentiment that cultural pluralism was potentially destabilizing (Meer and Modood 2012).

Cameron's statements represented a decisive pivot from policies that recognized and celebrated cultural diversity to an assimilationist model where cultural differences were considered secondary to a unified national identity (Cantle 2012). By framing cultural diversity as antithetical to national unity, this stance risked reinforcing exclusionary practices. From a critical perspective, such policies marginalize minority perspectives, compelling conformity to dominant cultural norms rather than fostering an inclusive identity that genuinely values diversity for its contribution to society (Kundnani 2007). This shift reflects a broader trend in British multicultural policy: prioritizing superficial unity over addressing the systemic issues, such as socio-economic and racial inequalities, that undermine true cohesion (Modood 2013). In doing so, integrationist policies may inadvertently perpetuate the very divisions they aim to resolve, by failing to engage with the structural inequities that lead to social exclusion and unrest.

5) Contemporary Multiculturalism and Anti-Immigration Riots (2020s-Present)

British multiculturalism has faced heightened challenges in the 2020s, particularly in the aftermath of Brexit. This period has been marked by intensified anti-immigrant rhetoric, exacerbated by economic instability, concerns about public services, and growing public dissatisfaction with immigration policies.

These tensions culminated in the July-August 2024 anti-immigrant riots, which were ignited by a tragic incident involving a Rwandan immigrant in Southport. Misinformation about the individual quickly spread on social media, falsely labeling them as a Muslim and an illegal immigrant, which fueled Islamophobic and xenophobic sentiments. This, in turn, sparked violent attacks against mosques and immigrant communities, beginning in Southport (UK Parliament 2024).

The nation-wide 2024 riots reveal deep-seated issues within British society, pointing to a troubling pattern where economic hardships fuel nationalist and xenophobic sentiments. Economic pressures—worsened by inflation and a cost-of-living crisis—have heightened public anxieties, often leading to immigrants being unfairly scapegoated for broader socio-economic grievances. This mirrors past patterns, such as the post-war migration influx and the 1970s racial tensions, where immigrant groups were economically necessary yet socially marginalized. In the post-Brexit era, these tensions have been further compounded by shifts in immigration policies and debates over national identity and sovereignty. The resulting atmosphere has intensified suspicion and hostility toward immigrant communities, particularly those perceived as coming from Muslim-majority countries, underscoring the persistent role of Islamophobia in contemporary British society (CNN 2024.04.02).

The violent riots exemplify the limitations of a multicultural model that emphasizes tolerance and coexistence while neglecting the structural causes of exclusion. As with the assimilationist policies of the 1950s and the tokenistic multicultural initiatives of the 1980s, the current model prioritizes unity and shared values over transformative changes that address systemic inequities. Despite past efforts to implement anti-racism measures in the 1980s and recognize religious diversity in the 1990s, these policies have often been confined to superficial gestures that fail to tackle the structural inequalities underpinning social fragmentation. It is increasingly clear that contemporary multiculturalism, by continuing to overlook the economic and institutional structures that drive

exclusion, risks perpetuating rather than dismantling divisions within society.

4. Implications for South Korea

South Korea's multicultural policies have evolved over time, primarily addressing the immediate economic and demographic challenges posed by labor migration and international marriages. However, unlike the UK, where multicultural policies developed in response to post-colonial migration (Gilroy 2004; Modood 2005), South Korea's policies have been shaped largely by demographic imperatives and economic necessity rather than a historical commitment to cultural pluralism (Choi 2018; Lee and Cho, 2022).

South Korea's engagement with multiculturalism appears to have emerged primarily from economic necessity in the 1990s, as rapid industrialization drove the demand for foreign labor. Policies like the Industrial Trainee System, while designed to address labor shortages, framed foreign workers as short-term participants rather than integral members of society. Reinforcing South Korea's traditional self-perception as a homogeneous society, it has offered limited opportunities for long-term integration (Choi 2018). Based on critical multiculturalism, these policies reveal a functional, rather than inclusive, view of multiculturalism that positioned diversity as peripheral, raising questions about the extent to which these initiatives facilitated genuine intercultural exchange or structural transformation.

As a result, these policies have largely followed an assimilationist approach, emphasizing cultural adaptation and linguistic integration while neglecting systemic inclusivity and long-term structural reforms (Jahng and Lee 2013). This contrast underscores the importance of policy frameworks that move beyond short-term adaptation and actively promote social and economic integration. The UK's multicultural policy trajectory demonstrates the complexities and potential limitations of multicultural governance, particularly in its transition

from early multicultural recognition policies to integration-focused models. While South Korea and the UK operate within different historical and demographic contexts, both nations have faced challenges in balancing national identity with multicultural integration. The UK's experience underscores that surface-level inclusivity without structural equity can lead to social tensions rather than genuine cohesion. Therefore, South Korea must move beyond symbolic policies and develop a contextually relevant multicultural model that prioritizes systemic inclusion, equity, and long-term integration strategies rather than reactive responses. Moving forward, a paradigm shift is necessary—one that moves beyond the narrow focus on cultural conformity and embraces an inclusive model that recognizes multiculturalism as a valuable aspect of national identity. Policies must prioritize intercultural engagement, mutual understanding, and equitable access to social and economic opportunities for multicultural communities. Achieving this requires a shift in both policy orientation and public perception, positioning multiculturalism as an opportunity for enrichment rather than a societal challenge to be managed.

Education remains a critical area where transformative changes can facilitate meaningful integration. Currently, South Korea's educational initiatives largely center on language acquisition and cultural adaptation, yet they fail to address deeper issues such as systemic bias and the need for cross-cultural competencies. Educational reforms must incorporate diverse cultural perspectives into curricula to foster mutual respect and equip students with the skills to thrive in an increasingly diverse society. Training educators to create inclusive learning environments and challenge stereotypes will be essential in shaping public attitudes. Moreover, schools should serve as bridges between communities, facilitating engagement between multicultural families and broader society to foster mutual understanding and social cohesion.

Despite policy advancements, many multicultural families and foreign workers in South Korea continue to face systemic barriers to full social and economic participation. The cases of Afghan special contributors, Yemeni asylum

seekers, and Karen refugees highlight the inconsistencies in Korea's multicultural policies, where short-term humanitarian responses often lack long-term integration strategies. Addressing these gaps requires a shift from reactive crisis management to a proactive, justice-oriented policy framework that ensures structural inclusion. Addressing these disparities requires a concerted effort to promote economic and social inclusion through targeted initiatives that ensure equal access to resources and opportunities. Policies aimed at improving employment conditions for foreign workers, expanding social welfare coverage for multicultural families, and providing legal protections against discrimination will be crucial in dismantling systemic barriers to full participation. Ensuring that immigrant communities are not relegated to low-wage, precarious jobs and instead have access to career development and social mobility opportunities is essential to achieving sustainable social cohesion.

Public perception remains one of the most significant challenges to multicultural integration in South Korea. Negative attitudes toward immigrants and multicultural families, often fueled by misinformation and media sensationalism, hinder efforts to foster an inclusive society. Shaping a more positive public discourse requires strategic engagement through awareness campaigns, media partnerships, and community outreach programs that highlight the contributions and potential of multicultural communities. Encouraging cultural exchange at the grassroots level, fostering inclusive dialogues, and challenging xenophobic narratives through balanced reporting and public education initiatives will be vital to changing societal attitudes toward multiculturalism.

In addition to addressing public perceptions, effective policy coordination and governance are essential to the successful implementation of multicultural initiatives. The current fragmentation of responsibilities across multiple government agencies has led to inconsistencies and inefficiencies in policy execution. A more centralized and strategic approach, such as establishing a dedicated national multicultural agency, could provide comprehensive oversight and facilitate the alignment of national and local initiatives. Improved inter-agency

collaboration, better resource allocation, and data-driven policy planning will help ensure that multicultural programs are effectively implemented and continuously adapted to meet evolving social needs.

The media plays an influential role in shaping public attitudes toward multiculturalism, and it is imperative that efforts are made to promote more balanced and inclusive portrayals of multicultural communities. South Korea's media landscape has often amplified negative stereotypes and contributed to public anxieties about immigration. A proactive approach that promotes diverse narratives, highlights success stories of multicultural integration, and challenges biased portrayals will be crucial in reshaping public discourse. Media literacy initiatives that empower citizens to critically engage with information and resist xenophobic rhetoric can further contribute to a more informed and accepting society.

As South Korea navigates its evolving multicultural landscape, a forward-thinking and justice-oriented approach to policy development is imperative. Policies must go beyond short-term cultural adaptation strategies and embrace long-term systemic reforms that address economic, social, and institutional inequalities. By fostering an inclusive multicultural society that values diversity as a national strength, South Korea can position itself as a model for multicultural governance in East Asia. Achieving this vision requires sustained collaboration among policymakers, educators, civil society organizations, and the multicultural communities themselves. Through inclusive policymaking and proactive public engagement, South Korea can create a more harmonious and resilient society that embraces multiculturalism as an integral part of its national identity.

5. Conclusion

The evolution of multiculturalism in the United Kingdom provides valuable insights for South Korea as it navigates its own multicultural transformation.

The UK's early reliance on assimilationist policies often marginalized minority communities, suppressing their cultural identities and contributing to social unrest, as evidenced by events such as the Brixton riots (Commission for Racial Equality 2002). These experiences highlight the potential consequences of policies that prioritize cultural conformity over meaningful inclusion. South Korea faces similar risks if it continues to emphasize assimilation into traditional Korean values without creating spaces for cultural pluralism and meaningful participation. Moving forward, South Korea must adopt equity-based policies that address structural barriers and foster a more inclusive and cohesive society.

A critical lesson from the UK's experience is the necessity of addressing systemic inequalities that fuel social divisions. The 2024 anti-immigrant riots in the UK (UK Parliament 2024) highlight how failing to tackle socio-economic disparities and neglecting marginalized communities can lead to escalating social tensions. South Korea must ensure that its multicultural policies do not merely manage diversity but actively work toward structural inclusion. South Korea's current focus on cultural adaptation rather than structural equity mirrors early UK approaches and could result in similar social tensions. A forward-thinking approach that empowers minority communities by ensuring access to economic opportunities, social protections, and meaningful civic participation is crucial to preventing social fragmentation and unrest.

Education remains a powerful tool for shaping societal attitudes and fostering long-term integration. The UK's experience demonstrates the limitations of superficial multicultural education policies that celebrate diversity symbolically while failing to challenge systemic inequalities (Swan 1985). South Korea must avoid these pitfalls by developing a comprehensive multicultural education framework that not only respects cultural diversity but also actively addresses issues of prejudice, privilege, and systemic discrimination. Empowering educators to foster inclusive learning environments and equipping students with critical multicultural competencies will be essential in building an inclusive future.

Public perception and media representation play equally significant roles in

determining the success of multicultural policies. In the UK, post-Brexit anti-immigrant sentiments exposed the fragility of public support for diversity when multiculturalism is poorly managed. South Korea faces similar challenges, with public resistance to the arrival of Yemeni refugees on Jeju Island and Afghan special contributors in Ulsan reflecting deep-seated anxieties and cultural insecurities. A comprehensive strategy that includes public engagement, media literacy initiatives, and balanced portrayals of multicultural communities is necessary to counter misinformation and foster a more accepting and informed society.

As South Korea stands at a pivotal crossroads, it has the opportunity to choose between continuing with assimilationist policies or adopting a transformative, justice-oriented multicultural framework. The latter approach, which prioritizes equity, social justice, and the dismantling of institutional barriers, offers a sustainable path toward meaningful integration and long-term social cohesion. Without such a shift, South Korea risks exacerbating social divisions, marginalization, and potential unrest, further complicating its multicultural future.

Ultimately, multiculturalism should be viewed as an evolving and dynamic process that requires ongoing adaptation and commitment to equity-driven reforms. Drawing on lessons from the UK's successes and shortcomings, South Korea has the potential to develop an inclusive model that not only recognizes diversity as an inherent part of its national identity but also leverages it as a driving force for social and economic progress. The future of South Korea's multicultural landscape will depend on its ability to embrace diversity as a foundation for equity, justice, and meaningful social integration.

교신: 여수빈(한남대학교 린튼국제학부 조교수)(sarah5430@hnu.kr)

Correspondence: Subin Sarah Yeo (Assistant Professor, Linton Global School, Hannam University)
(sarah5430@hnu.kr)

References

- Banks, J. A., 1994, *An introduction to multicultural education*. MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Banks, J. A. and C. A. McGee Banks, 1995, *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*. Macmillan.
- BBC News, 2011.02.05, State multiculturalism has failed, says David Cameron. BBC News. <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-12371994>.
- Blinder, S., 2015, Imagined immigration: The impact of different meanings of ‘immigrants’ in public opinion and policy debates in Britain. *Political Studies*, 63(1), 80-100.
- Cantle, T., 2012, *Interculturalism: The New Era of Cohesion and Diversity*. Palgrave Macmillan London.
- Choi, Y., 2018, 다문화교육 정책의 변화와 개선방안, *The Journal of Lifelong Education and HRD*, 14(2), 55-75.
- CNN, 2024.04.02, CAIR says it received more than 8,000 complaints of anti-Muslim bias in 2023—a 56% increase over previous year. <https://edition.cnn.com/2024/04/02/us/cair-muslim-bias-complaints-2023/index.html>.
- Escobar, A., 2008, *Territories of Difference: Place, Movements, Life, Redes*. Duke University Press.
- Esses, V. M. et al., 2013, Uncertainty, threat, and the role of the media in promoting the dehumanization of immigrants and refugees. *Journal of Social Issues*, 69(3), 518-536.
- Etzioni, A., 1995, *The Spirit of Community: Rights, Responsibilities, and the Communitarian Agenda*. Crown.
- Freire, P., 1970, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Seabury Press.
- Fitzgerald, J. et al., 2014, Defying the law of gravity: The political economy of international migration. *World Politics*, 66(3), 406-445.
- Gilroy, P., 2004, *After Empire: Melancholia or Convivial Culture?* Routledge.
- Hainmueller, J. and D. J. Hopkins, 2014, Public attitudes toward immigration. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 17, 225-249.
- Home Office Minister of State, 2002, *The Cantle Report: Community Cohesion*.
- Jahng, K. and S. Lee, 2013, A poststructuralist analysis of multicultural education in South Korea. *Journal of Education and Society*, 10(2), 293-314.
- Kundnani, A., 2007, *The End of Tolerance: Racism in 21st Century Britain*. Pluto Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G., 1995, Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Edu-*

- cational Research Journal, 32(3), 465-491.
- Ladson-Billings, G., 2004, *The Dreamkeepers: Successful Teachers of African American Children*. Jossey-Bass.
- Lee, S. and H. Cho, 2022, Understanding Anti-Immigrant Sentiment in Korea: A Sociological Perspective. *Journal of Korean Sociology*, 54(1), 102-120.
- McLaren, P., 1997, *Revolutionary multiculturalism*. CO: Westview press.
- Meer, N. and T. Modood, 2012, How Does Interculturalism Contrast with Multiculturalism?. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 33(2), 175-196.
- Modood, T., 2005, *Multicultural Politics: Racism, Ethnicity, and Muslims in Britain*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Modood, T., 2013, *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea*. Polity Press.
- Phillips, T., 2005, Parallel lives? Challenging discourses of British Muslim self-segregation. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 39(3), 279-299.
- Rawls, J., 1971, *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard University Press.
- Scarman, L., 1981, *The Brixton Disorders, 10-12 April 1981: Report of an Inquiry*. Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Semali, L. M. and J. L. Kincheloe, 1999, *What is Indigenous Knowledge? Voices from the Academy*. Routledge.
- Sides, J. and J. Citrin, 2007, European opinion about immigration: The role of identities, interests, and information. *British Journal of Political Science*, 37(3), 477-504.
- Sleeter, C. E., 1996, *Multicultural Education as Social Activism*. SUNY Press.
- Sleeter, C. E. and C. A. Grant, 2009, Race, class, gender, exceptionality, and educational reform. In J. A. Banks and C. A. M. Banks(Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. NY: John Wiley & Son, 59-82.
- Solomos, J., 2003, *Race and Racism in Britain*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Swan, M., 1985, *Education for All: The Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups*. HMSO.
- Taylor, C., 1992, *Multiculturalism and "The Politics of Recognition": An Essay*. Princeton University Press.
- The Guardian, 2001.12.11, Report condemns race riots as warning sign. <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2001/dec/11/race.world>.
- Torres, C. A., 1998, *Education, Power, and Personal Biography: Dialogues with Critical Educators*. Routledge.

- Torres, C. A. and M. Tarozzi, 2020, *Global Citizenship Education and the Crises of Multiculturalism: Comparative Perspectives*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- UK Parliament, 1965, Race Relations Act. Legislation.gov.uk. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1965/73>.
- UK Parliament, 1988, Education Reform Act. Legislation.gov.uk. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1988/40>.
- UK Parliament, 2024, *Anti-Immigrant Riots and Social Unrest: Official Report*. UK Government Publications.
- Yeo, S., 2023, Multicultural Approaches and Challenges in Educational Integration for Afghan Special Contributors and Refugees in the Korean Context. 45(3), 221-258.

영국의 다문화주의 및 다문화교육 정책 발전과 한국에의 사회적 함의: 사회정의론적 관점에서

여수빈*

요약 본 연구는 영국의 다문화주의 정책 발전 과정을 심층적으로 분석하고, 이를 통해 한국의 다문화 정책 수립에 대한 시사점을 도출하는 데 목적이 있다. 영국의 다문화 정책은 1940~1960년대 전후 노동 이주를 시작으로, 1980년대의 동화주의적 접근, 1990년대의 종교적 다양성 인정, 그리고 2000년대 이후 통합 지향적 모델로의 전환을 거쳐 발전해왔다. 본 연구는 정부 보고서, 공식 성명서 및 담론 분석을 통해 이러한 정책의 변천 과정을 검토하고, 사회적 통합과 차별 해소를 위한 영국 정부의 적극적인 노력에도 불구하고 반이민 정서의 확산과 지속적인 사회적 갈등이 정책 이행의 복잡성을 여실히 드러내고 있음을 논의한다. 영국의 경험을 바탕으로, 저출산 위기 및 다문화사회의 진입 단계에서 급격한 사회적 변화를 겪고 있는 한국이 보다 포용적이고 지속 가능한 다문화 사회를 구축하기 위한 정책적 접근을 모색한다. 특히, 본 연구는 사회정의론적 관점에서 포용적 다문화 정책을 통해 다양성을 존중하고 진정한 사회 통합을 도모할 수 있는 정책적 시사점을 논한다.

주요어 다문화주의, 반이민 정서, 사회 정의, 영국

* 한남대, 린튼국제학부, 조교수, sarah5430@hnu.kr