

Teaching How To Discriminate: Globalization, Prejudice, and Textbooks

By Incho Lee

Language education is a complex social practice that reaches beyond teaching and learning phonology, morphology, and syntax. Language is not neutral; it conveys ideas, cultures, and ideologies embedded in and related to the language, so that language education needs to be examined not only on the purely linguistic level, but also on the broader social and political level. One of the social and political factors that influence language education is governmental policy. Language education is often subject to explicit policy decisions made by governmental bodies. This study seeks to unveil the influence of South Korea's globalization policy on the content of government-approved South Korean high school EFL (English as a Foreign Language) textbooks. I will examine the ways in which globalization is reflected and promoted in the textbooks. In doing so, I will investigate popular social

perceptions about globalization in South Korea and interpret textbook contents within unique South Korean social and historical contexts. Then the implications of this study will be discussed with respect to the role that all teacher educators need to play in encouraging pre-service teachers to examine instructional materials through a critical lens.

Many researchers have examined the social and political aspects of language education and the crucial roles that governments play in shaping the implementation and practice of English as a Second Language

Incho Lee is an assistant professor in the Department of Educational Studies of the College of Education and Human Services at the University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire, Wisconsin.

Teaching How To Discriminate

(ESL)/English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education (Recento, 2000; Recento & Burnaby, 1998; Tollefson, 1991, 1995, 2002; Tsui & Tollefson, 2007). For example, learning and using English tend to exacerbate the negative residual effects of colonialism in many Asian and African countries, including India, Hong Kong (Pennycook, 1994, 1998), Sri Lanka (Canagarajah, 1999), and Tanzania (Vavrus, 2002). The English language is also invariably related to the historical imperialism of two powerful countries—the United States and Britain (Pennycook, 1994, 1995, 1998; Phillipson, 1992). These two countries have used both implicit and explicit policies with regard to the promotion of English that were designed to promote national interests (Phillipson, 1992, 1994).

Globalization

Discourse on globalization tends to center on new and internationalized consumption patterns, global markets, workers, and cross-national investments (Burbules & Torres, 2000; Short & Kim, 1999). Telecommunications such as the Internet and the World Wide Web, the rise and proliferation of supranational organizations such as the United Nations (UN), the International Monetary Funds (IMF), and the World Trade Organization (WTO), and blurred distinctions between international and domestic affairs (Short & Kim) also figure prominently.

However, this broad-spectrum sketch often fails to capture the complexity of globalization, and offers little information on the means by which globalization takes place within the boundaries of a given society. What is needed is an in-depth interpretation of cultural globalization that highlights the particular way that each society experiences globalization (Capella, 2000; Luke & Luke, 2000; Pike, 2000). Cultural globalization cannot be fully understood without thorough discussions of the unique social, political, economic, and historical factors that interact within a given society. This approach is sometimes called *glocal* (Burbules & Torres, 2000), *hybridization*, *creolization*, or *reterritorialization* (Short & Kim, 1999). From this perspective, it is too simple to explain the complex mechanisms of globalization merely as, for example, Americanization/Westernization. For a thorough analysis of globalization, it is necessary to include situated and local uniqueness (Capella, 2000; Luke & Luke, 2000; Pike, 2000), since globalization is not itself a unified global phenomenon in any case (Burbules & Torres, 2000). This point of view serves as guidance for the present study, as I attempt to analyze situated meanings of the contents of South Korean high school EFL textbooks.

Globalization and EFL Education in Korea

The South Korean government has implemented *Segyehwa*, the South Korean equivalent of globalization, since 1995 (Kang, 2000) in hopes of a national and international economic jump-start (Kang, 2000; Park, 1996; Shin, 2003). The globalization policy is strongly linked to EFL education because the English language

is considered the quintessential tool for South Koreans to be globalized, and more generally, for economic advancement (Shin). Efforts to ensure that South Koreans become equipped with better English skills included heavy governmental funding for a national EFL program, including curriculum development, teacher training, and education technology (Jung & Norton, 2002). The mass media also support intensive EFL education (Hong, 2000; Yang, 2001; Yun, 2005). It is not difficult to find newspaper articles with titles such as “English-for-Survival Spread” (Hong, 2000), “More Colleges for English as a Medium of Instruction” (Yang, 2001); “English Village at Kyung Sang University” (Yun, 2005).

Some Koreans even support the proposal that English be a second official language in South Korea, arguing that South Koreans’ ability to speak English will improve dramatically by speaking English every day. They relate South Koreans’ fluency in English to an increase in foreign funds by attracting more foreign businesses and tourists. The rationale for these efforts to be fluent in English is that South Koreans need to compete for more economic power through English in the era of globalization. Personal efforts to achieve English competency have even gone to the extreme of having children’s tongues snipped surgically for better English pronunciation (Demick, 2002), particularly among families with high socioeconomic status (Park, 2002). In such contexts, language is perceived as an uncomplicated and static tool that carries economic value just like other commodities.

Despite this overwhelmingly celebratory promotion of EFL education as a tool for success on both national and personal levels, a few South Korean analysts warn that English education is a pathway toward Americanization in South Korea (Choi, 1996; Kim, 2000). For example, Yim (2007) maintains that Korean middle school EFL textbook authors tend to embellish lifestyles of the people in the U.S. through various descriptions and illustrations, and globalization is presented as Americanization. More importantly, Yim points out that the textbooks highlight only images of upper-middle-class Whites of European decent, omitting the subcultures of the U.S. Coupled with South Koreans’ view of White middle-class U.S. English as the most desirable representation of contemporary English (Jeong, 2004; Grant & Lee, 2009), this caution becomes more alarming. These analysts condemn South Korean English educators and English linguists as “followers of American ways of thinking and living by arguing that English is the world language” (Kim, 2000, p. 21). This argument, which represents the stance of a minor number of South Koreans, exemplifies the crucial point that the policymakers often fail to recognize: ESL or EFL education is not neutral (Auerbach, 1995; Pennycook, 1998; Phillipson, 1992; Tollefson, 2002; Tsui & Tollefson, 2007; Valdes, 1998).

Recent History of South Korea and its Globalization Policy

Since this study examines the content of EFL textbooks related to globalization in South Korea, a situated understanding of South Korean society is crucial. In this

Teaching How To Discriminate

study, the distinctiveness of South Korean society is investigated primarily from its recent history, especially after liberation from Japanese rule in 1945. As soon as Korea was liberated from Japan after 35 years of colonization, the government of the Republic of Korea (South Korea) was established under the auspices of the U.S. government and the United Nations (UN) military governing commission (1945-1948). Consequently, in the first South Korean government, Americans and their South Korean appointees occupied many major government posts (Baik, 1994).

The Korean War lasted for three years (1950-1953), and when it ended U.S. aid played a central role in the ensuing period of economic rehabilitation and reconstruction. Unfortunately, U.S. aid resulted in economic dependence and discouraged South Korean industrial growth (Macdonald, 1996), since the ultimate goal of developmental aid was not primarily to encourage the economic development of South Korea but rather to generate and promote “potent and essential tools that advance our [the U.S.] interests” (Commission on Security and Economic Assistance, in Phillipson, 1992, p. 157).

After serious political turmoil in the early 1960s, several military governments ruled South Korea for almost 30 years (1961-1987). Among these military governments, the Park regime (1963-1979) extricated South Koreans from poverty-stricken lives after the period of colonization and the war (Kang, 2000) through its modernization policy. Utilizing the expertise of US-trained civilian economists, the government achieved extraordinary economic development, referred to as the “Miracle on the Han,” which fostered in South Koreans pride and self-confidence as a nation (Macdonald, 1996). The Kim Young-Sam government (1993-1998) undertook the second wave of modernization, globalization (Segyewha), which evolved from earlier concepts such as *New Korea* in 1993 and *Internationalization* in 1994 (Kang, 2000). These campaigns were actively developed by the government in the hope of giving the Korean economy a jump-start, nationally and internationally, and reinforcing an attitude of national economic competitiveness that would make South Korea “the central country in the management of the world” (Kang, 2000, p. 186). In other words, the South Korean government implemented globalization for the sake of economic advancement and global leadership (Kang, 1998; Kim, 1996; Park, 1996). If the first wave of modernization targeted the eradication of poverty, the second wave of modernization, *Segyewha*, aimed for higher political and economic status for South Korea on the global level. *Segyewha* was adopted as a goal in many fields, including education.

Methods

Content analysis was performed through a close reading and rereading of the selected textbooks. I examined texts and identified textbook segments in which people and cultures of various countries were mentioned. The identified text passages were then compressed into summaries. In other words, I constructed summaries based

on chosen passages. Then, I generated themes that emerged from the summaries. Grounded theory provides relevant theoretical backgrounds for developing themes from data. Grounded theory is an emergent methodology developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967) to generate theory from data, making it possible to illustrate characteristic examples of data. This approach to data analysis allows researchers to consider contextual nuances (Piantanida, Tananis, & Grubs, 2004).

I analyzed the messages within and among themes, implicit and explicit, about society in other countries. I examined the situated meanings of embedded messages and cultural assumptions that seem to underlie these messages, particularly with respect to notions of globalization in South Korea. In doing so, I employed the core concepts of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a tool, which allowed me to interpret meanings of the emergent themes within Korean contexts and situations by connecting the passages to social context, rather than analyzing the linguistic characteristics of the passages. CDA “is a socially committed scientific paradigm” (Rogers, Malancharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Hui, & Joeseph, 2005, p. 370) that allows analysts to engage with the broad social meanings of discourse rather than language per se (Blackledge, 2003; Fairclough, 1989; Titscher, Meyer, Wodeak, & Vetter, 2002) by making explicit the connection between the content and its wider social context (Blackledge, 2003). This function of CDA is crucial in this analysis because meaning, in this analysis the meaning of textbook contents, is perceived as socially embedded (Hodder, 2003; Gee, 1999). Through this function, CDA allows text analysis to be situated in the particular historical location and position (Luke, 1995) of South Korea, and helps to unveil the unique social context of textbook contents and their ideological basis.

After investigating the situated meanings of textbook contents, I compared the situated meanings to cultural models that derived from popular social discourses in Korea on situated globalization. Cultural models illustrate “the simplified storylines, schema, or mental models that people use to make sense in the world” (Sluys, Lewison, & Flint, 2006). Different social and cultural groups have different “explanatory theories” about words that they use or situations that they are in because meaning rests in the shared understanding of words or situations in the social contexts, not in the words or situations themselves (Gee, 1999). The cultural group hardly realizes these theories because the theories tend to be “a totally or partially unconscious explanatory theory or ‘storyline’ connected to a word” (Gee, p. 44) or a situation. The unconscious character of cultural models implies that social and cultural assumptions, common sense, and ideologies constitute cultural models. Thus, in the present study, the situated meanings of textbook contents that reflect the dominant ideology of Korean society can be understood as examples of cultural models.

Materials

The South Korean high school EFL textbooks under scrutiny in this paper are

Teaching How To Discriminate

designed for students in the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd years of senior high in South Korea, equivalent to grades 10, 11, and 12 in U.S. high schools. All were authorized by the South Korean government, so it is presumed that they meet the Ministry of Education's declared standard for textbook content selection: "[EFL textbook content should be] conducive to broadening the insight and understanding of the world, leading to a cooperative life with foreigners in the global world" (KICE, 2001).

There are more than 15 companies in South Korea that publish high school English textbooks. Each company publishes three textbooks that are allotted for high school students: *English*, *English I*, and *English II*. I confined the samples for the analysis to *English*. I excluded *English I* and *English II* because *English* is the first book that first-year high school students are assigned to read, and the first book in the sequence of textbooks. In addition, *English II* is supplementary, not required for students to read. I chose three sample *English* textbooks from three publishing companies for analysis based on their popularity in South Korean high schools. The three companies are *Neung-Yul-Young-O-Sa*, *Ji-Hak-Sa*, and *Chun-Jae-Kyo-Yuk*. According to the Korea Institute of Curriculum and Evaluation (KICE, 2002), the three chosen textbooks from these companies made up 53% of all textbooks published (see Table 1).

The authors of these textbooks are mutually exclusive. A majority of authors are South Korean professors in English language and literature, English education, or linguistics departments in South Korean colleges. My review of EFL textbooks shows that some of the chapters are adapted by the textbook authors from other sources, and the textbooks share many structural similarities. They each have 12 chapters and are approximately 300 pages long.

Findings and Interpretations

Examinations of the textbook content reveal a notion of globalization based on four main themes: Legal/Illegal Action, Capability/Incapability, Equality/Inequality, and High/Low Quality of Education. People in Western countries are presented as being law-abiding, capable of getting things done, living in a society that respects equality, and educated in a way that gives them a sense of personal responsibility.

Table 1
Textbook Usage by Publishing Company

EFL Textbook Publishing Companies	% of High Schools that Chose the Textbooks Published by the Company in 2002
Neung-Yul-Young-O-Sa	21%
Ji-Hak-Sa	17%
Chun-Jae-Kyo-Yuk	15%
Jung-A-Kyo-Yuk	11%
Various Others	36%

On the other hand, people in the non-West are described as being less respectful of the law, incapable of getting things done, resigned to social inequality, and lacking in personal responsibility because of poor education. The textbook authors' delineations of Western and non-Western societies display a sharp contrast.

Theme 1: Legal/Illegal Actions

In the chapter "Endangered Animals," Africans, as a group, are depicted as being poor and having so many problems that they fail to maintain an environment that used to be friendly to gorillas.

The number of people in Africa is increasing, so people cut down trees to sell the wood and to make new houses and farms. This means gorillas don't have many places to live and hunt for food. African countries are trying to protect the gorillas, but these countries are very poor and have many problems. (Lee, Lee, Ku, & Baker, 2002, p.177)

The authors further illustrate that

There are three types of gorillas, but the mountain gorilla is the most endangered. Only 600 are in existence today. The main reason for this decrease is hunters who kill gorillas illegally. They kill gorillas for their meat and for trophies. (Lee, Lee, Ku, & Baker, 2002, p. 177)

Therefore, by killing gorillas, people in Africa not only contribute to environmental disasters but also commit illegal actions.

Not only Africans but also Asians are blamed for environmental disasters in the textbooks. The authors blame Asian superstitions for tiger extinction.

Many Asians believe that tiger body parts can cure various diseases. As Asians become richer, they are willing to pay a lot of money for dead tigers. (Lee, Lee, Ku, & Baker, 2002, p. 175)

The authors point out that these beliefs led Asians to willingly pay a considerable amount of money for dead tigers as well as to encourage an illegal tiger trade, which ultimately leads to the extinction of tigers. In addition, in this statement, the authors seem to praise the fact that Asians have become economically affluent, implying that they now enjoy a high standard of living. However, this statement functions to support the authors' other claim that Asians kill rare animals, not for their own survival, but for dubious, culturally driven beliefs that eventually lead animals to extinction. The content, therefore, implies that these people are not only incapable of maintaining a healthy environment, but also are either unaware of the law or are willing to disregard it.

Theme 2: Capability/Incapability

While the textbook authors condemn Africans and Asians for illegal actions and mishandling the environment, the authors approach environmental issues differently

Teaching How To Discriminate

when the issues are explored within the U.S. and Japan (why Japan is not included as one of the Asian countries will be discussed later). The authors maintain that the U.S. and Japan have environmental problems as do many countries in Africa and Asia. However, when the subject is the U.S. and Japan, it centers around cleanup efforts and volunteers' work instead of focusing on their initial role in destroying nature or on the devastating consequences of environmental destruction.

In the United States, the beach cleanup sponsored by the Center for Marine Conservation collected more than 7 million items of trash in 1993. In Connecticut, volunteers collected 1,840 cigarette butts per mile of beach. And in Japan, about 100,000 tons of coastal garbage were collected in 2000. (Lee et al, 2002, p. 242)

No information is given on the destruction of the environment, why it happened, whose fault it was, or why these countries did not have the foresight to prevent the destruction from happening in the first place. What readers may learn from these contents include that volunteers are abundant and that cleanup ships collect waste, which suggest that these countries have human resources as well as technical and monetary resources at their disposal to preserve their environment.

Conversely, for a solution to environmental problems, according to the authors, people in Borneo must resort to sending out international pleas for help in preserving their disappearing rain forests. They "wrote a letter to the world in order to ask for help" (Lee, Park, Ryou, Han, & Lee, 2002, p. 253) instead of striving to preserve their rain forests themselves. Asians are shown as being incapable of solving their own environmental problems. In this way, it is implied that they are ignorant of conservation methods and do not have any internal resources to preserve their environment.

Theme 3: Equality/Inequality

A similar contrast can be found in the chapter "Our Changing Home," in connection with the topic of gender inequality at home between husband and wife. The authors focused on the US, Britain, France, Japan, and South Korea only (Lee, Park, Ryou, Han, & Lee, 2002).

In three cities around the world, people were asked the question: do you think a man should share the housework equally with his wife if she has a job? To this question, over 90 percent of men in New York and London said "yes." Only about 50 percent of men in Seoul answered positively. (Lee, Park, Ryou, Han, & Lee, 2002, p. 198)

The chapter also includes a chart showing that, for the question "do you cook meals?" over 40 % of men in Paris answered yes, following by 40 % in New York, and 25 % in Tokyo. The authors further claim that equality between husband and wife has taken root in countries such as the U.S., France, and the United Kingdom, while equality is not yet well-grounded in Korea and Japan, and women in South Korea and Japan suffer from an unfair division of house chores at home. The authors mention that it will take some time in South Korea to change these husbands'

attitudes toward sharing chores because working women and sharing house chores are recent phenomena, compared to the situation in New York or in London.

The authors impute the inequality in South Korea to society. They blame it on the relatively short period of time that women have been employed in the workplace. They suggest that the uneven division of labor is a social phenomenon, and not the result of individual perceptions. The authors, therefore, make it a gender equality issue, rather than a personal one. In this way, it is implied that gender equality is well-established in Western countries while inequality continues to exist in Asian countries.

Theme 4: High/Low Quality of Education

Students in the U.S. are described in a way that shows they are considerate and enjoy school life and personal life after school: They join clubs, sports teams, and academic groups; they have girlfriends; and they use computers (Lee, Lee, Ku, & Baker, 2002). It is also mentioned that typical U.S. high schools have 25 students in a class. Meanwhile, a student in South Korea complains about a large class size and other students' behaviors: "There are about 40 students in my class. Don't you think that is a large class? My homeroom teacher, Mr. Hong, has a hard time keeping us [students] out of trouble" (Lee, Park, Ryou, Han, & Lee, 2002, p. 19). Thus, while US high school students are capable of enjoying their school life by keeping themselves out of trouble, South Korean high school students lack the self-regulation necessary to solve their own problems. To summarize, in the textbooks under scrutiny, people in Western countries are described as being capable and law-abiding, and they enjoy gender equality and a quality education. On the contrary, people in Asian and African countries tend to be scofflaws, and suffer gender inequality and low-quality education.

Discussion

Passages in the textbooks tend to include only positive aspects of developed Western countries while positive and productive aspects of Asian and African lives are excluded. Do these contents live up to the EFL textbook content selection criteria stated by the Korean Ministry of Education: broadening insight, understanding the world, and appreciating diverse cultural communities? The roles that EFL textbooks play in the understandings of diverse cultures are crucial because the English language is considered the quintessential tool for South Koreans to be "globalized" (Shin, 2003). In other words, through the textbook contents written in English, Korean students are expected to broaden their perspectives and insights of the multicultural world. Thus, the question of whether the selectively included contents nurture the balanced views toward the multicultural world or not is valid. If the passages in the EFL textbooks are not particularly conducive to appreciation of multiculturalism, why does a discrepancy exist between the pronounced

Teaching How To Discriminate

principles for content selection and the actual EFL textbook contents? Why do the actual messages in the textbooks not live up to ideally stated textbook selection criteria? Does the divergence reflect a gap between widespread beliefs of which South Koreans themselves are rarely aware and the ideal notion of cultural understandings? The images of the West and non-West portrayed in the textbooks must be prevalent in South Korean society because curricular materials present knowledge that represents cultural authority, norms, and values that society itself accepts and acknowledges (Luke, 1995). Cultural and social beliefs shape school's curricula, and curricula cannot be excised from their social and cultural contexts and policies (Apple, 1992, 1996; Ornstein & Hunkins, 2004). The depictions presented in the textbook passages for the West and against the non-West mirror the prevalent beliefs in South Korea and exemplify a cultural model that South Koreans, as a cultural group, exhibit.

The close investigations of findings reveal Koreans' cultural model that favors economically affluent and politically commanding Western countries. To understand South Koreans' favorable attitudes toward Western countries, it is important to recognize who represents the advanced West in the minds of South Koreans. The terms *West*, *Self*, or *Center* designate agents, a group of people or societies with power that influence and dominate the Non-West, Others, or the Periphery. West, Self, or Center are not solely characterized by geographical location of the West. For example, although Puerto Rico is located in the West, Puerto Rico is hardly considered West, Self, or Center. Instead, West, Self, or Center represents the dominant group, the one with capital, influence, and power. Researchers have explored complex and bidirectional influences between the Western center and non-Western periphery in the field of language education (see Canagarajah, 1999; Kubota, 1999).

The way Japan is depicted in the textbooks supports the binary understandings of the West and the non-West based on power and capital. Table 2 presents the profiles of Western countries, Non-Western Countries, and Japan on the four themes. The plus sign (+) designates that the content has positive connotations toward regions while the minus sign (-) implies that the content has negative connotations. The zero (0) means no content is included in the textbooks. Table 2 shows that certain themes have a negative connotation when placed within the boundaries of non-Western countries, including Japan. However, all the content relays positive messages for Western countries.

Table 2
Themes with Positive, Negative, or No Messages by Regions

Themes	Western countries	Non-Western (except Japan)	Japan
Legal/Illegal Actions	+	-	0
Capability/Incapability	+	-	+
Equality/Inequality	+	-	-
High/Low Quality of Education	+	0	0

The textbook authors' treatment of Japan, as is shown in the topics of Capability/Incapability and Equality/Inequality, does not fit into the equation that South Koreans admire the West and belittle the non-West. Geographically, Japan is an Asian country so that it still shares Asian cultural norms like gender inequality (husbands do not share household chores as much as their Western counterparts do). Yet, Japan is considered as an able country like other Western countries, as described in the topic of Capability/Incapability. Japan is the only Asian country, except South Korea, that is positively mentioned as being able to clean up its own environmental mess, as Western countries do, which implies that Japan has been equated with many affluent Western countries. Japan is separated from other non-Western countries because, unlike other non-Western countries included in the textbooks, Japan enjoys high economic status accompanied by political power. Thus, in understanding the separation between West and non-West, the focus should not be geographic location. Rather, the distinction should be based on political and economic power that the West possesses.

The stark contrast between the West and the non-West, excluding Japan, is clearly revealed in the comparison within and among the themes reported in the findings section. As described under the theme Capability/Incapability, the image of people in Borneo, being unable to keep nature healthy by themselves—presumably because they do not have adequate resources, knowledge, or technology—displays a sharp contrast to the plentiful resources implied in cleanup efforts in the U.S. and Japan. Also, when the textbook authors' descriptions of the volunteers who work in the U.S. and Japan are compared with law-breaking non-Japanese Asian and African people, an interesting dynamic is revealed. Considering that volunteers donate their time and effort, citizens in the U.S. and Japan are depicted as people who are willing to pitch in and help with no demand for reimbursement or compensation. This contrasts with the authors' portrayal of Asians and Africans who, far from behaving altruistically, cannot even manage to abide by the law. By mentioning only illegal actions in Asian and African countries in contrast to the socially constructive work of people in the U.S. and Japan, the textbook passages allow the interpretation that people in Asia and Africa, mostly economically deprived countries, tend to be scofflaws while people in the U.S. and Japan are socially responsible. These explanations and implications amplify the negative images of developing countries and bolster the positive images of people in the developed countries.

Among many developed Western countries, the U.S. tends to represent "the most developed" to many Koreans. The textbook descriptions of class size of the U.S. and Korea, reported under the theme of "High/Low Quality of Education," exemplify Koreans' general perceptions of the U.S. Considering that the authors mentioned that U.S. high schools typically have 25 students, the passages about class size in Korea and teachers' efforts to keep students out of trouble invite the interpretation that somehow a big class size contributes to South Korean students' behaving badly. Passages regarding South Korean schools' having a large class

Teaching How To Discriminate

size while the U.S. enjoys a small class size reflect the popular perception among South Koreans that the U.S. operates an ideal educational system, which leads to a great number of South Korean students' moving to the U.S. for education. The number of South Korean students who were studying in the U.S. was over 100,000 in the year 2006, which made up the largest group of overseas students in the U.S., closely followed by students from India and China (Kim, 2007). The perception of a better learning environment can evolve into a perception that the U.S. is a better society, because schools and educational systems are a part of the social fabric, and it is impossible for these elements to be compartmentalized (Tollefson, 1991, 1995, 2002; Tsui & Tollefson, 2007).

What factors contributed to these widespread beliefs and values toward the West and the non-West that are reflected in the textbooks? The perspectives result from complicatedly related cultural, political, historical, and social issues. Historical and social factors such as the Korean War and the globalization policy have cumulatively resulted in a high regard for the affluent West, especially the U.S. as a representative of the West. For South Koreans who worked hard to transform the war-torn country to one of Asia's dragons after the War, the developed West represented the ideal advanced-society with economic and political power. Among the developed countries, the U.S. was particularly seen as an ideal and superior society because of the political and economic role it plays in the contemporary world as well as the military and economic aid it provided with Korean during and after the Korean War. Baik (1994) argues, "The consequences [of the War and aid] were that American ideologies, values and culture, as well as the language itself, were portrayed as being superior to those of Korea" (p. 123).

The perceived importance of the English language and South Korea's persistent admiration of the West continued as the government began its globalization policy. Discourse regarding globalization was exhibited most publicly as a slogan for an economic jump-start in an age of increasingly fierce and borderless global competition, reflecting the long anticipation of South Korea to become one of the developed countries. The West represents the ideal other, the world leader that South Korea wants to emulate in order to convert itself into one of the leader countries, rendering the West an exceptionally high status. Accordingly, the language of the advanced West, English, particularly contemporary English of the U.S., is considered as the simple necessity to gain power in this globalized world. Ignored by many South Koreans who believe in this equation that the English language means more economic and political power is the fact that a language constitutes the core of an individual's identity, carries ideological values, and reflects the beliefs and values of the speakers (Canagarajah, 1999; Nieto, 2002; Phillipson, 1992; Tsui & Tollefson, 2007). The simplified role of the English language as a commodity and the mechanical perception of globalization contrast with the ideal understanding of globalization as awareness of diversity and intercultural competence.

While the U.S. and the West are idealized, the non-West receives little attention

from South Koreans. The non-West tends to be understood as undeveloped with little economic power, so that it can hardly contribute to South Korea's economic growth. This understanding has accorded low status to the non-West. In other words, acceptance and respect for others in social discourses of English education is available only when it is formally necessary, such as in textbook forewords and national standards for textbook contents. The textbook contents reported and analyzed in the present study reflect the popular beliefs. To recap, the Korean War, economic aid from the West and the U.S., South Koreans' determination to be one of the developed nations, and the enactment of a globalization policy constitute the factors that influenced the social biases reproduced in the textbooks.

Implications

The current study exemplified skewed textbook contents. The contents of EFL textbooks under scrutiny mirror a popular social understanding of globalization, admiring economic success and the affluent West accompanied by disparagement of the non-affluent non-West. Even though the present study focuses on EFL textbooks and globalization, the results of this study have implications for larger educational communities because curriculum content tends to cover only dominant ideologies of the society (Apple, 1992, 1996; Auerbach, 1995; Luke, et al., 1989). In other words, skewed content may be found in textbooks in any content areas at any grade levels. Researchers have challenged the limited variety of points of view as well as covert and overt prejudice toward certain groups of people presented in curriculum content, such as invisibility of indigenous peoples, migrants, women, and working-class students in Australian textbooks (Luke, 1995), and marginalization and negative stereotypes of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender populations in college textbooks (Macgillivray & Jennings, 2008).

Thus, the present study contributes to literature that calls for critical readings of all curriculum materials for all pre-service teachers and teacher educators. Special efforts that will lead to a deeper understanding of textbook contents and social biases should begin in the teacher education program. Teacher educators need to encourage pre-service teachers to examine all instructional materials through a critical lens. Both teacher educators and pre-service teachers should be vigilant and strive to be aware. They need to actively question, rather than blindly obey, the authority of (Hinchey, 2004), in this case, textbook contents. When they find content that implies stereotypes, they should develop counter-discourses (Pennycook, 1995) in order to challenge stereotypes. In developing counter-discourses, critical pedagogy (Hinchey, 2004; Phillipson, 1992) may be a good start. The first step to engage pre-service teachers in critical pedagogy is through problem-posing education (Freire, 2000). That is, both teacher educators and pre-service teachers should "strive for the emergence of consciousness and critical intervention" (Freire, p. 81) to challenge the ill-conceived notions toward certain groups of people. Therefore,

Teaching How To Discriminate

the suggested resolution for teacher educators and pre-service teachers is to be critically aware of biased materials.

Developing such awareness is crucial for English teachers, as Pennycook (1995) argues: “English language teachers should become political actors engaged in a critical pedagogical project [in order] to use English to oppose” (p. 55) the dominant discourses of and about the West and to help the articulation of counter-discourses in English. What teachers, especially South Korean English teachers, need to realize is that the English language is not neutral. It is inextricably associated with ideological, social, political, and economic aspects of the everyday life of learners, not only in South Korea but also in many other countries such as Hong Kong, India, Singapore (Pennycook, 1994), Sri Lanka (Canagarajah, 1999), and the Philippines (Tollefson, 1991). South Korean English teachers need to consider these social aspects of teaching English. After all, educators cannot meaningfully deliver or implement curriculum without reflecting on the relationship between schools and society (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2004). Counter-discourses, when including social elements, should work to lead English education and South Korean English learners to insightful understandings, instead of biased perceptions, of diverse cultures.

In addition to teachers’ and teacher educators’ efforts, the broader social discourse needs to be examined because the social, cultural, political, and economic contexts in which bias occurs have major reciprocal effects on the content of textbooks. Thus, on a social level, the importance of morals, ethical considerations, respect for others, and the notion of living cooperatively on a global scale should replace the overemphasized importance of economic success. In understanding diverse cultures and people, students should not only be tolerant but also accept and respect others (Nieto, 2002). When the idea of respect for all people is encouraged society-wide, then that belief will be reflected in the content of textbooks. In this way, globalization will not be equated entirely with economic success any more. Rather, globalization will encourage South Koreans to broaden their knowledge of other cultures and foster the ability to discern and define other cultures with a minimum of prejudice.

References

- Apple, M. W. (1992). The text and cultural politics. *Educational Researcher*, 21(7), 4-11.
- Apple, M. W. (1996). *Cultural politics and education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Auerbach, E. R. (1995). The politics of the ESL classroom: Issues of power in pedagogical choices. In J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Power and inequality in language education* (pp. 9-33). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Baik, M. J. (1994). Language, ideology, and power: English textbooks of two Koreas. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- Blackledge, A. (2003) Imagining a monocultural community: Racialization of cultural practice in educational discourse. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 2(4), 331-347.
- Burbules, N., & Torres, C. (2000). Globalization and education: An introduction. In N.

- Burbules & C. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 1-26). New York: Routledge.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Capella, J. (2000). Globalization, a fading citizenship. In N. Burbules & C. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 227-251). New York: Routledge.
- Choi, J. (1996). Segyehwa shidaeu oeguko kyoyuk [Foreign language education in the global age]. *Kyoyuk Wolbo [Education Monthly]*, 169, 50-53.
- Demick, B. (2002, March 31). Some in South Korea opt for a trim when English trips the tongue. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved April 2, 2002, from <http://www.latimes.com>
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London, UK: Longman.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Gee, J. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Grant, A. R., & Lee, I. (2009). The ideal English speaker: A juxtaposition of globalization and language policy in South Korea and racialized language attitudes in the United States. In R. Kubota & A. Lin (Eds.), *Race, culture, and identities in second language education: Exploring critically engaged practice* (pp. 44-63). New York: Routledge.
- Hinchey, P. H. (2004). *Becoming a critical educator: Defining a classroom identity, designing a critical pedagogy*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Hodder, I. (2003). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (pp. 155-175). London, UK: Sage.
- Hong, S. C. (2000). "English-for-survival" spread. *Donga Ilbo*. Retrieved March 1, 2000, from <http://www.donga.com>
- Jeong, Y. K. (2004). A chapter of English teaching in Korea. *English Today*, 78(20).
- Jung, S. K., & Norton, B. (2002). Language planning in Korea: The new elementary English program. In J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language policies in education* (pp. 245-265). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kang, M. K. (1998). *A reconsideration of cultural imperialism theories: Globalization and nationalism*. Retrieved February 24, 2001, from <http://www.prome.snu.ac.kr/~news/home/impe.html>
- Kim, K. (2007, April 6). Miguknae Hangukin Yuhaksaeng Gumanyomyong [Korean students studying in the US, over 90,000]. *Chosun Ilbo*. Retrieved May 2, 2007, from <http://www.chosun.com>
- Kang, M. K. (2000). The second modernization failed: Discourse politics from 'new Korea' to 'globalization.' In P. Gilroy, L. Grossberg, & A. McRobbie (Eds.), *Without guarantee: In honor of Stuart Hall* (pp. 181-192). New York: Verso.
- Kim, Y. M. (2000). *Nanun Kobalhandu [I accuse]*. Seoul, Korea: Hankyore Shinmunsa.
- Kim, Y. S. (1996). *Korea's reform and globalization*. Seoul, Korea: Korean overseas information service.
- Korea Institute of Curriculum and Evaluation (KICE). (2002). Personal email communication (August 5, 2002).
- Korea Institute of Curriculum and Evaluation (KICE). (2001). *Naeyongui Sonjeonggwa Chojik* [Content selection and organization]. Seoul, Korea. Retrieved May 7, 2001, from <http://www3.kice.re.kr/menu3.htm>

Teaching How To Discriminate

- Kubota, R. (1999). Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for applied linguistics research and English language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 9-35.
- Lee, B. M., Park, K. H., Ryou, K. H., Han, J. G., & Lee, J. W. (2002). *High school English*. Seoul, Korea: Chun-Jae Kyo-Yuk.
- Lee, K. D., Lee, J. W., Ku, E. Y., Baker, S. (2002). *High school English*. Seoul, Korea: Neung-Yul-Young-O-Sa.
- Lee, M., Whang, J. R., Kim, Y. S., Kim, G. J., Yang, H. K., & Kim, J. W. (2002). *High school English*. Seoul, Korea: Ji-Hak-Sa.
- Luke, A. (1995). Text and discourse in education: An introduction to critical discourse analysis. *Review of Research in Education*, 21, 3-28.
- Luke, A., & Luke, C. (2000). A situated perspective on cultural globalization. In N. Burbules & C. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 275-297). New York: Routledge.
- Macdonald, D. S. (1996). *The Koreans: Contemporary politics and society* (3rd ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Nieto, S. (2002). *Language, culture and teaching: Critical perspectives for a new century*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (2004). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Park, H. O. (1996). *Segyehwa: Globalization and nationalism in Korea*. Retrieved February 24, 2001, from <http://www.umich.edu/~iinet/journal/vol4no1/>
- Park, S. (2002). English study abroad rising, and at a much younger age. *Joongang Ilbo*. Retrieved August 5, 2002, from <http://english.joins.com>
- Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. New York: Longman.
- Pennycook, A. (1995). English in the world/The world in English. In J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Power and inequality in language education* (pp. 34-58). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R. (1994). English language spread policy. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 107(2), 7-24.
- Piantanida, M., Tananis, C., & Grubs, R. (2004). Generating grounded theory of/for educational practice: The journey of three epistemorphs. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 17, 326-346.
- Pike, G. (2000). Global education and national identity: In pursuit of meaning. *Theory Into Practice*, 39(2), 64-73.
- Recento, T. (2000). Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4(2), 196-213.
- Recento, T., & Burnaby, B. (Eds.) (1998). *Language and politics in the United States and Canada: Myths and realities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rogers, R., Malancharuvil-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., Hui, D., & Joeseph, G. O. (2005). Critical Discourse Analysis in education: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(3), 365-416.
- Shin, G. W. (2003). *The paradox of Korean globalization*. Retrieved November 3, 2006, from <http://iis.db.stanford.edu/pubs/20125/Shin/pdf>
- Short, J., & Kim, Y. (1999). *Globalization and the city*. London, UK: Longman.
-

- Sluys, K. V., Lewison, M., & Flint, A. S. (2006). Researching critical literacy: A critical study of analysis of classroom discourse. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 38(2), 197-233.
- Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodeak, R., & Vetter, E. (2002). *Methods of text and discourse analysis*. London, UK: Sage.
- Tollefson, W. J. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality: Language policy in the community*. London, UK: Longman.
- Tollefson, W. J. (Ed.). (1995). *Power and inequality in language education*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tollefson, W. J. (Ed.). (2002). *Language policies in education: Critical issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tsui, A. B. M., & Tollefson, J. W. (2007). *Language policy, culture, and identity in Asian contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Valdes, G. (1998). The world outside and inside schools: Language and immigrant children. *Educational Researcher*, 27(6), 4-18.
- Vavrus, F. (2002). Postcoloniality and English: Exploring language policy and the politics of development in Tanzania. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(3), 373-397.
- Yang, K. M. (2001). Taehakmada Yongo Chinhaeng Kangui Hwaksan [More colleges for English as a medium of instruction]. *Chosun Ilbo*. Retrieved June 22, 2001, from <http://www.chosun.com>
- Yim, S. (2007). Globalization and language policy in South Korea. In A. Tsui & J. Tollefson (Eds.), *Language policy, culture, and identity in Asian contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Yun, S. H. (2005). Kyongsangdae Yongo Chonyong Kanguidong 'English Village' Kaekwan. [English Village at Kyung Sang University]. *Ohmynews*. Retrieved September 22, 2005, <http://www.ohmynews.com>