ORIGINAL ARTICLE

P&P
POLITICS & POLICY

International scholarship for social change? Re-contextualizing Global Korea Scholarship alumni's perceptions of justice and diversity in South Korea

Moon Suk Hong[1] | **Minjeong Jeon[2]** | **Kadir Jun Ayhan[3]**

[1]International Development Cooperation Program, Busan University of Foreign Studies, Busan, Republic of Korea

[2]Global Education Cooperation Program, Seoul National University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

[3]Graduate School of International Studies, Ewha Womans University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

Correspondence
Minjeong Jeon, Global Education Cooperation Program, 606-1, College of Education Building 10-1, Seoul National University, 1, Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu, 08826, Seoul, Republic of Korea.
Email: minjeongjeon1@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examines South Korea's international scholarship program based on responses to the Global Korea Scholarship (GKS) alumni survey to find how the participants perceive the host country's dimensions of justice and diversity. We employ the concept of justice in terms of redistribution, recognition, and representation. Analysis of GKS alumni perceptions of Korean society revealed that international mobility programs may provide positive and negative experiences for the participants depending on their positionality in terms of gender, ethnicity, and Korean language proficiency. Some had the exclusive opportunity to access global knowledge, skills, and networks. Others were exposed to unexpected misrepresentation and misframing while living and learning in the new society. We suggest the need for multidimensional policy discussions to consider both positive and negative outcomes of international scholarship programs and their potential to play a transformative role in global higher education.

KEYWORDS

Asia, diversity, Global Korea Scholarship, higher education, international scholarship, justice, *P&P* Special Issue, public diplomacy, South Korea, student mobility

Related Articles in this Special Issue

Ayhan, Kadir Jun, and Nancy Snow. 2021. "Introduction to the Special Issue—Global Korea Scholarship: Empirical Evaluation of a non-Western Scholarship Program from a Public Diplomacy Perspective." *Politics & Policy* 49(6): 1282–1291. https://doi.org/10.1111/polp.12440.

Jon, Jae-Eun, and Kadir Jun Ayhan. 2021. "Satisfied or Dissatisfied: The Determinants of Global Korea Scholarship Recipients' Satisfaction with Life in Korea." *Politics & Policy* 49(6): 1391–1414. https://doi.org/10.1111/polp.12437.

Perez, Loarre Andreu, Myoung-Gi Chon, Kelly Vibber, and Jeong-Nam Kim. 2021. "Classifying Foreign Publics:

Examining the Relationships Behavioral Experience, Symbolic Environment, and Communication Behaviors among Key Foreign Publics." *Politics & Policy* 49(6): 1308–1322. https://doi.org/10.1111/polp.12439.

International student mobility programs have been fundamental in fostering opinion leaders and in creating outcomes consequential to international relations and development processes (Altbach et al., 2009; Dassin et al., 2018; Loerke, 2018; Scott-Smith, 2008). Over the past two decades, the literature on international student mobility has highlighted the benefits of international scholarship programs for the recipients (Findlay et al., 2012; Wiers-Jenssen, 2008) and to the wider society (Solimano, 2008; Spilimbergo, 2008; Stapleton et al., 2016). More recent studies have focused on analyzing international higher education scholarship programs as means of enhancing the host country image or public diplomacy (Aras & Mohammed, 2018; Ayhan & Gouda, 2021; Mathews-Aydinli, 2016; Metzgar, 2017; Snow, 2008; Varpahovskis & Ayhan, 2020; Yun, 2014). One reason for the growing interest in international scholarship programs as a public diplomacy tool could be its potential to nurture international opinion leaders, inculcating a favorable stance toward the host country and a better understanding of the host country's culture, values, and lifestyle (Leonard et al., 2002; Scott-Smith, 2008).

Scholarship programs such as the Chevening Fellowship, the Fulbright Program, the UK Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Programme, the German Exchange Service (DAAD), the New Colombo Plan, and the Open Society Foundation have built extensive human networks between host countries and institutions, and participating students, researchers, and policy leaders (Ailes et al., 2005; Byrne, 2016; Dassin et al., 2018; Mawer, 2014; Tournès & Scott-Smith, 2018). Varpahovskis and Ayhan (2020) looked at how the Global Korea Scholarship (GKS) alumni's cognitive and affective image of South Korea (hereafter Korea) and explain whether or not they maintain their relationship with the country after their studies on a personal and a professional level. Other studies examined discrimination, hatred, and enmity against international students and scholars in the host countries (Lee et al., 2017; Sidhu et al., 2019; Tam & Ayhan, 2021; Yun & Vibber, 2012). Regardless of the normative intentions, international students build complex relationships with the host countries based on their experience.

Inspired by previous literature, in this article we examine GKS alumni's perception of the normative dimensions in Korean society; in particular the issues of justice and diversity. Ayhan and Gouda (2021) find that the GKS alumni's image of Korea along these normative dimensions has been the most influential in determining negative word-of-mouth about Korea among GKS students. This finding warrants a closer look at how different demographic groups of GKS recipients evaluate the issues of diversity and justice in Korea. Therefore, we analyzed GKS alumni's perspectives on these dimensions using both quantitative data based on their responses to survey questions, and qualitative data based on their open-ended responses. The open-ended responses give reasons for their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with life in Korea and provide deeper insight and context to complement the survey results. This approach helps challenge the assumptions behind public diplomacy and education policy on GKS and other similar scholarship schemes. It also introduces more transformative elements in discussions on international scholarship programs.

This article is structured as follows. The next section develops the conceptual framework. This is followed by an explanation of the research design and method, implementation, and analysis. We then present our findings. In the last section, we discuss the findings, their implications for theory and policy, and conclude the article.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Changing contexts of global mobility programs and higher education

In recent years, there have been growing concerns about the shrinking space of knowledge exchange, learning,and training opportunities, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic. The global pandemic, climate change, rising inequality, and persistent poverty have led many to question again the current national, institutional, and local capacity to respond to these profound challenges (Dassin et al., 2018; Hong & Hwang, 2020; Peters et al., 2020). As the space for human mobility and physical exchanges shrinks, there has been a rising sense of urgency to cooperate for sustainable knowledge, solutions, and capacity building. In this shifting global context, it is apparent that the role of international scholarship needs to be re-examined in order to create new pathways for social change at the local, national, and global levels.

In the last decade, there have been increasing calls for assessment and evaluation of individual and social outcomes of public and private scholarship programs (Campbell, 2018; Findlay et al., 2012; Oketch et al., 2014; Stapleton et al., 2016; Volkman et al., 2009). Evaluation studies in the field of international scholarships raised both normative and methodological questions regarding program values, behaviors, and attitudes of participants and alumni, as well as post-scholarship program transition (Loerke, 2018; Marsh & Oyelere, 2018; Martel, 2018; Mawer, 2018; Zha & Wang, 2018). In the field of public diplomacy, despite calls for the rigorous evaluation of exchange or scholarship programs, such efforts remain lacking (Banks, 2020; Sommerfeldt & Buhmann, 2019). The small number of works that have been undertaken have evaluated student mobility programs from the public diplomacy perspective and overlook topics of justice and diversity.[1]

Dassin and others (2018) conducted a notable study to question the social, political, and normative aspects of global mobility in higher education. The study organizes articles from politics, sociology, and policy evaluation studies to highlight five different pathways international scholarships may take to produce social change—the academic diversity pathway, the international understanding pathway, the widening of access to higher education, the social network pathway, and the agent of change pathway. Unlike the past literature on international scholarship programs within public administration studies or evaluation studies that heavily focused on the efficiency and effectiveness of strategizing, planning, and selecting the appropriate scholarship candidates, recent literature has paid closer attention to the various pathways of scholarship experiences that are deeply connected with the global positionality of scholarship program participants and their political, social, and cultural agency. However, there is an apparent lack of literature on the scholarship participants' beliefs and emotions toward the host country's society and culture after the program is finished. In this regard, we are interested in how GKS alumni perceive the normative aspects of the host country and how these perceptions change based on their direct experience of the country.

Concept of justice and global parity of participation

Justice and diversity, two critical conceptual and practical dimensions for social change, have been receiving renewed attention in the United States, the United Kingdom, and many parts of European political and policy debates due to increasing economic inequalities,

---

[1]For some exceptions, see Ayhan, Gouda & Lee (2021), Lee and Snow (2021), Loerke (2018), and Yun (2015).

sociopolitical movements, and environmental risks. Among the numerous related social and political dimensions of justice and diversity, Nancy Fraser's (2008a, 2008b) works on social and political theory and feminist theory have been particularly notable for their sweep and scope. She developed a three-dimensional model of justice: redistribution (economic justice), recognition (cultural justice), and representation (political justice) (Fraser, 2008a, 2008b). Her works analytically disentangle the intersecting dimensions of social justice to clarify the concept and challenges of injustice.

Representation—or parity of participation, according to Fraser (2008b)—can be defined as the absence of structural exclusion across major areas of social interaction, as well as cultural exclusion rooted in political economy, status order, or both (see also Vincent, 2019). It must be noted that this participatory parity can be transnational and it is possible, though difficult, to consider "justice in the framework of the modern territorial state of a global order" (Fraser, 2008a, p. 340). While addressing global and transnational issues, she argues that "the obstacle to justice [is] neither economic nor cultural, but fundamentally political" (Fraser, 2007, p. 314). Hence, the issues of politics of representation and misrepresentation are deeply connected to culture.

Fraser (2008b, 2010) argues that in addressing transnational issues of the politics of representation and misrepresentation, two levels of misrepresentation occur: ordinary-political misrepresentation (related to the full representation of a particular group, voter registration, and quotas for political representation) and misframing (related to the wrong exclusion of some groups of people due to their backgrounds and banning a chance of participation). Fraser's concepts of misrepresentation *and* misframing help to critically conceptualize the positionality of the mobility program participants who are given sponsored learning opportunities to acquire global-level knowledge and skills, but at the same time experience expected and/or unexpected misrepresentation and misframing during the program.

Although higher education and the global mobility policy and programs have not been the direct topic of Fraser's works, her conceptualizations of justice and diversity have been widely disseminated within the critical study of education and learning policies and practices in Europe and North America. Leibowitz and Bozalek (2018), for instance, pointed to the importance of participatory parity in the reciprocal relationship of teaching, learning, and researching in higher education as well as across the wider society. Examining higher education in South Africa, they argue how maldistribution (a lack of economic justice), misrecognition (a lack of cultural justice), and misframing (a lack of political representation) can impact higher education actors' perceptions of and participation in their institutions and their society.

In East Asia, however, only a few scholars have introduced Fraser's conceptualization to the issues of higher education and global mobility. H. J. Lee (2014), Kim (2010), and Moon (2016) first initiated theoretical discussions around Fraser's ideas of justice, redistribution, recognition, radical feminism, and a critique of neoliberal capitalism in the Korean context. Jung (2017) applied such concepts to education and suggested that if we are to enhance our understanding of justice and injustice in education, it is critical to recognize justice more multidimensionally. Yet, such discussions linking Fraser's concept of justice with higher education and learning have not paid attention to transnational layers of justice and diversity—issues of recognition and representation of diverse agents' multiethnic, multilinguistic, and multicultural backgrounds and the issues of global distribution of knowledge and skills.

In this regard, the critical evaluation of international scholarship literature in Korea, by Hong and others reveals that official policy and academic discourse depict international students as a *source* of income, a *means* of improving university rankings, and most often as *an object* of management. They argue that the existing conceptual frameworks in the areas of mobility policy and programs in Korea are insufficient for critically understanding the particularly complex sets of injustices that are perceived and experienced by many politically unrepresented, socially vulnerable, or alienated global inbetweeners. Their study discusses the

importance of placing the participants of the international scholarship programs at the center of the agenda and emphasizes the need to pay attention to issues of redistribution (economic justice), recognition (cultural justice), and representation (political justice). These considerations provide critical opportunities to connect normative and ethical dimensions to global scholarship studies.

METHODOLOGY

Methodological approach

In this article, we intend to challenge the underlying normative public diplomacy and education policy assumptions behind GKS and other similar scholarship schemes and offer a new dimension in the discussion on international scholarship programs and their transformative potential. Therefore, based on Fraser's (2008a, 2008b) conceptualization of justice discussed above, we have examined the dimensions of justice and diversity in GKS. As a preliminary study, we thematically categorized 31 survey items into five dimensions: politics and governance, economy, culture and the Korean wave, justice, and diversity (see the full set of survey questions and the list of dimensions in the Appendices 1–5). Overall, the image of Korea in areas of politics and governance, economy, culture, and the Korean Wave were positively perceived by the alumni although responses varied according to the respondents' gender, ethnicity, and Korean language proficiency. But the perceptions on Korea's economy, politics, and culture were not similarly reflected in the other two aspects of justice and diversity. Therefore, we particularly focused on the dimensions of justice and diversity based on Fraser's (2008a, 2008b) conceptualization of justice, specifically: redistribution (economic justice), misrecognition (cultural justice), and misrepresentation (political justice).

Sampling

We used the GKS dataset that was created by Ayhan and his colleagues to examine GKS alumni's perceptions of Korea (Ayhan et al., 2021; see also Ayhan & Gouda, 2021; Ayhan, Gouda & Lee, 2021; Varpahovskis & Ayhan, 2020). The alumni survey in the dataset was conducted in June 2018 via Surveymonkey; 741 GKS alumni participated in the survey, but we used 579 responses which did not have missing values. Among these 579 survey respondents, 15.9% were in undergraduate programs, 67.9% in the master's, and 16.2% were in doctoral programs from 2005 to 2018. Of these, 55.3% were female. The respondents were from 110 different countries, and most were from Indonesia (4.8%), Vietnam (4.3%), Mongolia (3.9%), the Philippines (3.6%), and Malaysia (3.1%), while the percentage of other nationalities did not exceed 3%. Table 1 shows the demographic details of the survey participants.

Operationalization

The survey originally consisted of 92 questions (including closed-ended, open-ended, and multiple-choice questions, some of which were followed by multiple subquestions) regarding the respondents' cognitive and affective evaluation of Korea, satisfaction in Korea, and their personal demographic information. The survey questions were adopted from Alexander Buhmann's (2016) 4D Model of the Country Image.

We selected ten survey items on the normative dimensions of respondents' evaluation of Korea and broke them down into two categories of justice and diversity. The questions for both

TABLE 1   Research participant's demographic information

Gender		
Female	320	55.3%
Male	259	44.7%
Total	579	100%
GKS degree		
Undergraduate program	92	15.9%
Master's program	393	67.9%
Doctoral program	94	16.2%
Total	579	100%
Current employment status		
Employed in a full-time job	343	8.5%
Employed in a part-time job	49	13.8%
Continuing student	80	12.1%
Unemployed	70	6.4%
Other	37	100%
	579	

categories are listed in Appendix 1. To explore alumni perception on justice, they were asked regarding Korea's commitment to social issues, ethical standards, responsibility for helping in international crises, civil rights, welfare system, and fairness in international politics. On diversity, the alumni were asked if they perceive Korea as a county that respects the values of other nations and peoples, whether it is a welcoming country, and how they rate the integrity of Korea in terms of its norms and values. Cronbach's alpha was calculated to measure the reliability of the survey items, and for both constructs the result was above .82. We made cross-sectional comparisons based on the participants' gender, ethnicity, and Korean language proficiency.

Furthermore, the survey asked the alumni respondents retrospective questions on their cognitive evaluation of Korea. Specifically, the respondents were asked how much they agree with statements about Korea such as "South Korea is a welcoming country." After each of these questions, the survey asked the participants about their pre-arrival evaluation and their present one by providing them 7-point Likert-scale options for both periods. Each response was weighted accordingly. Despite existing controversy over the accuracy of the respondents' memory (Garcia, 2011), this method was employed to complement the lack of pre-arrival test due to budget and time limits to compare their perceptions of Korea before and after their program experience (Ayhan et al., 2018).

The open-ended questions asked the alumni to list their reasons for overall satisfaction or dissatisfaction with life in Korea. In total, the respondents gave 539 reasons for satisfaction, and 574 reasons for dissatisfaction. We analyzed these responses by frequency. Then the responses related to justice and diversity were grouped into three categories according to the respondents' gender, ethnicity, and Korean language proficiency. Some of these responses are only directly quoted in the findings section. These answers enrich the analysis by highlighting some of the complexities.

Analysis

We analyzed our data using the SPSS 26 software to examine how the GKS alumni evaluate Korea in terms of justice and diversity before and after their experience in Korea through

the GKS program. For this purpose, we created an independent variable for each question by calculating the difference of opinion (7-point Likert-scale response) before and after their experience. A positive calculation was interpreted as a positive change in the respondent's evaluation of Korea, and vice versa.

In addition, these changes in perception of the normative dimensions in Korean society were broken down by the respondents' gender, ethnicity, and Korean language proficiency. To measure the changes in the alumni perception by different demographic and personal characteristics, independent sample *t*-test, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and correlation analysis were conducted. We conducted two sample-independent *t*-tests to examine the gender difference in alumni perception. One-way ANOVA was performed to examine the effect of ethnic identity (classified as Asian, Black, Caucasian, and others) on alumni's responses. We further conducted post hoc comparison using Scheffe and Tamhane tests. Finally, we conducted correlation analysis to measure the direction and strength of the relationship between the responses and the respondents' Korean language proficiency. All statistical analyses were conducted at the .05 significance level while nonresponses were excluded. The analysis results are supplemented with open-ended responses on the aspects of redistribution, recognition, and representation.

FINDINGS

Cross-sectional comparisons

Gender

The alumni evaluation of Korea regarding justice and diversity showed difference in perception before and after the GKS program by gender. While all male alumni showed positive perception changes in both dimensions of justice and diversity, the female alumni tended to be less positive than the male alumni on all questions (see Table 2). Some negative changes of perception were also identified among female respondents. On matters of justice, the female alumni perceived Korea negatively on issues regarding ethical standards, civil rights, and the welfare system. For the diversity-related questions, the female alumni tended to disagree with the statement that Korea respects the values of other nations and peoples and that it is a welcoming country.

Open-ended questions regarding reasons for dissatisfaction with life in Korea reveal the gendered dynamics of the GKS participants' experiences in Korea. In particular, the issues of misrepresentations and direct discrimination based on the program participants' gender appeared to be prominent reasons for dissatisfaction. Some of the reasons were "discrimination on sex, especially for women," "discrimination for foreign women," "sexual harassment and the lack of education about the issues," and "overall intolerance especially toward homosexuals." The respondents' comments show that they have experienced misrecognition and misrepresentation throughout their stay and study, such as receiving age-related comments, getting judged by their physical appearance, receiving too much or unwanted attention, and constant comments on their foreign appearance. These female participants' negative evaluations of Korea on both justice and diversity suggest the intersectional nature of gender in regard to age and physical appearance.

Ethnicity

On the justice-related questions, whether Korea takes responsibility for helping in international crises was the only question for which all alumni showed positive change of perception

TABLE 2 GKS alumni perception on South Korea's justice and diversity aspects by gender

Questions	Sex	N	Means	Standard deviation	Means difference	t	p
Justice							
50. South Korea is known for its strong commitment to social issues (e.g., development aid, civil rights).	Female	237	.063	1.432	−.256	−1.936	.053
	Male	219	.320	1.391	−.256		
51. South Korea has high ethical standards	Female	252	−.313	1.528	−.466	−3.412	.001**
	Male	216	.153	1.408	−.466		
52. South Korea is a socially responsible member of the international community	Female	250	.032	1.064	−.354	−3.488	.001**
	Male	223	.386	1.133	−.354		
54. South Korea takes responsibility for helping in international crises	Female	230	.109	1.070	−.220	−3.488	.031*
	Male	219	.329	1.089	−.220		
56. South Korea has excellent civil rights	Female	226	−.155	1.319	−.413	−3.192	.002*
	Male	213	.258	1.392	−.413		
57. South Korea has a very just welfare system	Female	217	−.055	1.315	−.205	−1.557	.120
	Male	200	.150	1.377	−.205		
58. South Korea acts very fairly in international politics	Female	222	.050	1.017	−.215	−1.989	.047*
	Male	204	.265	1.199	−.215		
Diversity							
53. South Korea respects the values of other nations and peoples	Female	252	−.516	1.524	−.557	−4.019	.000**
	Male	220	.041	1.475	−.557		
55. South Korea is a welcoming country	Female	264	−.390	1.701	−.577	−4.022	.000**
	Male	225	.187	1.470	−.577		
59. How do you rate the integrity of South Korea, its norms and values (e.g., in civil rights, sustainability, and international politics)?	Female	239	.017	1.021	−.219	−2.149	.032*
	Male	212	.236	1.132	−.219		

Note: *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$.

regardless of their ethnicity. For the rest of the questions related to justice, the Caucasian alumni perceptions changed negatively after their GKS experience. Additionally, post hoc test results (classified as 1 = Asian, 2 = Black, 3 = Caucasian, and 4 = others) reveal that the Black alumni had the most significant perception change for the positive, followed by the Asian alumni. For the diversity-related questions on whether Korea respects the values of other nations and is a welcoming country, the Asian and Caucasian alumni's evaluation turned negative after their experiences in Korea, while the Black alumni's perceptions changed for the positive (see Table 3). The post hoc test corresponds to the previous results which showed that the Black alumni perceptions changed most positively after their stay and study in Korea, followed by the Asian alumni. The Caucasian alumni responses showed negative change in their perceptions on justice and diversity in Korea.

The open-ended responses giving reasons for dissatisfaction showed they were discriminated based on their ethnic identity. "Discrimination of skin color and ethnicity," "discrimination against poor country and people from the developing country," "racial discrimination and racism," and "prejudice against foreigners" were some of the most common reasons given by the GKS alumni. Discrimination against Chinese and other Asians tends to be more apparent when we compare the results based on ethnicity. The respondents' comments on their experience of ethnic and racial discrimination include: "Some Koreans discriminate people from Asia;" "Discrimination against Chinese is serious;" "Discrimination against nonwhite foreigners is common." The respondents also recalled their experience of racism and discrimination when they were off-campus and exposed to the wider society. Some more striking comments read: "The acceptance [of others] in public is challenging. For example, at times it is evident that people have second look at people with a different skin color;" "I faced racism in public few times, that made me not want to stay in Korea after my studies;" "Koreans seem to favor Caucasians;" "Some, really, some people look down on people from not developed countries while you can see their nice attitude towards people from developed countries;" "The different treatment to Asians, while Koreans more welcome to the Americans or Europeans." The results of our analysis on the perception on the Korean society based on the respondents' ethnicity provide some uneasy and challenging questions.

Korean language proficiency

Language has been one of the most important aspects in non-English speaking countries' international mobility policy and practice (Ghanem, 2017; Hall et al., 2005; C. Lee, 2014). When analyzing the GKS alumni's evaluation of Korea in terms of justice and diversity based on their Korean language proficiency, all statistically significant results show negative correlation. As shown in Table 4, the more fluent the alumni was in Korean, the less positively they evaluated Korea after their GKS experience. More specifically, the respondents who were proficient in Korean more often disagreed on justice-related statements that Korea is strongly committed to social issues, has high ethical standards, takes responsibility for helping in international crises, and has excellent civil rights. On diversity-related statements as well, the alumni who were more proficient in Korean tended to disagree more that Korea respects the values of other nations and people and is a welcoming country. They also gave lower ratings on Korea's integrity on its norms and values.

In the open-ended responses, those respondents who were proficient in Korean expressed their dissatisfactions regarding the language barrier, communication issues, and Korean language classes. The scholarship program participants are required to attend a year-long Korean language course, but the respondents were skeptical on whether it adequately prepared them for their studies: "One year feels like too short to learn Korean enough to be part of Korean society;" "Unreasonable expectations for international students to become fluent in Korean

TABLE 3 GKS alumni perception on South Korea's justice and diversity aspects by ethnicity

Questions		Total	Asian	Black	Caucasian	Others	F	p	Post hoc test
Justice									
50. South Korea is known for its strong commitment to social issues (e.g., development aid, civil rights)	N	455	243	69	85	58	9.355	.000**	2 > 3,4
	Means	.191	.317	.710	−.282	−.259			1 > 3,4
	Standard deviation	1.414	1.303	1.351	1.485	1.540			
51. South Korea has high ethical standards	N	467	252	67	90	58	10.524	.000**	2 > 1,3,4
	Means	−.092	−.016	.612	−.467	−.655			
	Standard deviation	1.486	1.408	1.141	1.439	1.850			
52. South Korea is a socially responsible member of the international community	N	472	252	72	93	55	8.234	.000**	2 > 1,3,4
	Means	.203	.175	.750	−.043	.036			
	Standard deviation	1.106	1.094	1.045	.988	1.217			
54. South Korea takes responsibility for helping in international crises	N	448	241	70	83	54	3.071	.028*	2 > 3
	Means	.217	.216	.529	.012	.130			
	Standard deviation	1.085	1.078	1.100	1.121	.972			
56. South Korea has excellent civil rights	N	438	236	65	85	52	15.222	.000**	2 > 1,3,4
	Means	.046	.174	.692	−.682	−.154			1 > 3
	Standard deviation	1.371	1.237	1.322	1.382	1.474			
57. South Korea has a very just welfare system	N	416	223	64	82	47	13.403	.000**	2 > 1,3,4
	Means	.043	.260	.453	−.646	−.340			1 > 4
	Standard deviation	1.349	1.210	1.259	1.400	1.508			

(Continues)

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Questions		Total	Asian	Black	Caucasian	Others	F	p	Post hoc test
58. South Korea acts very fairly in international politics	N	425	222	68	85	50	3.630	.013*	2 > 3
	Means	.153	.126	.485	−.094	.240			
	Standard deviation	1.113	1.077	1.044	1.278	.960			
Diversity									
53. South Korea respects the values of other nations and peoples	N	471	251	72	91	57	9.693	.000**	2 > 1,3,4
	Means	−.255	−.339	.569	−.637	−.316			
	Standard deviation	1.527	1.484	1.452	1.434	1.616			
55. South Korea is a welcoming country	N	488	259	73	98	58	2.903	.034*	2 > 3
	Means	−.125	−.097	.260	−.469	−.155			
	Standard deviation	1.625	1.648	1.581	1.514	1.673			
59. How do you rate the integrity of South Korea, its norms and values (e.g., in civil rights, sustainability, and international politics)?	N	450	238	70	87	55	8.194	.000**	2 > 3,4 1 > 3
	Means	.120	.189	.529	−.230	−.145			
	Standard deviation	1.080	1.003	1.100	1.128	1.096			

Note: *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$.

TABLE 4 GKS alumni perception on South Korea's justice and diversity aspects by Korean language proficiency

Questions	Correlation	Korean proficiency
Justice		
50. South Korea is known for its strong commitment to social issues (e.g., development aid, civil rights)	Pearson correlation	−.094*
	Sig. (two-tailed)	.04
	N	456
51. South Korea has high ethical standards	Pearson correlation	−.172**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	.00
	N	468
52. South Korea is a socially responsible member of the international community	Pearson correlation	−.09
	Sig. (two-tailed)	.05
	N	473
54. South Korea takes responsibility for helping in international crises	Pearson correlation	−.129**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	.01
	N	449
56. South Korea has excellent civil rights	Pearson correlation	−.134**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	.00
	N	439
57. South Korea has a very just welfare system	Pearson correlation	−.06
	Sig. (two-tailed)	.19
	N	417
58. South Korea acts very fairly in international politics	Pearson correlation	−.09
	Sig. (two-tailed)	.08
	N	426
Diversity		
53. South Korea respects the values of other nations and peoples	Pearson correlation	−.153**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	.00
	N	472
55. South Korea is a welcoming country	Pearson correlation	−.094*
	Sig. (two-tailed)	.04
	N	489
59. How do you rate the integrity of South Korea, its norms and values (e.g., in civil rights, sustainability, and international politics)?	Pearson correlation	−.111*
	Sig. (two-tailed)	.02
	N	451

Note: *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$.

with just one year of Korean language studies;" and "not only classes, but the education system itself is mainly in Korean, implying that sometimes I would miss out on the course contents." Some alumni were dissatisfied with the quality of the language course: "[The] quality of Korean language course was lower than expected;" "Korean language is very difficult and the teaching system is bad;" "I am not satisfied with the Korean language program, with the book;" and "Instead of encouraging me, a teacher bullied me, others treated me as a bad student." As English is not a working language in most teaching, learning, and research environments in higher education, Korean proficiency is critical for day-to-day survival of the scholarship

participants. Some other notable comments from the alumni were: "My Korean communications and interaction ability is not good enough [to study and work with supervisors and researchers] in the labs;" and "There was insufficient communication among the professors and the students. As a result, I [as a foreigner] suffered." The issues of discrimination, prejudice, and language capacity caused difficulties in interaction, communication, and relationship building between Koreans and scholarship program participants. In addition, the alumni with intermediate to advanced levels of Korean language proficiency also experienced various injustices.

Redistribution of financial and educational opportunities

GKS alumni experiences of lack of recognition and representation do not mean that the scholarship recipients reject the importance of financial opportunities and incentives. Given that the GKS program provides a generous scholarship package for international students, one would expect to see positive comments from the recipients who are given the opportunity to live and learn in a new country. For the GKS alumni, participating in the GKS program gave them opportunities for "new life experience," "discovery of a new culture," "learning opportunities for a new language," and most importantly, "making friends from all over the world." To the open-ended question on reasons for satisfaction with life in Korea, the alumni mentioned the quality of higher education. Other reasons included the learning environment and access to facilities (e.g., "excellent study/learning environment," "high level of education with advanced technology," "good research facilities," "access to facilities for studies"), and high institutional and academic standards and expectations (e.g., "internationally recognized educational institution," "high education standards," "higher expectation for study," "encouraging and enthusiastic study environment").

In particular, the GKS program seems to provide critical financial stability for students who need monetary assistance. Research participants repeatedly mentioned financial benefits such as financial stability, financial well-being, and satisfaction with having "no financial concern." For many of the program participants, "GKS unquestionably provides sufficient living expenses for the students;" "The financial support that I got from the Korean Government Scholarship Program (KGSP)[2] are very helpful that I didn't need to be bothered by financial problems;" and the "Upkeep allowance and tuition waiver implied I had less financial stress while at Korea." This finding is supported by the survey question that inquired whether the alumni would have come to study in Korea if they did not receive the Korean government scholarship: 60.1% answered either "unlikely" or "somewhat unlikely." Moreover, when asked why they chose to study in Korea and were given seven different reasons (quality of higher education in Korea; Korean government scholarship; to study about Korea; to live in Korea; to leave my country, to be closer to friends/family who are in Korea; and Korean popular culture), 56% of the total respondents chose the Korean government scholarship opportunity as their number one reason, while 21.8% opted for the quality of higher education. Although the program participants' household background or their level of income is uncertain, the fully sponsored international scholarship program provided the critical financial resources to overcome economic barriers to higher education and learning opportunities.

IMPLICATIONS

By recontextualizing the perceptions and experiences of the GKS alumni on the dimensions of justice and diversity, this article highlighted some of the complexities in fostering global

---

[2]KGSP is one of GKS programs.

leaders who are expected to become international and intercultural bridges between the host and their home countries. The re-categorized alumni survey data were analyzed based on individual characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, and Korean language proficiency. The analysis revealed concerning results regarding Korean society and its sociopolitical structure as experienced by the international scholarship participants. There are several implications for the academic study on higher education mobility as well as for international scholarship policy and implementation.

One clear challenge is the issue of representation or misrepresentation (political injustice). While Fraser (2008b, 2010) divided the levels of misrepresentation into ordinary-political misrepresentations and misframing, in this research, we have identified various types of misframing that have been experienced and perceived by international scholarship participants. Some of the alumni recalled their heightened experience of misframing based on gender and ethnicity. As shown in the findings of this study, the results depended on the positionality of the scholarship program participants. For some, the GKS program was an exclusive opportunity to gain access to global knowledge, skills, and networks, but for others, it exposed them to unexpected misrepresentation and misframing while living in a new society. Some of the comments collected from the alumni in the section on ethnicity are particularly concerning. Similarly, the results from the gender analysis of the alumni perception of Korean society are equally alarming.

However, one should be careful when highlighting issues pertaining to cultural injustice. Culturally rooted issues in Korean society—such as discrimination against Chinese international students and other Asian students—reveal the lack of recognition, or malrecognition (cultural injustice), thereby promoting group differentiation based on ethnicity and gender. At the same time, it is critical to note that this experienced and perceived cultural injustice is also related to economic discrimination against the poor (e.g., developed or developing countries of origin). Therefore, any solution that attempts to remedy these concerns must not only address cultural injustice but also economic and political injustice.

Here, it is critical not to undermine the importance of financial opportunities and incentives given to scholarship recipients. Although some experienced misrepresentation and malrecognition, the financial benefits of the government scholarship program are still critical for the majority of the participants. Naturally, such an opportunity is favorably perceived and expressed. The question on the redistributive potential of scholarships in regard to the dynamic between redistribution (economic justice) and representation (political justice) cannot be fully answered in this research. Therefore, further investigation is needed to answer if scholarship participants from low-income countries and/or the low-income households have a positive perception of Korea and their experiences of that country, and whether their images of Korea are more positive than those of their cohorts.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, the present analysis of the GKS alumni survey on the dimensions of justice and diversity challenges some of the existing public diplomacy and international education policy assumptions. Participation in the GKS program does not guarantee that they will retain a positive image of Korea as the host country, which means the program participants may not necessarily become willing international and intercultural bridges. Therefore, government scholarship programs should broaden their strategies and methodologies to include more culturally engaged and ethically grounded principles and practices. Culturally sensitive curricula and multilinguistic and cross-cultural pedagogical practices in Korea's higher education may expand the public sphere of justice in addressing complex sets of injustices in Korean society. If the GKS or other scholarship-based international student mobility programs aim to foster the participants as the host country's strategic public diplomacy stakeholders, not

only the higher education institutions but also the entire society must become more inclusive of those who are perceived as the "Other." We argue that appropriate cultural recognition of different types of knowledge, values, and norms is the very first step toward coexistence.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Ailes, Catherine, Susan Russell, Jongwon Park, Robert Carr, H. R. Coward, Mary Hancock, John Mathieson, and Esther K. Hicks. 2005. *Outcome Assessment of the U.S. Fulbright Scholar Program: Executive Summary.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of State.

Altbach, Philip G., Liz Reisburg, and Laura E. Rumbley. 2009. *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution—A Report Prepared for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education.* Paris: UNESCO.

Aras, Bulent, and Zulkarnain Mohammed. 2018. "The Turkish Government Scholarship Program as a Soft Power Tool." *Turkish Studies* 20(3): 421–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/14683849.2018.1502042.

Ayhan, Kadir Jun, and Moamen Gouda. 2021. "Determinants of Global Korea Scholarship Students' Word-of-Mouth about Korea." *Asia Pacific Education Review* 22(1): 15–29. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-020-09648-8.

Ayhan, Kadir Jun, Moamen Gouda, and Hyelim Lee. 2021. "Exploring Global Korea Scholarship as a Public Diplomacy Tool." *Journal of Asian and African Studies.* https://doi.org/10.1177/00219096211035800.

Ayhan, Kadir Jun, Moamen Gouda, Hyelim Lee, Nancy Snow & Eriks Varpahovskis 2021. "Global Korea Scholarship as a Public Diplomacy Tool Dataset Version 1.0." https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.13550021.v2.

Banks, Robert. 2020. "Public Diplomacy Evaluation." In *Routledge Handbook of Public Diplomacy*, edited by Nancy Snow and Nicholas J. Cull, 64–75. New York: Routledge.

Buhmann, Alexander. 2016. *Measuring Country Image.* Fribourg: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.

Byrne, Caitlin. 2016. "Australia's New Colombo Plan: Enhancing Regional Soft Power through Student Mobility." *International Journal: Canada's Journal of Global Policy Analysis* 71(1): 107–28. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020702015617786.

Campbell, Anne C.. 2018. "Influencing Pathways to Social Change Scholarship Program Conditionality and Individual Agency." In *International Scholarships in Higher Education*, edited by Joan R. Dassin, Robin R. Marsh, and Matt Mawer, 165–86. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62734-2_7.

Dassin, Joan R., Robin R. Marsh, and Matt Mawer. 2018. *International Scholarships in Higher Education.* Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62734-2_7.

Findlay, Allan M., Russell King, Fiona M. Smith, Alistair Geddes, and Ronald Skeldon. 2012. "World Class? An Investigation of Globalisation, Difference and International Student Mobility." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 37(1): 118–31.

Fraser, Nancy. 2007. "Identity, Exclusion, and Critique." *Journal of Political Theory* 6(3): 305–38.

Fraser, Nancy. 2008a. "Prioritizing Justice as Participatory Parity: A Reply to Kompridis and Forst." In *Adding Insult to Injury: Nancy Fraser Debate her Critics*, edited by Kevin Olsen, 327–346. London; New York: Verso.

Fraser, Nancy. 2008b. *Scales of Justice; Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fraser, Nancy. 2010. "Injustice at Intersecting Scales: On 'Social Exclusion' and the 'Global Poor.'" *European Journal of Social Theory* 13(3): 363–71.

Garcia, Melody. 2011. *Micro-Methods in Evaluating Governance Intervention.* Bonn: German Development Institute.

Ghanem, Carla. 2017. "Teaching Intercultural Communicative Competence: The Perspective of Foreign Language Graduate Student Instructors." *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 11(2): 1–9.

Hall, Joan Kelly, Gergama Vitanova, and Ludmila A. Marchenkova. 2005. *Dialogue with Bakhtin on Second and Foreign Language Learning Abroad: New Perspectives.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hong, Moon Suk, and Yoonjung Hwang. 2020. "'Epistemological Shifts in Higher Education Post-Covid-19: South Korea's Critical Opportunities and Challenges for Renewing Visions of Higher Education' in Reimagining the new Pedagogical Possibilities for Universities Post-Covid-19." *Educational Philosophy and Theory*: 1–44.

Jung, Hoon. 2017. "The Content of Justice in Education: Focused on Nancy Fraser's Theory of Justice." *The Journal of Korean Educational Idea* 31(1): 137–58.

Kim, Woen-Sick. 2010. "Justice in the era of Globalization: A Critical Examination of Nancy Fraser's Theory of Justice." *Philosophical Investigation* 21(11): 113–39.

Lee, Cheng-Fei. 2014. "An Investigation of Factors Determining the Study Abroad Destination Choice." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 18(4): 362–81.

Lee, Hyun-Jae. 2014. "Three Aspects of Women's Poverty: Economic, Cultural Political Poverty: Focused on Justice Theory of Nancy Fraser." *Korean Women's Philosophy* 21: 39–66.

Lee, Hyelim and Nancy Snow. 2021. "Gendered Experience in Student Mobility Programs Global Korea Scholarship Recipients' Evaluation of Korea's Country Image." *Politics & Policy* 49(6).

Lee, Jenny, Jae-Eun Jon, and Kiyong Byun. 2017. "Neo-Racism and Neo-Nationalism within East Asia: The Experiences of International Students in South Korea." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 21(2): 136–55.

Leibowitz, Brenda, and Vivienne Bozalek. 2018. "Towards a Slow Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in the South." *Teaching in Higher Education* 23(8): 981–99. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2018.1452730.

Leonard, Mark, Catherine Stead, and Conrad Smewing. 2002. *Public Diplomacy.* London: Foreign Policy Centre.

Loerke, Martha. 2018. "What's Next? Facilitating Post-Study Transitions." In *International Scholarships in Higher Education*, edited by Joan R. Dassin, Robin R. Marsh, and Matt Mawer, 187–207. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62734-2_7.

Marsh, Robin R., and Ruth Uwaifo Oyelere. 2018. "Global Migration of Talent: Drain, Gain, and Transnational Impacts." In *International Scholarships in Higher Education: Pathways to Social Change*, edited by Joan R. Dassin, Robin R. Marsh, and Matt Mawer, 209–34. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Martel, Mirka. 2018. "Tracing the Spark that Lights a Flame: A Review of Methodologies to Measure the Outcomes of International Scholarship." In *International Scholarships in Higher Education: Pathways to Social Change*, edited by Joan R. Dassin, Robin R. Marsh, and Matt Mawer, 281–304. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mathews-Aydinli, Julie. 2016. *International Education Exchanges and Intercultural Understanding: Promoting Peace and Global Relations.* Cham: Springer.

Mawer, Matt. 2014. *Trajectories and Impact of UK Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Programme Alumni: Interim Quantitative Analysis.* London: Commonwealth Scholarships.

Mawer, Matt. 2018. "Magnitudes of Impact: A Three-Level Review of Evidence from Scholarship Evaluation." In *International Scholarships in Higher Education: Pathways to Social Change*, edited by Joan R. Dassin, Robin R. Marsh, and Matt Mawer, 257–80. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Metzgar, Emily. 2017. "Willing Interpreters and Receivers: American Alumni of the Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) Program." *Palgrave Communications* 3(1): 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1057/palcomms.2017.13.

Moon, Sunghoon. 2016. "The Limitation and the Alternative of Fraser-Honneth's Debate." *Korean Society for Social Philosophy* 32: 219–58.

Oketch, Moses, Tristan McCowan, and Rebecca Schendel. 2014. *The Impact of Tertiary Education on Development: A Rigorous Literature Review.* London: The Department for International Development.

Peters, Michael A., Fazal Rizvi, Gary McCulloch, Paul Gibbs, Radhika Gorur, Moon Hong, Yoonjung Hwang, et al. 2020. "'Reimagining the New Pedagogical Possibilities for Universities Post-Covid-19." *Educational Philosophy and Theory*: 1–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2020.1777655.

Scott-Smith, Giles. 2008. "Mapping the Undefinable: Some Thoughts on the Relevance of Exchange Programs within International Relations Theory." *ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616(1): 173–95. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716207311953.

Sidhu, Ravinder K., Ho Kong Chong, and Brenda S. A. Yeoh. 2019. *Student Mobilities and International Education in Asia: Emotional Geographies of Knowledge Spaces.* Cham: Palgrave Pivot.

Snow, Nancy. 2008. "International Exchanges and the U.S. Image." *ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616(1): 198–222. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716207311864.

Solimano, Andrés. 2008. *The International Mobility of Talent: Types, Causes, and Development Impact.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Sommerfeldt, Erich J., and Alexander Buhmann. 2019. "The Status Quo of Evaluation in Public Diplomacy: Insights from the US State Department." *Journal of Communication Management* 23(3): 198–212. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-12-2018-0137.

Spilimbergo, Antonio. 2008. *Democracy and Foreign Education.* IMF Working Papers, National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), 1–50. Washington, DC: IMF.

Stapleton, Amy, Mihaela Mecea, and Lulzim Beqiri. 2016. "The European Union's Contributions to International Stability: The Role of Education and Study Mobilities." *AI and Society* 31(30): 401–12.

Tam, Lisa and Kadir Jun Ayhan. 2021. "Evaluations of People, Affection, and Recommendation for a Host Country: A Study of Global Korea Scholarship (GKS) Recipients." *Politics & Policy* 49(6).

Tournès, Ludovic, and Giles Scott-Smith, eds. 2018. *Global Exchanges: Scholarships and Transnational Circulations in the Modern World.* New York: Berghahn Books.

Varpahovskis, Eriks, and Kadir Jun Ayhan. 2020. "Impact of Country Image on Relationship Maintenance: A Case Study of Korean Government Scholarship Program Alumni." *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*: 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41254-020-00177-0.

Vincent, Carol, ed. 2019. *Nancy Fraser, Social Justice and Education*. London: Routledge.

Volkman, Toby A., Joan Dassin, and Mary S. Zurbuchen, eds. 2009. *Origins, Journeys, and Returns: Social Justice in International Higher Education*. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Wiers-Jenssen, Jannecke. 2008. "Does Higher Education Attained Abroad Lead to International Jobs?" *Journal of Studies in International Education* 12(2): 101–30.

Yun, Seong-Hun. 2014. "Do International Students' Direct Experiences with the Host Country Lead to Strong Attitude-Behavior Relations? Advancing Public Diplomacy Research and Beyond." *International Journal of Communication* 8: 787–809. http://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/2418/1101.

Yun, Seong-Hun. 2015. "Does Student Exchange Bring Symmetrical Benefits to Both Countries? An Exploration Case for China and Korea." *International Journal of Communication* 9: 710–31. http://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/3207/1324.

Yun, Seong-Hun, and Kelly Vibber. 2012. "The Strategic Values and Communicative Actions of Chinese Students for Sociological Korean Public Diplomacy." *International Journal of Strategic Communication* 6(1): 77–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/1553118X.2011.634864.

Zha, Qiang, and Dongfang Wang. 2018. "Case Study: The Chinese Government Scholarship Program—The Brain Development Scheme that Illuminates a Vision across 30 Years." In *International Scholarships in Higher Education: Pathways to Social Change*, edited by Joan R. Dassin, Robin R. Marsh, and Matt Mawer, 235–54. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Moon Suk Hong is Assistant Professor and Head of Busan University of Foreign Studies (BUFS)'s newly established International Development and Cooperation Major. Holding a PhD in global education at the Seoul National University (SNU) (2016), and an MA in Anthropology and Development at the Australian National University (ANU) (2010), she has extensively worked in East and Southeast Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa in the areas of development and education for 15 years. Current main research interests include theories and methodology of human development, education, and anthropology of glocal development with a regional focus on East and Southeast Asia. She has published articles in International Development and Cooperation Review, Asia Pacific Education Review, Education Theory and Philosophy, and the Southeast Asian Review, among others.

Minjeong Jeon is a PhD candidate and holds an MA in Global Education at the Seoul National University (SNU), Seoul. She holds a BA in Spanish Linguistics and English Education from Hankuk University of Foreign Studies (HUFs), Seoul. Her research interests include exploring systems, politics, and practices of international development within higher education, with a special focus on service learning and student mobility. Prior to her doctoral program, she worked in the field of international development, concentrating on international volunteering programs and education in various regions such as Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

Kadir Jun Ayhan is Assistant Professor of International Relations at Ewha Womans University Graduate School of International Studies. His main research interests include public diplomacy, power in world politics, Korean foreign policy, and active learning pedagogy for international relations. Ayhan serves as Editor-in-Chief for *Journal of Public Diplomacy* and Associate Editor for *Quality & Quantity*, and *Journal of Contemporary Eastern Asia*. He regularly consults for governmental public diplomacy projects in Korea. Ayhan holds a PhD (2016) and MIS (2010) from Seoul National University Graduate School of International Studies and a Bachelor of Commerce (2008) from The University of Auckland. He has published articles in *International Studies Perspectives*, *Korea Observer*, *Asia Pacific Education Review*, and *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, among others.

APPENDIX 1.

SURVEY QUESTIONS

Politics & Governance

How much do you agree with this statement? Competent political officials govern this country

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea has a very stable political system

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea provides well-functioning welfare systems and pension plans

Economy

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea's economy is highly innovative and fit for the future

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea produces very high-quality goods and services

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea has highly competent entrepreneurs

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea is very wealthy

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea is technologically highly advanced

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea holds a strong position in the global economy

How much do you agree with this statement? The labour market in South Korea is equipped with highly competent people

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea has a well-functioning infrastructure

How do you rate South Korea's competitiveness, its political and economic performance and effectiveness?

Culture & Korean Wave

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea has a globally influential culture

How much do you agree with this statement? Athletes and sports teams from South Korea are internationally known for their success

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea is home to beautiful cultural assets (e.g., arts, architecture, music, film etc.)

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea has delicious foods and a wonderful cuisine

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea has a very fascinating history

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea has rich traditions

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea has beautiful scenery

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea has a lot of well-preserved nature

How do you rate South Korea in terms of aesthetics, i.e., its beauty and attractiveness as a cultural and scenic space

Justice

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea is known for its strong commitment to social issues (e.g., development aid, civil rights)

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea has high ethical standards

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea is a socially responsible member of the international community

(Continues)

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea takes responsibility for helping in international crises

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea has excellent civil rights

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea has a very just welfare system

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea acts very fairly in international politics

Diversity

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea respects the values of other nations and peoples

How much do you agree with this statement? South Korea is a welcoming country

How do you rate the integrity of South Korea, its norms and values (e.g., in civil rights, sustainability, and international politics)?

APPENDIX 2.

GKS ALUMNI PERCEPTION ON SOUTH KOREA BY GENDER

Questions	Sex	N	Means	Standard deviation	Means difference	T	p
Politics & Governance							
41. Competent political officials govern this country	Female	255	−.1137	1.405	−.277	−2.117	.035*
	Male	215	.1628	1.416	−.277		
42. South Korea has a very stable political system	Female	261	−.176	1.483	−.564	−4.260	.000**
	Male	227	.388	1.430	−.564		
44. South Korea provides well-functioning welfare systems and pension plans	Female	224	.027	1.485	−.223	−1.591	.112
	Male	200	.250	1.392	−.223		
Economy							
32. South Korea's economy is highly innovative and fit for the future	Female	301	.040	1.505	−.364	−2.996	.003*
	Male	250	.404	1.311	−.364		
33. South Korea produces very high quality goods and services	Female	304	.368	1.377	−.184	−1.797	.073
	Male	246	.553	1.028	−.184		
34. South Korea has highly competent entrepreneurs	Female	273	.150	1.418	−.330	−2.759	.006*
	Male	229	.480	1.230	−.330		
35. South Korea is very wealthy	Female	301	−.033	1.458	−.523	−4.578	.000**
	Male	245	.490	1.147	−.523		
36. South Korea is technologically highly advanced	Female	310	.455	1.078	−.147	−1.632	.103
	Male	251	.602	1.036	−.147		
37. South Korea holds a strong position in the global economy	Female	287	.251	1.116	−.274	−2.779	.006*
	Male	244	.525	1.149	−.274		
38. The labour market in South Korea is equipped with highly competent people	Female	271	−.151	1.588	−.413	−2.988	.003
	Male	233	.262	1.499	−.413		
43. South Korea has a well-functioning infrastructure	Female	276	.587	1.136	−.209	−2.046	.041
	Male	235	.796	1.166	−.209		

APPENDIX 2   (Continued)

Questions	Sex	N	Means	Standard deviation	Means difference	T	p
48. How do you rate South Korea's competitiveness, its political and economic performance and effectiveness?	Female	280	.282	1.112	−.148	−1.550	.122
	Male	230	.430	1.029	−.148		
Culture & Korean Wave							
39. South Korea has a globally influential culture	Female	302	.457	1.232	−.098	−.896	.371
	Male	238	.555	1.291	−.098		
40. Athletes and sports teams from South Korea are internationally known for their success	Female	271	.387	.963	−.028	−.293	.769
	Male	236	.415	1.169	−.028		
60. South Korea is home to beautiful cultural assets (e.g. arts, architecture, music, film etc.)	Female	296	.426	1.019	−.169	−1.849	.065
	Male	232	.595	1.073	−.169		
61. South Korea has delicious foods and a wonderful cuisine	Female	275	.560	1.419	−.308	−2.305	.022*
	Male	212	.868	1.515	−.308		
62. South Korea has a very fascinating history	Female	280	.386	1.041	−.281	−2.821	.005*
	Male	219	.667	1.151	−.281		
63. South Korea has rich traditions	Female	292	.418	1.014	−.220	−2.372	.018*
	Male	221	.638	1.077	−.220		
64. South Korea has beautiful scenery	Female	283	.477	1.032	−.395	−4.043	.000**
	Male	218	.872	1.145	−.395		
65. South Korea has a lot of well-preserved nature	Female	260	.381	1.141	−.375	−3.483	.001**
	Male	209	.756	1.182	−.375		
67. How do you rate South Korea in terms of aesthetics, i.e. its beauty and attractiveness as a cultural and scenic space	Female	289	.291	.985	−.390	−4.303	.000**
	Male	213	.681	1.029	−.390		
Justice							
50. South Korea is known for its strong commitment to social issues (e.g. development aid, civil rights)	Female	237	.063	1.432	−.256	−1.936	.053
	Male	219	.320	1.391	−.256		
51. South Korea has high ethical standards	Female	252	−.313	1.528	−.466	−3.412	.001**
	Male	216	.153	1.408	−.466		
52. South Korea is a socially responsible member of the international community	Female	250	.032	1.064	−.354	−3.488	.001**
	Male	223	.386	1.133	−.354		
54. South Korea takes responsibility for helping in international crises	Female	230	.109	1.070	−.220	−3.488	.031*
	Male	219	.329	1.089	−.220		
56. South Korea has excellent civil rights	Female	226	−.155	1.319	−.413	−3.192	.002*
	Male	213	.258	1.392	−.413		

(Continues)

APPENDIX 2 (Continued)

Questions	Sex	N	Means	Standard deviation	Means difference	T	p
57. South Korea has a very just welfare system	Female	217	−.055	1.315	−.205	−1.557	.120
	Male	200	.150	1.377	−.205		
58. South Korea acts very fairly in international politics	Female	222	.050	1.017	−.215	−1.989	.047*
	Male	204	.265	1.199	−.215		
Diversity							
53. South Korea respects the values of other nations and peoples	Female	252	−.516	1.524	−.557	−4.019	.000**
	Male	220	.041	1.475	−.557		
55. South Korea is a welcoming country	Female	264	−.390	1.701	−.577	−4.022	.000**
	Male	225	.187	1.470	−.577		
59. How do you rate the integrity of South Korea, its norms and values (e.g. in civil rights, sustainability, and international politics)?	Female	239	.017	1.021	−.219	−2.149	.032*
	Male	212	.236	1.132	−.219		

Note: $*p < .05$; $**p < .01$.

APPENDIX 3.

GKS ALUMNI PERCEPTION ON SOUTH KOREA BY ETHNICITY

Questions	Total		Asian	Black	White	Others	F	p	Post hoc test
Politics & Governance									
41. Competent political officials govern this country	N	469	243	70	97	59	11.774	.000**	2 > 1,3,4
									1 > 3
	Means	.013	.119	.671	−.443	−.458			
	Standard deviation	1.417	1.242	1.176	1.486	1.822			
42. South Korea has a very stable political system	N	487	253	75	99	60	15.508	.000**	2 > 1,3,4
									1 > 3
	Means	.082	.107	.947	−.515	−.117			
	Standard deviation	1.483	1.357	1.173	1.574	1.678			
44. South Korea provides well-functioning welfare systems and pension plans	N	423	228	63	82	50	8.785	.000**	2 > 3
									1 > 3
	Means	.130	.298	.556	−.463	−.200			
	Standard deviation	1.446	1.327	1.161	1.573	1.726			
Economy									
32. South Korea's economy is highly innovative and fit for the future	N	550	288	80	113	69	10.579	.000**	2 > 3,4
	Means	.205	.326	.750	−.204	−.261			1 < 3,4
	Standard deviation	1.432	1.300	1.436	1.434	1.651			

(Continues)

APPENDIX 3 (Continued)

Questions	Total		Asian	Black	White	Others	F	p	Post hoc test
33. South Korea produces very high quality goods and services	N	549	289	78	113	69	3.086	.027*	2 > 4
	Means	.454	.443	.808	.372	.232			
	Standard deviation	1.235	1.192	1.217	1.344	1.190			
34. South Korea has highly competent entrepreneurs	N	501	267	76	98	60	12.589	.000**	2 > 3,4, 1 > 3
	Means	.307	.360	.987	−.133	−.067			
	Standard deviation	1.338	1.133	1.291	1.375	1.755			
35. South Korea is very wealthy	N	545	285	80	110	70	11.263	.000**	2 > 1,3,4
	Means	.202	.161	.950	−.100	−.014			
	Standard deviation	1.353	1.306	1.211	1.433	1.280			
36. South Korea is technologically highly advanced	N	560	291	82	115	72	4.016	.008 *	2 > 3
	Means	.523	.588	.756	.322	.319			
	Standard deviation	1.060	1.035	1.095	.996	1.149			
37. South Korea holds a strong position in the global economy	N	530	276	79	107	68	7.064	.000**	2 > 1,3,4
	Means	.377	.319	.899	.280	.162			
	Standard deviation	1.139	1.122	1.139	1.062	1.180			
38. The labor market in South Korea is equipped with highly competent people	N	503	268	76	97	62	9.843	.000**	2 > 3,4 1 > 3
	Means	.042	.104	.737	−.402	−.387			
	Standard deviation	1.560	1.444	1.473	1.546	1.832			
43. South Korea has a well-functioning infrastructure	N	510	263	80	102	65	3.521	.015*	2 > 3
	Means	.690	.681	1.038	.559	.508			
	Standard deviation	1.143	1.025	1.227	1.239	1.264			
48. How do you rate South Korea's competitiveness, its political and economic performance and effectiveness?	N	509	264	75	106	64	8.367	.000**	2 > 1,3,4 1 > 4
	Means	.350	.394	.787	.160	−.031			
	Standard deviation	1.077	.989	1.166	1.025	1.221			
Culture & Korean Wave									
39. South Korea has a globally influential culture	N	539	285	77	111	66	.997	.394	
	Means	.501	.523	.662	.441	.318			
	Standard deviation	1.259	1.128	1.231	1.406	1.541			
40. Athletes and sports teams from South Korea are internationally known for their success	N	506	269	75	98	64	2.128	.096	
	Means	.401	.450	.573	.265	.203			
	Standard deviation	1.064	1.020	1.055	1.031	1.262			

(Continues)

APPENDIX 3   (Continued)

Questions		Total		Asian	Black	White	Others	F	p	Post hoc test
60. South Korea is home to beautiful cultural assets (e.g. arts, architecture, music, film etc.)	N	527		277	75	107	68	9.441	.000**	2 > 1,3,4
	Means	.505		.491	1.040	.271	.338			
	Standard deviation	1.041		.939	1.340	.907	1.074			
61. South Korea has delicious foods and a wonderful cuisine	N	486		263	65	100	58	1.843	.139	
	Means	.698		.627	1.092	.670	.621			
	Standard deviation	1.468		1.411	1.598	1.288	1.795			
62. South Korea has a very fascinating history	N	498		262	72	101	63	3.909	.009*	
	Means	.512		.500	.833	.267	.587			
	Standard deviation	1.097		1.027	1.199	1.182	1.042			
63. South Korea has rich traditions	N	512		267	72	107	66	5.611	.001**	2 > 1,3,4
	Means	.514		.502	.944	.336	.379			
	Standard deviation	1.047		1.027	1.124	.941	1.092			
64. South Korea has beautiful scenery	N	500		266	73	101	60	4.750	.003*	2 > 1,3
	Means	.650		.605	1.082	.495	.583			
	Standard deviation	1.100		1.088	1.222	1.074	.926			
65. South Korea has a lot of well-preserved nature	N	468		251	67	93	57	9.514	.000**	2 > 1,3,4
										1 > 3
	Means	.547		.594	1.060	.097	.474			
	Standard deviation	1.174		1.082	1.313	1.189	1.120			
	Means	.252		.260	.746	.053	−.016			
	Standard deviation	1.195		1.150	1.172	1.030	1.478			
67. How do you rate South Korea in terms of aesthetics, i.e. its beauty and attractiveness as a cultural and scenic space	N	501		268	67	106	60	3.279	.021*	
	Means	.459		.478	.761	.292	.333			
	Standard deviation	1.020		1.026	1.156	.839	1.068			
Justice										
50. South Korea is known for its strong commitment to social issues (e.g. development aid, civil rights)	N	455		243	69	85	58	9.355	.000**	2 > 3,4
										1 > 3,4
	Means	.191		.317	.710	−.282	−.259			
	Standard deviation	1.414		1.303	1.351	1.485	1.540			
51. South Korea has high ethical standards	N	467		252	67	90	58	10.524	.000**	2 > 1,3,4
	Means	−.092		−.016	.612	−.467	−.655			
	Standard deviation	1.486		1.408	1.141	1.439	1.850			

(Continues)

APPENDIX 3 (Continued)

Questions	Total		Asian	Black	White	Others	F	p	Post hoc test
52. South Korea is a socially responsible member of the international community	N	472	252	72	93	55	8.234	.000**	2 > 1,3,4
	Means	.203	.175	.750	−.043	.036			
	Standard deviation	1.106	1.094	1.045	.988	1.217			
54. South Korea takes responsibility for helping in international crises	N	448	241	70	83	54	3.071	.028*	2 > 3
	Means	.217	.216	.529	.012	.130			
	Standard deviation	1.085	1.078	1.100	1.121	.972			
56. South Korea has excellent civil rights	N	438	236	65	85	52	15.222	.000**	2 > 1,3,4
									1 > 3
	Means	.046	.174	.692	−.682	−.154			
	Standard deviation	1.371	1.237	1.322	1.382	1.474			
57. South Korea has a very just welfare system	N	416	223	64	82	47	13.403	.000**	2 > 1,3,4
									1 > 4
	Means	.043	.260	.453	−.646	−.340			
	Standard deviation	1.349	1.210	1.259	1.400	1.508			
58. South Korea acts very fairly in international politics	N	425	222	68	85	50	3.630	.013*	2 > 3
	Means	.153	.126	.485	−.094	.240			
	Standard deviation	1.113	1.077	1.044	1.278	.960			
Diversity									
53. South Korea respects the values of other nations and peoples	N	471	251	72	91	57	9.693	.000**	2 > 1,3,4
	Means	−.255	−.339	.569	−.637	−.316			
	Standard deviation	1.527	1.484	1.452	1.434	1.616			
55. South Korea is a welcoming country	N	488	259	73	98	58	2.903	.034*	2 > 3
	Means	−.125	−.097	.260	−.469	−.155			
	Standard deviation	1.625	1.648	1.581	1.514	1.673			
59. How do you rate the integrity of South Korea, its norms and values (e.g. in civil rights, sustainability, and international politics)?	N	450	238	70	87	55	8.194	.000**	2 > 3,4
									1 > 3
	Means	.120	.189	.529	−.230	−.145			
	Standard deviation	1.080	1.003	1.100	1.128	1.096			

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01.

APPENDIX 4.

GKS ALUMNI PERCEPTION ON SOUTH KOREA BY RELIGION

Questions		Total	Roman Catholicism	Protestants	Islam	Hinduism	Buddhism	Others	No religion	F	p	Post hoc test
Politics & Governance												
41. Competent political officials govern this country	N	470	75	50	86	25	66	45	123	3.876	.001**	2 > 7
												5 > 7
	Means	.013	.053	.400	.012	.400	.348	.067	−.447			
	Standard deviation	1.416	1.355	1.229	1.393	1.683	1.259	1.601	1.392			
42. South Korea has a very stable political system	N	488	77	53	87	26	67	48	130	4.820	.000**	2 > 7
												3 > 7
	Means	.086	.026	.509	.322	.654	.239	.188	−.438			
	Standard deviation	1.484	1.469	1.436	1.334	1.129	1.256	1.770	1.535			
44. South Korea provides well-functioning welfare systems and pension plans	N	424	62	46	81	23	62	37	113	5.192	.000**	5 > 1,7
	Means	.132	−.177	.304	.123	.609	.758	.432	−.301			
	Standard deviation	1.444	1.420	1.280	1.426	1.373	1.183	1.573	1.481			
Economy												
32. South Korea's economy is highly innovative and fit for the future	N	551	86	57	103	29	78	56	141	3.190	.004*	
	Means	.205	.593	.421	.311	.552	.718	.661	.227			
	Standard deviation	1.431	1.278	1.194	1.291	1.088	1.226	1.468	1.078			
33. South Korea produces very high quality goods and services	N	550	86	57	103	29	78	56	141	2.123	.049*	
	Means	.451	.593	.421	.311	.552	.718	.661	.227			
	Standard deviation	1.236	1.278	1.194	1.291	1.088	1.226	1.468	1.078			
34. South Korea has highly competent entrepreneurs	N	502	81	52	93	27	73	48	128	2.234	.039*	2 > 7
												5 > 7
	Means	.301	.235	.654	.215	.481	.603	.333	.039			
	Standard deviation	1.344	1.469	1.153	1.421	1.424	1.024	1.754	1.200			

(Continues)

APPENDIX 4 (Continued)

Questions		Total	Roman Catholicism	Protestants	Islam	Hinduism	Buddhism	Others	No religion	F	p	Post hoc test
35. South Korea is very wealthy	N	546	86	57	103	28	77	55	140	2.286	.035*	
	Means	.201	.012	.544	.194	.571	.338	.382	-.036			
	Standard deviation	1.352	1.359	1.297	1.365	1.260	1.353	1.683	1.184			
36. South Korea is technologically highly advanced	N	561	90	58	105	29	79	56	144	2.602	.017*	
	Means	.520	.456	.621	.486	.931	.772	.554	.313			
	Standard deviation	1.061	1.062	1.040	.991	1.193	1.012	1.159	1.041			
37. South Korea holds a strong position in the global economy	N	531	82	54	101	29	75	53	137	1.829	.091	
	Means	.377	.439	.537	.356	.724	.387	.547	.146			
	Standard deviation	1.138	1.123	1.111	1.375	.996	1.102	1.309	.896			
38. The labour market in South Korea is equipped with highly competent people	N	504	77	53	94	28	73	49	130	2.392	.027*	2 > 7 5 > 7
	Means	.040	-.208	.377	.096	.429	.301	.184	-.277			
	Standard deviation	1.559	1.550	1.643	1.627	1.399	1.309	1.845	1.473			
43. South Korea has a well-functioning infrastructure	N	511	84	53	95	26	72	52	129	1.949	.071	
	Means	.683	.643	.811	.600	.769	.931	.923	.465			
	Standard deviation	1.154	1.116	1.039	1.152	.863	1.092	1.266	1.231			
48. How do you rate South Korea's competitiveness, its political and economic performance and effectiveness?	N	510	79	53	98	25	74	49	132	2.746	.012*	5 > 7
	Means	.349	.316	.509	.408	.360	.608	.490	.061			
	Standard deviation	1.077	1.172	1.187	1.165	.860	.948	1.139	.931			
Culture & Korean Wave												
39. South Korea has a globally influential culture	N	540	85	56	103	27	77	52	140	2.237	.038*	
	Means	.500	.565	.357	.524	.963	.701	.654	.243			
	Standard deviation	1.258	1.258	1.242	1.364	1.192	1.052	1.480	1.174			
40. Athletes and sports teams from South Korea are internationally known for their success	N	507	79	54	96	28	73	48	129	2.509	.021*	
	Means	.400	.392	.444	.260	.786	.562	.688	.209			
	Standard deviation	1.063	.966	1.160	1.145	1.287	1.041	.926	.982			

(Continues)

P&P POLITICS & POLICY

APPENDIX 4 (Continued)

Questions		Total	Roman Catholicism	Protestants	Islam	Hinduism	Buddhism	Others	No religion	F	p	Post hoc test
60. South Korea is home to beautiful cultural assets (e.g. arts, architecture, music, film etc.)	N	528	85	54	97	27	74	53	138	1.493	.178	
	Means	.500	.494	.704	.443	.481	.649	.660	.326			
	Standard deviation	1.045	1.201	1.021	1.224	.580	.867	1.073	.945			
61. South Korea has delicious foods and a wonderful cuisine	N	487	76	51	90	24	72	47	127	1.398	.213	
	Means	.694	.697	.569	.644	.958	.667	1.213	.551			
	Standard deviation	1.468	1.414	1.360	1.750	1.488	1.444	1.444	1.320			
62. South Korea has a very fascinating history	N	499	82	51	90	26	70	46	134	1.480	.183	
	Means	.509	.610	.725	.344	.808	.514	.609	.381			
	Standard deviation	1.098	1.039	1.234	1.367	.801	1.189	1.043	.857			
63. South Korea has rich traditions	N	513	84	54	94	27	70	50	134	.735	.622	
	Means	.513	.583	.574	.457	.741	.543	.600	.388			
	Standard deviation	1.046	.947	1.126	1.309	.656	1.112	1.088	.866			
64. South Korea has beautiful scenery	N	501	80	52	97	27	71	48	126	1.101	.361	
	Means	.649	.675	.500	.753	.778	.704	.833	.484			
	Standard deviation	1.099	1.088	1.213	1.155	.801	1.126	1.226	.994			
65. South Korea has a lot of well-preserved nature	N	469	73	48	89	26	70	44	119	1.360	.229	
	Means	.548	.493	.500	.674	.923	.614	.659	.345			
	Standard deviation	1.173	1.203	1.368	1.175	.891	.997	1.311	1.153			
67. How do you rate South Korea in terms of aesthetics, i.e. its beauty and attractiveness as a cultural and scenic space	N	502	76	54	94	25	72	49	132	1.771	.103	
	Means	.456	.329	.481	.617	.840	.500	.490	.295			
	Standard deviation	1.021	1.148	1.041	1.098	.800	.888	.916	1.002			
Justice												
50. South Korea is known for its strong commitment to social issues (e.g. development aid, civil rights)	N	456	68	48	85	25	73	41	116	4.104	.001**	
	Means	.186	−.191	.500	.282	.640	.466	.537	−.190			
	Standard deviation	1.417	1.528	1.238	1.377	.995	1.303	1.343	1.503			

(Continues)

APPENDIX 4 (Continued)

Questions		Total	Roman Catholicism	Protestants	Islam	Hinduism	Buddhism	Others	No religion	F	p	Post hoc test
51. South Korea has high ethical standards	N	468	73	50	89	25	68	41	122	2.256	.037*	
	Means	-.098	-.288	.160	-.112	.360	.132	.195	-.402			
	Standard deviation	1.490	1.720	1.315	1.570	1.150	1.280	1.631	1.424			
52. South Korea is a socially responsible member of the international community	N	473	75	52	88	27	69	42	120	2.118	.050	
	Means	.199	.080	.442	.136	.593	.232	.452	.017			
	Standard deviation	1.110	.983	1.461	1.157	.797	1.100	1.173	.979			
54. South Korea takes responsibility for helping in international crises	N	449	72	50	86	25	67	40	109	.959	.453	
	Means	.216	.167	.360	.163	.600	.239	.275	.101			
	Standard deviation	1.084	1.233	1.208	1.177	.957	.923	1.281	.860			
56. South Korea has excellent civil rights	N	439	65	49	79	25	65	40	116	4.165	.000**	
	Means	.046	-.246	.286	.177	.560	.338	.350	-.362			
	Standard deviation	1.369	1.358	1.633	1.196	1.193	1.314	1.292	1.347			
57. South Korea has a very just welfare system	N	417	64	47	76	23	63	36	108	3.470	.002*	
	Means	.043	-.328	.255	.105	.391	.508	.111	-.241			
	Standard deviation	1.347	1.222	1.674	1.126	1.118	1.148	1.508	1.407			
58. South Korea acts very fairly in international politics	N	426	67	47	80	24	62	40	106	1.296	.258	
	Means	.153	.075	.340	.100	.500	.290	.200	-.019			
	Standard deviation	1.112	1.078	1.166	1.239	.978	.948	1.265	1.051			
Diversity												
53. South Korea respects the values of other nations and peoples	N	472	75	51	89	25	71	45	116	.969	.446	
	Means	-.256	-.453	.078	-.146	-.120	-.239	-.200	-.422			
	Standard deviation	1.525	1.545	1.635	1.709	1.563	1.429	1.700	1.273			
55. South Korea is a welcoming country	N	489	75	54	94	25	73	45	123	3.659	.001**	4 > 1,7
	Means	-.125	-.707	-.167	-.085	.680	.219	.156	-.252			5 > 1
	Standard deviation	1.623	1.777	1.950	1.591	.988	1.283	1.381	1.653			

(Continues)

APPENDIX 4 (Continued)

Questions	Total		Roman Catholicism	Protestants	Islam	Hinduism	Buddhism	Others	No religion	F	p	Post hoc test
59. How do you rate the integrity of South Korea, its norms and values (e.g. in civil rights, sustainability, and international politics)?	N	451	70	49	86	23	68	40	115	1.931	.074	
	Means	.120	.000	.265	.093	.435	.221	.425	–.078			
	Standard deviation	1.079	1.142	1.221	1.194	.728	1.063	.984	.947			

Note: *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$.

APPENDIX 5.

GKS ALUMNI PERCEPTION ON SOUTH KOREA BY KOREAN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

Questions	Correlation	Korean proficiency
Politics & Governance		
41. Competent political officials govern this country	Pearson correlation	−.092*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.05
	N	470
42. South Korea has a very stable political system	Pearson correlation	−.139**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00
	N	488
44. South Korea provides well-functioning welfare systems and pension plans	Pearson correlation	.00
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.94
	N	424
Economy		
32. South Korea's economy is highly innovative and fit for the future	Pearson correlation	−.169**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00
	N	551
33. South Korea produces very high-quality goods and services	Pearson correlation	−.123**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00
	N	550
34. South Korea has highly competent entrepreneurs	Pearson correlation	−.140**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00
	N	502
35. South Korea is very wealthy	Pearson correlation	−.159**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00
	N	546
36. South Korea is technologically highly advanced	Pearson correlation	−.06
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.13
	N	561
37. South Korea holds a strong position in the global economy	Pearson correlation	−.091*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.04
	N	531
38. The labour market in South Korea is equipped with highly competent people	Pearson correlation	−.164**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00
	N	504
43. South Korea has a well-functioning infrastructure	Pearson correlation	−.087*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.05
	N	511
48. How do you rate South Korea's competitiveness, its political and economic performance and effectiveness?	Pearson correlation	−.106*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.02
	N	510

(Continues)

APPENDIX 5 (Continued)

Questions	Correlation	Korean proficiency
Culture & Korean Wave		
39. South Korea has a globally influential culture	Pearson correlation	−.088*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.04
	N	540
40. Athletes and sports teams from South Korea are internationally known for their success	Pearson correlation	.00
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.93
	N	507
60. South Korea is home to beautiful cultural assets (e.g., arts, architecture, music, film etc.)	Pearson correlation	−.149**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00
	N	528
61. South Korea has delicious foods and a wonderful cuisine	Pearson correlation	−.118**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.01
	N	487
62. South Korea has a very fascinating history	Pearson correlation	−.089*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.05
	N	499
63. South Korea has rich traditions	Pearson correlation	−.154**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00
	N	513
64. South Korea has beautiful scenery	Pearson correlation	−.105*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.02
	N	501.
65. South Korea has a lot of well-preserved nature	Pearson correlation	−.126**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.01
	N	469
67. How do you rate South Korea in terms of aesthetics, i.e. its beauty and attractiveness as a cultural and scenic space	Pearson correlation	−.145**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00
	N	502
Justice		
50. South Korea is known for its strong commitment to social issues (e.g. development aid, civil rights).	Pearson correlation	−.094*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.04
	N	456
51. South Korea has high ethical standards	Pearson correlation	−.172**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00
	N	468
52. South Korea is a socially responsible member of the international community	Pearson correlation	−.09
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.05
	N	473
54. South Korea takes responsibility for helping in international crises	Pearson correlation	−.129**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.01
	N	449

(Continues)

APPENDIX 5 (Continued)

Questions	Correlation	Korean proficiency
56. South Korea has excellent civil rights	Pearson correlation	−.134**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00
	N	439
57. South Korea has a very just welfare system	Pearson correlation	−.06
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.19
	N	417
58. South Korea acts very fairly in international politics	Pearson correlation	−.09
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.08
	N	426
Diversity		
53. South Korea respects the values of other nations and peoples	Pearson correlation	−.153**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00
	N	472
55. South Korea is a welcoming country	Pearson correlation	−.094*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.04
	N	489
59. How do you rate the integrity of South Korea, its norms and values (e.g., in civil rights, sustainability, and international politics)?	Pearson correlation	−.111*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.02
	N	451

Note: *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$.