

ISSN Online: 2167-7751 ISSN Print: 2167-7743

# A Study on Assessing the Effectiveness and Commitment of Leadership Practice in Multiculturalism Implementation

# Sintayehu Asfaw Ermeco, Seung-Hee Baek

Division of Leadership, Yemyung Graduate University, Seoul, Korea Email: ermecoa@gmail.com, q100sh@gmail.com

How to cite this paper: Ermeco, S. A. & Baek, S.-H. (2022). A Study on Assessing the Effectiveness and Commitment of Leadership Practice in Multiculturalism Implementation. *Open Journal of Leadership,* 11, 462-478.

https://doi.org/10.4236/ojl.2022.114024

Received: October 31, 2022 Accepted: December 27, 2022 Published: December 30, 2022

Copyright © 2022 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

 $\underline{\text{http://creative} commons.org/licenses/by/4.0/}$ 





## **Abstract**

This paper explores the effectiveness and commitment of leadership in implementing multiculturalism practices in four major cities in South Korea. Korea has seen an increase in immigrants and foreigners wishing to live and work there. It has forced the government to rethink its approach to multiculturalism by implementing programs that promote cultural integration. Leadership is vital in promoting cultural integration, from the top with the president to municipal leaders and corporate executives. The municipal city leaders are responsible for supporting foreigners to ensure cultural integration. However, while the top government leadership is incorporating strategies through policy implementation and social activities like international sports that bring all people together, some foreigners feel like local and regional area leaders and city administrators do not strongly commit to multiculturalism. For effective leadership in multiculturalism to be affected, all stakeholders must come on board for the multicultural policies in South Korea to be implemented.

# **Keywords**

Leadership, Multiculturalism, Cultural Diversity, Integration and Korea

# 1. Introduction

The term "multiculturalism" emerged in the 1970s in countries like Canada and Australia and, to a lesser degree, in Britain and the United States (Meer & Modood, 2012). It fundamentally started by rejecting the assimilation tradition, which had unfairly expected newcomers to be perfectly merged into the existing society without "disturbing" the established social order. The concept has been

loved for decades and has been further developed and enriched by many scholars (Goldberg, 1994; Taylor, 2012; Kymlicka, 2012; Honneth, 1996; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; Fraser, 2007; Torres, 1998; Parekh, 2000, 2002; Fraser & Honneth, 2003; Kymlicka & Banting, 2006; Modood, 2017; Banks, 2009; Werbner, 2012).

In 2006, President Rho Moo Hyun declared that Korea was on an unalterable multicultural route. Accordingly, the Great Korean government has been exploring efforts to accommodate rising numbers of foreign nationals and immigrants, bi-racial and bi-ethnic people, whom this study names' multicultural people. Over the years, the Korean government has been adopting various plans and policies to improve its legal and social status. For example, the "Plan for Promoting the Social Integration of Migrant Women, Biracial people, and Immigrants," or so-called "Grand Plan," "The First Immigration Plan (2008-2012)," "The Second Basic Plan for Immigration (2013-2017)," "The Third Master Plan for Immigration Policy (2018-2022)," the amended Nationality Act to allow permanent dual citizenship in 2010, etc.

These policies controlled multicultural people's pathways to citizenship and their welfare eligibility. However, the procedures proved insufficient to address social problems, such as discrimination, prejudice, stereotyping, and others. In other words, the policies proved inadequate to achieve complete integration and inclusiveness, which is the original goal of Korean multicultural policies. About these problems, this study aims to examine the Commitment of Leadership to implementing the above multicultural implementation policies (Haddock & Sutch, 2003). To achieve this purpose, the study firstly reviews theoretical concepts of multiculturalism and ethnic and civic nationalism. Then, it continues to investigate the nature of Korean national identity in the theories mentioned above. Based on these considerations, it tries to explain differences in the legal and social treatment of multicultural people with the Korean national identity (Joppke, 2008). In other words, after looking at the degree of inclusiveness of multicultural people in Korea according to their legal and social status, this study evaluates the impact of Korean national identity on their level under the prism of inequalities.

Lastly, this study concludes by suggesting making recommendations based on the multicultural theory that adopting important features of national civic identity can be beneficial for creating inclusive multiculturalism in Korea. For example, Korean presidents such as Syngman Rhee, Park Chung Hee, and Chun Doo Hwan used Korean ethnic nationalism to justify their rule and to receive public support. Furthermore, multicultural theories, presented by scholars such as Kymlicka (2012), offer explanations for discriminatory treatments of multicultural people in a society, emphasizing the importance of national identity for inclusiveness and acceptance of immigrants.

This paper has ELEVEN (11) sections. Section two describes what kind of theoretical framework is in it and how various theories and proponents have discussed the idea behind multiculturalism and its importance. Section three describes the context of the study, and we see that ethnic nationalism and the

Korean multicultural policies have different forms. Section four is the method it describes before conducting the main investigation into how pilot study was done. The fifth section research design part explains primary data collection, interview, and questionnaire issues. Section six is the final part: how staffs provide the highest number of responses for research. The seventh section is the discussion part: there are so many issues in this part on leaders' response area, we see how the score difference and based on their perception than what the staff looks about. Section eight shows the limitations of the study. On this, we see two categories the foreign staff and leaders. In Section nine, the author shows his recommendation on this part. In Section ten of summary and implication, the author shows the Korean government's positive strides. Lastly, in Section eleven, in a short, the writer declares no conflict of interest regarding the publication of the paper.

# 2. Theoretical Framework

Various theories and proponents have discussed the idea behind multiculturalism and its importance in its implementation in modern society. Multiculturalism is simply about the diversity of cultures, and Parekh (2000) discusses it as culturally embedded diversity. Multiculturalism takes the form of subcultural variety, where members of the society share a common culture but with different beliefs and views, and perspective diversity, where members of the society challenge the existing norms in society and do not conform to the concept of having a common culture. There is also communal diversity, where communities are self-conscious and live according to their norms. This type of multiculturalism exists among indigenous communities and other minority cultures.

A multicultural society is a society with communal diversity in one country. One of the theories that support the idea of a multicultural society is egalitarianism. Egalitarians, such as Barry (2003) think that equality is achieved by giving people the same rights and obligations, or so-called "uniform citizenship". In other words, a state should adopt a difference-blind approach and provide the same treatment for all citizens, irrespective of differences in race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, etc. Furthermore, according to Barry (2003), uniform citizenship is essential for social cohesion, as it provides a sense of belonging to a common political entity and promotes cooperation and sacrifice.

The opposite theory is multiculturalism liberalism, which does not support the idea of a state being neutral in its operations. It's due to many different sub-groups, such as religious groups, homosexuals, disabled people, and even women, who can be categorized as sub-group. Often, by being neutral and treating everyone equally, the state inevitably discriminates against subgroups. The idea of having a homogenous society under this theory is, therefore, impossible. In this, Kymlicka (2012) argues that despite the expanded concept of citizenship, some sub-groups are still disadvantaged compared to the dominant majority. These theories and their application thereof impact how leaders, both political and corporate, implement multiculturalism in their areas of leadership

(Archer, 1995). If a leader chooses to treat every culture equally, most of the time, the minority cultures within tend to feel sidelined and that their views and ideas are not respected.

# 3. The Context for the Study

Ethnic nationalism and the Korean multicultural policy form an important point of discussion for multicultural implementation in the Korean Republic. The theory underlying ethnic nationalism is that national identities are only imagined as such. The same is subject to change. Anderson propounded this idea. In his analysis, Anderson (1991) stated that the origins of nationalism are from the lexicographical revolutions in 19th-century Europe. In the Korean context, Shin Gi-Wook (2006) stated that Korean nationalism emanated from the 20th century, a period when Koreans were resisting Japanese assimilation. The two examples show that the perception of an external threat to the nation leads to the growth and adoption of nationalism. Koreans before the 20th century never really identified as Koreans but had different levels of identity-based on the existing dynasties. Some, for instance, identified as Buddhists during the Koryo dynasty. Later on, Confucianism took over as the dominant state ideology. These changes, therefore, show that ethnic nationalism is a concept that was subject to change in Korea, and with the rise of multiculturalism, it is expected to take the same route (Shin Gi-Wook, 2006).

Fast forward to the 1990s, the Korean multicultural model, also known as the assimilation model, began to take shape. The policy was based on the integration of married migrants and the children of these migrants, and the other pillar was implementing policies that regulated the life and work of foreign workers. It was after the government realized the increase in the number of immigrants in the country. At the time, the world was beginning to become a global village with the exchange of workers and access to employment opportunities by foreigners in Korea. As a result, multiculturalism became a popular concept in the circles of the Korean government in the 2000s that was used to counter the term Korean mono ethnicity. As a result, the government began sponsoring multicultural projects. However, the focus was mostly on married immigrants and their families compared to foreign workers who were only considered temporary residents and excluded from the integration efforts (Parekh, 1997). This Plan was followed by a new Plan, The First Basic Plan for Immigration Policy (2008-2012), that was meant to deal with immigrants and the issue of immigration extensively.

The First Plan is based on Article 5, Act on Treatment of Foreigners in Korea, which states that the Justice Ministry would be responsible for announcing a new plan every five years. It includes main policy objectives, measures to obtain them, funding sources and necessary resources (Zaccaro, 2004). With this plan, the government initiated a 'strategic opening' to the World based on Korea's economic needs; thus, it covered four main areas: enhancing workforce competitiveness, supporting multicultural families, enforcing immigration laws and

control, preventing discrimination, and protecting humans, including refugee rights. The plan was deemed a significant step forward; however, it lacked specific information and measures to achieve set goals and a strategy to achieve shared national identity and common values (Joppke, 2008). For example, under the second heading, "High-quality social integration, 'subheading 2.1', Improving public understanding of a multicultural society's background and need," it is stated that mutual understanding is necessary. Also, Koreans need to accept immigrants and cultivate understanding through education. This plan was, therefore, a positive move by the government from the national level in promoting multiculturalism in Korea. The policies by the Korean government were very important in ensuring multiculturalism is achieved in Korea. However, they tended to be general, and there was no clear explanation or pathway on how to achieve them. However, subsequent plans, such as the Second Plan, and the Second Basic Plan for Immigration Policy (2013-2017), addressed the problems in the First Plan and solved them. As a result, the government began to see and realize the importance of immigration to the Korean government, which led to massive economic gains for the country.

However, a gap still exists; most Koreans, despite the efforts put in place by the government, do not recognize multiculturalism and cultural integration. It's due to the social problems brought about by immigrants coming to Korea; the low-income Korean nationals felt that the immigrants were taking their opportunities and the government was focusing on the immigrants, yet it had nationals who were still poor. Such anti-multicultural sentiments are felt in many countries that have adopted multicultural policies and are therefore expected (Kymlicka & Hee, 2005).

## 4. Methods

Before conducting the main investigation, a pilot study was done. An arranged questionnaire was sent to the professor and the university's main advisor before the pilot study. The supervisor edited the questionnaire, and the research then started with the selected multicultural community. The pilot study helped determine the dependability and validity of the data-gathering material. At the time of the pilot study, 25 participants, 15 representatives of the multicultural community, and 10 leaders participated.

For the main study, the target population was the selected city mayors, Department heads in Seoul and Incheon Metropolitan Cities, Gimpo Municipal City, selected heads and staff from foreign Resident Support Centers, and Program Coordinators from Resident Support Centers. The staffs from the targeted areas were from the UNHCR, Korea, Refugee NGOs, City Department heads, City Managers, and City Administration Leaders. In addition, 87 males and 83 females from multicultural communities, and 30 males and 12 females represented the leaders from the selected cities. Of the 210 questionnaires distributed and given by consulting, a total of 162 were responded to, which constituted the target.

All scales applied in this thesis were passed with a reliability exam to see if they were internally consistent with each other. To get the reliability coefficients, Cronbach's was employed. Cronbach's Alphas test was applied to modeling the way, inspiring a shared vision, challenging shared vision, enabling others to act, encouraging the heart, multiculturalism families' job satisfaction, and leadership commitment. Alpha values for Cronbach's alpha range from 0.705 and 0.857. The following hypotheses, H1a, H1b, H2a, and H2b, were tested using inferential analysis. The hypotheses are stated below. H1a: LMX and Leadership satisfaction exhibit a positive and statistically significant relationship. These are; H1b: PSM and staff exhibit a positive and statistically significant relationship. H2a: LMX and leadership commitment have a positive and statistically significant association, and H2b: PSM and Leader's commitment have a positive and statistically significant relationship. The association between the variables under study (Leaders' commitment, leaders' satisfaction, staff satisfaction, LMX, and PSMM) was decided using a spearman correlation.

The first hypothesis (H1a) states a positive relationship between LMX and leaders' satisfaction. The second hypothesis (H1b) stated that PSM and Staff satisfaction have a positive association. The third hypothesis (H2a), which stated a positive relationship between LMX and leaders' commitment, was also tested using Spearman's rho Correlations. The hypothesis (H2b), which stated that a positive correlation exists between PSM and teacher commitment, was valid. However, there was no statistically significant correlation between the two variables. The T-test and ANOVA were used to determine whether there is a positive and significant correlation between demographic factors and the independent (LMX and PSM) and dependent (Leaders' Job Satisfaction, Staff's Job satisfaction, and Leaders' Commitment) variables. An exploration of the impact of LMX on multicultural community work satisfaction and Leadership commitment was supervised using multiple regression analysis (Tables 1-5).

# 5. Research Design

For primary data collection, interviews and questionnaires were the primary sources of collecting data. The participants in the study involved High-Level

Table 1. Descriptive statistics.

Scale	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Modelling the way	3.84	0.953	1	5
Inspiring Shared Vision	3.71	0.928	1	5
Challenging the Process	3.61	0.884	1	5
Enabling others to act	3.76	0.885	1	5
Encouraging the heart	3.43	0.814	1	5
Multicultural families Job Satisfaction	3.57	0.809	1	5
Leadership commitment	3.60	0.717	1	5

**Table 2.** Reliability test.

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha
Modelling the way	0.857
Inspiring Shared Vision	0.726
Challenging the Process	0.734
Enabling others to act	0.746
Encouraging the heart	0.705
Multicultural families Job Satisfaction	0.728
Leadership commitment	0.804

Table 3. Spearman's rho correlations.

		TC	TJS	LMX Total	PSM Total	PSM COMP	PSM SS	PSM PI
TC	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	0.207**	0.191*	0.123	0.172*	-0.046	0.263**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.006	0.011	0.103	0.023	0.545	0.000
TJS	Correlation Coefficient	0.207**	1.000	0.193*	0.065	0.184*	-0.121	0.132
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.006		0.010	0.390	0.015	0.110	0.080
LMXTotal	Correlation Coefficient	0.191*	0.193*	1.000	0.014	0.616**	0.185*	0.388**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.011	0.010		0.203	0.000	0.014	0.000
PSMTotal	Correlation Coefficient	0.123	0.065	0.014	1.000	0.622**	0.716**	0.460**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.103	0.390	0.203		0.000	0.000	0.000
PSMCOMP	Correlation Coefficient	0.172*	0.184*	0.616**	0.622**	1.000	0.125	0.023
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.023	0.015	0.000	0.000		0.098	0.761
PSMSS	Correlation Coefficient	-0.046	-0.121	0.185*	0.716**	0.125	1.000	0.134
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.545	0.110	0.014	0.000	0.098		0.076
PSMPI	Correlation Coefficient	0.263**	0.132	0.388**	0.460**	0.023	0.134	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.080	0.000	0.000	0.761	0.076	

 $<sup>^{**}</sup>$ . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).  $^{*}$ . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4. T-test/ANOVA.

Variable Category		Mean	Stand deviation
Sex	Male	3.58	0.723
SEX	Female	3.54	0.754
	20 to 29 years	3.76	0.832
	30 to 39 years	3.45	0.674
Age distribution	40 to 49 years	3.46	0.772
	50 to 59 years	3.34	0.834
	60 to 69 years	3.65	0.765
	Single	3.78	0.767
Marital status	Married	3.65	0.744
	Divorced/ widowed	3.43	0.765
	BSC/BA	3.76	0.888
Level of education	MSC/MA	3.44	0.676
	P. HD	3.74	0.665
	0 to 3 years	3.64	0.774
Service in current position	4 to 6 years	3.62	0.788
position	Six years more	3.65	0.565

Table 5. Dependent variable: TJS.

Linear Regression Coefficients for LMX and TJS						
Unstandardized Standardized  Model Coefficients Coefficients T						
В	Std. Error	Beta	<u> </u>			
10.593	2.724		3.888	0.000		
0.096	0.037	0.199	2.762	0.009		
	Unstar Coef B 10.593	Unstandardized Coefficients  B Std. Error  10.593 2.724	Unstandardized Standardized Coefficients  B Std. Error Beta  10.593 2.724	Unstandardized Coefficients Coefficients T  B Std. Error Beta  10.593 2.724 3.888		

<sup>\*</sup>*p*-value < 0.05.

Leaders, Advisors, Department heads and administration leaders from the four municipalities in South Korea. This primary data was corroborated by secondary data on multiculturalism implementation manuals, implementation reviews and reports.

The questionnaires were used to obtain primary data from the respondents' two categories: the City Administration offices, stakeholders, potential respondent NGOs and city leaders. In addition, the questionnaires contained a Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI) tool (a tool developed by Kouzes and Posner, 2007) and other questions that helped to assess the adherence of leadership to the multiculturalism program implementation framework. The LPI tool was adapted to suit the context of global citizen program leadership (Parekh, 2007).

As for interviews from the main informants, the mayor and vice Mayor's office, bureau of City Administrator, bureau of Economy and Culture, bureau of welfare and Culture, Advisory office of foreign Community and foreign resident Support Center staff and leaders were interviewed with the aid of semi-structured questions.

The main secondary data sources are reports from the mayor's office and Timely Memory from the refugee office. These documents are important for the analysis of integration outcomes, adherence to the implementation framework, and detailed performance profile in this study. In addition to these core secondary sources, published and unpublished documents, Research Reports, programs and strategic documents, government policies, websites, ministry of justice reports, and journals were analyzed for this study.

## 6. Results

From the primary research, 210 questionnaires were distributed to the various stakeholders that would help with the study. Of these, 185 questionnaires were responded to. The staff provided the highest number of responses in this study. On the Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI) Score, the statement that states the leaders as respectful to others' Values and focuses on a shared value was ranked highest from the statements grouped under modeling the way. Thus, it appeared that multicultural community staff, foreign workers, and the concerned stakeholders perceived that their leaders honor others' values and build consensus around shared values. Regarding the practices of leaders in challenging the process, the observer's staff of multiculturalism, welfare, Resident Corporation, and related Stakeholders attested that the leaders sometimes ask for a lesson when things do not go as expected. But the leaders rarely search for innovative ways outside the organization to overcome possible challenges in the leadership processes. Here Below attached the importance result with necessary figures.

# 6.1. Summary of Self-Score (N = 50) (Table 6)

In Addition to that the relevant result data has two sections at the beginning. The first section presents the results of surveyed data. A description of the response rate, demographic data, and statistically analyzed results are presented on the main dissertation result too. This part also reports data in tabular and graphic forms with descriptions. The second section of the chapter is the discussion part. In that section, the key findings are discussed and interpreted in comparison with the existing literature in line with the basic research Questions under the study.

# 6.2. Statistical Analysis Technique

The raw data will be grouped into categories following basic research questions and the study's objectives to manage the data. Descriptive statistics were used to

Table 6. Summary of self-score.

LPI Statement	Mean	* S. D
LPI Statement for Modeling the W	ay	
Honour other's values and focus on shared values	4.22	0.766
Spend time and energy on principles	3.89	1.029
Actions consistency with words	3.87	0.973
Clear about the philosophy of leadership	3.91	0.951
Sets personal example	3.68	1.057
Ask for feedback	3.87	0.945
LPI Statement for Inspiring shared V	ision	
Enthusiastic about future	4.01	1.009
Communicate vision	3.82	0.847
Appealing to others to share dreams	3.45	0.885
Speak about the purpose of the work	3.82	0.965
Enlist others in a common vision	3.70	1.014
Envision the future	3.91	1.005
LPI Statement for Challenging the Pr	ocess	
Ask, "what can we learn?"	3.77	1.107
Experiment and take risks	3.54	0.971
Take the initiative to overcome obstacles	3.47	1.038
Initiate trying a new and innovative approach	3.61	0.862
Seek challenging opportunities	3.52	1.038
Search outside the organization for innovative ways	3.59	1.071
LPI Statement for Enabling Others to	o act	
Treat others with dignity and respect	3.87	1.076
Listen attentively to others' opinions	3.91	1.105
Develop a cooperative relationship	4.01	0.982
Support decisions of another	4.01	1.034
Give freedom and choice in deciding how to do	4.03	0.965
Strive to develop others' skill	4.17	1.051
LPI Statement for Encouraging the F		
Praise people for jobs well done	3.50	1.044
Confidence in others' ability	3.57	0.952
To give appreciation and support	3.08	1.155
Recognize publicly	3.56	0.852
Celebrate accomplishment	3.84	1.103
	J.04	1.103

#### Continued

LPI Statement related to commitment					
3.84	1.083				
4.08	0.887				
4.05	0.943				
4.12	0.852				
4.33	1.084				
3.84	1.120				
4.01	1.219				
3.84	0.887				
3.77	0.917				
3.87	0.951				
	3.84 4.08 4.05 4.12 4.33 3.84 4.01 3.84 3.77				

<sup>\*</sup> Maximum = 5, \*Minimum = 1. Source: Own survey (2022).

analyze the quantitative data obtained through primary and secondary sources. Thus, after checking for completeness, errors and missing quantitative data were summarized using SPSS version 20.0 for determining means, standard deviations, percentages, cross-tabulation, comparing means and drawing Tables to relate to the general facts and theories. The qualitative data were analyzed by categorizing responses using an index matrix.

# 6.3. Survey Results

### 6.3.1. Response Rate

Approximately 210 questionnaires were delivered to the sample of the population that served as the basis for responses, of which one hundred and sixty-two (162) were retrieved, representing a 77.1% valid response rate and acceptable. The response rate is consistent with Baruch and Holtom (2008), who established that a response rate of 52% and above is acceptable for approval.

## 6.3.2. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

As indicated in **Table 2**, all the staff and stakeholder's category respondents have almost similar numbers and percentages, male & female. Still, on the side of leaders, the male participant is a little bit high, 76% & 24% respectively. From **Table 2**, 27 foreigners, multicultural community representatives, or staff workers from the staff side their age fall 20 to 25, which is 15.9 per cent. On the staff and stakeholder side, the remaining 143 respondents, or 87.8, are more than 30 years old. According to the Educational background from the observing staff and stakeholder side, we will get 18, 87, and 47 B. A/BSC, MA/MSc and PhD, respectively.

Regarding their marital status, except for 9 from the staff and stakeholders' side, all the remaining were married (44.1%) and single (50.6%). Finally, regarding the service year in the current position for the staff category, most of the

respondents (45.3%) have served for less than 4 - 6 years on average.

There were also stakeholders (15.9%), in terms of service years, who have served for 2 - 3 years. The remaining 38.8% have served more than 6 years. **Table 2** provides basic information about the selected cities' foreign support centre, non-governmental organizations, and city administration leaders.

The respondents in this category (Leaders' category) were 76% male and 24% female. The average age of the majority (70%) of these leaders was above 40 years. Their educational level ranges are BA/BSc to PhD. Regarding the Service years of the leaders, in their current position, a majority (60%) of them served more than 3 years. It reveals that it will be easy if they add their effectiveness and commitment again to bringing the best achievement for the effective implementation of multiculturalism (Table 7).

## 6.3.3. Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics for the variables under investigation are presented in this subsection. Thus, the dependent variables are the mean, Standard deviation, minimum and maximum. (Staff satisfaction and Leadership Commitment) and predator variables (LMX and PSM) (Table 8).

# **6.3.4. Reference 2 Summary of LPI-Self and LPI-Observers Scores** See Table 9.

#### 7. Discussion

Multiculturalism is an important concept not only in government leadership but also in corporate governance. 51.7% of foreign staffs acknowledge the policies put in place by the Korean government to ensure that multiculturalism is adopted and respected in the Korean Republic. However, the challenge of anti-multiculturalism still exists in the major cities listed despite the efforts put in place by the government (Kymlicka & Banting, 2006). It shows that multiculturalism is political and requires social policies and personal changes to succeed. The foreign staff still felt that the leaders did not do enough to ensure multiculturalism and did not give them time or offer opportunities to meet with them regularly. The study also raised the issue of staff satisfaction with their current job condition and the project's status in the multiculturalism implementation process, especially for foreign staff (Koopmans, 2010). Most of them have low job satisfaction, which applies across all cities. The general problem with the leadership in the country was that leadership had a communication problem with the foreign staff, and there was no planning on the use of multicultural policies and implementation of multicultural policies (Banting, 2005). The leaders, however, felt like they did well in promoting multiculturalism in the workplace, which was not seconded by the staff. Leaders were felt to engage less in promoting multicultural actions despite the positive move by the government seen through the inclusion of multicultural policies in the country. The leaders, therefore, seemed to score higher based on their perceptions than what the staff felt about them.

Table 7. Demographic characteristics of respondents.

Characteristics	Multicultural Community Representatives		Leaders from Seoul, Incheo and Gimpo City, Mayors, Administration office Directors, etc		
	Frequency (N = 112)	Percent	Frequency (N = 50)	Percent	
Sex					
Male	87	51.2	38	76	
Female	83	48.8	12	24	
Age					
20 - 29 years	27	15.9	-	-	
30 - 39 years	77	45.3	15	30	
40 - 49 years	26	15.3	15	30	
50 - 59 years	31	18.2	15	30	
60 - 69 years	9	5.3	5	10	
Educational level					
BSC/BA	18	11.8	15	30	
MSC/MA	87	57.2	30	60	
P. HD	47	30.9	10	20	
Marital status					
Single	86	50.6	20	40	
Married	75	44.1	28	56	
Divorced/widowed	9	5.3	2	4	
Religion					
orthodox	38	22.4	8	16	
protestant	77	45.3	25	50	
catholic	45	26.5	12	24	
others	10	5.9	5	10	
Service year in present Position					
0 - 3 years	27	15.9	10	20	
4 - 6 years	77	45.3	30	40	
>6 years	66	38.8	10	20	

The study also raised the issue of staff satisfaction with their current job condition and the project's status in the multiculturalism implementation process. The data was obtained from each selected city's staff and leaders (Table 10).

Table 8. Descriptive statistics.

Scale	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Modelling the way	3.84	0.953	1	5
Inspiring Shared Vision	3.71	0.928	1	5
Challenging the Process	3.61	0.884	1	5
Enabling others to act	3.76	0.885	1	5
Encouraging the heart	3.43	0.814	1	5
Multicultural families Job Satisfaction	3.57	0.809	1	5
Leadership commitment	3.60	0.717	1	5

Table 9. Summary of LPI-Self and LPI-observers scores.

Leadership Practice	Mean* (LPI-Observe)	S. D. (LPI-Observe)	Mean LPI-Self	S. D. LPI -Self
Modelling the Way	3.80	0.953	3.888	0.953
Inspiring a Shared Vision	3.64	0.892	3.785	0.954
Challenging the Process	3.64	0.892	3.583	0.876
Enabling Others to Act	3.87	0.986	3.65	0.784
Encouraging the Heart	3.43	0.950	3.44	0.678

**Table 10.** Table staff and leaders' attitude for their job satisfaction in percent.

	Foreign Staff <b>and</b> Stakeholders (N = 112)	City and Administration area Leaders (N = 50)
Low	51.7%	16%
Meddle	41.9%	70%
High	6.25%	14%

Source: Own survey (2022).

The above figure shows that 51.7% of the foreign or multicultural representatives' satisfaction with their job is low. On the contrary, (6.25%) of the staff were found to have high-level satisfaction with their current job. The remaining 41.9% reported that their level of satisfaction was medium. Regarding leaders, most (70%) believe they are averagely satisfied with their current job. Generally, there is a Perception difference among leaders concerning staff's satisfaction on their job that ranges from "low" to "High" satisfaction.

## 8. Limitation

The respondents were categorized into two categories. The first category contains all the selected sample cities, multicultural community staff, foreign staff in all parts of South Korean territory, and any foreign stakeholders for the case

study project cities: Seoul and Incheon Metropolitan Government and Gimpo Municipal City. The second category contains Seoul and Incheon Metropolitan Government and Gimpo Municipal City Top leaders, the above three city administrators and Directors in any related multicultural organizations. While one of the fifty City and regional area leaders failed to respond from the leader's category, the others participated in the study. As seen also, most of the participants were staff, and the self-score participants were the leaders, which led to the discrepancy in the results, as noted in the discussion section, as leaders felt that they scored high in the promotion of multiculturalism which feeling was not supported by the foreign staff.

# 9. Recommendations

The leadership practices described by Kouzes and Posner (2007) need to be developed, enhanced, and acted upon. So, the Ministry of Justice and the Seoul, Incheon metropolitan, and Gimpo municipal cities Governments must arrange a leadership development program to capacitate the skills and knowledge of each leader at the all-district level. The multiculturalism policy implementation guideline must be revised and needs to address the accommodation-related issues of foreign staff. City Education and multicultural leaders need to develop mechanisms to obtain feedback from the foreign staff and anyone stuck to multiculturalism activities or regarding their leadership practices. Each leader should have their professional staff evaluate their leadership practices using the Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI) to understand their followers' perceptions (Kouzes & Posner, 2007). Lastly, further studies must include potential stakeholders so that the effectiveness of the leadership in implementing the policy program can be analyzed in a broader context.

# 10. Summary and Implications

The Korean government has made positive strides since the 1990s in the inclusion of multiculturalism in its programs through the various programs stated in this paper. It's a positive move that saw the move from ethnic nationalism, which is always subject to change. However, based on the primary study, there is a mismatch between the perception leaders have of multicultural integration in their various areas of leadership and the reality that foreign staff face. As a result, the high Government, City leaders and Local foreign support leaders are not discharging their responsibilities to the extent the implementation guideline dictates. Regarding some outcomes of multicultural policy implementation, it will be great for all areas of the program's success if it is strongly done. However, it is noted that the programs mostly favored the Korean immigrants that were married and their children and considered the foreign staff who were seen as temporary despite the need that arose in the Korean society that saw the economic importance of foreign investment to the Korean government. There is, therefore, more to be done concerning implementing multicultural policies by the leaders.

## **Conflicts of Interest**

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

## References

- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* Verso.
- Archer, M. S. (1995). *Realist Social Theory: The Morphogenetic Approach*. Cambridge University Press. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511557675">https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511557675</a>
- Banks, J. A. (2009). Diversity and Citizenship Education in Multicultural Nations. *Multicultural Education Review*, *1*, 1-28. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/23770031.2009.11102861">https://doi.org/10.1080/23770031.2009.11102861</a>
- Banting, K. G. (2005). The Multicultural Welfare State: International Experience and North American Narratives. *Social Policy & Administration*, *39*, 98-115. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9515.2005.00428.x
- Barry, D. T. (2003). Cultural and Demographic Correlates of Self-Reported Guardedness among East Asian Immigrants in the US. *International Journal of Psychology, 38*, 150-159. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/00207590244000287">https://doi.org/10.1080/00207590244000287</a>
- Baruch, Y., & Holtom, B. C. (2008). Survey Response Rate Levels and Trends in Organizational Research. *Human Relations*, *61*, 1139-1160. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726708094863
- Fraser, N. (2007). Re-Framing Justice in a Globalizing World. In *(Mis)recognition, Social Inequality, and Social Justice* (pp. 29-47). Routledge.
- Fraser, N., & Honneth, A. (2003). *Redistribution or Recognition? A Political-Philosophical Exchange*. Verso.
- Goldberg, D. T. (1994). Multiculturalism: A Critical Reader. Blackwell.
- Haddock, B., & Sutch, P. (2003). *Multiculturalism, Identity and Rights*. Routledge Taylor and Francis Group. <a href="https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203563250">https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203563250</a>
- Honneth, A. (1996). The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts. MIT Press.
- Joppke, C. (2008). Immigration and the Identity of Citizenship: The Paradox of Universalism. *Citizenship Studies*, *12*, 533-546. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/13621020802450445">https://doi.org/10.1080/13621020802450445</a>
- Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (1997). *Changing Multiculturalism*. Open University Press.
- Koopmans, R. (2010). Trade-Offs between Equality and Difference: Immigrant Integration, Multiculturalism and the Welfare State in Cross-National Perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36, 1-26. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/13691830903250881">https://doi.org/10.1080/13691830903250881</a>
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2007). Leadership Challenge (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Kymlicka, W. (2012). Comment on Meer and Modood. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 33, 211-216. https://doi.org/10.1080/07256868.2012.649528
- Kymlicka, W., & Banting, K. (2006). Immigration, Multiculturalism, and the Welfare State. Ethics and International Affairs, 20, 281-304. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7093.2006.00027.x">https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7093.2006.00027.x</a>
- Kymlicka, W., & Hee, B. G. (2005). *Multiculturalism in Asia*. Oxford University Press. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1093/0199277621.001.0001">https://doi.org/10.1093/0199277621.001.0001</a>
- Meer, N., & Modood, T. (2012). How Does Interculturalism Contrast with Multiculturalism? *Journal of intercultural studies, 33,* 175-196.

### https://doi.org/10.1080/07256868.2011.618266

- Modood, T. (2017). Must Interculturalists Misrepresent Multiculturalism? *Comparative Migration Studies, 5,* 1-17. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-017-0058-y">https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-017-0058-y</a>
- Parekh, B. (1997). Equality in a Multiracial Society. In J. Franklin (Ed.), *Equality* (pp. 123-155). Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Parekh, B. (2007). Being British. *Political Quarterly*, *78*, 32-40. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-923X.2007.02017.x
- Parekh, B. C. (2000). *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory.* Harvard University Press.
- Parekh, B. C. (2002). Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory. Harvard University Press.
- Shin, G.-W. (2006). *Ethnic Nationalism in Korea, Genealogy, Politics and Legacy*. Stanford University Press. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1515/9780804768016">https://doi.org/10.1515/9780804768016</a>
- Taylor, L. (2012). Decolonizing International Relations: Perspectives from Latin America. International Studies Review, 14, 386-400. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2012.01125.x
- The Third Master Plan for Immigration Policy (2018-2022). https://www.immigration.go.kr/
- Torres, C. A. (1998). Democracy, Education, and Multiculturalism: Dilemmas of Citizenship in a Global World. *Comparative Education Review, 42*, 421-447. https://doi.org/10.1086/447522
- Werbner, P. (2012). Multiculturalism from above and below: Analyzing a Political Discourse. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, *33*, 197-209. https://doi.org/10.1080/07256868.2012.649527
- Zaccaro (2004). Industrial Accidents in South Korea Raise Questions on Treatment of Korean-Chinese Migrant Workers. *South China Morning Post*.