

25

Curriculum Studies as Reconceptualization Discourse

A Tale of South Korea

YOUNG CHUN KIM, DONG SUNG LEE, AND JAE HONG JOO

A student: Professor Kim, we took the National Employment Test for Korean Teachers yesterday. And one of test questions was about William Pinar's theory of *currere*. Since we learned it from your course, I earned one point. Thanks.

Professor Kim:

Really, Wow. You got the answer correct. Congratulations. Also, I did not expect to see the Pinar's *currere* appear as a question in the National Test for Korean Teachers.

Introduction

The above dialogue happened seven years ago in Professor Kim's office. The dialogue is unforgettable even today because questions on Pinar's *currere* were unexpected in the National Test for Korean Teachers at the time.¹ He had been teaching it to the undergraduate and graduate students for more than 10 years but suspected that other scholars in South Korea did not value the concept. He was wrong. Things began to change in the early 2000s, and the selection of the question clearly has shown that our South Korean curriculum field has already experienced a paradigm shift. William Pinar's *currere* and other North American curriculum research was now appreciated (Pinar et al. 1995). We welcomed the new age.

Today we are living in the age in which Reconceptualization Discourse (RD) has become the leading discourse in the Korean field of curriculum. Many RD works have been translated into Korean, and many books about RD have been written by Korean researchers over the last 20 years. More importantly, its influence goes beyond the curriculum studies field to fields such as physical education, early child education, and educational technology. Important figures such as William Pinar, Michael Apple, and Jean Clandinin have visited South Korea.

Since RD has been the most powerful/influential stimulus to radically transform the historical tradition of Korean curriculum studies, it is necessary to outline its history

here, asking: "When did RD start and how has it grown as a competing discourse in the country?" More specific questions occur, differing according to the readers' ethnic, national, and academic backgrounds. For example, if you are a scholar from the West, you may pose questions such as "What was the popular discourse before RD appeared?", "Whose names and works of the West were introduced?", "Were their interpretations precise and clear?", or "How different was their research compared to the Western approach?" If you are a scholar from a non-Western country, you may pose questions such as "What's going on in curriculum studies in my country?" or "Is my country similar to South Korea?" By answering these questions, one develops comparative and cultural knowledge on the status of RD as an international phenomenon. We presume that our story on RD in South Korea will not limit its importance to South Korea itself.

We have been researching this area since 1995. We have witnessed the changing process as insiders. We make the story more authentic by using not only formal documents but also informal data such as memories, personal experiences, and interactions. Also, triangulation of multiple data will make our presentation of Korean RD more accessible, since sometimes the single use of formal documents may not include the context and background knowledge. We will focus on: 1) the historical development of RD, 2) three major research trends, and 3) three future topics.

History of RD in South Korean Curriculum Studies

Korean curriculum studies began in the early 1950s, after Korea was emancipated from Japanese colonization (S. Hur, 2002). In the published accounts of education before the emancipation, historians focus mainly on the philosophy of education in different periods, the development of school subjects, and school activities (H. Jeong, 2005; D. Soh, 2009). They tended not to examine questions of curriculum.

Curriculum studies were established as a discipline of education after 1945 because Korean scholars, who had studied the field of curriculum in the United States after emancipation, began to disseminate curriculum inquiry in South Korea as a new field in educational research. Thus, since then, South Korean curriculum studies have been influenced principally by U.S. curriculum studies. The first Korean curriculum scholar was Bummo Jung. A former advisee of Ralph Tyler at the University of Chicago, Jung (1956) wrote *Curriculum*, a book based on Tyler's (1969) *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Jung's students and followers became university professors and established an academic group that promoted Tyler's rationale for South Korean curriculum studies in the 1960s and 1970s.

The 1970s, S. Hur (2002) explains, was the "age of [the] shaping of Korean curriculum studies" (p. 7). During this period, many North American ideas and theories of curriculum were circulated in Korea, prominent among them Jerome Bruner's (1977) *The Process of Education* and Hilda Taba's (1962) *Curriculum Development*, both of which were translated into Korean. Other imported concepts included mastery learning (based on Benjamin Bloom's 1973 theorization). It became very popular. Given the increasing emphasis on curriculum studies, the Korean Department of Education allowed universities to offer graduate programs in curriculum studies, and the first volume of the *Korean Journal of Curriculum Studies* appeared in 1974.

In the 1980s, Korean curriculum studies emphasized three areas: 1) school curriculum, 2) instructional design theories, and 3) non-Tylerian discourses. The first two areas were prominent in traditionalist curriculum studies; the third area was a new domain. Korean scholars who returned from North America and Europe dispersed the sociology of school curriculum. Other reconceptualist ideas would be imported in the late 1980s. The apparently gracious acceptance of these ideas is not surprising given South Korean curriculum studies' history of being influenced by North American curriculum studies (Y.H. Lee, 2002a).

A number of curriculum scholars in Korea began energetically working to apply Pinar et al.'s (1995) definition of reconceptualization as "a shift in the field's fundamental mission from curriculum development to understanding curriculum" (pp. 186–187). Indeed, reconceptualist discourses were taught and researched as a way of understanding Korean curriculum. Korean researchers believed that curriculum could be improved by analyzing school culture, the hidden curriculum, and the ideologies of textbooks. As a result, nowadays Koreans appreciate that traditionalist curriculum perspectives are not the only discourse in curriculum studies (Y.C. Kim, 2010).

The appearance of RD in South Korea led Koreans to question curriculum "development" as the single best system (Tyack, 1974). Today, Koreans are surrounded by more complex approaches to curriculum (e.g., reproduction, lived

experience, emancipation, and deconstruction) including the shift to counter-hegemonic practices akin to Lather's (1986) postmodern conception of "research as praxis."

Despite these important shifts, the major theme of curriculum studies in South Korea remains "curriculum development." It has been the main undertaking of curriculum research in South Korea since the 1950s, and many researchers still think that curriculum involves only developing curriculum. Scholars who are also curriculum developers influence most of the decisions made by the Association of Korean Studies for Curriculum Studies (KSCS), including annual conference themes and research initiatives undertaken with the government Department of Education. In the next sections, we focus on 1) the transplantation age of Western RD, 2) the creative formation age of Korean RD, and 3) the scholarly expansion age of Korean RD.

The Transplantation of RD Korean curriculum studies is no home-grown field; it was adopted. The appearance of RD in South Korea began in the 1980s with translations of Western texts.² This importation was consistent with earlier formulations of Korean curriculum studies, themselves borrowed from conceptions devised in the West (Y.C. Kim, 2005a). As noted, Korean curriculum studies after 1945 has been influenced by North America. In a relatively few years, RD became a "trendy" topic among some Korean curriculum scholars. The first wave of translators generally included scholars in the sociology of education or curriculum studies who had trained in the West (especially in the United States, Canada, and England). Thanks to these early translations in the 1980s, a considerable number of books first written in English have since been republished in Korean. These translated texts have been assigned to students of education and curriculum studies as required reading for graduate studies and teacher education. For some Korean faculty and students, RD became "the sign of the times."

The texts translated were quite varied, ranging from the early reproduction theory of Bowles and Gintis to the later work of hooks and Peters and Burbules. These translated texts are still read today; they will probably be read in the future. For instance, Apple's (1990) *Ideology and Curriculum* and Giroux, Penna, and Pinar's (1981) *Curriculum and Instruction* have been used since the 1990s as textbooks in many universities, such as Hanyang University, Yonsei University, and Seoul National University. These translated texts shaped the formation of a new generation of researchers. RD scholars participated earlier in various translation projects that spread reconceptualist ideas; their academic careers became associated with the fate of RD in South Korea. Incumbent upon these scholars was the explanation of these texts and the adaptation of the ideas to the specificities of Korean education. Through the explanation of Western curriculum concepts, even mimicry functioned as a productive cultural act in the creation of the new Korean curriculum studies.

The Creative Reformulation of Korean RD The transplantation of Western reconceptualist ideas through translated texts also allowed Korean scholars (B. Kim, 2007; K. Lee, 2006; Y. H. Lee, 2007; M. Park, 2005) to theorize RD from their own perspectives and publish books and articles based on their study of these texts. This creative formation of Korean RD began in the late 1980s and continues to the present day. For example, Kiseok Kim's historic and sociological approach to cultural reproduction and schooling was published in 1987; Young Chun Kim's extensive qualitative research on Korean elementary schools was published in 1997. In addition, Young Chun Kim (2006) edited the book *After Tyler: Curriculum Theorizing 1970–2000*. The book's contributors introduced Western ideas, e.g., Deliberation, Symbolic Interactionism, Ethnomethodology, Phenomenology, Educational Criticism, Narrative Inquiry, Life History, Action Research, Neo-Critical Theory, Feminism, Postmodernism, Orientalism, and Post-colonialism. And they elaborated their significance to the Korean curriculum field.

South Korean scholars revised reconceptualist ideas by using their own knowledge and selecting local examples for Korean readers. Young Chun Kim would argue that such creative "reconceptualization" advanced RD in Korea by introducing new themes and background knowledge. In effect, theorizing RD in South Korea contributed to the reconceptualization of Korean curriculum studies, now linked explicitly to Korean contexts and experiences. South Korean authors revised Western theories of reconceptualization so they could be more easily read by a Korean audience.

This shift in Korean writing from "transplantation" to "creative reformulation" was stimulated by two developments. First, using multiple imported resources not only augmented Korean knowledge of Western ideas, but also enabled Korean scholars to shift from a receptive and passive position to a more active and productive position. They were not simple imitators of Western RD texts anymore, but intellectually independent scholars who, like Western scholars, rewrote RD based on their own creative ideas. Second, this radical change in RD in South Korea quickly led to the composition of a second wave of texts focused less on translated works and more attuned to the expectations of South Korean students of education. Korean students had difficulties comprehending certain concepts, sometimes because they were too complicated, but sometimes because the translation was inadequate. Additionally, Western texts referenced Western examples, leaving some Korean readers feeling alienated by the context.

Confronting these difficulties, South Korean scholars wrote according to their perception of the situatedness of Korean readers. As native speakers, they were able to explain reconceptualist ideas in local terminologies. They labored to make the texts more interesting to Korean readers through the juxtaposition of Western theories and Korean cases. Simple inclusion of Western theories without reference to Korean educational life rendered Western

theories too difficult and too foreign. With copious reference to the Korean situation, this second wave of texts addressed Korean readers directly by engaging their everyday life and rendering RD accessible.

Each text emphasizes different elements of reconceptualization while providing a range of specifically Korean references recognizable to Korean readers. Their topics vary from critiques of Tyler's approach (M. Kim, 1991) to the promotion of postmodernism (M. Park, 2005). Notably, most of the texts were written as "general" texts providing introductions to RD and related knowledge. The main topics included definitions of RD and elaborations of the purposes of reconceptualization. Since theoretical knowledge has long been respected in Korean pedagogy, South Korean scholars seriously studied the theories cited as supportive of reconceptualization, writing books on phenomenology, hermeneutics, and feminist theories. Kiseok Kim's (1987, 1994) research is noteworthy as his two-volume work elaborated the concept and role of "cultural capital" in relation to modern schooling.

The Scholarly Expansion of Korean RD Importing reconceptualist ideas not only stimulated academic production and the intellectual advancement of Korean curriculum studies, it also inspired South Korean scholars to expand the potential impact of these concepts on Korean school curriculum practices. The interest in RD moved from translation to recontextualization to pedagogical adaptation to the Korean school curriculum. Concepts such as the hidden curriculum, school culture, and gender discrimination enabled Korean teachers and practitioners to critique in new terms their own schools, curriculum, and teaching.

Prior to RD, school curriculum practices had not often been studied as sites of curriculum inquiry. In this new perspective, the direction of curriculum studies in South Korea slowly moved from "curriculum development" to "understanding curriculum" in classroom contexts and alternative practices. Drawing especially on the perspectives of interpretative and critical approaches, South Korean scholars attempted to redefine and reinterpret the features and roles of Korean schools. Among these features were school culture (J. Lee and Y. Choi, 2007a; Y. S. Lee, W. Jung, and K. Park, 1988; N. Park, 2002), curriculum implementation (M. A. Kim, 2007; S. Kim, 2008; Y. C. Kim, and H. Kang, 2007; M. Sohn), textbooks (J. Joo, 2006; Y. Yoo, 2004), classroom teaching (C. Hur, 2006a; S. J. Kim, 2006; Y. C. Kim, 1997), and teachers' lives (Y. C. Kim, 2005a; KNUE, 2005; J. W. Lee, 2008; N. Park, J. Park, and J. Moon, 2008).

The analysis of the Korean school curriculum advanced the Korean field by expanding local knowledge, encouraging curriculum scholars to glimpse what had not been systematically studied before. Through thick description, sophisticated analysis, and profound interpretation, the familiar world of South Korean schooling became unfamiliar. Using post-positivist curriculum methods, South Korean scholars began to reinterpret Korean schools and

curriculum, and engage in a wide range of research on curriculum practices toward a genuine understanding of curriculum-as-planned and curriculum-as-lived (Aoki, 2005 [1985/1991], pp. 231–232). New understandings of South Korea school curriculum emerged from site-based studies. To illustrate, we review three major research trends in South Korea from the 1990s to the 2000s: understanding curriculum variously as 1) ethnographic, 2) neo-critical, and 3) focused on teachers' lives.

Major Research Trends in South Korea

Trend 1: Curriculum Studies as Ethnographic Text As the title implies, this research employs ethnographic methods to understand school curriculum and includes concepts such as thick description, everyday life, and school culture. Because the “inner life” of Korean schooling had never been a prominent research concern in the past, ethnographic portrayals of Korean schooling and curriculum provided opportunities to learn about the experience of teachers and students inside school and classrooms (Y. C. Kim, 1997; Y. H. Lee, 2002b). “Mundane” knowledge of classroom settings and school life now merits academic attention, providing important resources for critically examining the everyday issues of Korean education. An important example of research conducted in this field can be found in *Qualitative Research in Education: Methods and Applications* (Y. S. Lee, and Y. C. Kim, 1998).

The major contribution of ethnographic text was a new understanding of the everyday life and routine in school curriculum, teaching-learning, and stakeholders' educational activities. For the first time, Korean curriculum scholars appreciated how students learn inside classrooms and how teachers teach in actual situations (Y. Cho, 2001; Y. S. Lee, 1991). Also, they were able to discern the significance of the physical, sociocultural structures of Korean schools for students' learning and development (Bronfenbrenner, 1970). Representative ethnographic research themes include: 1) hidden curriculum in the classroom and school, 2) teachers' strategies in classifying students, 3) teachers' professional culture, and 4) parents' and citizens' educational involvement. These ethnographic studies interlinked micro activity strategies of agents with macro contexts.

First, the elaboration of the “hidden curriculum” in Korean schools helped educators to recognize that students learn values in addition to school subjects, especially competition, compliance, and passive ways of thinking. The research findings (C. H. Kim, 2001; M. Kim, 1986; Y. S. Lee, 1990, 1992) required Korean educators to be more attentive to school life and culture, thereby extending their inquiry beyond the formal curriculum. For example, Y. S. Lee's (1992) study of Korean elementary schools was the first to recognize the influences of the hidden curriculum on classroom teaching and student learning in South Korean schools, identifying questions concerning uniformity, authority, obedience, outcome-based evalua-

tion, a culture of corporal punishment, and a culture of competitive learning.

In another research case, H. Lee (2006) revealed how the 7th curriculum is being practiced in schools and the strategies students use to cope with it. This paper discovered that the 7th curriculum in South Korea is being practiced according to cultural principles of “milieu adjustment,” “teacher-centered,” and “entrance exam-oriented.” Milieu adjustment minimizes the student' movements between classes and limits students' choice when it comes to selecting classes. To cope with such curriculum management, the students learn important coping strategies. One such strategy divides the subjects into “exam subject” and “non-exam subjects.” Students selectively participated in lessons according to the degree of importance. Another strategy is for the students to regard the upper-level and middle-level classes as teaching the same materials. The hidden curriculum is carried out in close accordance with the entrance-exam system.

Second, ethnographic curriculum studies allowed Korean educators to identify classroom teachers' strategies in classifying students (J. W. Kim, 1999; D. S. Lee, 2009). For instance, J. W. Kim (1999) illuminated the meanings of classification in classroom teaching through a participant-observer study in an elementary school. Kim found that the classification of children in class (“good children,” “average children,” “poor children”/ “pretty children,” and “distracted children”) follows from teachers' dealing with the subject and controlling the children. The children who are able to understand the teachers' explanations and complete assigned tasks are classified into “good children.” The difference in the school learning opportunity based on performing school work becomes wider as children move up to higher grades (J. W. Kim, 1999).

Thirdly, research on professional culture stressed vivid voices and social realities in the real-life world of school-teachers. D. H. Lee (2004) described the professional teaching culture of a rural middle-school teacher who, he discovered, experienced conflicts between idealistic and realistic views of teaching as a profession. Teachers emphasized guidance rather than instruction. Relationships between teachers and students, and teachers and parents, were more friendly and informal in rural middle school than in the urban middle schools (D. H. Lee, 2004).

Finally, research on parents' and citizen's educational involvement depicted education stakeholders' participation in schooling. For instance, H. Lee (2005) discovered that parents' activities are divided into two domains: one is “organizational activity” and inspires a feeling of integration; the other is “educational activity” shaping critical consciousness through lecture. Playing an active role as educational citizens enables parents and citizens to attain the identity of *Yeoulin* (H. Lee, 2005). Ethnographic curriculum studies such as these revealed that curriculum, teaching, and learning are not context-free activities and products, but sociocultural products, which are similar to Russian wooden dolls (*Matryoshka*). In other words,

everyday life and routine in the school and classroom is deeply related to the macro contexts, including the political, economic, social, cultural, and historical.

Trend 2: Curriculum Studies as Neo-Critical Theory Texts School-based studies using a neo-critical approach made clear the extent to which Korean schools were engaged in social reproduction (Institute of Elementary Schooling Culture, 2003, 2005; M. Kim, 1986; I. Lee, 1991). Guided by the question, “Whose knowledge is surreptitiously reproduced and reinforced as dominant and normal?” South Korean scholars analyzed classroom discourses. As in the West, various aspects of the Korean curriculum—student experience, textbooks, teaching practices, and classroom activities—were critically examined and reinterpreted through critical theories (K. Kim, 1994; H. Koh, 1990). These studies tell us that Korean schooling also plays an important role in reproducing the extant social order (gender, class, political regime, etc.) through explicit and implicit curriculum practices.

Firstly, this research indicated that political ideologies associated with Korean governments during specific periods were strengthened through forms of indoctrination in the content of the school curriculum (Y. Jang, 2005; C. Park, 2007). For instance, Korean nationalism was strongly emphasized in many textbooks in many subject areas during the 1960–1980s. To indoctrinate loyalty to the government, students studied “Military Practicum.” Respecting the military government was a major theme of several school subjects. In extracurricular classes, students were asked to sing the national anthem before the first class began; students had to bow to the national flag at the beginning of every lesson. Indeed, since 1945, the national curriculum reform has been driven by the ideological commitments of each new government. These demands were included in newly developed school curricula, especially in new textbooks and curriculum guides. As in the United States (see T. Yu, 2003), “moral education” was devised to inculcate group solidarity and anticommunism among South Korean students (J. Yang, 2008, p. 9). Nationalism was extensively emphasized as the primary virtue of South Korean citizenship.

Second, gender-related issues were also studied through analyses of textbook content, subject matter construction, and classroom management. Major findings found that the daily lives and educational development of women are considered less important than those of men (K. Choo, 1985; C. Hur, 2006b; J. J. Kim, 1985; M. Min, 2002; H. Yoo, 2004). Female students are indoctrinated to be passive and docile by internalizing and representing desirable behaviors such as obedience, patience, and respect for their husbands. Such discriminatory and oppressive practices still exist, even in the first year of Korean elementary schooling (Y. C. Kim, 1997). Using Thorne’s (1993) approach to gender analysis, C. Hur (2006b) documented Korean women’s experiences of gender stereotyping in secondary schools.

These issues have been recognized since the 1990s by the Korean government. One of the major projects administered by the Department of Women and Welfare was to critically assess the discriminatory content and practices in Korean schools and replace them with a more “gender-fair curriculum” (J. Kim and S. Wang, 1999). However, even though the formal curriculum emphasizes gender equity, the deep-rooted preference for males remains embedded in Korean schools. Interestingly, Korean Confucianism (which considers boys superior to girls) is still reproduced through the not-so-always-hidden curriculum. The emancipatory voices and actions for women’s rights have become, however, one of the leading discourses in Korean society in the twenty-first century.

Third, studies of social class were conducted not only by curriculum scholars but by sociologists of education in South Korea. These were inspired by Western reproduction theories, such as economic reproduction theory (S. Bowles and H. Gintis, 1997) or correspondence theory, cultural reproduction theory (P. Bourdieu and J.C. Passeron, 1977), and resistance theory (H. Giroux, 1983; P. Willis, 1981). Rooted in the Frankfurt School (e.g., Horkheimer, Adorno, Benjamin, Marcuse, and Fromm), these studies criticized the structural functionalism associated with mainstream sociology and curriculum development. According to neo-critical theory, educational expansion is no march of progress toward ever greater equality of opportunity, but a tale of betrayals and false promises. Schools have served and continue to serve as “channeling colonies”—channeling the poor into careers appropriate to their inability as defined by officially sanctioned testing (C. Hurn, 1993).

Western reproduction theories suggested critical insights and implications to Korean academic scholars two decades ago. However, contemporary Korean neo-critical curriculum studies differ from Western versions. Historically, Korean society does not have definite class categories (upper classes, middle classes, the lower classes, and the proletariat) like European countries. As a consequence, Korean curriculum scholars and sociologists of education prefer the Weberian concept of stratification rather than the concept of class of Marx. Recently, research is moving from a normative and macro to an interpretative and micro approach. Among the critical research themes are: 1) the policy of assigning students, 2) *Hakbeolism* as status attainment, and 3) the high school diversification policy. These themes are related to reproduction of educational inequality in Korea.

Korean scholars have studied the policy of assigning students in terms of social class. For example, C. G. Kim (2005) studied whether the policy of assigning students to high schools according to their place of residence is problematic in terms of educational inequality, given patterns of urban segregation. He focused on Seoul, where there is stratification by students’ achievement and family income. Kim concluded that low-income students are not disadvantaged due to the neighborhood school policy. Another interesting topic in this area is *Hakbeolism* as a product of

status attainment struggles. In Korea society, *Hakbeol* has been criticized as being responsible for ranking universities, instrumentalizing education, obsessing over exams, and contributing to education fever (J. K. Lee, 2003; K. M. Lee, 2007). To evaluate such criticism, K. M. Lee (2007) examined the history of *Hakbeol* formation and discussed relevant issues, construing *Hakbeol* as capital: human, social, and cultural. He concluded that *Hakbeol* is not inherent in education, but a product of status attainment struggles among competing groups. Also, he claimed that *Hakbeol* is perpetuated by academic cronyism. *Hakbeol* has justified the meritocratic idea that inequality is due to fair process. Thus *Hakbeol* serves as a mechanism for establishing and reproducing inequality (K. M. Lee, 2007).

The final emergent research theme concerns the high school diversification policy as an unequal competition system. The high school system in South Korea has undergone significant transformation thanks to the Lee M-B conservative government's diversification policy, which embodies aspects of the classed competition system (J. Son, 2010). In this context, J. Son (2010) analyzed the social characteristics and limits of the Korean high school diversification 300 project (the high school diversification policy) carried out by the Lee M-B government. In particular, he focused on the horizontal stratification of high school as a class practice of the middle class, which tries to obtain academic capital with high status value useful for entrance into top universities. Because horizontal stratification of schools reflects social stratification, lower class and low-achievement students are socially stigmatized and self-excluded. In the university entrance system, the diversification policy has the unintended role of strengthening the university ranking system.

Despite improvements in Korean society, critical curriculum studies remain a high-impact research trend. Social class related research will become a more prominent issue owing to the dominance of neoliberalism in South Korea. In this context, it is reasonable that research on inequality issues, such as the policy of assigning students, *Hakbeolism*, and the diversification policy of high schools, can contribute to social justice and equality.

Trend 3: Curriculum Studies of Teachers' Lives As the phrase *teachers' lives* implies, the purpose of this research is to study Korean teachers' lives from postpositivist perspectives. These perspectives differ dramatically from "process-product" research paradigms (Floden, 2001). The process-product approach to classroom teaching behaviors had been prevalent in Korean quantitative research, educational administration, and teaching effectiveness research. It remains one of the most dominant topics in Korean curriculum research.

This trend is not concerned with the "effectiveness" of teaching behavior but rather with understanding teachers' lives and the worlds they inhabit. Researchers believe that classroom teachers' attitudes about what and how to teach are seriously influenced by their everyday school life. For

example, Y. C. Kim's (2005a, 2005b) books *Starry Night: Korean Teachers' Lives and Their World I* and *Starry Night: Korean Teachers' Lives and Their World II* report that teachers with high expectations abandoned their educational philosophy due to peer pressure and the hierarchical school administration. Korean researchers have come to recognize the significance to teaching of teacher's lives, in large part due to reading Western scholars such as Ayers (1993), Bullough (1989), Goodson (1992), and Sykes (2001). Reading the work of these scholars enabled Korean academics to recognize that teachers themselves can be understood as "curriculum makers" (Connelly and Clandinin, 1988). Furthermore, studying teachers' lives and learning about their professional expertise is considered significant in understanding the classroom dynamics of school curriculum and, therefore, in utilizing "understanding" for curriculum improvement. Finally, curriculum scholars recognized that the classroom teacher is not simply a passive implementer of curriculum but a key decision maker in the enactment of school curriculum.

Without knowing about teachers' personal, social, and cultural lives, it is not possible to formulate suggestions that might lead to curriculum improvement. Since 2000, Korean researchers have paid sustained attention to studying teachers' lives and their teaching profession (D. H. Kim and K. Park, 2003; S. J. Kim, 2006; Y. C. Kim, 2005a, 2005b; Y. C. Kim, J. Jung, and Y. Lee, 2006; D. S. Lee, 2007; J. Lee and Y. Choi, 2007a, 2007b). The areas studied include: 1) Korean school culture, 2) teachers' responses to the pressures of national educational reform, 3) teaching for university entrance examination, 4) teachers' lives in isolated regions, 5) marginalized teachers' stories, 6) successful teachers' stories, 7) first-year teachers, and 8) Korean teachers' personal practical knowledge (Connelly and Clandinin, 1988). In addition, Kwangju National University of Education (2005) established a Center for the Culture of Elementary Schooling that has produced considerable research on classroom teachers' lives (J. Lee and Y. Choi, 2007a). Teacher development has been heavily researched in curriculum studies, teacher education, and educational administration through life history approaches (Y. C. Kim, J. Jung, and Y. Lee, 2006; H. K. Lee, 2005; J. Lee and Y. Choi, 2007b; J. W. Lee, 2008).

As a consequence of these research initiatives, many teachers have been encouraged to share their classroom stories, students' stories, and school stories based on their autobiographical experiences (W. Jang, 2009; S. J. Kim, 2006; C. Lee, 1998). These tales are often critical of working conditions in schools. The most representative tale in this genre is *The Death of a Baby Bird* by Chiseok Lee (1998). Lee candidly reported teachers' practices of categorizing students and the prevalence of misunderstandings, even conflict, among many teachers. As the subtitle *A Shameful Diary of Teaching by a Classroom Teacher* foretells, the book reveals various negative cultures of Korean schooling: principals' apparently omnipotent power, sexism, and the inappropriate use of school budgets. This

book reminded readers of Western texts such as Alex Kotlowitz's (1991) *There Are No Children Here* and Jonathan Kozol's (1967) *Death at an Early Age*.

Inquiry into teachers' lives seems destined to become even more popular in South Korea as many classroom teachers cite such studies as contributing to their professional development. Indeed, research on teachers' lives has received considerable attention from classroom teachers as well as from scholars of education. Classroom teachers have used qualitative research to study their schools and classrooms and have reported on ideas for improvement in master's theses, doctoral dissertations, and professional books (O. Kim, 2010; S. Kim, 2008; D. S. Lee, 2009; N. Park, J. Park, and Moon, 2008).

The use of qualitative methods such as ethnography, action research, narrative inquiry, autobiography, and participant observation indicate the extent to which reconceptualist ideas have been incorporated into South Korean curriculum studies and creatively recontextualized. Combined with critical inquiries into curriculum as a means of social production and reproduction, these methodologies have helped Korean curriculum scholars and teachers to uncover local practices of school knowledge and determine new focuses of research.

Future Topics for Indigenous Curriculum Studies

In continuing the dialogue of the RD in South Korea, we will suggest three future topics of RD. These include: 1) multiculturalism and diversity, 2) postcolonial discourses, and 3) teachers' participatory research as praxis. We think of these three future topics of reconceptualization represent the "Koreanization" of RD. The "Koreanization" of RD denotes the development of an indigenous or context-specific agenda for Korean curricular practices alongside the ideas of Western RD. "Koreanization" represents as well the search for new language, concepts, and terminologies to help Koreans understand Korean practices distinctively and thus differently from the perspective of Western RD (which some regard as a metanarrative implying totality, universality, and absolute knowledge). The

"Koreanization" of RD is the development of regional-local curriculum discourses and methodologies that more precisely understand Korean practices.

Multiculturalism and Diversity The topics of multiculturalism and diversity will become more important because Koreans are experiencing social and educational problems related to their multicultural and multiethnic society. Owing to the increasing number of multicultural families, multiculturalism and diversity are now becoming practical issues in South Korean society. The increase of multicultural families in South Korea is induced by demographic changes such as immigrant workers, international marriages, and North Korean defectors.

South Korea is, then, no exception to transnational flows economically, politically, and culturally. The long-standing belief that Korea is an ethnically, linguistically, and culturally "homogeneous" society has been challenged by recent migrant workers, families, and ethnically diverse student populations from different countries (S. Moon, 2010, p. 2). According to the statistical data from the Ministry of Administration and Security (2010) of South Korea, the number of foreigners who dwell in South Korea is about 2.2% (1,106,884) of total residents registered (49,593,665). Foreigners in South Korea are composed of foreigners workers (575,657; 52%), marriage immigrants (125,673; 11.4%), foreign students (77,322; 7%), overseas Koreans (43,703; 4%), other foreigners (103,115; 9.3%), naturalized foreigners by marriage (41,417; 3.7%), naturalized foreigners by other causes (32,308; 2.9%), and children (107,689; 9.7%).

TABLE 25.1
International marriage ratio (%)

Year	Total case	International marriage	Foreign wives	Foreign husbands
2006	330,634	38,759 (11.7)	29,665 (8.9)	9,094 (2.8)
2007	343,559	37,560 (10.9)	28,580 (8.3)	8,980 (2.6)
2008	327,715	36,204 (11.0)	28,163 (8.5)	8,041 (2.5)
2009	309,759	33,300 (10.8)	25,142 (8.1)	8,158 (2.6)

*Resource: Statistics Korea (2010)

TABLE 25.2
The present situation of parents of multicultural families from various nations (January 4, 2008)

	Nations of parents of multicultural families in South Korea													Total
	Japan	China	USA	Philippines	Vietnam	Thailand	Russia	Mongolia	Indonesia	SouthAsia	MiddleAsia	Europe	Other	
Children of international marriages	8,601	4,594	216	3,009	864	311	204	216	126	188	124	125	508	11,345
Foreign workers' children	308	284	40	111	30	10	34	368	8	43	39	13	93	1,402
Total	8,909	4,878	256	3,120	894	321	238	584	134	231	163	138	601	20,467
Composition	43.5	23.8	1.3	15.2	4.4	1.6	1.1	2.9	0.7	1.1	0.8	0.7	2.9	100.0

*Resource: Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (2008)

TABLE 25.3
The number of children of multicultural families (%)

Year	Total	Elementary school	Middle school	High school
2005	7,702	6,334	935	433
2006	9,389	7,910	1,139	340
2007	14,645	12,190	1,979	476
2008	20,180	16,786	2,527	867
Composition ratio	100.0	84.0	12.9	4.1

*Resource: Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (2009. 7)

These demographic changes require educators and curriculum scholars to appreciate multiculturalism and diversity as the most pressing issue for South Korean schooling and society. In this context, critical issues such as race, ethnicity, culture, and equality are being intensively researched in South Korean curriculum studies. Western multicultural research is well known (Banks, 2007; Bennett, 2010; Sleeter and Grant, 2009) and has been translated into Korean (O. Kim, J. Kim, and I. Shin, 2009; K. Mo, C. Choi, and M. Kim, 2008; S. Moon, Y. C. Kim, and J. Jung, 2009). Also, many academic and administrative activities have been undertaken. For example, the Korean Association for Multicultural Education's (KAME) 2010 international conference—"Multicultural Education in the Asia-Pacific Region"—was held at Hanyang University in Seoul. James Banks and William Pinar were among the keynote speakers. KAME's 2011 international conference—"Beyond the Nation State: Remodeling of Citizenship Education in a Global Age"—was held at Woosuk University. Among the keynote speakers at the 2012 conference were Christine Sleeter, Carl Grant, and Nicholas Ng-A-Fook. A number of international conferences on multicultural education and globalization were held in 2009: The Ansan Multicultural Education Forum; The Conference of the Department of Education of Kyungnam Province; and The First Annual International Conference of the Korean Association for Multicultural Education. Starting in 2010, a new course called "Understanding Multicultural Education" will be a required class for all elementary schoolteacher candidates at the eleven National Universities of Education.

Research themes on multicultural education include: 1) direction and trends, 2) multicultural families, and 3) teacher education. To begin with, Korean research on the direction of multicultural education suggested philosophical, sociohistorical, and practical implications for creating an indigenous multicultural education (Y. Jo, 2011; C. D. Kang, 2010; S. Kim., and J. Han, 2010). Recently, the concept of nation has faded under the growing influence of multiculturalism under globalization (C. D. Kang, 2010). The racially homogeneous nation view of history and multiculturalism represent two extreme value systems contradicting each other. To harmonize this contradiction, Kang (2010) suggested a "Hongikingan" ideology that broadly benefits all the people, rather than Dangun

(the originator of Korean's) ideology of blood descendant. Y. Jo (2011) also reconsidered multicultural education from anthropology and ontology. Because South Korea had been a single-race nation historically, S. Kim and J. Han (2010) pointed out that South Koreans usually think of multicultural education as being only for those who are immigrants (S. Kim and J. Han, 2010). They suggested that the new direction of multicultural education in South Korea should address not only minorities but also majority populations.

Other curriculum scholars also analyzed research trends (I. Chang, 2012; I. Chang and K. Cha, 2012; H. Y. Chun et al., 2008; K. Lee, 2011). For instance, K. Lee (2011) critically analyzed the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology's "Support Plan for Children from Multicultural Families" (2006–2010). There is confusion concerning the meaning of culture as well as misconceptions and prejudices. Also, government and educational policies are focused on matters associated with female immigrants by marriage and their multicultural families (K. Lee, 2011). This research indicates it is time to establish a clear concept, one which goes beyond the notion of assimilation (I. Chang, 2012).

Several curriculum studies explore the life and education of children of multicultural families (E. Bae, 2006; S. Choi, 2011; H. Y. Jo, D. H. Soe, and S. H. Kwon, 2008; Y. C. Kim, D. S. Lee, and Hwang, 2010; D. S. Lee et al., 2010; D. S. Lee, Y. C. Kim, and Hwang, 2012; M. K. Lee, and K. K. Kim, 2009; S. B. Oh, 2006; W. Y. Shim, 2009). This research revealed that multicultural education in Korea stressed assimilation and adaptation for children and parents of multicultural families rather than coexistence and mutual understanding in Korean society. Also, these studies demonstrated that children of multicultural families are disadvantaged in school.

Lastly, researchers have explored teacher education (S. Choi, 2011; S. Kim et al., 2010; Y. C. Kim, D. S. Lee, and C. H. Hwang, 2010; D. S. Lee et al., 2010; D. S. Lee, Y. C. Kim, and Hwang, 2012; K. Mo, 2009; J. H. Na, 2011; Y. K. Park, 2011). For instance, K. Mo (2009) examined current practices of multicultural teacher education and suggested that more courses in multicultural education be offered both in primary and secondary teacher education programs. S. Kim et al. (2010) constructed a conceptual framework for teacher education programs in Korea.

Postcolonial Discourse in Curriculum Studies The second future topic is postcolonial discourse, one of the pressing issues for contemporary and next-generation curriculum scholars, increasingly crucial due to the academic and social desire to restore Korean identity through critical reflection on the past and the present. Scholars have posed questions concerning identity, curriculum, and education that are influenced by Eurocentric and U.S.-centric ideology (H. J. Choi, 2008; J. Joo and J. Cho, 2005; D. H. Kim et al., 2012; D. H. Lee, 1982; J. K. Lee, 1993; G. Y. Min, 2010). They complained that Korean curriculum studies

are replicating Eurocentric knowledge (H.J. Choi, 2008; J. Joo, 2006; J. Joo and J. Cho, 2005; D.H. Kim et al., 2012; D.H. Lee, 1982; J.K. Lee, 1993; G.Y. Min, 2010). Several scholars have applied postcolonial theory to curriculum assessment and textbook analysis (J. Joo, 2008, 2009; J. Joo and Y.C. Kim, 2010; A.Y. Kim, 2010; B.Y. Kim, 2004; S.K. Kim, 1997; Y.C. Kim, S.H. Moon and J. Joo, 2012; B.E. Kor, 2005; J.K. Lee, 1993).

J.K. Lee (1993, p. 13) is a sociologist of education who argues that knowledge is transferred from the United States to Korea without critically challenging U.S.-centric discourse: “Korean educational studies are replicating Eurocentric epistemology in their understanding of knowledge, learning and teaching. They are not independent because this reproduction of Eurocentric knowledge is not generated from Korea’s context.” J.K. Lee (1993) considered Korean educational studies as a “virgin forest.” D.H. Lee (1982), who is a philosopher of education, argued that South Korea’s educational philosophy is also highly influenced by the United States and that our educational discourses are neither creative nor independent.

Postcolonial scholars include Y.C. Kim (2005c)—author of “Post-colonialism and the Reconceptualization of Korean Curriculum Studies”—and Y.C. Kim, S. Moon, and J. Joo (2012), authors of “Elusive Images of the Other: A Postcolonial Analysis of South Korean World History Textbooks.” Y.C. Kim (2005c) has attempted to delineate the possible boundaries and content for postcolonial curriculum inquiry: “How can curriculum studies in Korea be re-territorialized or reconceptualized in order to increase decentered consciousness and decolonized minds?” He summarized the colonized features of Korean scholarship into three categories: curriculum of translation, curriculum of abstract theories, and curriculum of domestication. He proposed six thematic areas: 1) analyzing school curriculum, 2) developing postcolonial curriculum, 3) centering decentered Korean phenomena, 4) demystifying validities of curriculum theories, 5) developing new curriculum metaphors, and 6) self-reflexivity (Y.C. Kim, 2005c, pp. 8–23).

The first research agenda item is to analyze the school curriculum in Korea with postcolonial perspectives. This means to critically analyze how the school curriculum presents and reproduces certain images of America and the West in the Korean curriculum (particularly through textbooks, subject offerings, and extra curriculum) toward ideological control. The second item is to develop a “post-colonial curriculum.” This means to select and design a school curriculum enabling Korean students to decolonize consciousness. This approach is considered as an active strategy to enable students to recognize their arrested subjectivities and to develop resistant perspectives and actions against colonial ideologies and practices through classroom instruction. The fourth item is to center what are now decentered Korean phenomena in Korean curriculum studies. The fifth item is the formulation of a new curriculum language. The sixth item on the new Korean

research agenda is the representation of our personal and professional activities through self-reflexivity. This means that *our* Korean curriculum scholars will continue to survey our colonized subjectivities vis-à-vis our professional activities. That is, we need to examine continually and self-reflexively how our thinking and study are caught in a cultural web of colonized knowledge (Y.C. Kim, 2005c).

Y.C. Kim, S. Moon, and J. Joo (2012) explored how South Korean history textbooks silence and marginalize historical events and people, and ultimately reproduce Eurocentric ideology. Guided by postcolonial theories, they analyzed how three mainstream high school World History textbooks represent and reproduce various localities as objects subordinated and controlled for centuries by the West. First of all, they conceptualized the criteria to analyze the textbooks from a postcolonial perspective (Fanon, 1967, 1990; Said, 1979; Spivak, 1990). To explicate the ways in which Korean textbooks describe East and West, they used four criteria: 1) constructions of subject/other, 2) discourses of inclusion/exclusion, 3) silencing of voices, and 4) narratives of re-colonization.

The first criterion provides a lens for analyzing how history textbooks construct subjectivity and other contributions of specific nation-states to historical events. The second criterion examines what parts of the histories of specific nation-states are included and excluded in the textbooks. The third refers to whose voices are silenced. Using this criterion, they analyzed whether or not the victims’ agony and struggles due to colonization and colonial ideology are discussed in the history textbooks. The final analyzes how colonial ideology is reproduced in textbooks and thus re-colonizes the consciousness of students. The aim was to assess how the textbooks express stereotypes about the East and the West and hierarchical relations.

Kim, Moon, and Joo suggested that educators analyze textbooks in other subject areas as well to see the extent to which colonial ideology is perpetuated. Educators and researchers should also pay more attention to the important role of teachers in helping students become aware of decolonizing perspectives. They asserted that teachers should go beyond the conventional approach in the education of teaching students to “accumulate” object knowledge and a universal value system. Since no knowledge is neutral or objective, teachers need to help students to be independent and critical learners. Furthermore, this study implied that educators and researchers should closely examine neo-colonial discourses that are recurring through discursive practices in school textbooks, media, and other communication in a global context. Although their study focused on South Korea’s world history textbooks, they hope it opens possibilities for widening critical perspectives (Y.C. Kim, S. Moon, and J. Joo, 2012).

In relation to postcolonial discourse in South Korea, George Orwell’s (1949, p. 35) famous warning—“who controls the past controls the future; who controls the present controls the past”—reminds us of the relationship between knowledge and power. According to the premises of Orwell

(1949) and Foucault (1980), legitimate knowledge and curriculum are determined by present power-relationships of respective nations. Curriculum is not only a product of the past, but also of the dominant discourse of the present. Postcolonial discourse in Korean curriculum studies demonstrates that the curriculum is not an apolitical and ahistorical product. It empowers scholars and educators to emancipate themselves from dominant and sometimes invisible Western discourse. In our opinion, postcolonial discourse in Korea will become a theoretical catalyst to deconstruct an implicit cartel of knowledge and power derived from Western discourses.

Teachers' Participatory Research: Action Research and (Auto)Biographical Research Teachers' participatory research represents a third future topic for indigenous curriculum studies in Korea. The works of teachers' participatory research can be divided into two branches. On one hand, there is the action research of teachers in schools, and on the other hand, there is the (auto)biographical research of teachers. Teachers' participatory research is focused on praxis in everyday school life, self-reflection in curriculum and instruction, and reflexivity of the teacher-as-researcher. Teachers' participatory research enables them to critically reflect and improve their everyday life and practices in school. The theoretical premise and methodological intimacy empowers them to close the gap between educational theory and educational practice. Action research and (auto)biographical research enables the schoolteacher who is a teacher-researcher to become a subject and agent.

Action research can be divided into two subtopics: 1) teacher professional development and 2) collaborative action research. In this section, we will present several representative examples of Korean action research according to the above subtopics. Along with action research, (auto)biographical research is regarded as a teachers' participatory research for creating indigenous curriculum studies. We will present (auto)biographical studies through two subtopics: 1) identity and perspectives of teachers and 2) teaching experience. Meanwhile, we will regard similar qualitative methodologies such as biography, autobiography, life history, and auto-ethnography as (auto)biographic method, as an inclusive methodological concept.

There has been a long tradition of teacher-research, but most of it has been quantitative (H. K. Lee, 2002). Teachers had struggled to find methodologies that represented their subjective, local, and existential experience. Teachers were conceived of as consumers who applied others' theoretical knowledge to their practice. However, action research is arising as an alternative paradigm. Action research now enables schoolteachers to become subjects of research through inquiring into their own practice (J. Kang and K. So, 2011; H. K. Lee, 2002).

Action research has explored teachers' professional development. For instance, Y.J. Shon, W.K. Son, and H.Y. Jung (2008) studied teacher's expectations concern-

ing action research, including fear. While many teachers expected the improvement of teaching practice using action research, many teachers also worried about their ability to accomplish action research and the fear of making public their teaching practice (Shon, Son, and Jung, 2008). S.H. Kim (2009) investigated teachers' reflective practice in classroom instruction, suggesting that action research accorded teachers the basic conditions for reflective practice in classroom instruction. H. Im and S. Kim (2009) regarded action research as a method to improve practice and to close the gap between researchers and practitioners. Y. Lee (2010) investigated the effects of action research on elementary schoolteachers. This research revealed that action research gave teachers chances to reflect on their classroom process, to better understand their students and their learning process, and to deepen the teaching theories in the field by exploiting the applicability of the theories they had learned. This article also showed that teachers' teaching theories were internalized through action during the action research period. J.S. Kim (2011) explored teachers' perceptions of reflective teaching in terms of subject matter knowledge, instructional design, class material, teachers' practice, and their assessment in the classroom. Instead of short-term studies of teachers' reflective teaching, there needs to be, she suggested, long-term studies of teacher reflective processes and teacher knowledge.

Second, action research explored the theme of collaboration in teacher study groups. H.S. Cho and M.J. Kim (2011) analyzed the meaning of the professional learning community for a primary education teacher who is an action researcher in science education. They found that teachers came to enjoy science and science teaching through collaborative action research. Teachers also enhanced their science teaching competency and treated children with respect as collaborators. B.M. Lee (2010) also explored cooperation among child-care teachers as they participated in action research. Lee found that teachers had strategies to overcome the uncertainties in the research process, such as the ability to make self-inquiring questions, debates with colleagues, and engaging in moral discussions over ethical dilemmas. Through collaborative action research, teachers shared the meaning of collaborative growth in community.

(Auto)Biographical research is regarded as an emerging paradigm for indigenous curriculum studies. The (auto)biographical research emphasizes the cultural, social, economic, political, and historical situatedness of teachers. The (auto)biographical turn in curriculum studies represents methodological intimacy in procedures such as data gathering, data analysis and interpretation, and writing (Y.C. Kim and D.S. Lee, 2011; D.S. Lee, 2012). (Auto)Biographical research focuses especially on 1) the identity and perspective of teachers and 2) the teaching experience.

Korean curriculum scholars (Y.C. Kim, 2006) have reconceptualized the (auto)biographical studies through five criteria (or research themes): 1) teachers' lives (Britzman,

1989; Bullough, 1989; Bullough and Knowles, 1990; Goodson, 1995; James, 2002; Neumann, 1998; Schubert and Ayers, 1992), 2) the process of teaching and learning (Doerr, 2004; Fernandez, 2003; Frank, 2000; Murray, 1995; Neumann and Peterson, 1997), 3) teachers' practical knowledge (Beattie, 1995; Ben-Peretz, 1995; Clark and Yinger, 1997; Connelly and Clandinin, 1994; Elbaz, 1983), 4) students' lives (Kohl, 1967; Kotlowitz, 1991; Kozol, 1992), and administrators' lives (Bloom and Munro, 1995; Danzig, 1997; Smulyan, 2000; Wolcott, 1973).

(Auto)Biographical studies are illuminating the identity and perspective of the schoolteacher. D. S. Lee (2011a) described his research journey from a schoolteacher to an education researcher through three metaphoric concepts: the "parallel," the "confluence," and the "intersecting point." Lee (2011a) pointed out that improvement of the practical teaching skills of a school teacher was rooted in personal and local theorizing in the pedagogical practices of everyday life. He asserted that a teacher-researcher should be a local theorist who tries to theorize his/her practice. Lee (2011b) also described the identity and perspective of a teacher educator in colleges and graduate schools of education through auto-ethnographic writing. He narrated that the pedagogical content of a teacher educator was not objective and value-free knowledge but a product of academic discourse. And the best way of teaching was not lecturing or student-centeredness, but the shared pursuit for new horizons of knowing and living by mutual understanding of academic knowledge.

(Auto)Biographical studies are also exploring the teaching experience of school teachers. D. S. Lee (2011d) discussed school athlete clubs through auto-ethnographical writing about his teaching experiences in elementary schools. In addition, Lee (2010) studied individual experiences in teaching of underachievers through auto-ethnographical writing. Also, Lee (2011e) scrutinized an alternative perspective to understand and improve physical education (PE) through his scholarly personal narrative. He asserted that the PE specialist was not a technician to transmit exercising skills and to improve students' physical strength, but an educational facilitator who is devoted to education for the whole of person through his (her) knowledge, identity, and consciousness.

The (auto)biographical turn ended estrangement between theory and practice for school teachers (D. S. Lee, 2010, 2011a, 2011b, 2011c, 2011d, 2011e). It proved a teacher-friendly, even therapeutic method for reflecting teachers' everyday lives. Most of all, the (auto)biographical approach enabled school teachers to reflect on their own practices through experimental writing and participant research (D. S. Lee, 2010, 2011a, 2011b, 2011c, 2011d, 2011e). In our opinion, the (auto)biographical turn in curriculum studies in Korea will become a prominent topic and methodology. *Currere* can become an indigenous RD about teacher development, teaching culture, curriculum development, and the reconceptualization of curriculum.

Promise: Reinterpretation and New Meaning of RD in South Korea

To portray the history of RD in South Korea, we identified three key periods: 1) the transplantation of Western RD, 2) its creative reformulation, and 3) its expansion. We discussed three research trends: 1) ethnographic studies 2) neo-critical theory and 3) teachers' lives. Finally, we concluded our tale with the explication of three future topics: multiculturalism and diversity, postcolonial discourse, and teachers' participatory research. These are gaining in popularity, and their academic position will become more important in the future.

We hope our work has enabled the reader to reflect on issues concerning "the implantation of RD in another country," "scholarly comparison in between Korea and my country," or "evaluation of usefulness and relevance of RD in my country." Also, we hope our story is educational and emancipatory in the South Korean curriculum field where the traditional approach to curriculum studies has been more dominant. We have presented the case that RD is researched as an important of a discourse as the traditionalist paradigm is. This disciplinary history complements the history of curriculum reform in South Korea (Y. Lee, 2003). Reporting the RD contributes to the changing political geography of curriculum discourse by making RD more salient and legitimate. To do so is a social political act to breach the historical nexus of knowledge (curriculum studies) and power (traditionalists) as Foucault (1980) has theorized. It will expedite the day when RD is discussed as a legitimate and credible theme in South Korea. In time, curriculum knowledge will be a nomadic practice to theorize or redefine curriculum studies with multiple ideas, methodologies, and perspectives of various disciplines.

The more profound purpose of this chapter is to formally invite and encourage curriculum scholars to seriously consider and discuss this topic as a significant part of the future of international curriculum studies. Even though this story of non-Western narratives of curriculum reconceptualization represents local discourses, in so doing, it advances the field of curriculum internationally by reminding us of the importance of the worldwide discussion. It implores curriculum scholars of RD to begin to address the application of RD in their respective countries. International cooperation and communication through the examination, reflection, and critique of the RD of the West will herald the era of post-Western curriculum studies, where scholars from non-Western countries are valued as contributors as much as Western scholars. Finally, it helps to transgress the fixed boundaries between mainstream (Western) and marginalized (Eastern discourses) groups. As Pinar (Trueit et al., 2003, p. 5) explained, a "worldwide" field of curriculum studies is not uniform nor is it a copy of the American field. The discussion of RD will be international since it is not only a U.S. discourse any more, but a worldwide phenomenon.

Under these conditions, RD is not a colonizing practice to oppress the potential power to create new/nomad/ idiosyncratic curriculum discourse of a particular country or another dominant discourse as a colonizing process. Smith's (1999)'s exposition on the role of research as decolonization is needed. We will be more curious about posing questions and creating ideas than in finding answers about RD since reconceptualization asks for redefinition of the tradition (Pinar, 2003; Pinar et al., 1995). Such a new period can be called the "post-reconceptualization" (Cary, 2007), "Reconceptualization of Reconceptualization," or even "De-Reconceptualization," inspired by critiques of Orientalism (Fanon, 1967, 1990; Said, 1979), postcolonialism (Fanon, 1990; Gough, 2004; Hutcheon, 1995; Kanu, 2003), and decolonization (Asher, 2010; Coloma, 2009).

As a concluding remark, we dream that in the near future, more books and publications on the local stories of RD will be available. And the title of the book may be as follows: "Curriculum Studies in South Korea" or "Curriculum Studies in India." Publication and research on RD will be conducted under the general boundary of "International Studies of RD" or "RD and Internationalization of Curriculum Studies." From that perspective, Pinar's series (2003, 2010, 2011a, 2011b) on non-Western curriculum studies is frontier work and has become a practical reference that we have considered as a model. The certain difference and expectation is that we will have more scholars like William Pinar in Africa, Asia, and non-Western countries.

Notes

1. Based on Kim's prior experience as a test-maker in the National Employment Test, the selection was based on the explicit rule that first, the question was drawn from major textbooks that are used for pre-service courses around Korea, and second, all test makers should be unanimous in selecting a particular question. In considering the social and political nature of item selection in the test, we can imagine that the test makers (who are selected from college of education professors) recognized the importance and value of the question through unanimous agreement, and also that there were many textbooks and reference materials available for test makers to depend on and were provided as reasonable sources such as: in which textbooks the concept was introduced, how, by whom it was explained, and why it is important.
2. The transplantation age of RD in Korean curriculum studies began with translations of Western texts. The Western texts translated were quite varied, ranging from the reproduction theory in sociology of education to the works in curriculum studies. The representative Western texts translated in South Korea are as follows.

- * Anyon, J. (1979). Ideology and US history textbooks. *Harvard Educational Review*, 49, 361–386.
- * Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *Journal of Education*, 162(1), 67–92.
- * Apple, M. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- * Apple, M. (1996). *Cultural politics and education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- * Apple, M. (2001). *Educating the "right way."* New York: Routledge.
- * Bernstein, B. (1974). *Class, Codes, and control (Volume 1): Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

- * Bernstein, B. (1975). *Class, Codes, and control (Volume 2): Applied studies towards a sociology of language*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- * Bourdieu, P., and Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London: Sage Publications.
- * Bowles, S., and Gintis, H. (1997). *Schooling in capitalist America*. New York: Basic Books.
- * Cherrylmes, C. (1998). *Power and criticism*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- * Clandinin, D. J., and Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- * Connelly, M. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- * Doll, W. (1993). *Perspectives on curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- * Eisner, E. (1991). *Enlightened eye*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- * Eisner, E. (2002). *The educational imagination*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- * Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- * Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory, resistance, and education*. Mass: Bergin and Garvey.
- * Giroux, H. (1988). *Teacher as transformative intellectuals*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.
- * Giroux, H. (1999). *The mouse that roared: Disney and the end of innocence*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- * Giroux, H. (2001). *Theory and resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- * Giroux, H., Penna, A., and Pinar, W. (1981). *Curriculum and instruction: Alternatives in education*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- * Hooks, B. (1993). *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics*. Boston: South End Press.
- * Hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- * Karabel, J. and Halsey, A. H. (Eds.) (1977). *Power and ideology in education*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- * Kincheloe, J. (2002). *The sign of the burger: McDonald's and the culture of power*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- * Peters, M. (2004). *Poststructuralism and educational research*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- * Pinar, W., et al. (1995). *Understanding curriculum*. New York: PeterLang.
- * Pinar, W. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?* New York: Routledge.
- * Sarup, M. (1982). *Education, state and crisis: A Marxist perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- * van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- * Willis, P., and Aronowitz, S. (1981). *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- * Young, M. F. D. (1971). *Knowledge and control*. New York: Macmillan.

References

In Korean

- Bae, I. (2006). A study on the ways to solve the problems in elementary school of foreign workers' children in South Korea. *The Korean Society for the Study of Anthropology of Education*, 9(2), 25–55.
- Banks, J. (2007). *Introduction to multicultural education*. Translated by Mo, K., Choi, C., and Kim, M. (2008). Seoul, South Korea: Academy Press.
- Bennett, Christine. (1986). *Comprehensive Multicultural Education*. Translated by Kim, O., Kim, J., and Shin, I. (2009). Seoul, South Korea: Hakjisa.
- Chang, I. (2013). Multicultural education in Korea: Its roots, status, and direction. Unpublished document.

- Chang, I., and Cha, K. (2012). Analysis of multicultural education research trends in Korea. *The Korea Educational Review*, 18(1), 283–302.
- Cho, H. S., and Kim, M. J. (2011). The meaning of the professional learning community of early childhood teachers who is action researcher on science education. *The Korean Journal of Early Childhood Education*, 31(4), 119–141.
- Cho, Y. (2001). *Politics of Curriculum*. Seoul, South Korea: Kyoukkwahaksa.
- Choi, H. J. (2008). A study of literature education on post-colonialism. *The Society of Modern Literary Theory*, 35, 331–348.
- Choi, S. (2011). The analysis of the school adjustment of the elementary school students from multicultural families. *The Korean Association for Multicultural Education*, 4(2), 105–130.
- Choo, K. (1985). The gender discriminations of educational opportunities. *The Korean Journal of Education*, 23(2), 17–34.
- Chun, H. Y. et al. (2008). Analysis of research papers about multicultural education published in domestic journals in the area of early childhood education. *The Journal of Child Education*, 17(3), 29–39.
- Hur, C. (2006a). Gender play: Border crossing between dichotomous gender identities among elementary school children. *The Korean Journal of Yeolin Education*, 14(3), 119–147.
- Hur, C. (2006b). Gendered practices and stereotypes in two women's secondary school life stories. *The Korean Journal of Middle Education Studies*, 54(2), 209–235.
- Hur, S. (2002). Review of Korean curriculum studies: History and future. *The Korean Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 20(3), 1–22.
- Im, H., and Kim, S. (2009). Perceptions and experiences of elementary schoolteachers related to action research: Phenomenological study. *Korean Journal of Sports Pedagogy*, 16(1), 103–118.
- Institute of Elementary Schooling Culture. (2005). *Elementary Classroom Teacher as Researcher*. Seoul, South Korea: Yangseowon.
- Jang, W. (2009). *Why Haha School Students Like Their Schools*. Seoul, South Korea: Cheolsoo and Younghee.
- Jang, Y. (2005). Korean history education policy in Park's Government age. *The Korean Journal of Humanities Studies*, 34(2), 447–489.
- Jeong, H. (2005). *Korean Educational Thoughts*. Seoul, South Korea: Munumsa.
- Jo, H. Y., Soe, D. H., and Kwon, S. H. (2008). An ethnographic study on the academic performance of children of migrants. *The Korean Society for the Study of Sociology of Education*, 18(2), 105–134.
- Jo, Y. (2011). Reconsidering multicultural education from the educational anthropologist eyes and exploring its ontological ways. *The Korean Journal of Anthropology of Education*, 14(3), 1–29.
- Joo, J. (2006). Orientalism and curriculum studies. In Y. C. Kim (ed.), *After Tyler: Curriculum Theorizing 1970–2000*. Seoul, South Korea: Munumsa.
- Joo, J. (2008). The image of oriental in world history textbooks of Korean high school in view of postcolonial curriculum theory: Concerned representations of India. *The Secondary Education Research*, 56(2), 325–358.
- Joo, J. (2009). *Image of the Orientalism Inside Us*. Seoul: Acanet.
- Joo, J., and Kim, Y. C. (2010). Postcolonialism and critical review of international education in Korea. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 28(3), 27–55.
- Jung, B. (1956). *Curriculum*. Seoul, South Korea: Poongkookhakwon.
- Kang, C. D. (2010). The social historical formation of the racially homogeneous nation view of history and the future for multicultural education. *The Korean Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20(4), 1–25.
- Kang, J., and So, K. (2011). Educational action research. *Asian Journal of Education*, 12(3), 197–224.
- Kim, A. Y. (2010). An analysis of world geography textbooks by post-colonialist perspective. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 28(3), 167–191.
- Kim, B. (2007). The hermeneutical reconceptualization of curriculum and teaching-learning process. *The Korean Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 25(4), 61–80.
- Kim, B. Y. (2004). The implications of post-colonial theory for education. *The Korean Journal of Korean Educational Forum*, 3, 39–56.
- Kim, C. G. (2005). A critical study on the claimed inequality of the high school equalization policy: Focused on neighborhood-school-based student assignment. *The Korean Society for the Study of Sociology of Education*, 15(1), 65–88.
- Kim, C. H. (2001). *A study on school culture in academic high school*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Youngnam University, Kyungsan, South Korea.
- Kim, D. H., and Park, K. (2003). A narrative inquiry into teachers' experience on curriculum implementation of school curriculum. *The Korean Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 21(2), 23–49.
- Kim, D. H., et al. (2012). *Education for International Understanding and Postcolonialism*. Seoul: Hakjisa.
- Kim, J., and Wang, S. (1999). *A Measurement for Achieving Gender Equity Education of 7th Curricular*. Seoul, South Korea: Korean Institute of Curriculum and Evaluation.
- Kim, J. J. (1985). *The Gender Roles Presented in Elementary School Textbooks*. Seoul, South Korea: Korean Women's Development Institute.
- Kim, J. S. (2011). A study of teacher as curriculum practitioner through teacher's reflection. *The Korean Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 29(1), 187–208.
- Kim, J. W. (1999). The meanings of classification in classroom teaching: A participant observational study in an elementary school. *The Korean Society for the Study of Sociology of Education*, 9(2), 65–95.
- Kim, K. (ed.). (1987). *Studies of Sociology in Education 1*. Seoul, South Korea: Kyoukkwahaksa.
- Kim, K. (ed.). (1991). *Theories of Cultural Reproduction*. Seoul, South Korea: Kyoukkwahaksa.
- Kim, K. (ed.). (1994). *Studies of Sociology in Education 2*. Seoul, South Korea: Kyoukkwahaksa.
- Kim, M. (1986). *A study of hidden curriculum in elementary social studies*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yonsei University, Seoul, South Korea.
- Kim, M. (1991). A critique on technical model of curriculum development. *The Korean Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 10(5), 63–85.
- Kim, M. A. (2007). *Research on the change towards postcolonial consciousness among Korean elementary students through currere method*. Unpublished master's thesis, Chinju National University of Education, Chinju, South Korea.
- Kim, O. (2010). *An elementary teacher's reflection on teaching through autoethnography*. Unpublished master's thesis, Jeju National University of Education, Jeju, South Korea.
- Kim, S. (2008). *A study on middle school discretionary programs based on multiple intelligences theory and flow theory: A model development and its effects*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Hanyang University, Seoul, South Korea.
- Kim, S., and Han, J. (2010). A fundamental study on multicultural families to develop the lifelong erudition program. *Andragogy Today: Interdisciplinary Journal of Adult and Continuing Education*, 13(2), 31–50.
- Kim, S. H. (2009). A research on teachers' reflective practice in classroom instruction. *The Journal of Korean Teacher Education*, 26(2), 101–121.
- Kim, S. J. (2006). *Three teachers' personal practical knowledge in elementary English classes*. Unpublished master's thesis, Chinju National University of Education, Chinju, South Korea.
- Kim, S. K. (1997). *Postcolonial literature and cultural imperialism*. *Arts and Sciences*, 27, 81–106.
- Kim, Y. C. (1997). *Tales of Four Schools: Classroom Life and Instructions in Korean Elementary Schooling*. Seoul, South Korea: Munumsa.
- Kim, Y. C. (2005a). *Starry Night: Korean Teachers' Lives and Their World I*. Seoul: Munumsa.
- Kim, Y. C. (2005b). *Starry Night: Korean Teachers' Lives and Their World II*. Seoul: Munumsa.
- Kim, Y. C. (ed.). (2006). *After Tyler: Curriculum Theorizing 1970–2000*. Seoul, South Korea: Munumsa.
- Kim, Y. C., Jung, J., and Lee, Y. (2006). *Ugly duckling: A year in the life of beginning teachers*. Seoul, South Korea: Munumsa.
- Kim, Y. C., Lee, D. S., and Hwang, C. H. (2010). Developing interview guide for life historic research on the children of multicultural

- families. *The Korean Association for Multicultural Education*, 3(2), 5–35.
- Kim, Y. C., and Lee, D. S. (2011). An inquiry on the theoretical perspectives and methodological characteristics of autoethnography. *The Korea Association of Yeolin Education*, 19(4), 1–27.
- Koh, H. (1990). Korean education as medium for labor productivities. *The Korean Journal of Sociological Education*, 1(1), 53–66.
- Kor, B. E. (2005). Postcolonial theory and the education of English literature. *The Journal of Teaching English Literature*, 9(2), 27–45.
- Korean Society for Curriculum Studies (KSCS). (2008). *Various approaches in curriculum studies*. Korean Society for Curriculum Studies Fall Conference, December 15. Seoul, South Korea: Korea Curriculum and Evaluation Institute.
- Korean Society for Curriculum Studies (KSCS). (2009). October Newsletter. Korean Society for Curriculum Studies.
- Kwangju National University of Education (KNUE). (2005). *The Elementary Teacher: Life as Researchers*. Seoul, South Korea: Yangseowon.
- Lee, B. M. (2010). The inquiry into collaborative action research experience of cooperative child-care teachers. *The Korean Association for Learner-Centered Curriculum and Instruction*, 14(3), 123–171.
- Lee, C. (1998). *The Death of a Baby Bird: A Shameful Diary of Teaching by a Classroom Teacher*. Seoul, South Korea: Samin.
- Lee, D. H. (1982). How Americanized is educational philosophy of Korea? *Chonbuk National University Center for International Studies Collection of Dissertations*, 1, 73–81.
- Lee, D. H. (2004). A study of teaching profession culture in rural middle schools. *The Korean Society for the Study of Sociology of Education*, 14(1), 69–99.
- Lee, D. S. (2007). An interpretative analysis on the faculty culture of the same-grade staffroom in chulsae elementary school. *The Korean Anthropology of Education*, 10(2), 101–129.
- Lee, D. S. (2009). *An interpretative study on the cultural characteristics and developmental modes of lessons*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pusan National University. Pusan, South Korea.
- Lee, D. S. (2010). An autoethnography on the teaching experiences of underachievers in elementary schools. *The Korean Society for the Study of Anthropology of Education*, 13(3), 141–168.
- Lee, D. S. et al. (2010). Methodological dilemmas and issues in studying students of multicultural families in Korea. *The Korean Association for Multicultural Education*, 3(1), 5–27.
- Lee, D. S. (2011a). An autoethnography on the transformative roles and perspectives of teacher-researcher. *The Korean Society for the Study of Anthropology of Education*, 14(2), 61–90.
- Lee, D. S. (2011b). An autoethnography on the teaching experiences of teacher educator in colleges and graduate schools of education. *The Korean Society for the Study of Anthropology of Education*, 14(3), 31–67.
- Lee, D. S. (2011c). An autoethnography on the participation experiences in a teachers' study group of elementary education. *The Korean Society for the Study of Elementary Education*, 23(3), 1–26.
- Lee, D. S. (2011d). An analysis on the teaching experiences of athlete clubs in elementary schools through autoethnography. *The Korean Society for the Study of Elementary Education*, 24(2), 341–363.
- Lee, D. S. (2011e). An autoethnography on the teaching experiences of a physical education specialist in elementary schools. *The Korean Society for the Study of Elementary Education*, 24(4), 45–70.
- Lee, D. S. (2012). *Autoethnography and Qualitative Research*. Seoul, South Korea: Academy Press.
- Lee, D. S., Kim, Y. C., and Hwang, C. H. (2012). Life and education of children of multicultural families in Korea: Reconstructing life historic voices. *The Korean Association for Multicultural Education*, 5(1), 1–18.
- Lee, H. (2005). An ethnography on the participation of educational citizen movement: A case of Yeoul parent association. *The Korean Society for the Study of Sociology of Education*, 15(1), 189–212.
- Lee, H. (2006). An ethnography on the principal of 7th curriculum application in a high school. *The Korean Society for the Study of Sociology of Education*, 16(3), 163–184.
- Lee, H. K. (2002). A study on problems with the support system on educational action research and suggested alternatives. *The Korean Anthropology of Education*, 5(2), 115–155.
- Lee, I. (1991). *Teaching culture of a high school*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea.
- Lee, J., and Choi, Y. (2007a). *Understanding of Korean elementary schooling culture*. Seoul, South Korea: Yangseowon.
- Lee, J., and Choi, Y. (2007b). Research on school experience of elementary head teachers. *The Korean Journal of Elementary Education*, 14(1), 181–211.
- Lee, J. K. (1993). *The Logic and Movement of Korean Education*. Seoul, South Korea: Moonumsa.
- Lee, J. K. (2003). *Credentialism and Hakbeolism in Korea*. Seoul, South Korea: Jibmoondang.
- Lee, J. W. (2008). *A life history of a female elementary teacher*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Dongdeok University, Seoul, South Korea.
- Lee, K. (2006). Phenomenology and the curriculum reconceptualization movement. *The Korean Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 24(2), 1–25.
- Lee, K. (2011). A critical review on the multicultural education policy in Korea. *The Korean Journal of Sociology of Education*, 21(1), 111–131.
- Lee, K. M. (2007). A study on “Hakbeolism” and class conflict in Korean society: Toward a theorization of “Hakbeol” capital. *The Korean Society for the Study of Sociology of Education*, 17(4), 63–85.
- Lee, M. K., and Kim, K. K. (2009). Adaptation strategies of migrant youths. *The Korean Society for the Study of Sociology of Education*, 19(2), 107–132.
- Lee, Y. (2010). Teachers' professional development through action research: Focused on their practical knowledge development. *Primary English Education*, 16(3), 147–180.
- Lee, Y. H. (2002a). Paradigm shift in curriculum theory and its implications for teachers. *The Korean Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 20(1), 27–51.
- Lee, Y. H. (2002b). The learning culture of adolescent Koreans in the educational system of competitive entrance examination. *The Korean Journal of Sociological Education*, 12(1), 135–171.
- Lee, Y. H. (2007). Knowledge as power/contract and curriculum. *The Korean Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 25(1), 1–23.
- Lee, Y. S. (1990). *An Ethnographical Research for Instructional Method in Korean Elementary Schools*. Seoul, South Korea: Korean Educational Development Institute.
- Lee, Y. S. (1991). A study of Korean secondary teachers' development. *The Journal of Korean Education*, 18, 293–295.
- Lee, Y. S. (1992). *Comprehensive Understanding and New Planning for Korean Schooling: Educational Contents and Methods*. Seoul, South Korea: Korean Educational Developmental Institute.
- Lee, Y. S., Jung, W., and Park, K. (1988). *Ethnographic Studies on the Improvement of Instructional Methods in Korean Elementary Schooling*. Seoul, South Korea: Korean Educational Developmental Institute.
- Lee, Y. S., and Kim, Y. C. (1998). *Qualitative Research in Education: Methods and Application*. Seoul, South Korea: Kyoukkwahaksa.
- Min, G. Y. (2010). A critical examination on multicultural education from postcolonial perspective. *Culture and Society*, 9, 101–131.
- Min, M. (2002). The issue of gender in the Korean educational policy. *The Korean Journal of Sciences of Education*, 12(2), 81–97.
- Mo, K. H. (2009). Policies and directions of multicultural teacher education in Korea. *The Journal of Korean Teacher Education*, 26(4), 245–270.
- Na, J. H. (2011). A review and synthesis of literature on multicultural teacher education curricula. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 29(2), 173–197.
- Oh, S. B. (2006). The implication of the ‘Kosian’ case for the multicultural education in Korea. *The Korean Society for the Study of Sociology of Education*, 16(4), 137–157.
- Park, C. (2007). Critical review on social studies textbooks, and moral education textbooks in elementary schooling from multicultural education. *The Korean Journal of Sociological Education*, 17(1), 109–129.

- Park, M. (2005). Postmodern paradigm and significant issues of curriculum development. *The Korean Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 23(4), 35–57.
- Park, N. (2002). *Looking at Elementary Teaching*. Seoul, South Korea: Baeyoungsa.
- Park, N. (2003). *Korea in Educational War*. Seoul, South Korea: Jangmi Press.
- Park, N., Park, J., and Moon, J. (2008). *How Korean Teachers Develop*. Seoul, South Korea: Urieducation.
- Park, S.B. (2001). *Understanding Curriculum: A Historical Approach*. Seoul, South Korea: Yangseowon.
- Park, Y.K. (2011). Development of multicultural curriculum and lesson plans in elementary social studies. *Theory and Research in Citizenship Education*, 43(2), 57–90.
- Shim, W.Y. (2009). Racial identity and psychological attitudes of multicultural students. *The Korean Society for the Study of Elementary Education*, 22(4), 27–47.
- Shon, Y.J., Son, W.K., and Jung, H.Y. (2008). A study about in-service teacher's expectations and fears on the improvement of teaching practices and action research in early childhood education. *The Korean Association for Learner-centered Curriculum and Instruction*, 12(6), 321–344.
- Sleeter, C., and Grant, C. (2007). *Making choices for multicultural education*. Translated by Moon, S., Kim, Y.C., and Jung, J. (2009). Seoul, South Korea: Academy Press.
- Soh, D. (2009). *Introduction to Historical Thoughts on Korean Education*. Seoul, South Korea: Yangseowon.
- Sohn, M., Kim, Y.C., and Kang, H. (2007). *Evaluational Research on the Curriculum Implementation of the Seventh Korean National Curriculum Plans*. Seoul, South Korea: Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development.
- Son, J. (2010). A study on the horizontal differentiation of Korean high school system: Focused on the diversification policy of high school in the Lee M-B Government in Korea. *The Korean Society for the Study of Sociology of Education*, 20(4), 139–169.
- Yang, J. (2008). *Critical review of moral education curriculum in Korea*. Unpublished master's thesis, SungkyunKwan University, Seoul, South Korea.
- Yoo, H. (2004). *Feminism and Educational Thought*. Seoul, South Korea: Hakjisa.
- Yoo, Y. (2004). Analysis on the dominant ideology of the gender in science textbooks. *The Korean Journal of Sociology of Education*, 14(1), 39–67.
- In English**
- Anyon, J. (1979). Ideology and US history textbooks. *Harvard Educational Review*, 49, 361–386.
- Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *Journal of Education*, 162(1), 67–92.
- Aoki, T. (2005 [1985/1991]). Signs of vitality in curriculum scholarship. In William F. Pinar and Rita L. Irwin (eds.), *Curriculum in a New Key* (pp. 229–233). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Apple, M. (1990). *Ideology and Curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. (1996). *Cultural Politics and Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Apple, M. (2001). *Educating the "Right Way"*. New York: Routledge.
- Asher, N. (2010). Postcolonial theory. In Kriedel, C. (ed.). *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Curriculum Studies* (pp. 661–663). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Ayers, W. (1993). *To Teach: The Journey of a Teacher*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Banks, J. (2007). *Introduction to Multicultural Education*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bennett, C. (2010). *Comprehensive Multicultural Education: Theory and Practice*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ben-Peretz, M. (1995). *Learning from Experience: Memory and the Teacher's Account of Teaching*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Bettie, M. (1995). The making of a music: The construction and reconstruction of a teacher's practical personal knowledge during inquiry. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 25(2), 133–150.
- Bernstein, B. (1974). *Class, Codes, and Control (Volume 1): Theoretical Studies Towards a Sociology of Language*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Bernstein, B. (1975). *Class, Codes, and Control (Volume 2): Applied Studies Towards a Sociology of Language*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Bloom, B. (1973). *Every Kid Can: Learning for Mastery*. New York: College/University Press.
- Bloom, L.R. and Munro, P. (1995). Conflicts of selves: Nonunitary subjectivity in women administrators' life history narratives. In J.A. Hatch and R. Wisniewski (eds.), *Life History and Narrative* (pp. 99–111), Washington D.C.: The Falmer Press.
- Bourdieu, P., and Passeron, J.C. (1977). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage Publications.
- Bowles, S., and Gintis, H. (1997). *Schooling in Capitalist America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Britzman, D.P. (1989). Who has the floor?: Curriculum, teaching, and student teacher's struggles for voice. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 19(summer), 143–162.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1970). *Two Worlds of Childhood: U.S. and U.S.S.R.* New York: Longman.
- Bruner, J. (1977). *The Process of Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bullough Jr., R., and Knowles, J.G. (1990). Becoming a teacher: struggles of a second career beginning teacher. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 3(2), 101–112.
- Bullough, V.R. (1989). *First Year Teacher: A Case Study*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cary, L. (2007). *Curriculum Spaces: Discourse, Postmodern Theory and Educational Research*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Cherryholmes, C. (1998). *Power and Criticism*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Clandinin D.J. and Connelly, F.M. (1994). Personal experience methods. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 413–427), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Clandinin, D.J., and Connelly, F.M. (2000). *Narrative Inquiry*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Clark, C.M. and Yinger, R.J. (1977). Research on teacher thinking. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 7(4), 279–304.
- Coloma, R.S. (2009). Destiny has thrown the Negro and the Filipino under the tutelage of America: Race and curriculum in the age of empire. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 39(4), 495–519.
- Connelly, M. (1988). *Teachers as Curriculum Planners: Narratives of Experience*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Connelly, M., and Clandinin, D. J. (1988). Studying teachers' knowledge in classrooms: Collaborating research, ethics, and the negotiation of narrative. *The Journal of Educational Thought*, 22(2A), 260–282.
- Danzig, A. B. (1997). Leadership stories: What novices learn by crafting the stories of experienced school administration. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 35(2), 122–137.
- Doerr, M.N. (2004). *Currere and the Environmental Autobiography: A Phenomenological Approach to the Teaching of Ecology*. NY: Peter Lang Publication.
- Doll, W. (1993). *Perspectives on Curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Eisner, E. (1991). *Enlightened Eye*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Eisner, E. (2002). *The Educational Imagination*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Elbaz, F. (1983). *Teacher Thinking: A Study of Practical Knowledge*. London, England: Croom Helm.
- Fanon, F. (1967). *Black Skin, White Mask*. New York: Grove Press.
- Fanon, F. (1990). *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Harmondsworth.
- Fernandez, A.E. (2003). Autobiography in multicultural, anti-racist education: Three case studies, teaching and learning. *The Journal of Natural Inquiry and Reflective Practice*, 18(1), 5–15.

- Floden, R. (2001). Research on efforts of teaching: A continuing model for research on teaching. In Virginia Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (4th ed., pp. 1–14). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon.
- Frank, M. (2000). Biography buddy: Interview each other. *Social Studies and Young Learner*, 12(3), 13–14.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory, Resistance, and Education*. Mass: Bergin and Garvey.
- Giroux, H. (1988). *Teacher as Transformative Intellectuals*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.
- Giroux, H. (1999). *The Mouse that Roared: Disney and the End of Innocence*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Giroux, H. (2001). *Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Giroux, H., Penna, A., and Pinar, W. (1981). *Curriculum and Instruction: Alternatives in Education*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Goodson, I. F. (ed.). (1992). *Studying Teacher's Lives*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Goodson, I. F. (1995). The story so far: Personal knowledge and the political. In J. A. Hatch and R. Wisniewski (eds.) *Life History and Narrative*, (pp. 89–98), Washington D.C.: The Falmer Press.
- Gough, N. (2004). A vision for transnational curriculum inquiry. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry*, 1(1), 1–11. <http://nitinat.library.ubc.ca/ojs/index.php/tci>
- Hooks, B. (1993). *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. Boston: South End Press.
- Hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Hurn, C. (1993). *The Limits and Possibilities of Schooling*. London: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hutcheon, L. (1995). The post always rings twice: The postmodern and the postcolonial. *Material History Review*, 41, 14–23.
- James, C. E. (2002). Achieving desire: Narrative of a black male teacher. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 15(2), 171–186.
- Joo, J., and Cho, J. (2005). Now and forever: Portraits of qualitative research in Korea. *The International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 18, 355–377.
- Kanu, Y. (2003). Curriculum as cultural practice: Postcolonial imagination. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 1(1), 67–81.
- Karabel, J. and Halsey, A. H. (eds.) (1977). *Power and Ideology in Education*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Kim, S. et al. (2010) Redesigning teacher education in the multicultural context of Korean society. *Multicultural Education Review*, 2(1), 93–119.
- Kim, Y. C. (2005c). Post-colonialism and the reconceptualization of Korean curriculum studies. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 21(1), 57–76.
- Kim, Y. C. (2010). Transnational curriculum studies: Reconceptualization discourse in South Korea. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 40(4), 531–554.
- Kim, Y. C., Moon, S., and Joo, J. (2012). (In press). Elusive images of the other: A postcolonial analysis of South Korean world history textbooks. *Educational Studies*.
- Kincheloe, J. (2002). *The sign of the Burger: McDonald's and the Culture of Power*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kohl, H. R. (1967). *36 Children*. New York: New American Library.
- Kotlowitz, A. (1991). *There Are No Children Here: The Story of Two Boys Growing Up in the Other America*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Kozol, J. (1967). *Death at an Early Age*. New York: Penguin.
- Kozol, J. (1992). *Savage Inequality: Children in America's School*. New York: Crown Publisher Inc.
- Lather, P. (1986). Research as praxis. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(3), 257–277.
- Lee, Y. (2003). Politics and theories in the history of curriculum reform in South Korea. In Pinar W. (2003). *The International Handbook of Curriculum Research*, (pp. 543–552).
- Moon, S. (2010). Multicultural and global citizenship in the transnational age: The case of South Korea. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 12(1), 1–15.
- Murray, F. B. (1995). *The Teacher Educator's Handbook: Building a Knowledge Base for the Preparation of Teachers*. Indianapolis, IN: Jossey-Bass.
- Neumann, A. (1998). On experience, memory knowing: A post holocaust (auto) biography. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 28(4), 425–442.
- Neumann, A. and Peterson, P. L. (1997). Learning from research in everyday life. In A. Neumann and Peterson (eds.) *Learning from our Lives: Women, Research, and Autobiography in Education*, (pp. 228–248). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Orwell, G. (1949). *1984*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Peters, M. (2004). *Poststructuralism and Educational Research*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Pinar, W., et al. (1995). *Understanding Curriculum*. New York: PeterLang.
- Pinar, W. (2003). *The International Handbook of Curriculum Research*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Pinar, W. (2004). *What is Curriculum Theory?* New York: Routledge.
- Pinar, W. (2010). *Curriculum Studies in South Africa: Intellectual Histories and Present Circumstances*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pinar, W. (2011a). *Curriculum Studies in Brazil: Intellectual Histories and Present Circumstances*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pinar, W. (2011b). *Curriculum Studies in Mexico: Intellectual Histories and Present Circumstances*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Said, E. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.
- Sarup, M. (1982). *Education, State and Crisis: A Marxist Perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Schubert, W. and Ayers, W. (eds.) (1992). *Teacher Lore: Learning from Our Own Experience*. New York: Longman.
- Sleeter, E. C., and Grant, A. C. (2009). *Making Choices for Multicultural Education: Five Approaches to Race, Class and Gender*. New York: Wiley.
- Smith, C. T. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous People*. New York: Zed books.
- Smulyan, L. (2000). *Balancing Acts: Women Principals at Work*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Spivak, G. (1990). *The Post-colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*. New York: Routledge.
- Sykes, H. (2001). Understanding and overstanding: Feminist-poststructural life histories of physical education teachers. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14(1), 13–31.
- Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice*. New York: Harcourt.
- Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender Play: Girls and Boys in School*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Timothy, R. (2005). *Non-Western Educational Traditions: Indigenous Approaches to Educational Thought and Practices*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Trueit, D., Doll Jr., W. E., Wang, H., and Pinar, W. F. (Eds.) (2003). *The Internationalization of Curriculum Studies: Selected Proceedings from the LSU Conference 2000* (pp. 1–13). New York: Peter Lang.
- Tyack, D. (1974). *The One Best System: History of American Urban Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tyler, W. R. (1969). *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Willis, P., and Aronowitz, S. (1981). *Learning to Labor: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1973). *The Man in the Principal's Office: An Ethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira press.
- Young, M. F. D. (1971). *Knowledge and Control*. New York: Macmillan.
- Yu, T. (2003). *In the Name of Morality: Character Education and Political Control*. New York: Peter Lang.