

## *Chapter One*

### INTRODUCTION

The globalised world space in modern times is one inextricably shaped by ebb and flow, force and motion – a context of ever-shifting imbrications and disjunctures (Appadurai 1996; Rizvi 2000); of ever-shrinking time and space (Bauman 1998:2); and the ever-increasing movement of individuals, ideas and imagery across national ‘boundaries’ (Rizvi & Lingard 2000:419). For the nation-state, such ‘fluidity’ exposes the increasingly porous nature of national physical and cultural boundaries, impacting upon the nation-state’s ability to manage “economic dynamics and political tensions” (Torres 2002:81), enabling unprecedented global scrutiny of national political, economic and social structures, and a (re)defining of national ‘success’. For the individual, such movements reveal a spectrum of life possibilities “stretch(ing) along the hierarchy of the global and the local” (Bauman 1998:121) – of alternate selves, communities or worlds for consideration via the imagination, or for exploration through travel and migration (Appadurai 1996).

Intimately bound with the production and maintenance of opportunity and openness within this compressed and thoroughly ‘porous’ world space (Bauman 2006; Bourdieu 1998) are the dominant economic, cultural, social and political discourses of globalisation. Such discourses, informed by economic and political neo-liberal agendas, speak of a Western-informed economic, cultural and political ‘liberalisation’ – the freedom to trade, produce and invest globally with minimal state intervention; the freedom to be global, to consume global products, to communicate globally, to compete and succeed globally (Appadurai 1996; Stromquist & Monkman 2000a:4; Torres 2002) – as symbols of a “marketopia” (Ball 2001 cited in Tamatea 2005:330) both “virtuous in character” (Rizvi & Lingard 2000:419) and

“pure and perfect” in order (Bourdieu 1998:online)<sup>1</sup>. Both the nation-state and the national are therefore positioned, within globalising and neo-liberal discourses, as actors within a storyline<sup>2</sup> of success and possibility with global dimensions, a storyline whose effects alter and re-establish relationships, dynamics and solidarities between the global, the national and the individual – and within the national (Appadurai 1996; Singh 2002a:131; Torres 2002). With the English language functioning as ‘gatekeeper’ to those alternatives synonymous with “bounty” and socio-economic privilege (Phillipson 1992:272) within such storylines, emphasis upon the acquisition of the English language within the educational policy of the non-Western nation-state<sup>3</sup> and the educational ‘desire’ of the non-Western national, has subsequently increased in modern times (Amin & Kubota 2004).

For a non-Western nation-state, such as the Republic of Korea (hereafter referred to as Korea), a nation of “strongly nationalistic language attitudes” (Park, J.S-Y. 2004:1) and a history shaped by seclusion and “exclusionary policy” (Kim, K.S. 1999; Kuznets 1977:2), the bounded-ness of the English language (a ‘sign’ of the Western and foreign ‘Other’) with globalising neo-liberal discourses of national ‘success’, presents an interesting conundrum and the potential for contradiction, for nation-state and ‘citizens’ within this context. It is this inherent tension, between the ‘re-forms for success’ constructed by modern globalising and neo-liberal discourses and cultural, social, linguistic and political traditions; between an

---

1 While notions of freedom and liberalisation are (re)presented as wholly positive within globalisation and neo-liberal discourses, Bauman (2006:96) disagrees, referring instead to a “wholly negative globalisation” in which the “highly selective globalisation of trade and capital, surveillance and information, coercion and weapons, crime and terrorism” evoke fear, rather than freedom.

2 Storylines are collective, culturally relevant “set(s) of sequences of action and positions” located within discourses and discursive practices (Brandth & Haugen 2005; Søndergaard 2002:191). The concept of storylines will be developed in greater detail in subsequent chapters.

<sup>3</sup> The term non-Western/non-West is used throughout this research to denote that which is not of or belonging to the ‘West’. While the researcher acknowledges the problematic nature of this use both in the monolithic assumptions implied by the term and the seemingly un-critical positioning of such nation-states as ‘Other’ or in relation to the ‘West’, as Olaniyan (1993:745) notes “none of the terms invented for these regions (the ‘non-West’) have ever been acceptable”. In committing however, within the (limited) bounds of this research, to exposing the historical/cultural/social/economic discourses, “network of interests” and “configurations of power” (Said 1978:3-5) that maintain such binaries, it is hoped the ‘violence’ of this use is somewhat mitigated.

increasing incursion of ‘signs’ of the West, such as the English language, and the ‘protection’ of nationalist sentiment<sup>4</sup> within this context that is of interest, constructing as it does the contextual background for this research project. While such tensions are thoroughly modern in nature, produced by the structural and material effects of a globalised world space, these ‘confrontations’ have a unique historical resonance for the Korean nation-state, replicating junctures between the global and the national, the Korean and multiple ‘Others’, that have irrevocably shaped the historic (and modern) storylines of this non-Western context.

While the historical storyline of the Korean nation-state popularly begins with Tan’gun, the “god-king who ... founded the Korean nation” (Asia Times Online 2002 quoted in Shin 2003:6) giving rise to assertions of a common ancestry and national ‘homogeneity’ (Lee 1994), this (re)view will broadly explore the period of national transformation from “hermit kingdom” (Kuznets 1977:4) to Asian ‘tiger’ or “economic giant” (Robertson 2002:7)<sup>5</sup>. Specifically, this section will expose the multiple ‘Others’ embroiled in this re-form, and the interweaving role of the English language and English education.

As a historically isolationist context (Kuznets 1977:39), the Korean nation-state has traditionally established strong cultural distinctions, distinctions at times formalised within governing policy (Kuznets 1977) between what is Korean and ‘Other’<sup>6</sup>. The “brief but brutal” (Lim 2003:145) occupation of Korea by Japanese ‘colonialists’, however, wrought dramatic and assimilationist economic, educational, social, cultural and political change (Hart 1999;

---

<sup>4</sup> Constructed during colonisation and forming the basis of Korean nationalist sentiment in modern times (Yim 2002:38) is *minjok*, a concept encapsulating notions of the “same bloodline”, “common language”, “a common history and culture” and the “consciousness of a community of ‘us’” (Hurt 2006a).

<sup>5</sup> It is important to note that this historical re-view is broad in its approach, highlighting only specific (limited) instances during a period of momentous economic, social and cultural change for the Korean nation-state.

<sup>6</sup> Despite this ‘isolation’, the Korean nation-state had an established relationship with China during this period and was dependent upon the Chinese for protection in return for allegiance (Kuznets 1977:5).

Yim 2002) with the imposition of “social, economic and political Western modernities”<sup>7</sup> (Lee, Y-H. 1997:124). The post World War II ‘liberation’ from Japanese rule<sup>8</sup> firmly established the Japanese as national ‘Other’, or that presented within both government and popular discourse as the converse of the nation, with anti-Japanese sentiment mobilised in efforts to re-unite the ‘new’ South Korean nation (Cho Han 2000).<sup>9</sup> The ‘First Korean Republic’ was therefore established in 1948 (Park, H.J. 2003:170) with the heavily conditional financial ‘aid’ of the United States government (Kuznets 1977:36)<sup>10</sup>. J.S-Y. Park (2004:45) refers to the “importance” of English competency for the Korean national during this transitional period, with English language ability bartered for both ‘insider’ status and reward.

The (re)focusing of Korean economic and cultural ‘activity’ necessitated by the neo-colonial (imperial) ‘interests’ of the United States is highlighted by the 1949 enactment of the ‘Education Law’; constructing ideals of ‘internationalisation’ as complimentary to, rather than in opposition with, patriotism and national preservation<sup>11</sup> (Lee, J-K. 2004). Accordingly, prior to the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950, Korea was admitted to the United Nations

---

<sup>7</sup> This ‘transformation’ included the introduction of a ‘modern’ Japanese education system (Breen, 1998), the replacement of Korean with Japanese as the language of education (Kuznets 1977:25), the ‘erosion’ of “egalitarian aspects” of Korean Confucianism (Lee, Y-H. 1997:125) and economic growth achieved through export and trade (Kuznets,1977:10).

<sup>8</sup> The Japanese surrender occurred in 1945 in response to a Russian declaration of war on Japan and acknowledgement of the loss of the war by the Japanese (Kuznets 1977:27-28). The division between North and South Korea was established during this period to “establish areas of responsibility for receiving the Japanese surrender” (Kuznets 1977:27-28).

<sup>9</sup> Such ‘resistance’ centred on notions of the *kukmin*, or “member of the nation” (Cho Han 2000:57), a nationalist discourse that “developed in conjunction and disjunction with anti-Japanese colonialism” (Cho Han 2000:59). As K-J Kim (2006:153) notes, “Korean nationalism became a mass phenomenon through the collective experience of harsh Japanese rule”.

<sup>10</sup> American funding was provided on the proviso that the Korean government, “attempt to balance its budget, control currency issues and bank credit, regulate foreign-exchange transactions, facilitate foreign private investment, develop export industries, either dispose of former Japanese property or administer it more effectively and establish a counterpart fund to be used in ways agreed upon by both parties” (Kuznets 1977:36).

<sup>11</sup> The specific articles referring to internationalisation within the Education Law are as follows: (Article 2:2) “Development of a patriotic spirit for the preservation of national independence and enhancement of an ideal for the cause of world”; and (Article 2:3) “Succession and development of our national culture and contribution to the creation and growth of the world culture” (Lee, J-K. 2004:online)

Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO 2006a).<sup>12</sup> Over the next four decades<sup>13</sup> and with the financial assistance of the World Bank<sup>14</sup>, the Korean nation-state transformed from agrarian to industrial economy (MacEwan, 1999). During this period, the United States was, in addition to Japan, (re)presented as ‘Other’ within nationalist discourse (Cho Han 2000; Kim, K-J. 2006)<sup>15</sup>. Despite strong American influence upon the re-form process, this rapid economic development was largely state-driven (and “market-conforming”) – a policy emphasis developed in response to “critical flaws” foreseen within the market-driven economic model of the United States (Park, H.J. 2003:175-176). This outcome is of interest, representing as it does an economic and political (re)positioning of the Korean nation-state, from being allied with, and dependent upon, to being ‘independent’ and at variance with the conformist, uniform model for ‘success’ advocated by the nation-state’s benefactors – the United States and the World Bank<sup>16</sup>. Rather, the Korean economic model aligned with that of Japan, establishing an economically credible non-Western alliance and

---

12 The United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) was established in 1946 to contribute to “peace and security by promoting collaboration among...nations through education, science and culture”, advocating educational, cultural and scientific exchange as an antidote to war (deJong-Lambert 2006; Dorn 2006:316).

13 This period included a military coup (Kim, K.S. 2005), a presidential assassination (Shin 2006), “frequent constitutional change” and “pro-democracy demonstrations” (Hahm 1997), the ingress of foreign aid agencies, and the exodus of students seeking American academic knowledge (Lee, J-K. 2004). By using the provision of aid “as leverage”, the American government continued its involvement in domestic policy (Lim 2003:149), insisting upon macroeconomic reform and stabilisation. As Lim (2003:150) states however, the continuing involvement of the United States in Korean domestic affairs provided impetus to the development of non-orthodox and ‘drastic’ economic measures designed to promote Korean economic independence.

14 The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development or the World Bank was formed by the United Nations in 1944 to channel global capital into reconstruction efforts after World War II (Gavin & Rodrik 1995; Mundy 2002:484). As an intergovernmental organisation, the World Bank is “owned by the very governments that it is attempting to influence”, requiring countries to adopt social, economic and educational policies that strengthen economies for private international investment, as a condition of lending (Gavin & Rodrik 1995:331).

15 Cho Han (2000) likewise refers to evidence of pro-American views within Korea during this period. Importantly, both pro- and anti-American sentiment contributed to the Korean nationalist ‘project’ or *kuukmin*, discussed previously. As K-J. Kim (2006:157) notes “images of the United States in South Korea are multiple and fluctuate according to changing circumstances”.

16 As an intergovernmental organisation, the World Bank is “owned by the very governments that it is attempting to influence”, requiring countries to adopt social, economic and educational policies that strengthen economies for private international investment as a condition of lending (Gavin & Rodrik 1995:331). Thus, as Jones (1998:151) remarks, the obligations of the World Bank are with the “international markets which provide its loanable capital”.

challenging the development-as-market-driven assertions of the ‘West’. With Korea granted membership in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)<sup>17</sup> in 1996 (Synott 2002) and the financial crisis of 1997 (Lim & Jang 2006), Korea’s period of global economic ‘Other-ness’ ceased<sup>18</sup>, with increasingly neo-liberal reforms embraced in response to both national and international criticism of prior policy. In (re)presenting the Korean nation(alism)-building ‘project’, modern Korean discourse therefore utilises multiple ‘Others’, constructing a collective ‘spirit’ able to be mobilised in response to “Western imperialism ... the Japanese threat” (Kim, K-J. 2006:151) and global relations of power (Cho Han 2000).

The increasing status of the English language, a status borne of the ambivalent relationship (of power) between the United States and Korea (Kim, T-Y. 2006) and augmented by international ‘exposure’<sup>19</sup> (Yim 2006), has bound with and induced policy reform within this context, producing structural and material effects that have altered notions of success and status - and failure (Kim, T-Y. 2006; Park, J.S-Y. 2004; Park, S.J. & Abelmann 2004). In practical terms, the ‘power’ of the English language for both the Korean nation-state and national has resulted in an annual investment of approximately US\$15 billion in private English language lessons (Samsung Economic Research Institute 2006:1), and an industry that includes pre-natal English education<sup>20</sup> (*Chosun Ilbo* 2 May 2007), “English-testing fever”

---

17 The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) was formally established in 1961 with a membership of seventeen nations from Europe and North America (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development 1962). Membership in the OECD is predicated on a commitment to “a market economy and a pluralistic democracy” (Henry et al 2001:8) and a willingness to contribute to the expansion of multilateral world trade (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development 1962:254).

18 Widespread and strict structural reform was implemented within guidelines established by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in the post-crisis period in exchange for financial aid.

19 Korea hosted the Asian Games in 1986 and the Olympic Games in 1988, events that Baik (1992 quoted in Park, J.S-Y. 2004:46) note, induced “ordinary Koreans ... to feel the imminent need to learn and speak English”.

20 Pre-natal education is English education tailored toward providing early exposure to the target language and is delivered through online lectures.

(*Hankyoreh* 6 January 2006), a burgeoning “goose daddies” phenomenon<sup>21</sup> (Tokita 2006:6), and English-only enclaves or “English theme parks” for students (Mitchell 2006:1). As a nation with a history of seclusion and autocracy (Kim, K.S. 1999; Kuznets 1977), the Korean acceptance of, indeed enthusiasm for, the English language as a ‘sign’ of the Western and foreign ‘Other’, provides an interesting contradiction. Is such acquiescence, as Kuznets (1977:39) presumes, due to an historical lack of “established forces of sufficient strength” to resist globalised flows? Or rather, do the discourses and actors that shape the forces and flows of this modern world space provide a compelling and commanding incentive for national and individual re-form?

From within this national context of discursive conjunction and juxtaposition, historical seclusion and isolation, non-Western and Western colonialism, Confucianism and burgeoning neo-liberalism, globalisation and nationalism, the Korean national embarks upon his or her English language acquisition journey. It is the potential contradiction represented by this educational ‘desire’, the global/national discourses framing (and constructing) this pursuit and the implications for the lived (and imagined) storylines and ‘Self’ of the Korean learner of English that initiated, and provided impetus to, this current research project. As Gunew (in Spivak 1990:66) states,

If you are constructed in one particular kind of language, what kinds of violence does it do to your subjectivity if one then has to move into another language and suppress whatever selves or subjectivities were constructed by the first?

---

21 ‘Goose daddies’ or *kirogi appa* are fathers who remain in Korea to provide financial support to families temporarily relocating to English speaking contexts to improve the English speaking skills of their children.

## THE SIGNIFICANCE OF GLOBAL/NATIONAL RESEARCH - QUESTIONING THE RHETORIC?

Instigated by a 'desire' to explore the global and national discourses used by Korean learners of English when constructing and narrating their individual pursuit of English education, this research project has been enabled by a theoretical 'positioning' within the poststructuralist paradigm and the assumptions of post-colonial theory. Importantly, from this theoretical 'standpoint', the English language is able to be (re)conceptualised from spoken and written text only, to a colonial language privileging those linguistic and discursive practices, knowledges and storylines that embody power-full 'truths' drawn from social, cultural, political, economic and historical conditions. Within this framing, the learner of English, a social actor acquiring the words, functions and structures of the language, additionally imbibes the "conditions of possibility for engaging in the social practice of using English" (Pennycook 1994:33).

This poststructural (re)framing of the second-language learner has therefore enabled a shift within the field of English as a Second-Language (ESL) research; from a traditional conceptualisation of the language learner as homogenous 'consumer' who is know-able and known<sup>22</sup>, to a 'view' of the language learner as a complex being participating in, contributing to, and positioned by a myriad of discourses within the "social context of language learning" (McKay & Wong 1996:578)<sup>23</sup>. Importantly, for the language learner, this context is one

---

22 Armitage (1999), for example, in a study exploring the 'adjustment' and motivation of Korean English learners located trans-nationally, defines the Korean student by national 'belonging'; asserting that the Korean learner of English – as a 'member' of the Korean race – will be restricted in their capacity to "make friends or live with Australians and therefore adjust to and integrate into Australian society" (1999:73).

23 In (re)presenting and 'capturing' the experiences of the second-language learner, previous studies have utilised qualitative methods such as semi-structured interviews (Kanno 2003; Koehne 2005, 2006); conversation analysis (McKay & Wong 1996); narrative analysis (Abelmann 1997; Rhee, J-e. 2006); questionnaires (Ajayi 2006); or a combination of methods (Hsieh 2006; Kim, J. 2002; Norton Peirce 1995a). Importantly, some studies have combined the analysis of the rich data arising from such methods with a critical discussion of the broader power relations that privilege the global hegemony of English and Western culture and knowledge, facilitating critical and individual awareness of those discourses speaking of and for the second-language or English learner (Ajayi 2006; Kanno 2003; Kim, J. 2002; McKay & Wong, 1996; Rhee, J-e. 2006).

inscribed by the discourses of their local, national/trans-national and, globalisation informed location, and those embedded within their target language. Poststructuralist theory further adds that, ‘subjected’ to the ideologically, culturally, and socially informed storylines, meanings, values and regulatory practices of such discourses (Davies 1989; Sowell 2004; Weedon 1987), the learner of English can only ‘be’ that which is possible “within the terms of available discourses” (Davies 2000:55). Thus, the ‘desire’ to pursue English competency, rather than rational choice and the exercise of free will, is a desire allow-able and allowed by those discourses available within the learner’s context (Davies 2000). In this way, poststructuralism problematises the concept of individual agency popularised by humanist theory<sup>24</sup>.

This current study therefore, in line with its poststructuralist/post-colonial foundations and prior research within the field, conceptualises the Korean learner of English as a complex social being with fluctuating, incongruous and multiple selves, shaped and influenced by an array of discourses. It is hoped however that additional contributions will emerge from a research focus and conceptual approach that offers some departures from previous ESL research.

Following Appadurai (1991; 1996), this study proposes that globalisation – its processes and effects – have re-configured and re-defined “the nature of locality, as a lived experience” (1991:196) in the modern world, irreparably altering the contextual and discursive ‘landscape’ – both lived and imagined (1991:197) – within which the individual constructs ‘Self’. The Korean learner’s pursuit of English therefore, while produced by the national (local) discourses of the individual’s physical location is, within a globalised world, also potentially shaped by exposure to alter-native discourses inherent to the forces and flows of globalisation, discourses increasingly ‘Western’ in origin. Thus, contrary to the simple

---

24 This will be explored in greater depth in Chapter Three.

descriptions of national(local) processes and histories characterising previous research, this research project positions the Korean learner globally, rather than locally, uniting analysis of individual educational storylines with critical analysis of the global/national discourses that speak of/for, and position and engage such learners.

Further, in highlighting the concept of the ‘imagination’ as proposed by Appadurai (1991, 1996), this research project also considers how the broader ‘possibilities’ articulated within the flows of a globalised world space and the collective storylines of Korean language learner’s past/present; national (local) and trans-national locations, facilitate the ‘creation’ of imagined selves, promoting desire and ‘agentic’ potential. By positioning the work of the imagination as mediator between the discursive flows characteristic of the globalised world space, and the enacted storylines and negotiated subjectivities of English language learners, this study additionally problematises the interaction between the global and the individual. Subsequently, this study, also considers discourses, material effects and the ‘perceived’ possibilities within global and national fields as contextual factors with the power to influence the “specific life trajectories” (Appadurai 1996:55) of Korean learners of English.

By theoretically and analytically locating the learner within a broader global/national context, this research project is thus able to illuminate the constraining and shaping influence of factors external to the student, and the internal ‘variables’ that are brought to bear upon language learning. It is hoped that this broad focus, in its commitment to “situated, local and self-critical analyses” (Luke & Luke 2000:275), will contribute to knowledge of the structural and material effects of the highly ‘Westernised’ forces and flows of globalisation upon this non-Western nation-state, and the Korean learner in pursuit of English competency. Further, through critical discussion of the broader power relations that privilege the global hegemony of English and Western culture and knowledge, this research project ‘exposes’ the social actors that govern discourse use, and the various factors, structures and processes

‘maintaining’ the global and national hegemony of the English language (Mey 1985:37). As Stromquist (2002:vi) asserts,

We need descriptions of contexts and settings that capture significant features in a variety of countries and regions and that weave events unfolding in the educational arena with those taking place in other arenas, be they economic, technological, cultural, political, or any combination.

With a research focus stretching from the global, across national boundaries, to the local and individual, this research project has endeavoured to meet this ‘challenge’.

### THE WESTERN ‘OTHER’ AS RESEARCHER

At the beginning ... is the awareness of self as researcher, of personal or political motives for wanting to carry out a particular research project, for wanting to ask a particular question in a particular way. Although a research question arises in part through one’s own specific and embodied history of being in the world, it can never be just an individualistic question, one that arises somehow spontaneously from one individual’s mind (Davies 1999:13).

As a ‘white’ ‘native speaker’ of English positioned by both global and Korean discourse as a privileged and power-full subject (Amin and Kubota 2004), a member of a linguistic in-group (Park, J.S-Y. 2004), with access to an ‘enlightened’ and ‘modern’ culture (Kim, J. 2002), what I “want to know and say” and what I “can be heard as knowing or saying” (Davies 1999:15) are prescribed by the discourses of my historic and modern ‘location’. Awareness of the particular discursive ‘location’ of the researcher (Davies 1999:13), and thus recognition of the value-laden and subjective nature of research (Kincheloe 2001), therefore forms a significant component of the background to this poststructuralist study.

The ‘seeds’ of this research project were sown during the researcher’s own trans-national re-location and re-framing, from ‘Australian primary school teacher’ to ‘teacher of English’ in Korea. Bound with both the Korean and expatriate storylines of this alter-native location,

this researchers' 'storylines' embodied many 'selves' – the 'white native speaker'; the 'holder of value-able linguistic, rather than cultural knowledge'; the 'white woman'; the 'Australian national'; the 'human resource' – 'selves' that were (re)presented differentially within the discourses of this new location and, as such, often in contradiction with those of the researcher's 'home'. While her own trans-national journey to Korea was unanticipated, even questioned, within the confines of those discourses constructing being and belonging within the researcher's 'home'-land, the 'reverse' journey for her Korean friends and students, was highly desired (even foreseen) within national (local) discourses. It was the inherent difference in 'power' between the journey that the researcher as a member of the 'West', was en-abled to embark upon (on impulse), and the journey the Korean learner was compelled to take, that provided the initial impetus to this research project.

#### FRAMING THE CURRENT STUDY

The research project that is reported in the following chapters explores how Korean learners of English engage with and use available global and national discourses of English in constructing the 'Self' as a learner of a second-language. The argument is made in this project that such learners strategically appropriate global/national discourses to (re)present the pursuit of English as an individual journey for individual 'reward', variously resisting the alternative positionings and storylines constructed for the 'learner of English' within such discourses. While this chapter painted the theoretical/contextual/historical/personal background of this research project in broad 'brushstrokes', outlining the initial impetus for this researcher's 'desire', Chapter Two problematises the privileged historical and modern positioning of the English language by unpacking the historical, social and cultural discursive bases of the hegemony of English and language education, in global and non-Western contexts. Chapter Three further adds to this re-view of literature, locating this research

project – and the Korean learner of English – theoretically and contextually through a review of globalisation, of poststructural and post-colonial research paradigms, and of the construction of the second-language learner broadly and the Korean learner of English in particular, within previous research. Chapter Four outlines the methodological positioning of this research project, operationalising concepts critical to the investigation of the research problem. The first level of analysis follows in Chapter Five, which establishes the analytical ‘foundations’ for subsequent deeper analysis, and focuses upon the globalised educational policy discourse of three intergovernmental organisations speaking of and for the re-form of the Korean nation-state. Chapter Six over-lays an analysis of the educational discourses of the Korean nation-state upon such globalised ‘foundations’ examining the convergence and/or divergence between the educational/social/economic re-forms advocated within intergovernmental discourse, and their (re)presentation within national discourse. In light of this discursive ‘background’, the final contextual chapter, Chapter Seven, examines how thirteen Korean learners of English variously located nationally and trans-nationally engage with and use intergovernmental, global and national discourses of English when constructing subjectivities and (re)presenting the ‘Self’ as a second-language learner. Chapter Eight concludes with a discussion of the consequences of the findings generated in the preceding chapters for the construction of a post-colonial subjectivity by second-language learners generally and Korean learners of English specifically. The chapter also reflects upon the implications of these findings in terms of research methodology.

## *Chapter Two*

### THE DISCOURSES OF ENGLISH IN GLOBAL, NON-WESTERN AND KOREAN CONTEXTS AND THE GLOBAL/NATIONAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE LEARNER OF ENGLISH

In this era of trans-national interconnectedness, the English language and its associated discourses flow across national boundaries to be appropriated by governments and citizens alike (Appadurai 1996; Pennycook 1994). For non-Western nation-states, the privileged global position of English, and its inextricable link with discourses of economic, cultural and social opportunity in global and national contexts (Lim 1994; Phillipson 1992) has led to a (re)framing of education policy, a proliferation of students seeking English language education nationally, and increasing flows of students seeking such education in trans-national contexts. This chapter attempts to develop a broader contextual understanding of the “network of power” (Kachru 1986:127) of the English language by unpacking the historical, social and cultural bases of the hegemony of English and language education, and the “discourses linked to English that construct English ... in particular ways” (Pennycook 1998:8) in global, Asian and Korean contexts. Various research examples will also be considered with the overall aim being a broad description of the discursive construction and positioning of the Korean learner of English. This chapter will therefore demonstrate that, within a globalised world space characterised by flow and movement, it has become imperative for second language education research to consider language learners as located within and by national and global contexts.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION AS A COLONIAL PROJECT

From an estimated four million speakers of English in 1500 (Pennycook, 1994:7), the English language has experienced an expansion of distinctive proportions over the past five hundred years. As Phillipson (1992:6) notes, “the spread of English is unique, both in terms of its geographical reach and as regards the depth of its penetration”. This section will “reveal the historicity and the contingency” (Rose 1999:276) of discourses promoting the ‘global dominance’ of English or English as a global language, by highlighting the ‘networks of power’ existing between such discourses and the structural effect of such discourses upon nation-state and nationals.

The antecedents of the power-full position of the English language in the modern global context can be traced back to colonialism, in particular the colonialist efforts of Britain (Pennycook 1994, 1998; Phillipson 1992). Established initially for mercantile benefit, British colonial policies aspired to ensure the “permanent subordination [of colonies] in the economic evolution of the Empire” (Egerton 1941:7). Changing public and political perception of the ongoing role of the British in colonised nations, however, led to a reframing of colonial policy and the widespread belief that colonies should ultimately become self-governing and ‘free’ (Egerton 1941). By the mid nineteenth century, the social and political strength of the “philanthropic movement” led primarily by the work of missionaries (Egerton 1941:233), resulted in a re-definition or re-focusing of colonial policy to “imperialisation on moral, religious, and scientific grounds”<sup>25</sup> (Brantlinger 1986 quoted in Pennycook 1994:77). It thus became the “moral imperative” of colonial rulers to enlighten and civilize Indian and African ‘savages’ via an English cultural and linguistic education

---

25 The ‘moral’ project of colonial policy and imperialist expansion was constructed within popular discourse as further evidence that the “British people, language and culture were ... superior to all others”, with the English language “superior ... both in terms of its own qualities and of the culture which it represented” (Pennycook 1994:99).

(Pennycook 1994:76), with British colonisers tasked with imbuing colonies with “English feeling ... English laws and English institutions” (Egerton 1941:223). In India, for example, English language education was established as an instrument of ‘modernisation’, and a tool for ‘educating’ a class of Indian elites to mediate between coloniser and colonised (Phillipson 1992). With the British colonial government tying access to social and material benefits in colonial India to English language ability, English soon became “the master(s) language of the Empire” (Phillipson 1992:111). Although a symbol of domination and repression, the ‘masters’ language was also available for appropriation and negotiation by the colonial ‘subject’ (Canagarajah 2000), emerging as a “hybrid – neither the one thing nor the other” (Bhabha 1994:49). Canagarajah (2000:125), for example, with reference to colonialism in Sri Lanka, describes how the English language of the colonial ‘master’ was appropriated by local intellectuals to develop “indigenous education traditions”, producing “hybrid texts ... in English syntax but contain(ing) Hindu terms”. Broadly however, the possession of ‘the language of the empire’ by ‘colonised subjects’ served disparate purposes, rendering the foreign more familiar (Phillipson, 1992:131); providing impetus to anti-colonial movements (Loomba 1998); creating new hierarchies within existing social structures based on language possession and aptitude (Krishnaswamy & Burde 1998); and offering a basis for solidarity among the colonised (Phillipson 1992).

While the initial expansionist ‘aspirations’ for the English language occurred under the dual patronage of the Commonwealth and the United States (Phillipson 1992), after World War II, English as a primarily British construct was increasingly sidelined by the work of the United States and the promotion of American English (Singh 2002a). Indivisible from economic, political and military interests, the cultural and linguistic goals of North America were subsequently promoted as the “American system”, a system borne of “moral ascendancy ... essential tolerance of ... world outlook ... generous and constructive impulses ... and the

absence of covetousness” (National Security Council quoted in Phillipson 1992:156). By intervening internationally, the United States aimed to develop a world context conducive to the ‘American system’ (Phillipson 1992:156), in which the broad interests of the nation could be advanced (Phillipson 1992:156). This ‘expansionist’ project was however framed as an ‘international good’, promoting a “fair deal” for the world (Truman 1964 quoted in Escobar 1995:3) through the duplication of the economic, cultural and political characteristics of the ‘advanced nation’ (Escobar 1995:4). The ‘American system’ was therefore assiduously promoted by North American interests, through military action in Asia<sup>26</sup>, foreign aid and assistance to nations in ‘need’, and the work of organisations such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. Acquisition of the English language thus became part of a “subtle assault upon populations” (Said 1978:293) within the broader project of structural, political and economic reform toward ‘development’. Following British colonialism, American neo-colonialism was enacted (Pennycook 1994:153); and the global influence of American English, as the language of neo-colonialism, was expanded and consolidated (Singh 2002a:138).

The concurrence of the expansion of the English language and the meta-discourse of the ‘American system’ in the post World War II period (Escobar 1995:4; Pennycook 1994) ensured that the discourses of development, in particular those of progress and modernity, signified by economic evolution and a “regime of order and truth” (Escobar 1995:7); and capitalism, or “the sanctification of private profit based on the ... labor-power of workers” (Hill 2003:online), became increasingly intertwined with the discourses of English language acquisition (Pennycook 1994:158) and the knowledge system of the ‘West’ (Escobar, 1995:15). Embedded in Western thought and founded upon “concepts of democratic fair

---

26 Lee (2002 quoted in Prey, 2005:32), for example, in an account of the influence of the United States in post-war, agrarian Korea states, “almost all aspects of governmental policy and administration in Korea, including educational issues, were copied after those of the United States”, necessitating the introduction of English language education and academic exchange (2005:33).

dealing” (Truman 1964, quoted in Escobar 1995:3), the ‘development’ discourse constructs increased growth as the key “remedy for poverty and unemployment”, and industrialisation as the means of “modernisation [for] backward economies” (1995:74). Such ‘constructions’ are however problematised by Escobar (1995:59) who refers to the discourse of development as a “cultural production” primarily concerned with establishing a body of citizens to act as “producing subjects” in the capitalist pursuit of profit, rather than a precursor of “peace and abundance” for all (1995:4).

A further potent legacy of this post World War II period are a series of enduring binaries or “powerful ... political and ultimately ideological realities” (Said 1978:327), embedded within discourses that continue to structure academic thought (Said 1978); beliefs and perceptions of the Third World (Escobar 1995:12); educational policy discourse, and the field of English language education. The most insidious of these dualistic constructions is that of the developed and the ‘under’ or ‘undeveloped’, a binary positioning the ‘developed’ nation as the modern, the industrial, the urban, and the ‘under-’ or ‘un-developed’ as a nation ‘mired’ in tradition, agriculture and rurality (Escobar 1995; Pennycook 1994:42). Similarly, the binary of ‘West’ and ‘Other’<sup>27</sup>, positions the West as “rational, developed, humane [and] superior”, and the contrasting ‘Other’ as “aberrant, undeveloped, [and] inferior” (Said 1978:300), establishing further distinctions between the modern and the traditional; the industrial and the agricultural; and the urban and the rural; binaries which, as Said (1978:327) notes, “no one can escape dealing with”. Co-existing with and mutually supportive of such binaries, and of interest to this research project, is a further distinction between the ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ speaker of English within discourse (Amin & Kubota 2004), a delineation determining who has legitimacy as an English speaker and educator (Pennycook 1998). While the

---

27 Said (1978:300), in referring to this binary, uses the terms ‘West’ and the ‘Orient’. The term ‘Other’ has been used within this analysis to signify the not-West, denoting the ‘Other’ whose contrast makes the Western ‘Self’ know-able or known. As Bhabha (1994:96) states “otherness is ... an articulation of difference ... and the exercise of colonial power through discourse, demands an articulation of forms of difference”.

developed/undeveloped distinction is constructed within development discourse as surmountable, with nation-states able to become developed through capitalist reforms such as wholesale reductions in public expenditure (Hill 2003) and “imperialist intervention” (Escobar 1995:15), the native/non-native distinction, like that of the ‘West’ and ‘Other’, is biological and inherent. Based upon racial origins (Amin & Kubota 2004:120), the ‘native’ speaker binary constructs English proficiency across all language domains as a birth ‘right’ of belonging (Pennycook 1998:178), fixedly and perpetually locating the non-native speaker of English as subordinate to and ‘less than’ the native speaker, regardless of education or competency.

With the overt promotion of English language acquisition by British and American ‘interests’ and the somewhat covert association between the discourses of development/modernity /capitalism and English education in national and international contexts, the field of English language education (ELT) was borne. This field, Pennycook (1994:158) notes, has now superseded the initial ‘expansionism’ of Britain and North America to become a global business and international commodity in its own right. Despite the shifting and thoroughly ‘modern’ nature of this current global context, the discourses of the English language (re)presented by the English education industry continue to reflect their colonial and imperialist origins, (re)producing the ‘power’ of such discourses and the interests that maintain them.

## THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AS A POST-COLONIAL<sup>28</sup> AND GLOBAL PROJECT

The “compression” of both time and space (Robertson 1992:8) and propensity for flow and motion (Appadurai 1999) characteristic of the globalised and increasingly interconnected modern world space have conferred individuals and nation-states with global ‘possibilities’ on an unprecedented scale, positioning the language, knowledge, values and consumption patterns that originate in Western contexts, as more desire-able or desired than those of non-Western contexts (Luke & Luke 2000:282; Stromquist & Monkman 2000a:11). As a world space where “modern and global [exist] as flip sides of the same coin” (Appadurai 1996:3), English – constructed as the language of ‘the modern’ (Tsui 2004) and ‘the global’ (Pennycook 2007a; Phillipson 2001; Yano 2001) by colonial and modern discourses – is positioned as the universal ‘lingua franca’ (Bamgbose 2003; Pennycook 1994; Phillipson 2001), ensuring the continued growth of the English teaching industry in non-English speaking contexts. While the previous section examined colonial and imperialist support for the growth of the English language and the discourses that accompanied English during this expansion, this section attempts to disentangle the discourses that are concomitant with the English language, maintaining the global ‘status’ of the language and the English language teaching industry, in this modern global context.

Although the modern world space “is now an interactive system that is strikingly new” (Appadurai 1996:27), the discourses that position the English language as ‘lingua franca’ or the modern global language remain predominantly mired in the distinctions that characterised their colonial and imperial origins, albeit with modern (re)framings. Tollefson (1991:84), for example, refers to the ongoing and mutually supportive relationship between the English

---

28 The term ‘post-colonial’ has been problematised by Hall (1996), who questions when the post-colonial, as distinct from colonialism in its various forms, began. The notion of the ‘post-colonial’ will be taken up in detail in Chapter Three.

language and the discourses of ‘developed’ or ‘developing’, a relationship initiated in colonial thought and continuing to mediate the access of the ‘developing’ to knowledge and “institutional structures and relationships” in its exercise of power. Bound with such discourses in current and colonial times, the discourse of modernity, in signifying progress and ‘forward’ movement (Bhabha 1992), continues to promote English language education as “development aid”, or the means of breaching the gap between the modern and the traditional, the developed and the developing (Pennycook 1994:158). Further, the imperialist discourse of capitalism (Phillipson 1992, 2000) in its current neo-liberal turn (Hill 2003; Pennycook 2007b), conjures a “free-market utopia” (Tickell & Peck 2003:1) in its injunction that an opening of the market and a freeing of trade facilitate national/global success (Morrow & Torres 1999:96). For the ‘developing’ nation therefore, access to and competence in English, as ‘gatekeeper’ to global communication, is bound with economic development, modernity and “participation in the world capitalist system” (Tsui, 2004:15). Interestingly, such discourses are also appropriated by “periphery elite” within ‘developing’ nations to advance collective interests through the exertion of power, and to identify with the ‘modernisation’ and profit-focused efforts of the elite in ‘advanced nations’ (Canagarajah 2000:126). Despite this promise of “marketopia” (Ball 2001 cited in Tamatea 2005:330), the reality is one of “perpetual tension” (Torres 2002:375) between the promise of English and the inequitable access to wealth, participation and knowledge it bestows (Phillipson 1992; Pennycook 1994); and between the promise of democracy and the reality of a neo-liberal capitalist system that bestows global benefits upon a market-determined few (Hill 2003).

Written ‘over’ such discourses are those that speak to the modern actor, discourses that reflect the globally interactive and action-oriented nature of the current globalised world space (Stromquist & Monkman 2000a; Torres 2002). Globalisation discourse, for example, as a discourse tightly bound with the neo-liberal agenda, speaks of a ‘utopian’ and border-less

global climate characterised by competition and inexorable market forces, interconnectivity and opportunity, success and possibility (Stromquist & Monkman 2000a; Tickell & Peck 2003). The English language, as the “global means of communication” (Widdowson, cited in Bamgbose 2001:359) is, within this construction, a tool for ‘uniting’ global citizens (Pennycook 1994:20) and for augmenting/assuring a plethora of economic and cultural opportunities by enabling access to those knowledges spoken in English or “Western knowledges”<sup>29</sup> (Pennycook 1994:20; Stromquist & Monkman 2000a). The potency of the construction of English within globalisation discourse is further emphasised by Martin (2007:170) in a review of the linguistics of global advertising,

The mere presence of English associates the product with modernity, quality engineering, exclusivity, professional mobility, international appeal, and other positive concepts, depending on the product category and target audience.

In this way, the global ideas and imagery associated with the English language construct an overall image of agency, or agentic behaviour, for an English speaker in a globalised world; a definition assuring the individual “he or she is an actor, where in fact he or she is at best a chooser” (Appadurai 1996:42). Positioned by a discourse of globalisation that speaks of and for the ‘global actor’, the non-English speaker has “little choice but to demand access to English” (Bamgbose 2003; Pennycook 1994:74).

The English language thus presents a pervasive force, evident throughout economic, political, cultural and global/national spheres of function and presented in a variety of guises, including English-as-global, English-as-modern, English-for-democracy, English-for-knowledge, English-for-individual/national-success, English-for-culture, English-for-development/capitalism/neo-liberalism, to name a few. With the support of such power-full

---

<sup>29</sup> Chang (2006:516), for example, indicates that for the Chinese national, the desire to learn English is based primarily on a belief in the prestige of the language in “international business relations and communication”.

discourses, and the interests that continue to disseminate and promote them, the global project of English education for the masses is flourishing. However, as Tollefson (2000 quoted in Pennycook 2007b:102) cautions,

At a time when English is widely seen as a key to the economic success of nations and the economic well-being of individuals, the spread of English also contributes to significant social, political and economic inequalities.

### THE DISCOURSES/FRAMEWORKS OF ENGLISH AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION IN A POST-COLONIAL WORLD

The global expansion of the English language and its associated industries has been accompanied by a myriad of discourses that speak ‘of’ or ‘for’ such expansion. Problematizing these discourses, however, are ‘critical’ frameworks of English that simultaneously conceptualise and question the use, purpose, value, function and historic experience of English for the non-Western nation-state and ‘citizen’. This section considers these legitimising discourses and ‘critical’ frameworks and, following Pennycook (2001), examines the ideological positions of each to determine their implications for both the ‘learner of English’ and the English language teaching industry.

Drawing primarily from the historical discourses of the colonial and imperial powers, the “colonial-celebratory” position (Pennycook 2000a:108) views the current global ‘expansion’ of English as justified in light of the superiority of English, and the cultural and material benefits of English language competence. In comparing English with other languages, the perceived strength of English, for this discourse, lies in its inherent characteristics – its ‘extensive’ and ‘subtle’ vocabulary – and its functional value for citizens and nations alike (Pennycook 2000a). As a strong driver of British and American foreign policy throughout history (Phillipson 1992), the colonial-celebratory perspective has been appropriated by governments and individuals in non-traditional contexts to justify continued or increased

investment in English language education. Bok Geoil (1998 cited in Park, J.S-Y. 2004:58-60), for example, ignited controversy in his native Korea, after proposing that English should replace Korean as the official language. Bok's arguments in favour of English draw heavily from the discourses of the colonial-celebratory position, citing the language's usefulness in international social, political and cultural contexts; in academia; in information and knowledge transfer; and in facilitating global access to Korean culture, as reasons why it renders the Korean language obsolete, (re)presenting the 'expansionist' arguments of British foreign policy in the 1950's. The ideological implications of this perspective are clear – the use of the English language does impact upon individuals; however these impacts are constructed as purely beneficial, with increasing value in both national and international contexts.

In framing the English language purely in terms of its instrumental and global value while celebrating the use of local languages at a local level, the second discourse – the liberalist perspective – presents an evocative position for second language learners and educational planners alike (Pennycook 2000a:110). Advocating pluralism, tolerance and “freedom of choice” (Pennycook 2000b:111), liberalism argues that English is ideologically neutral, simply existing as one of a multitude of options in the global/local linguistic array – albeit, an option with global communicative significance. This position is clearly demonstrated by Crystal's (1997:110) comment that the status of English as an international language is due to its being positioned “in the right place at the right time”. Within this perspective, the global spread of English is viewed as primarily driven by consumer-demand resulting from the ‘value’ of English in the global marketplace. In narrowing its focus to the promotion of freedom-of-choice while encouraging the maintenance of local languages to provide for a diversity of linguistic options, the liberalist perspective effectively divorces itself from political or ideological considerations (Pennycook 2000a).

In viewing English as “socially, culturally and politically neutral” (Pennycook 1994:164) and language teaching as a service driven purely by market forces, the liberalist discourse represents an alluring option for the ELT industry (Pennycook 2000a:111). This is particularly evident in the focus of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) organisation upon teaching students “how to use English as a world language and become comfortable with the various cultural practices of English-speaking people” (TESOL 2008a:online) while respecting “individual language rights” (TESOL 2008b:online). Binding effectively with the broad spectrum of economic and global discourses privileging global markets and neo-liberal capitalism with its ‘English-as-market-driven’ rhetoric, the liberalist discourse positions English as the language of the global space, citing ‘market forces’ or the (free) will of the people as the impetus for this status. In appropriating the liberalist discourse, the ELT industry, rather than implicated in fostering a climate of insatiable demand for English, can defend its expansionism on purely economic terms. Further, by supporting ‘local’ languages for ‘local’ purposes, the liberalist discourse simultaneously secures the global position of the English language, while maintaining the ‘illusion’ that language teaching and learning are neutral processes (Pennycook 1994). This discourse however fails to acknowledge the global structural forces that mediate access to the English language, and serve to position language education providers and language users inequitably (Pennycook 1994). The liberalist position further denies the contextual factors of the modern world space that often inform the nation and nation-state’s prioritisation of globally as opposed to locally sourced ideas, images and offerings.

The belief that the English language is an ideologically neutral ‘instrument’ co-existing alongside a myriad of other languages has been vociferously resisted by several authors (Bamgbose 2001; Kachru 1986; Pennycook 1994; Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas 1996; Tollefson 1991). Phillipson (1992:287), for example, states:

Claiming that English is neutral (a tool, an instrument) involves a disconnection between what English *is* ('culture') from its structural basis (from what it *has* and *does*). It disconnects the *means* from *ends* or *purposes*, from what English is being used for. (Original emphasis)

At the basis of criticism of the liberalist perspective is a belief that the position is, in fact, highly ideological due to its covert promotion of globalisation and Western English-speaking hegemony (Park, J.S-Y. 2004). Within the overarching framework of "linguistic imperialism" (Phillipson 1992:15) and more specifically English linguistic imperialism, Phillipson aims to highlight the relationship between global inequities produced by imperialism in all its forms, and the spread of the English language. Thus, while the liberalist perspective views the statement, 'English is a world language', as unproblematic, linguistic imperialism might ask why such a statement can be made with authority when there are more non-English than English speakers globally (Phillipson 2001:30). From a critical perspective, the global spread of English is primarily due to "decision-making in the contemporary global political and economic system" (Phillipson 2001:189) that allocates "more material resources to English [and English speakers] than to other languages" (Phillipson 1992:47). Thus, the freedom of choice between linguistic options is deemed illusory, with individual use of English argued to be more so the result of "structural and cultural" imperialism (Phillipson 1992:47).

While the 'critical' framework of linguistic imperialism provides a critical analysis of the hegemony of English, the inevitability of the processes described, and their "threat to linguistic human rights" (Pennycook 2000a:113) has led to the development of a framework that provides a more empowering vision of global language, while acknowledging structural and cultural inequalities. This perspective, variously termed "language ecology" (Haugen 1972 cited in Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas 1996:441); "linguistic ecologies" (Mühlhäusler 1996 quoted in Pennycook 2000a:111); and "ecology-of-language paradigm" (Phillipson &

---

30 Phillipson's (1992:47) working definition of English linguistic imperialism is: "... the dominance of English is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages".

Skutnabb-Kangas 1996:429), examines how the introduction of a foreign language ‘species’ disrupts linguistic balance in various contexts. Drawing from work on natural ecologies within the field of science (Pennycook 2000a:111), this paradigm emphasises the “cultivation and preservation of languages”, through prediction, classification and comparison<sup>31</sup> (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas 1996:441-442). Mühlhäusler (1996 quoted in Pennycook2000a:111) however cautions against an interpretation of linguistic ecology that equates language maintenance simply with language preservation, supporting instead the relative “structured diversity” of languages within a context. Thus, within this paradigm, the use of the English language within non-English speaking contexts re-defines the purpose or uses of existing languages, resulting in corresponding change to both cultural and ideological possibilities (Pennycook 2000a:112; Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas 1996). Tsuda (1994 cited in Pennycook 2000a:114) and Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1996) have further developed the ecology-of-language framework to include a concurrent emphasis on linguistic human rights. Such rights are framed within the altered paradigm as an attempt to “harness the fundamental principles and practices from the field of human rights”, and apply such principles to the currently inequitable assistance for marginalised languages in a global world space (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas 1996:442).

By recasting the statement ‘English is a world language’ to ‘All Englishes are valid world languages’, the final ‘critical’ framework of World Englishes, recognises the various culturally determined ‘Englishes’ that have been, and continue to be, developed in local contexts. Moving away from an emphasis upon British and American English, the World Englishes framework advocates an understanding of the global spread of English that acknowledges the changes to its form, role and function (Bamgbose 2001). Kachru (1986), an author closely

---

31 In approaching the preservation of language as a scientific endeavour, Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas (1996:441) state that such endeavours should become a “predictive and even a therapeutic science”, in which the development of a typology or classification of languages based upon the “status of languages, functions and attitudes” provides a guide to the position of the language and enables comparison between languages.

associated with the World Englishes paradigm, emphasises a dual role for the framework – the advancement of understanding of the many varieties within the global ‘family of Englishes’, and a questioning of “the relationships of power that have denounced new varieties of English as invalid” (Park, J.S-Y. 2004:7). Reconciling the analysis of power relations with the exploration of ‘Englishes’, J.S-Y Park (2004:7) maintains, has been problematic for research within the World Englishes tradition however, with studies often highlighting the “systematicity and creativity of new Englishes” at the expense of an analysis of the structures of power in which such Englishes are located.

Although the above discourses and ‘critical’ frameworks commonly acknowledge the global spread and dominant positioning of the English language, each differs in its engagement with broader structural or ideological considerations and local contexts. ‘Global’ for the colonial-celebratory and liberalist discourses, and the linguistic imperialist framework, refers primarily to English use *around* the world, while the ecology-of-language and World Englishes frameworks emphasise English use *in* the world; that is the ways English is appropriated, adapted or resisted within local contexts. Such frameworks, in (re)presenting the response of the Western and non-Western nation-state and national to the English language, provide a snapshot of the subjective ‘reality’ or perspective of these positions. While both the colonial-celebratory and liberalist discourses are strongly bound with the globally power-full discourses of development, modernity, globalisation and neo-liberal capitalism, the alternatives offer opportunities for resistance (linguistic imperialist, ecology-of-language), and adaptation (World Englishes) for those using English *around* and *in* the world. The engagement with both the global and the national (local) within the context of this current research project therefore provides a unique opportunity to examine the extent to which Asian contexts, or more specifically the ESL learning nation of Korea and Korean learners of English, engage with or appropriate the hegemonic discourses of the English language

expansion and the English education industry, or resist such hegemony via engagement with alternative and ‘critical’ frameworks of English.

## THE POST-COLONIAL PROJECT OF ENGLISH AND ENGLISH EDUCATION IN ASIAN CONTEXTS

An existence within a globalised context, whose demands and vagaries emanate primarily from Western English-speaking contexts, requires an economic, social and political response from the non-Western, ESL context. This ‘response’ to the problem of English potentially ranges from a reinforcement of the global position of English by acknowledging the ‘need’ for English competence, to an endorsement or defence of the local (Luke 2003) potentially resulting in contestation or resistance – or a permutation of both positions<sup>32</sup>. This section will therefore explore the broad response of Asian countries to the incursion of the English language and its associated discourses.

The increasing presence, through neo-colonialism or globalisation, of the English language within local contexts of the non-Western nation-state has seen the global power of the language and its discourses – as maintained by global interests – ‘tether’ to local interests, imparting social and economic advantage upon competent speakers of English, and shaping language mediated hierarchies in these locations. The ‘power’ of the English language in Korea, for example, mediates access to university<sup>33</sup> (Mitchell 2006) and white collar occupations (Shim 1994), associating English speakers with “higher social status ... success and fortune” (Shim 1994:238), facilitating socio-economic advancement nationally and

---

32 Referring to the inclusion of English language instruction requirements in education policy in Japan, Kubota (1998:301) contrasts the popular modern discourse of *kokusaika* – a discourse of educational reform that promotes the ‘harmonious co-existence’ of patriotism and Japanese cultural identity with English teaching and learning – with the more traditional and anti-English discourse of *nihonjinron*. In Northern India with its history of colonialism, ideologies of English move from pro-English and anti-English sentiments on the left that work to “re-appropriate vernaculars as part of an anti-elite project”; to a simultaneous defence of and opposition to English on the right (Sonntag 2000:134).

33 The admission exam for the best universities in Korea requires applicants to pass at least two interviews in English (Mitchell 2006).

globally, and distributing wealth and power on highly inequitable terms (Pennycook 1994). Additionally, within the Malaysian context, Pennycook (1994:203) has identified a strong association between English speaking skills and social and economic advantage, particularly for a “small high-flying minority”, while in Thailand, Baker (2003) notes that English ability has become a prerequisite for higher education. Such evidence provides further impetus to the colonial-celebratory discourse of English, with English appropriation and engagement seemingly bestowing upon users the ‘natural’ advantages of the language within non-Western contexts.

While English language competency is increasingly constructed as a means of global/national ‘power’ within many Asian contexts, an affirmation, “however contradictory and ambivalent” (Collins 2005:418), of the hegemonic constructions inherent to the global discourses of English, is also evident within the linguistic ‘landscape’ of such nation-states (or the use of English *in* the world). Kubota (1998:297), for example, refers to the growing use of English “loan words” in Japan, despite the existence of an ‘equivalent’ word or concept in Japanese language, indicating the relative ‘power’ of English knowledge and concepts. In this way, following the ecology-of-language ‘critical’ framework, the introduction of the English ‘species’ has infiltrated the ‘native’ language species environment. Sargeant (2005:315) however, maintains that the appropriation of ‘loan words’ by Japanese language users is indicative of a naturalisation of the foreign, rather than a threat to the native, due to the apparent adaptation of such words through altered phonology, lexical meanings and morphological contraction. Similarly, J.S. Lee (2004:446) examined the ways in which English words were variably used by K-Pop, or Korean popular music, to (re)present a modern, assertive and hedonistic, or Western identity. In an apparent act of resistance to the traditional Korean identity positions available within their national location, this use of English ‘loan words’, J.S. Lee (2004:446) states, “epitomizes South Korean youth’s battle with

their unsettling identities”. In addition, following the World Englishes framework, various authors have noted the ‘adaptation’ of the English language to create hybrids or English varieties within non-Western contexts, including Singlish in Singapore (Lim 1994); a “codified variety of Korean English” in Korea (Shim 1999:247); “made in Japan English” in Japan (Moody 2006:212; Stanlaw 1987); the “Englishization of Chinese” in China (Pei & Chi 1987:111); and Hinglish or Hindu-English in India (Kachru 2006).

While this chapter has focused primarily on the social and ideological bases and structural implications of the expansion of English in post-colonial global and non-Western contexts, Pennycook (2000a:108) asserts that such discussion must also consider the ideological or discursive effects of English language use on language users. For the non-Western national residing in Asian contexts therefore, the learning of English as a second language is seemingly constructed as an imperative, albeit one in which the potential student is positioned as ‘actor’. Linguistic freedom of choice for the non-English speaking actor, as discussed above, if global/national, social and/or economic ‘success’ is desired, is however illusory when such desires are mediated by the English language. Borrowing Appadurai’s (1996:31) construction of the relationship between agency and possibility as mediated by the imagination; by learning English, the non-Western national gains access to an existence stretching from the ‘known’ or near, involving social and economic mobility (as provided by English) within the national context, to the ‘unknown’ or far, existing within “globally defined fields of possibility” and accessible via the imagination, the exercise of individual agency and English competency. The bounty or rewards therefore for ‘choosing’ the English language for the non-English speaker are ‘agency’ and possibility, the ability to inhabit a life on a spectrum ranging from the local to the trans-national, and, within the discourses of English, also power and prestige, wealth and knowledge.

## DISCOURSES OF ENGLISH WITHIN THE NATIONAL CONTEXT OF KOREA

The intersection of the discourses, structures and possibilities maintaining the global position of the English language, with those social, political, economic and cultural discourses emanating from the national (local) context construct, to borrow Bakhtin's (1981 quoted in Bhabha, 1996:58) terminology, a 'hybrid'; a space shaped by the "negotiation of discursive doubleness". This act of negotiation, or confrontation, between the global, the national, and the local, has broad implications for the discourses of the national context, and those that such discourses speak of and for. While Chapter One outlined the multiple junctures of the historic storyline of the Korean nation-state, this section will explore how the 'intersection' between the global discourses of English and national (local) discourses has been negotiated or confronted within modern Korea, and the discourses and potential subjectivities arising from this hybridity.

J.S-Y. Park (2004), in a study of the ways in which English and the learning of English are constructed within the national context of Korea, identified three key ideologies within four domains of popular and local language use. These ideologies, referred to as 'necessitation', 'externalisation' and 'self-deprecation', frame linguistic practice and, as J.S-Y. Park (2004:x) notes, "motivate Koreans' heavy pursuit of English as an all-important language". J.S-Y. Park's (2004) conceptualisation of the term 'ideology' connects language use, form and structure with "social meaning" (2004:18), and "relationships of power" (2004:21) within the Korean context, and therefore strongly echoes the significance attached to the concept of discourse used throughout this current research project. This section will further explore those ideologies of the English language, or discourses, identified by J.S-Y. Park (2004) as contributing to the hegemony of English within the Korean context.

The discourse of necessitation constructs the English language and English language learning as essential or a necessity for Koreans, with language competency deemed imperative within a globalised world reliant upon English as a medium for inter-cultural and inter-national communication (Park, J.S-Y 2004:76). The binding of the necessitation discourse with the interests of the global and national power-full is further indicated by the strong emphasis within this discourse upon English for economic success in a globally competitive environment. In appropriating Western and global discourses, particularly those of development, modernity and neo-liberal capitalism, to speak of and for the non-Western context of Korea, the necessitation discourse “repeats rather than re-presents” (Bhabha 1994:125), signifying an acceptance of a thoroughly Western construction of power and success, and visualising such power as the nation’s own (Bhabha 1994:122). This dynamic is further emphasised by Bok Geoil’s (1998 cited in Park, J.S-Y. 2004:60) framing of the necessitation discourse within neo-liberal terms during debates regarding the status of English within the Korean nation-state. Thus English, while broadly providing economic success for the Korean nation-state, is, within the necessitation construction, able to liberate the individual from the social constraints that limit freedom (Park, J.S-Y. 2004:60). In this way, the articulations of the necessitation discourse mirror those articulations of the West uttered within the colonial-celebratory and liberalist discourses. As discussed previously however, associating English acquisition with absolute individual freedom and ‘choice’ is potentially problematic. For the Korean learner of English, the discourse of necessitation positions the pursuit of English as a highly nationalistic endeavour synchronous with individual goals. The Korean English learner is thus constructed within this discourse as a primarily global citizen, encouraged to appropriate English as one’s own in the pursuit of success, and required to subordinate Korean language and culture until positioned globally as able to promote the very language and culture previously subordinated.

In contrast, the discourse of externalisation positions the English language as a symbolic representation of the 'foreign', and as such distant from and contradictory to all that is national and inimitably Korean (Park, J.S-Y. 2004:80). Invoking the familial and the communal in its construction, the externalisation discourse positions the Korean language as a birthright, "an inheritance of the mind" (Bak 2001 quoted in Park, J.S-Y. 2004:81) for the Korean national, and as such intrinsic to the Korean 'Self'. With references to the historical 'defence' of language and culture by past patriots in the face of prior colonisation and domination (Park, J.S-Y. 2004:82-83), the externalisation discourse speaks of a Korean 'Self' strongly founded in tradition, a fixed and essential 'Self' whose linguistic, cultural and social expressions mirror those of ancestors. In appealing to nationalist sentiment and tradition as a 'defence' against the invasion of the English language, the externalisation discourse seemingly establishes a global versus national binary, while supporting the West/non-West classification apparent within global discourse. By positioning the English language as anti-national interest, this discourse lends further weight to the construction of English as the language of the global, and the West. Further by characterising global English as insidious and pervasive in nature, a 'threat' to the purity and uniqueness of the national linguistic landscape, the externalisation discourse of the Korean context strongly echoes the ecology-of-language 'critical' framework discussed earlier. For the Korean learner of English therefore, this framework constructs the pursuit of English education as the antithesis of the national interest, and symbolic of a renouncing of Korean heritage and identity, with strong implications for the construction of subjectivity.

Of final interest is the discourse of self-deprecation, a discourse strongly apparent across various domains of linguistic engagement in the Korean context (Park, J.S-Y. 2004:x). Self-deprecation discourse is highly critical of the English competency and skills of the Korean population, referring to the collective Korean as "hopelessly incapable of mastering English"

(Park, J.S-Y. 2004:84). Linking with the discourse of necessitation<sup>34</sup> and the discourse of externalisation<sup>35</sup> in turn, the self-deprecation discourse has, J.S-Y. Park (2004:89) states, become “highly naturalised”, a generalised and “uncontested” trait of being Korean. While the discourse is broadly critical of the English language education system within Korea as a whole, it is highly problematic in its construction of the Korean learner of English as incompetent and un-able, a “bad speaker of English” (Park, J.S-Y. 2004:84) condemned to linguistic failure, despite continued investment in English education. In positioning the Korean learner of English, a non-native language user, as ‘less than’ and ‘un-able’, the self-deprecation discourse seemingly binds with and maintains global discourses promulgating the native/non-native distinction, while supporting the pursuit of English education in overseas contexts through its derision of Korean English education.

In summary, J.S-Y. Park’s (2004) research provides an interesting insight into the ways in which three discourses of the English language and English language learning (necessitation, externalisation, self-deprecation) structure and influence linguistic practice across popular and local domains of language use within the non-Western context of Korea. While appropriation of each discourse was apparent within the domains of language use examined, J.S-Y. Park (2004:x) found that the discourses of necessitation and self-deprecation were consistently strengthened in each domain, while the discourse of externalisation, despite broad acceptance, was positioned secondary to that of necessitation and self-deprecation. In positioning such discourses within the broader global discursive context, it becomes apparent that the emergent discourses of English within the Korean context, link to varying degrees with the

---

34 The self-deprecation discourse is used in conjunction with necessitation discourse, particularly in the context of debates to establish English as the official language of Korea. As J.S-Y. Park (2004:85) states, necessitation discourse establishes English competency as an essential skill in a globalised world while self-deprecation positions Koreans as bad speakers of English despite increasing investments of time and money. The binding of these discourses is used to justify the use of “drastic measures” to encourage English proficiency, and to emphasise the current inability of the Korean population to compete globally within an English dominated environment.

35 Within the externalisation discourse framing, the supposed inability of Koreans to speak English is due to the ‘foreign’ nature of the language (Park, J.S-Y. 2004:92-93).

discourses of global English identified earlier. Such linkages further strengthen the 'relationships of power' of particular discourses within this context with implications for English language learners, and learner subjectivities.

### EMERGENT QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

In traversing the global discourses, structures and possibilities that speak of and for English language users in modern times, and moving to those of the broadly Asian, and specifically Korean context, this review of research has reversed the trans-national journey of the ESL learner. For such learners, the constructed economic, social and cultural 'value' of the English language within a globalised world, and the increasing affiliation between English ability and agency or socio-economic advantage within their global/national/local context (Singh 2002a), have left non-English speakers with few linguistic alternatives.

The national and trans-national pursuit of English education has broad implications for the construction of 'Self'. As discussed earlier, a multitude of global/national (local) discourses speak of and for the position of 'English learner', seemingly compelling the learner to navigate and negotiate the multiplicity of fluctuating and potentially conflicting subjectivities available. Table One below provides a broad overview of the global discourses speaking of and for English in 'global' times, and the discourses of English identified by J.S-Y. Park (2004) within the national context of Korea. By contrast, Table Two below provides an overview of the global frameworks critical of the English language, and those national discourses problematising the pursuit of English, as outlined by J.S-Y. Park (2004).

**Table One: Summary of global/national discourses for English**

Global discourses for English		National discourses for English	
Colonial-celebratory	Liberalist	Necessitation	Self-deprecation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as inherently superior and thus critical to cultural and material 'success'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as language with global communicative significance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as essential skill with global communicative significance and critical to national and individual 'success'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Koreans as bad speakers of English due to structural and individual 'failings' in the pursuit of competency.</li> </ul>

**Table Two: Summary of global frameworks critical of English and their national discursive 'counterparts'**

Global frameworks critical of English			National discourses critical of English	
Linguistic Imperialism	World Englishes	Ecology-of-language	Externalisation	Self-deprecation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The global position of English as constructed by power-full interests</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Englishes as culturally determined and locally (re)constructed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as 'threat', harmful to existing linguistic balance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as invasive and a 'threat' to national interest and language</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Koreans as bad speakers of English due to 'foreign' nature of the language</li> </ul>

In specifically considering learners of English embarking from or located within the Korean context, this contestation and negotiation is potentially between the positionings and practices of the nationalist externalisation discourse; those of the discourse of necessitation, a discourse that binds with privileged discourses arising from the global context; and the self-deprecation discourse that positions the pursuit of English competency as obligatory yet fruitless. What global discourses however, particularly in light of the increasing availability of such discourses in globalised times, speak to such learners? How do Korean learners of English utilise these global discourses, and is there evidence of variance between the ways in

which global discourses are used by learners located nationally or trans-nationally? Further, what subjectivities are constructed by the interaction and potential contestation between such discourses? Lastly is, as power-full discourses suggest, English language acquisition enabling agency, or agentic behaviour, for learners of English from the Korean context? These questions are examined in detail in the chapters that follow.

Emerging from this review of the research and other related literature therefore is a clear need for second language education research to locate the learner within the broader national and global context. By illuminating those factors external to, yet impinging upon, the learner of English, such research can combine individual analysis with a critical discussion of the contextual influences, including power relations and social actors that privilege the global hegemony of English and speak of and for such learners. While previous research of the Korean learner of English has varied in its engagement with and reflective movement between individual and contextual analysis, this current research project engages with global discourses of Korea and learning English, and national discourses of the global and learning English, in its critical analysis of the individual Korean learner of English located in national and trans-national contexts.

THE POST-COLONIAL SUBJECT IN A GLOBALISED WORLD

The “fullness” of the globalised world, a world in which geographical, social and psychological space is ‘occupied’ (Bauman 2002:12), ensures that each and all are subjected to the vagaries of “modernity at large” (Appadurai 1996:23) – there is “no place for oneself ... to be oblivious to all the rest” (Bauman 2002:12). For the individual located within and by global/national/local “terrain [that] is continuously shifting and reconfiguring itself” (Singh 2002:146), the construction of ‘Self’ is no longer bound by geographical, cultural, social and economic ‘location’ (Appadurai 2006; Singh & Han 2006). Rather, within a globalised world, there exists a ‘new’ potentiality and possibility for the ‘Self’, emerging from the amplified border-crossing of both individual and image (Appadurai 1996; Singh & Han 2006); a juxtaposition which, as Appadurai (1996:4) notes, constructs a “new order of instability in the production of modern subjectivities”.

For the Korean learner of English, an individual whose desire for English competency engenders both physical and imaginary ‘border-crossings’, this construction of ‘Self’ is shaped by a multiplicity of subjectivities arising from innumerable positionings within multiple global/trans-national and national (local) discourses, in addition to those discourses engaged with during English education. While Chapter Two explored the construction of such learners within discourses of English and related discourses emerging from global, non-Western and Korean contexts, this chapter will ‘locate’ the Korean learner of English contextually and theoretically through an explication of globalisation and the ‘orientation’ of this research project. Various research examples will also be considered to provide, in broad brushstrokes, a pre-view of the second-language learner and the Korean learner of English, as they emerge from previous research.

## GLOBALISATION AS...

Broadly, the concept of 'globalisation' refers to a modern (re)shaping and (re)structuring of relations between social actors, in a process emerging from fundamental shifts in "domestic and international orders" (Dale 1999; Mundy 1998:468) that "transcend(s) national borders" (Astiz, Wiseman & Baker 2002:66). Stromquist and Monkman (2000a:3) note however, that the concept of globalisation is an "inexact term" whose definition and depiction is shaped largely by the positioning of those speaking of and for the concept. Mundy (1998:241), for example, defines globalisation in largely economic terms, referring to the process as "a period of major economic restructuring", while Stromquist and Monkman (2000a:3) broaden the term to include "changes in the economy, labour force, technologies, communication, cultural patterns, and political alliances". By contrast, Torres (2002:364-365) defines globalisation as a process of "blurring national boundaries, [and] shifting solidarities within and between nation-states" with critical implications for the construction of the national and the individual 'Self', while Rizvi (2000) states that globalisation is characterised by "increased cultural flows between nations". Bauman (2002:12-13) proposes however, that the 'endemic' border-crossing of globalised processes has, rather than simply 'blurred' national borders, exposed the permeability and provisional nature of all boundaries, rendering them futile. The social, economic, cultural and political 'openness' common to each of these accounts has led authors to refer to the demise or "withering away" of the nation-state (Appadurai 1996:19; Bauman 1998:57; Ohmae 1995).

Pivotal to the processes and effects (both intended and un-intended) of globalisation is electronic media (Appadurai 1996), a medium that enables the (re)conceptualisation of that which is 'near'<sup>36</sup> to include the ideas and images, storylines and possibilities with global

---

<sup>36</sup> The concept of 'near' is used to denote that which is physically, socially and culturally proximal to the individual. The corollary of this – the notion of 'far' – denotes that which is previously un-known and thus non-proximal.

origins (Appadurai 1996; Rizvi 2000; Stromquist & Monkman 2000a) across national boundaries for ‘consumption’, appropriation and hybridisation by the ‘local’. The resulting “imagined communities” (Anderson 1991) or “communities with no sense of place” (Meyrowitz 1985 quoted in Appadurai 1996:29) are shaped by the redevelopment of the local “vis-à-vis other cultural entities” (Giulianotti & Robertson 2006:172) and a (re)construction and (re)imagining of the ‘Self’ and the world, within a “polyphony of value messages” (Bauman 2001:127), in unanticipated ways (Appadurai, 1996:3). Juxtaposing this influx of the global ‘Other’ however, is a corresponding exodus or departure through migration and/or travel (Singh & Han 2006). The increasing ‘de-territorialisation’ of the individual and the formation of “diasporic public spheres” within trans-national locations (Appadurai 1996:22-23), in conjunction with globalised flows across national borders, has necessarily required a (re)visioning of national ‘belonging’ to include more global dimensions (Torres 2002:371); a (re)defining of national culture (Bhabha 1994:7); the (re)negotiation of the ‘Self’ (Fanon 1968:229) and the development of “cosmopolitan and hybrid identities” (Marginson & Mollis 2001:596). This section will further develop this discussion of globalisation, with a particular emphasis upon the various framings of the relationship between the global and the national (local) in a globalised world, indicating the critical need for a situated local analysis, rather than global assumptions, in the analysis of being and belonging within a modern world space.

## HOMOGENEITY, HYBRIDISATION AND LOCALITY CONSTRUCTION

In exploring the globalisation project and its consequences – anticipated and un-anticipated – upon nation-states and education systems, Singh (2002a:131-132) outlines three broad ‘framings’, namely globalisation-as-homogenisation, globalisation-as-hybridisation, and globalisation-as-localisation. While attempts to encapsulate the ‘essence’ of globalisation are fraught with difficulty due to the complexity and multi-dimensionality of the phenomenon,

such framings provide a useful means of exploring the diverse and multi-layered implications of an existence in a globalised world – for both nation-state and national.

#### GLOBALISATION-AS-HOMOGENISATION

In its homogenising ‘turn’, the broad globalisation project is presumed to exert a uniform and manifest influence, producing standardised political, economic, cultural and social responses and effects amongst nations and individuals<sup>37</sup>. Central to this ‘framing’ is a belief that globalised (Westernised?) images, ideas and goods flowing across national borders have, and will continue to, dominate and alter the local and national in a homogenous and uni-linear manner. Thus, an “international homogeneity of products ... from cultural entertainments and modes of transit to body-shape sizes and daily consumables” (McMurtry 1997:9) and the “popularity of homogenous global strategies that ... employ ... Western management theories” (Asgary & Walle 2002:59) have – within the globalisation-as-homogenisation framing – induced a global convergence of demands and preferences, an increasing tendency “among elites and middle classes ... to adopt ... an American way of life”, (Martinelli 2005; Stromquist & Monkman 2000a:7) and a convergence between national “education policy frames” and those of the “global policy community” (Rizvi & Lingard 2000:422-425).

In their totality, this assortment of standardised processes and products are variously referred to as “global mass culture” (Held & McGrew 2007:31), the “borderless economy” (Ohmae 1995:8), and the “McDonaldization of the World” (Rizvi & Lingard 2000:420). Inherent to this ‘global culture’ are the “deep structures of capitalism”, structures maintained by the ‘might’ of the trans-national, the intergovernmental, and the economic system of the ‘West’; and for whom, the homogenisation of ‘desire’ through standardised consumption patterns ensures both a ‘simplicity’ of the production process and a willingness of the nation-state and

---

<sup>37</sup> Waters (1995 cited in Rizvi 2000:207) notes however, that the effects and influence of this globalisation ‘project’ are strongest within the field of culture.

the national to enter the “global capitalist economic system” (Bergeron 2001; Tomlinson 1999:81-82). This “pure and perfect market” is, in turn, the utopia envisioned by the neo-liberal agenda (Bourdieu 1998:online); a modern agenda of global capitalism that (re)presents the eradication of national/local barriers to or restrictions upon globalised economic flows – or globalisation-as-homogenisation – as the basis for economic success (Hill 2003). McMurtry (1997:9) however, provides an alternate assessment of the ‘pure and perfect’ homogenisation envisioned by neo-liberalism and disseminated by globalised flows and forces, asserting that complete homogenisation will ensure:

... all are exhorted to ‘compete harder to survive’ ... As people are more and more relentlessly conditioned to obey and consume as conditioned functions and masses, humanity is brought to the level of ant hills.

#### GLOBALISATION-AS-HYBRIDISATION

In contrast, the globalisation-as-hybridisation ‘framing’ holds that contact between globalised forces and the national/local ‘space’ ensures indigenisation and hybridisation of the modern global flows within existing cultural attributes, values and beliefs, material and social conditions (Appadurai 1996:32; Giulianotti & Robertson 2006; Luke & Luke 2000; Martinelli 2005); and the (re)contextualisation of the processes of globalisation (Bonal 2003:160). Thus, while this ‘framing’ acknowledges the uniform or homogenous nature of global forces and flows and the “patterns of inter-dependence and inter-connection” fostered by globalisation, the national/local ‘response’ to such forces is constructed as un-predictable, un-even and shifting (Appadurai 1996; Dale 1999; Hall 1991; Luke & Luke 2000; Singh2002:132). As Asgary and Walle (2002:64) note, “the distinctive aspects of a culture’s ethos and its traditions are harder to standardise than economic systems, technological convergence and/or parallel marketing strategies”.

Kong (2005:186) provides evidence of such hybridisation in an account of the appropriation of the global neo-liberal economic agenda by Korea and the negotiation and (re)working of this agenda in response to the nation-state's "distinctive political, economic and ideological features". By constructing a hybrid and nationalised "democratic market economy", the Korean nation-state developed an economic system in which neo-liberal style expansion of the 'market' corresponded with the empowerment and expansion of labour and labour organisations, and the introduction of social measures to protect the population against market failures (Kong 2005:157-187). The 'democratic market economy' constructed by the Korean nation-state, in contrast to the global neo-liberal agenda, afforded strong protection to national/local business in its regulation of global capital, (re)presenting the influx of foreign capital as a 'threat' to national economic sovereignty (Kong 2005:186). Thus it seems, in contrast to the universalising presumptions of the globalisation-as-homogenisation position, the national/local response to globalisation can also be, as Appadurai (1996:47) states, "radically context-dependent".

#### GLOBALISATION-AS-LOCALISATION

Contrasting such perspectives, and in opposition to the globalisation-as-homogenisation 'framing' is the globalisation-as-localisation perspective; a perspective that examines the assertion of the 'local' and the 'traditional', in response to the incursions of the global (Stromquist & Monkman 2000a:7-8). Held and McGrew (2007) further question the constructed 'frailty' of the local within globalisation discourse, asserting that the historical and cultural construction of the national and the local, often within contexts of struggle and opposition, render such constructions impervious to the processes of the global. As evidence of the 'robustness' of the national within globalised times, both Held and McGrew (2007:40) and Asgary and Walle (2002:64-65) cite the emergence of increasingly fundamentalist and

trans-national expressions of nationalism, that, despite utilising the processes of globalisation, are in opposition to the broad globalisation project..

Therefore, characterised as both aggressive and passive (Astiz, Wiseman & Baker 2002:66); as positive and negative (OECD 2006, 2007a, 2007c; Rizvi & Lingard 2000); as a homogenising, hybridising and heterogenising influence (Appadurai 1996; Kellner 1997 cited in Torres 2002:365; Singh 2002a); as undermining of national democracies, while enabling a reconceptualisation of democratic influence (Torres, 2002:78); what is signified by the term 'globalisation' is that which embodies contradiction, contestation and ambiguity.

While each of the above three perspectives diverge in their account of national (local) effects of, and responses to, the influx of the global, each 'framing' converges in its assessment of the foundations of globalised flows, or as Bergeron (2001:985) refers, the "common discourse regarding the political economy of globalisation". This 'political economy' is underpinned by a neo-liberal agenda – a hegemonic discourse of "governance, political philosophy, and policy prescription" that broadly advances the notions of the "self-limiting state", deregulation of investment and capital, and an open global economic system characterised by 'free' trade (Fitzsimons 2000:506). Concurrent to the neo-liberal (re)working of the global, and the modern compression of time and space arising from global developments in technology and communication, is an influx of the cultural, political and social images, ideas and items of the 'Other' – an 'Other' of potentially global and/or international origins.

In theorising the response of the national/local to the "different levels, flows, tensions and conflicts" of the globalisation project (Kellner 1997 quoted in Torres 2002:366), alternately constructed as ambivalent (globalisation-as-homogenisation), adaptive (globalisation-as-hybridisation), or resistant (globalisation-as-localisation), each of the three framings under

consideration constructs a universal ‘account’ of the experience of globalisation. Thus, in light of the multi-dimensional nature of globalisation (Torres 2002), “situated, local, and self-critical analyses” (Luke & Luke 2000:276) may be necessary to capture the multiple responses of the national and the local to the influx of the global. Hence, this research project provides an account of the national and individual response of the Korean nation-state and the Korean learner through an analysis that tracks the policy of the global through to its ‘expression’ within the local. The following section articulates the theoretical positioning of this research project in further detail.

### THE POSTSTRUCTURALIST PARADIGM

The theoretical and analytical ‘desire’ to delve behind the apparent and the ‘common-sense’ within the storylines of Korean learners of English to reveal “the possibilities of sense making available within the discourses” (Davies 2004:5) available to such learners is strongly supported within this research project by a poststructuralist theoretical framework. Further, in (re)presenting the complexity and potential hybridity of a ‘Self’ as English learner constituted within a global/trans-national/national ‘in-between’, the assumptions of the post-colonial framework, in particular the inherent focus of the theory upon “the diverse ways in which individuals and groups identify selves culturally, socially and politically” (Iverson 2002:41), are argued to be of particular value. While this section will primarily outline the key concepts and positionings of the poststructuralist paradigm, the following section will describe those of post-colonial theory, with the overall aim being the development of a coherent account of the nexus between the poststructural and the post-colonial within the ‘context’ of this research project.

## POSTSTRUCTURALIST THEORY

While the sign ‘poststructural’ signifies a diversity of (evolving) theories and positionings (St. Pierre 2000:478), this diversity is underpinned by a common “recognition of the centrality of language and discourse” (Luke 1999:163) and a problematisation of the belief that “language mirrors the world” (St. Pierre 2000:481). Founded upon the work of Derrida – whose (re)presentation of the work of structural linguist Ferdinand de Saussure provided impetus to the poststructuralist ‘project’ (St. Pierre 2000:481) – and commonly associated with the work of Michel Foucault (Mirchandi 2005), poststructuralism dismisses “the possibility of arriving at a ‘truth’ about the essence of a phenomenon” (Søndergaard 2002:188). Rather, in offering the possibility of “disrupt(ing) that which is taken as stable/unquestionable truth” (Davies 2004) or essence, poststructuralism problematises and questions “what was being said in what was said” Foucault (1972:30).

In conceptualising the use of discourse as social practice, a poststructuralist ‘lens’ further interrogates the “social determinants” of discourse, or the broader factors that produce and maintain discourses and legitimised, cogent ‘truths’ within a context (Ainsworth & Hardy 2004; Fairclough 2001:137; van Dijk 2003). Critical to this ‘interrogation’ are the dual concepts of ‘power/knowledge’, whose nexus constitutes both discourses and the subject – or individual – that such discourses allow to speak, or speak of and for (Maclure 2003; Mills 2003; St. Pierre 2000). This section will further explore the theory of poststructuralism through a broad explication of concepts critical to the paradigm, namely discourse, power/knowledge, and subjectivity.

## DISCOURSE

In its broadest sense, the term discourse refers to written and spoken language use and exchange (Pennycook 2001; Weiss & Wodak 2003a). From a poststructuralist perspective

however, the concept of discourse refers to an entirety of texts about a subject or field, whose statements share “conditions of existence”, comprising references and knowledges that co-exist, interplay and are familiar intertextually (Foucault 1972:42; Ninnes 2004, Luke 1999), while acting as a “system that structures the way we perceive reality” (Mills 2003:55). Thus, as Davies and Harre (1990:45) note, “to know anything is to know in terms of one or more discourses”.

Concurrent with this poststructuralist emphasis upon the ‘untangling’ or loosening of statements and texts constituting discourse/s (Foucault 1972), is a theoretical and analytical focus upon the contextual and institutional conditions, practices and relations that permit such discourses to be constructed and used/exchanged with authority within a context (Mills 2003; Said 1978). The ‘embeddedness’ of discourse is therefore critical to the poststructural construction of the concept, enabling a reflexive questioning of the contextual ‘rules’ that have en-abled – and continue to en-able – a particular statement or set of statements to be produced and uttered as truth by ‘authorised’ and legitimised (power-full) speakers, as distinct from those denied the right to “proffer such a discourse” (Foucault 1972:54; Mills 2003). In ‘proffering’ discourse and engaging in discursive practice, the discourse user produces “social and psychological realit(y)” (Davies & Harre 1990:45) through a “delimitation of a field of objects, the definition of a legitimate perspective for the agent of knowledge and the fixing of norms for the elaboration of concepts and theories” (Foucault 1977 quoted in Mills 2003:57). Such delineation further serves to categorise the ‘world’, constructing dualisms and “binary oppositions” that simultaneously include and exclude, define and construct (Davies 1993; Sarup 1988:40). Thus, as Billig (1997:48) states,

When individuals speak they do not create their own language, but use terms which are culturally, historically and ideologically available. Each act of utterance, although in itself novel, carries an ideological history.

As context-dependent language reliant upon the language-user for (re)production, discourse is therefore perpetually in-flux, shifting relevance according to context and potentially at variance with discursive alternatives (Davies 1992:11; St. Pierre 2000) – a conceptualisation distinct from the ‘fixedness’ of discursive meaning within de Saussure’s original construction (Weedon 1987).

Importantly for poststructuralist research, the question now becomes, how do the ‘disciplining’ effects of discourse and discursive practice, and the foundations of discourse in relations of power-knowledge construct the individual – both those authorised to ‘speak’ and those silenced by discourse? It is, Weedon (1987:34) states, through the “actions of the individual” as a bearer of language and a perpetrator of discursive practice that discourses have “social and political effectivity”. By ‘taking up’ and acting upon the ways of being, relations, meanings and values inherent to discourse during language use, individuals are positioned by discourses and as such ‘subjected’ to the conditions and regulations of the discourse/s in question (Davies 1989; Weedon 1987). In this way, discourses constitute individual ‘subjects’ who are “subjected to the regime of meaning of a particular discourse and enabled to act accordingly” (Weedon 1987:34). Thus, the ‘subject’ is both constituted by and constitutes discourse (Luke 2000; Mills 2003).

In ‘confronting’ discourse and those discursive conditions and practices that perpetuate discourses within a context, poststructural analysis does not however seek to “reveal the real”, an objective truth or essence, but rather “to deconstruct and open [discourse] to show the ways in which the real is constructed” (Davies 2004:5). Poststructural analysis thus embraces the ‘deconstruction’ of discourse to render visible the machinations and operations of language, and the material and structural effects of both language and language use within a context (St. Pierre 2000:481).

## POWER/KNOWLEDGE

Of further importance to the poststructuralist paradigm are the notions of power and knowledge – and the nexus between them. While power is embedded and everyday, operating within and performed through an interaction or relation that influences or acts upon the actions of an-Other (Foucault 1982; Mills 2003); knowledge is the juxtaposition between these interactions (relations of power) and “information seeking” (Mills 2003:69), subsequently constructed as “accepted truth” within a context of use (Foucault 1972:200). Bauman (1998:7) further clarifies the workings of knowledge via the concept of “self-evident truths”, describing such truths as assertions made by members of a society that “serve to explain the world while themselves needing no explanation”. It is the unquestioned nature of these claims for legitimacy and transparency that imbues ‘knowledge’ and the knowledge owner or acquirer with ‘power’ within social contexts and during interaction (Weedon 1987). From a poststructuralist perspective therefore, power and knowledge are conceptually connected, with the production of knowledge and ‘regulations’ for the future production of knowledge intimately related to the exercise of power (Mills 2003).

In developing the poststructuralist conceptualisation of ‘power’, Foucault distinguishes between ‘relations of power’ and the concept of ‘power’ itself (St. Pierre 2000:489-490). For Foucault (1997/1984 quoted in St. Pierre 2000:489-490), the term ‘power’ signifies an enduring “over-all effect”, while the concept of ‘relations of power’ signifies the existence of power at the foundation or basis of all relationships, power that is disproportionate, modifiable, transferable, and unpredictable with the inherent possibility of resistance. The multiplicity of potential ‘relationships’ within a setting further ensures that ‘relations of power’ are not purely top-down exertions of domination, rather relations of power emerge and (re)emerge at various points (Foucault 1997/1984 quoted in St. Pierre 2000:490; Sowell 2004). Thus, within the poststructuralist paradigm framing this research project, ‘relations of power’

are a productive and in-flux social force, producing reality and thus know-able via analysis. Such analysis requires an understanding of the “system of differentiation [permitting] one to act upon the action of others”; the purpose of the ‘relation of power’; the conditions for the establishment of the power relation; the “forms of institutionalisation” and the “degrees of rationalisation” (Foucault 1982:223).

In discussing the production of ‘Orientalist’ discourse, Said (1978:12) for example, describes the exercise of “power political”, “power intellectual”, “power cultural” and/or “power moral” and the “uneven exchange” of power relations with the production of discourse. It is this ‘uneven exchange’ – during interaction, between the institution and the nation-state and, in a globalised world, between the nation-state and the intergovernmental organisation – that Foucault (1980 cited in Mills 2003:69) notes, is responsible for the production of particular domains of knowledge as ‘accepted truths’, legitimating the knowledge/s of the power-full while marginalising the knowledge of the ‘Other’. It is the production of naturalised ‘truths’ by the power/knowledge nexus, and the knowledge/s that are excluded from or (re)presented as ‘truth’ within this production, that are problematised by the poststructuralist paradigm. Thus, the goal of poststructural analysis is,

... not a matter of emancipating truth from every system of power ... but of detaching the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social economic and cultural within which it operates at the present time (Foucault 1980 cited in Mills, 2003:75).

In questioning “whose knowledge is considered legitimate” (Carspecken & Apple 1992:509) and why, the poststructuralist paradigm further critiques those knowledges – produced and maintained by ‘relations of power’ – that circumscribe those practices and fields of inquiry acceptable within a context (Foucault 1972; Luke 1999; Popkewitz 1988; van Dijk 2003), in turn influencing social structures, such as policy, legislation (Ainsworth & Hardy 2004) and

education (Luke 1999). These ideas have profound implications for this research on Korean learners of English.

#### SUBJECTION, THE SUBJECT AND SUBJECTIVITY

In rejecting the possibility of an existence outside of discourse (Luke 1999:163), poststructuralist thought positions the concept of discourse as central to the construction of both reality and the individual. Within the poststructuralist paradigm therefore, the individual, as an ongoing 'user' of multiple discourses and discursive practices, is 'subjected' to the meanings, values, and regulations of the multiplicity of discourses engaged with during spoken and written interaction and the 'relations of power' inherent to this multitude. Such 'subjection' (re)casts the individual as 'subject', enabling a poststructuralist conception of "human reality as a construction, as a product of signifying activities which are both culturally specific and generally unconscious" (Davies 1989, 1993; Sarup 1988:2; Weedon 1987) with manifold implications for the construction of 'Self'.

With the individual subject engaged with and by multiple discourses, the poststructuralist paradigm holds that each discourse of this multiplicity offers inherent subject positions or "possible selves" (Davies 1989:229) to the discourse user, positions that locate the subject both within the discourse and in relation to other discourses (Davies & Harre 1990). Said (1978:7), for example, speaks of the "positional superiority" of the Westerner in relation to the 'Oriental' within Orientalist discourse, with the position of 'Oriental' constructed within such discourse as subordinate, characterised by "gullib(ility)", "want of accuracy", and a lack of "energy and initiative" (Cromer 1907 quoted in Said 1978:38-39). It is from the juncture of multiple and fluid positionings that individual 'subjects' assume, negotiate and construct a 'Self in progress' (Davies 1993). This construction however, popularly referred to as 'identity' is "under erasure" within poststructuralism, with the term 'subjectivity' used to acknowledge

the discursively-contingent and thus potentially contradictory nature of the poststructuralist ‘Self’ (Davies 1993:8; Weedon 1987).

The theoretical ‘embrace’ of the term ‘subjectivity’ within the poststructuralist paradigm and the “decentring of the subject” implied by the use of the concept (Weedon 1987:33), demarcates the paradigm from humanist thought, positioning the poststructuralist ‘Self’ in opposition to the humanist ‘Self’. In positing that the poststructuralist ‘Self’ is experienced in terms of subjectivity, the paradigm – as used in this research project – deploys the concept to capture the ‘selves’ that emerge from the use of discourses, and the positionings of the discursive ‘subject’ within these discourses, during spoken and/or written interaction (Davies 2000). The shifting nature of discourse and the multiplicity of discourses with which the individual is engaged result in a ‘Self’ experienced in terms of multiple subjectivities, subjectivities that are “necessarily contradictory” (Davies 2000:57; Weedon 1987), experienced as “ambivalent understandings and emotions” (Davies 2004:7), adaptable and fluid (McKay & Wong, 1996). Thus, as Weedon (1987:33) notes, “forms of subjectivity are produced historically and change with shifts in the wide range of discursive fields which constitute them”. The poststructuralist ‘Self’ is therefore un-fixed, multifaceted, fractured and in-process/progress – written and (re)written – by ongoing and everyday discursive practice (Davies 1993; Hall 1996a). The fluidity and discursively-contingent nature of subjectivity is captured by Davies (2000:85), who notes,

Who we are, our subjectivity, is spoken into existence in every utterance, not just in the sense that others speak us into existence and impose unwanted structures on us, ... but in each moment of speaking and being we each reinvent ourselves ... socially, psychically, and physically.

By contrast, the concept of identity within humanist discourse implies both fixedness and coherency, an essential ‘essence’ that is immutable despite shifts in space and time (Gee 2000-2001; Grossberg 1994). The ‘Self’ emerging from humanist discourse is therefore stable

and rational, in control and controlling of context and self, conscious, knowing and unified (St. Pierre 2000:500).

With a firm positioning within the poststructuralist paradigm, the Korean learner of English spoken of within this current study, unlike the more humanist (re)presentations of the second-language learner within previous research, will therefore be framed in poststructuralist terms – as a subject in-process, “becoming rather than being” (Hall 1996a:4), constructed by and constructing multiple subjectivities during interactions both national and trans-national in nature. In exploring how such learners speak of this “fragmented and fractured” ‘Self’ (Hall 1996a:4) during interaction, and the narratives constructed within the discursive positionings available to such learners, the poststructuralist concept of storylines, as proposed by Davies and Harre (1990) will additionally be used.

#### STORYLINES

The concept of storylines refers to collective, culturally relevant “set(s) of sequences of action and positions” located within discourses and discursive practices (Brandth & Haugen 2005; Søndergaard 2002:191). A storyline is therefore a “condensed narrative” (Søndergaard 2002:191) embedded with “well known images or patterns within a culture” (Davies 1993:5), providing an “explanatory framework” for the ‘Self’ and an-Other. Søndergaard (2002:192), for example, describes the power-full storyline emerging with many discursive variations, of the poverty-stricken youth who, with hard work and perseverance, achieves unprecedented success and wealth. Primarily evident within the neo-liberal discourse, this rags-to-riches storyline constructs the subject position of ‘poverty-stricken youth’ while ‘storying’ the economic journey considered culturally acceptable and value-able for those positioned in this way. For the positioned ‘subject’, the rags-to-riches storyline provides a know-able and familiar framing for the (re)presentation and story of the ‘Self’ during interaction. Ongoing

participation in discursive practices and engagement with varying storylines located within specific and broader discourses thus allows individuals to constitute and reconstitute multiple and hybrid subjectivities as part of “the cumulative fragments of a lived autobiography” (Davies & Harre 1990:48; Luke 1995).

In utilising the concept of storyline, in addition to those of the ‘subject’ and ‘subjectivity’, this research project explores the ways Korean learners of English construct ‘Self’ through the discursive practices of both first and acquired language/s, through engagement with the global/national discourses that speak of an existence that “stretch(es) along the hierarchy of the global and the local” (Bauman 1998:121) and through the storylines that delineate the culturally, socially, economically and politically value-able ‘journey’ for the subject position of ‘Korean learner of English’. While this research project is positioned primarily within the poststructuralist paradigm, the insights of post-colonial theory, a paradigm that unites poststructuralism with conceptual tools developed to critically (re)present the “relation of the non-West to the West” (Mehta & Ninnes 2003; Pennycook 1999; Wehrs 2003:762) are also pertinent.

## THE POST-COLONIAL POSITION

The concept of the ‘post-colonial’ and the chronological and epistemological ‘boundaries’ of the concept are highly contested, both within the broad tradition of work considered post-colonial and that ‘outside’ of this work (Hall 1996b:253). In its chronological ‘turn’, the term ‘post-colonial’ has been used to denote a specific moment in history (Gikandi 2006), the temporal ‘space’ after colonialism<sup>38</sup> (Hall 1996b), the “historical period after variegated encounters” (Korang 2004:38), and a “long historical span (including the present)” (Shohat

---

38 The demarcation between colonial and post-colonial is however problematised within Hall’s (1996b) work.

1992:101). This chronological focus has however been problematised, with several authors questioning the assumptions underpinning such temporal demarcations (Hall 1996b; London 2003; Sökefeld 2005). Epistemologically, the 'post-colonial' also signifies a body of work embodying a diversity of positionalities, foci and practices (Bhatnagar 1986:3-4; Shohat 1992) broadly engaged in an ongoing project of,

... social criticism that bears witness to those unequal and uneven processes of representation by which the historical experience of the once-colonised Third World comes to be framed in the West (Bhabha 1990 quoted in Mongia 1996a:1).

Despite this chronological and epistemological 'contestation' the 'post-colonial', as a position, is united in its "theoretical resistance to the mystifying amnesia of the colonial aftermath" (Gandhi 1998:4), and its appropriation of poststructural themes and techniques. This section will therefore further develop an understanding of the positioning of the 'post-colonial' through a discussion of the conceptualisation of time/space and culture<sup>39</sup> within the post-colonial paradigm

## POST-COLONIAL TIME AND SPACE

In developing an understanding of "when was the post-colonial" and "what should be included and excluded from its frame" (Hall 1996b:242), much post-colonial research is cognisant of the inherent dangers of boundary-construction, particularly the precise demarcation of the 'post-colonial' from the 'colonial' (Bhabha 1994; Hall 1996b; Korang 2004; Said 1978; Sökefeld 2005). As Said (1994:35) notes, "the difficulty with ... barriers and sides, is that they give rise to polarisations that absolve and forgive ignorance and demagoguery more than they enable knowledge". Rather, the conceptualisation of the temporal and spatial dimensions of the 'post-colonial' has been developed through an understanding of transition

---

<sup>39</sup> The concept of 'the post-colonial subject' is also of critical importance to post-colonial theory. This will be discussed in the following section.

– of becoming, rather than being – of the varied disengagements of the nation-state and national from the colonial, and “displacement from the coloniser/colonised axis” (Hall 1996b:247-248).

In the temporal sense therefore, the term ‘post-colonial’, rather than speaking of a global ‘moment’, (re)presents the process of transition from an ‘encounter’ with the colonial during colonisation (Mani & Frankenberg 1993 cited in Hall 1996b:247), to political ‘independence’, and a negotiation of the economic, cultural, social and political trajectory of the nation within those structures and material effects (after-effects) of colonial hegemony. Importantly, as Hall (1996b:245) states, not all nation-states “are post-colonial *in the same way* (original emphasis)”. Spatially, the ‘post-colonial’ refers to a space of “contestation ... trans-culturation” (Manathunga 2007:26), of “cultural translation” and “lateral and transverse cross-relations” (Hall 1996b:247) with both global<sup>40</sup> and national dimensions. Globally therefore, the modern world space, as a space historically and inexorably altered by colonialism, is currently characterised by the,

... spatial relationship between superordinate Western (imperial) centres and [their] subordinate (colonial and/or neo-colonial) peripheries; between dominating (First World) metropolises and dominated (Third World) margins (Korang 2004:39).

This hierarchy of ‘spatial’ relations is further echoed within the national post-colonial ‘space’. In an exploration of the formation of the ‘centre’ and the ‘periphery’ within post-colonial Sri Lanka, Canagarajah (2000:126-127) for example, describes the appropriation of the English language as a ‘tool’ of anti-colonialism by the periphery during colonisation, and the (re)negotiation of the language in post-colonial times to consolidate the ‘power’ of this ‘periphery’ as the “new elite”. While colonialism is deeply inscribed within the ‘space’ of the

---

40 In using the term ‘global’ as a descriptor, the aim is not to denote universality or homogeneity of space. Rather, ‘global’ in this sense, is to denote ‘of the world’ or ‘throughout the world’, a space of permeable borders (Hall 1996b).

‘colonised’, the colonial experience also indelibly shapes the imperial ‘centre’, or the ‘coloniser’, albeit in a profoundly different manner (Hall 1996b:246). Post-colonial critics caution against the indiscriminate deployment of the term ‘post-colonial’, as a broad descriptor of all ‘space’ emerging from the colonial ‘encounter’ however, due to the potential conflation of the white settler colony with the “non-western colonised society” (Hall1996b:246), and the presumption of homogeneity (Slemon 1996:81). The task for post-colonialism therefore, as Torres (1998:428) notes, is an analysis of “trans-national-isation”, the constitution of the nation, and the role of “territorial space ... in the articulation of ... national sovereignty”.

The transitional and in-process nature of ‘post-colonial’ time/s and space/s are captured by the post-colonial concept of the ‘Third Space’ – an “in-between space” – shaped by the “inscription and articulation of culture’s hybridity” (Bhabha 1994:56). This hybridity, in conjunction with “questions of ... syncretism [and] cultural undecidability” (Hall 1996b:250) shapes the conceptualisation of post-colonial culture within the paradigm.

#### POST-COLONIAL CULTURE/S

In conceptualising culture, post-colonial theory rejects the possibility of an “inherent originality or purity” (Bhabha 1994:55), instead foregrounding the concepts of ‘hybridity’ and ‘syncretism’ – concepts that capture the (re)negotiation and imbrication of cultures during and after colonial/post-colonial encounters with an-Other (Shohat 1992:109). Such “borderline engagements”, as Bhabha (1994:3) notes, may

... as often be consensual as conflictual; they may confound our definitions of tradition and modernity; align the customary boundaries between the private and the public, high and low; and challenge normative expectations of development and progress.

The result, a multiplicity of in-flux post-colonial cultural assertions or juxtapositions of the colonial, the borrowed, and the indigenous (Loomba 1998) associated with and belonging to the nation-state, while enabling an understanding of the national 'Self', as distinct from 'Other' (Said 1994:xiii-xiv). Within the Korean nation-state, a post-colonial context with a history of 'encounters' with both Western and non-Western 'Others', that which is considered 'uniquely' Korean (re)presents an inherent belief in a "shared bloodline and common ancestry" (Shin 2003:6); a pre-modern history "heavily influenced by elements of culture borrowed from China" (Palais 1995:411-414); the influences of Japanese colonialism (Yim 2002:41-42); Confucianism and neo-Confucianism (Kim, K-J. 2006); and modern 'encounters' with Western culture, through both the American 'occupation' and globalised flows of information. The continued emphasis upon national 'homogeneity' within Korea, despite such historical 'encounters' and hybridity, illustrates Bhabha's (1994:55) assertion that, "the meanings and symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity; ... even the same signs can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricised and read anew".

This section has, therefore, explored the concepts of post-colonial time/s, space/s and culture/s with the aim of elucidating the broad premises of the post-colonial paradigm. With a foundation in poststructural theory and a theoretical focus on the implications and reverberations of the cross-cultural/colonial encounter for both nation-state and national, the premises of the post-colonial paradigm provide an alternate 'reading' of the storylines of Korean learners of English within this research project – a 'reading' that acknowledges the space 'in-between' "the world and the home" (Bhabha 1992:141) and the "re-creation of the self in the world of travel" (Bhabha 1994:12) in global/post-colonial times.

## THE NATURE OF SUBJECTIVITY IN GLOBAL TIMES

Emerging from this broad conceptual and theoretical outline, therefore, is a global context in-flux; shaped by juxtapositions between those forces and flows emanating from the local, the national, and the global, and the machinations of power and power-full knowledge/s inherent to such forces and flows. Intersecting this global 'space' is the national – the post-colonial nation-state – a context inexorably shaped by junctures between the global and the local, the traditional and the modern, the colonial and the indigenous. For the individual 'subject' spoken of and for by the global, national, local discourses inherent to such forces and flows, the construction of 'Self' is no longer "tightly territorialised [and] spatially bounded" (Appadurai 1991:191). Thus this section will examine the potentialities/possibilities/realities for the Korean learner of English's construction of 'Self' – or subjectivity/ies – in global times, in light of the theoretical and conceptual 'framing' of the research project discussed earlier.

### THE POST-COLONIAL SUBJECT AND SUBJECTIVITY

As noted, the 'subject' within humanist discourse is both rational and unified, a 'Self' with a coherent and continuous identity inculcated from birth through socialisation and internalisation of collective values and meanings (Davies 2000:57). By contrast, the poststructuralist subject is in-flux and in-process, fragmented and contradictory, constructed by multiple positionings within multiple discourses and the interplay between such 'multiplicities'. Similarly, the 'subject' emerging from the 'post-colonial' paradigm "represents a hybridity" (Bhabha 1992:148; Pennycook 2000b), a multiplicity of subjectivities and positionings arising from "displacements, immigrations and exiles" (Shohat 1992:109) and the 'in-between' temporality and spatiality of a post-colonial existence. Fanon (1968:229) for

example, captures this hybridity in his assertion that “in the world in which I travel, I am endlessly creating myself”.

For the post-colonial subject, such ‘travels’ include both lived and imaginary elements, comprising routine (re)imaginings of alter-native and possible lives (Appadurai 1996), “forced exile(s) and ‘voluntary’ immigration(s)” (Shohat 1992:102), and trans-national movement. Thus, while the poststructural subject is located by and within a multiplicity of discourses, the conceptualisation of the post-colonial subject imbricates this discursive construction with an awareness of the shaping influence of locality and spatiality – or “unhomeliness”<sup>41</sup> (Bhabha 1994:13) – upon being and belonging. It is from within this ‘unhomely’ in-between, therefore, a space with both discursive and physical elements, that post-colonial and hybrid subjectivities are constructed and enacted.

While the post-colonial conceptualisation of the power/knowledge nexus and the production of discourse strongly resonate with that of poststructuralism, the asymmetry between the West and the non-West provides the ‘context’ for this conceptualisation within the post-colonial paradigm. The discourses emerging from the interplay between the West and the non-West speak of and for the post-colonial ‘subject’ in banal terms, positioning the individual in the metro-urban/global/power-full/Western ‘centre’ or the rural/local/disempowered/non-Western periphery<sup>42</sup>, fixedly locating the subject as ‘we’ or ‘Other’, and establishing the relations of power between the two ‘locations’ (Bhabha 1994; Korang 2004). When positioned as a post-colonial ‘Other’ however, the subject (and nation-state) potentially

---

41 As Bhabha (1994:13) notes, to be “unhomed is not to be homeless”, rather unhomeliness is “the condition of extra-territorial and cross-cultural initiations”.

42 McCarthy et al. (2003:456) note however, that while such relations are properly understood as “centre-periphery relations”, such relations are not exhaustively so and “continue to be asymmetrical in their organisation and character”.

“loses its power to signify, to negate, to initiate its historic desire, [and] to establish its own institutional and oppositional discourse” (Bhabha 1994:46).

#### THE AGENTIC SUBJECT?

The concept of ‘agency’ in its humanist ‘turn’ is synonymous with notions of “freedom, autonomy, rationality, and moral authority” – an instinctive product of adult-hood, able to be exercised rationally and individually in response to external and/or social forces (Davies 2000:55-56). From a poststructuralist perspective however, agency and agentic behaviour are “fundamentally illusory”, with individual ‘choice’ and action the result of discursive positioning, rather than the exercise of ‘free will’<sup>43</sup> (Davies 2000:60; O’Donnell 2003). Feminist poststructuralist theory has however (re)framed this construction of agency, to include a potential or possibility for ‘movement’ within discursive boundaries and between discourses, enabling a re-interpretation and inversion, and facilitating new modes of being, counter-acting and being heard as a discursive subject (Davies 2000:66).

The potential for agency ascribed to the subject within this poststructuralist (re)framing is further evident within the post-colonial paradigm. It is, Kapoor (2002) notes, the ambivalence inherent to colonial discourse that enables agency, transforming “conditions of impossibility into possibility” (Spivak 1988 quoted in Kapoor 2002:651) and facilitating “deliberate, individuated action” (Bhabha 1994:265). Using the ‘tools’ of the ‘Master’ through a “process of reinscription and negotiation”, the colonised establishes his/her own authority from ‘within’ (Bhabha 1994:276), exercising agency and thus disrupting the authority of the

---

43 The ‘dehumanisation’ of the subject within poststructuralist theory was primarily in response to the early conceptualisation of the subject and agency by Foucault. In later work, Foucault has however re-enabled the subject, exploring the ways in which the individual constitutes and recognises the self as subject (O’Donnell2003:757).

coloniser (Bhabha 1984)<sup>44</sup>. Poststructuralist theory, while acknowledging, like post-colonialism, the inherent contradictions of ideology inscribed within discourse (Codd 1988), presumes that agency is dependent upon *knowledge* of those discourses that subjectify, rather than ‘slippages’ within the discourses themselves (Kapoor 2002). Moore-Gilbert (1997 cited in Kapoor 2002:658) however problematises the post-colonial conceptualisation of agency, maintaining that economic hierarchies within the broad category of ‘colonised’ impinge upon the exercise of agency. As Kapoor (2002:658) questions,

Does the colonised subject’s status in the capitalist economy not impinge on her/his ability to represent or negotiate, or on how forcefully s/he can represent or negotiate in relation to another subject?

Thus, agency is variably constructed as inherent, as knowledge-dependent, and as discursively-dependent within the three broad paradigms discussed. Of interest to this research project however is the construction of the ‘Self’ as an agentic ‘subject’ by Korean students located nationally or trans-nationally. Do participants ascribe ‘agency’ to inherent factors, perceive agency as the result of acquisition of the English language or, alternatively, exercise agency in response to possibilities/slippages within those discourses of the ‘West’ speaking of and for the Korean learner?

## THE SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNER IN GLOBAL TIMES

Traditionally, research in the field of second language education has presented learners as acquirers of both grammar and lexicon, focusing upon individual and group differences in skill acquisition as compared to the target skills of ‘native’ English speakers (McKay & Wong 1996). With the growing recognition that competency in function and content are not sufficient preconditions for interactional proficiency (Peterson & Coltrane 2003), and an

---

<sup>44</sup> Pennycook (2000b:117-118) for example, speaks of the agentic use of both indigenous and colonial languages such as English by colonial ‘subjects’ to resist, to establish new possibility, and to re-shape the present.

understanding that such proficiency requires socialisation into the beliefs, thoughts, and verbal patterns of the target language's culture (Kramsch 1987, 1997), the global movement of individuals seeking English education through cultural immersion and international language courses has escalated. In attempting to (re)present the lived experiences of this shifting, heterogeneous group of English learners negotiating identity within a 'third culture' (Kramsch 1993) or space, research has digressed from the historically static view of the learner as a motivated or unmotivated 'receptacle', to a belief that language acquisition is influenced by 'belonging' to meta-categories such as gender, ethnicity or age (Armitage 1999; Choi 1997; Yihong et al. 2005). A growing body of research has however diverged from the belief that "people's use of linguistic variables can be correlated [only] with their demographic characteristics" (Cameron 1995 quoted in Pennycook 2001:53). This body of poststructuralist and post-colonial research conceptualises those learning English as complex social beings located within and by the "social context of language learning" (McKay & Wong 1996:578), experiencing a multiplicity of subjectivities arising from the multiple positions of the various discourses such learners are engaged with and by. This section will broadly explore this (re)construction of learners of English through the 'lens' of previous research, in particular the poststructural/post-colonial (re)framing of such learners as impinged upon by and impinging upon their spatial/ educational/social location.

Norton Peirce (1995a:10), in a seminal study of the narratives of immigrant learners of English in Canada, rejects the "artificial distinctions between individual and context" that characterised prior ESL research. Norton Peirce (1995a) alternatively utilises the concept of subjectivity, as espoused by Weedon (1987), in order to conceptualise second-language learners of English as dynamic, changing and contradictory beings, whose participation in power-full discourses positions them as a 'subject', shapes individual sense of self, and creates possibilities for human agency. Challenging the belief that lack of motivation is the primary

factor for difficulties acquiring the ‘target language’, Norton Peirce (1995a) suggests broad relations of power position individual learners in ways that constrain their opportunities to speak, while subjectivities determine the educational ‘investment’ of the individual learner, and willingness to resist or redefine this ‘position’. Underpinning Norton Peirce’s (1995a:16) analysis however is an assumption that, by highlighting or naming the multiple and changing ‘positions’ and/or discourses – for example, primary caregiver, immigrant – that locate second language learners, the possibility for pedagogical and curricular intervention exists. However, by failing to critically examine the broader power relations and structures of inequality that produce such positions and discourses within the context in question, Norton Peirce falls short of exposing the social actors involved in the discursive construction of immigrant identities, and the basis of this involvement. The relations of power and “common-sense assumptions” (Fairclough 2001:2) that shape the subjectivities of English language learners within this context therefore, remain obscured, diminishing the emancipatory and/or empowering ‘returns’ of educational intervention.

By contrast McKay and Wong (1996) employed a contextualist perspective to highlight the interplay of multiple discourses and power relations shaping the multiple identities of Chinese immigrant students in an American high school. Combining both informal interviews with classroom observations and formal questionnaires, McKay and Wong (1996) developed a rich description of contextual factors, highlighting and problematising the multiple discourses and social actors that serve to position English language students and shape identities. Importantly, McKay and Wong (1996:603) contend that the concept of ‘investment’ advanced by Norton Peirce (1995a) had limited applicability within their context, with student participants focusing upon both “agency and identity enhancement” instead. Further, McKay and Wong (1996:603) refute the assumption that subjectivity is contingent on English language proficiency for second-language immigrant students, indicating that the

multiplicity of subjectivities shaped by discourses outside of the language classroom, provided students with adequate identifications and representations, such that desire to improve English language skills often waned.

Kanno (2003), however, makes an important distinction between sojourning students – or those residing overseas temporarily – and immigrant students, in a longitudinal study of the trans-national narratives of four teenage Japanese English learners. Within this study, Kanno (2003:132) merges both the poststructuralist view of subjectivity as fragmented and often contradictory, with a narrative approach that examines the “narrative links [that individuals] ... make between multiple identities ... to seek [a] position between two languages and cultures”. Of interest to this research project however, is a question of whether the transitory nature of this time across the trans-national divide increased student ‘willingness’ to embrace the English language, and its associated discourses and subjectivities. Alternatively, as per the immigrant student group identified in McKay and Wong’s (1996) research, were students sufficiently grounded in previous subjectivities that a desire to learn English and embrace more ‘Western’ subjectivities became redundant. Kanno’s (2003) findings indicate that, while residing in Canada, participants tended to gravitate toward one language and one culture, negotiating their own narrative within a trans-national context laden with ideological and power-full constraints upon subjectivity. However upon returning to Japan, students gradually fulfilled their role as a member of Japanese society and, over time, negotiated an awareness of ‘Self’ as a bicultural and bilingual being, a negotiation that was facilitated by a privileging of the English language within Japanese discourse (Kanno 2003). Thus, “once they grew competent in Japanese social interaction, whatever else they had was a bonus” that “carried a significant weight in Japan” (Kanno 2003:125). In this way, Kanno’s (2003) research supports the view that second-language learners develop multiple and often contradictory subjectivities, however Kanno (2003:131) combines this finding with a

narrative perspective when adding that individuals attempt to, with differing levels of success, unite these varying ‘fragments’ and subjectivities into a coherent and cohesive narration of ‘Self’.

Alternatively, in a study of the ‘multiple voices, multiple realities’ of teenage Hispanic learners of English, Ajayi (2006) indicated that these students, in contrast to Kanno’s (2003) findings within the Japanese context, were aiming to achieve a linguistic and cultural ‘separation’ or ‘harmonious co-existence’ between heritage and ‘new’, or the self ‘at home’ and the self ‘at school’. In aiming to achieve interactional competence in the target language, the sampled students were motivated and willing, constructing highly positive views of themselves as both learner and speaker of English. Interestingly however, while these students positioned themselves as ‘competent’ and agentic, they were positioned by educational discourse and school structures as ‘un-able’ or lacking, due to their bilingual status. This contradiction resulted in both resistance and ambivalence, with learners questioning the timetabled segregation between the ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ speakers, while ‘forced’ to participate within such structures in order to “learn English and new cultures” (Ajayi 2006:476).

Utilising a sample reflecting the trans-national pursuit of education and combining poststructuralist techniques with the concept of storylines, Koehne (2005, 2006) examined how international students attending university in Australia construct ‘Self’. Koehne (2005) aimed to render visible the subject positions that ‘construct’ and ‘speak’ the category of international student, while simultaneously questioning how individuals use agency in locating themselves within available positions. Participants in Koehne’s study shared an instrumentalist notion of international education as a vehicle bringing expertise and knowledge, competence, mobility and power (2006:244). As Koehne (2006:248) states,

[The] desire to become an international student is enabled through the marketing of international education and the possibilities that exist through globalisation and is constructed by the students through a storyline of strength and agency.

Although little coherence existed in participant's accounts of the category of 'international student', each experienced tension between international education as imagined, and international education as a reality (Koehne 2006). In revisiting or constructing subjectivities within this 'rupture' to reflect their altered discursive and physical 'location', many students spoke of themselves as persons with agency (Koehne 2006). Interestingly, students spoke of agency and resistance, while also acknowledging the limiting nature of dominant discourses and practices that construct 'international students' and sameness/difference within universities. In discussing the varied positionings and storylines of this group of international students, Koehne (2005, 2006) thus exposes how dominant discourses and discursive practices co-exist with agency to mutually shape individual subjectivities. Koehne (2005) also advocates educational intervention to ensure pedagogical practices and broader discourses reflect a 'hybrid' rather than 'binary' construction of the international student. However, by failing to examine the contextual factors at a local, national and global level that 'author' subjectivities of learners (Ainsworth & Hardy 2004), Koehne (2005) conceals the "historicity and the contingency of ... truths" about international students (Rose 1999:276-77). Broader analysis of contextual factors, as Stromquist (2002) maintains, is a precursor for effective interventions at any level.

The learner of English as a poststructural/post-colonial 'subject' constructed within this body of reviewed research is, unlike traditional research, a dynamic, changing and contradictory being, positioned by and striving to position the 'Self' within the multiple and power-full discourses of the national or trans-national context. While Norton Peirce (1995a) speaks of educational 'investment' rather than motivation in her work with second-language learners, McKay and Wong (1996) refer instead to 'agency' and 'identity enhancement' as concepts

shaping the complex relationship between language learners and the target language. In conceptualising the multiple subjectivities of learners of English, previous research has found evidence of integration, contradiction and fragmentation within immigrant, second-language learner and trans-national student populations. Of interest to this research project, in light of the broad findings of previous research within the poststructuralist tradition, are the ways in which the Korean learner of English, a non-Western 'national' acquiring a colonial language, constructs 'Self' within the contradictions of this spatial/educational/social/discursive location. The following section provides a broad overview of previous research exploring this potential contradiction with Korean learners of English.

#### THE KOREAN LEARNER OF ENGLISH IN GLOBAL TIMES

Within a poststructuralist framing, the appropriation, adaptation or resistance of/to the 'conditions of possibility' embedded within English, positions learners of English variably. For students pursuing English education in trans-national and/or non-Western locations, this appropriation, adaptation or resistance is further problematised by the interaction, and potential disparity both within, and between, the discursive practices and positionings made available in their second language, and those of their first language and national homeland. It is from the viewpoint and location of these multiple positions/ings within potentially 'duelling' discourses that the Korean learner of English constructs and negotiates a multiplicity of fluctuating and conflicting subjectivities (Ainsworth 2001; Ajayi 2006; McCarthy et al. 2003; Somers 1994). This section will therefore examine the ways in which the 'Korean learner of English', speaks of 'Self' and is spoken of and for in previous research.

Armitage (1999), in a study of Korean learners attending English education classes in Australia, explored the factors influencing student 'adjustment' to the trans-national location, and the motivation for 'border-crossing'. Supporting the extrinsic motivation of students in

the Korean based sample in T-Y. Kim's (2006) research discussed below, over half of the students surveyed cited improvement in job opportunities in Korea as the primary reason for the acquisition of English competencies. While Armitage's (1999) research did not explore the subjectivity negotiations of such students, the findings of the questionnaire indicated contestation and opposition between the structures of Korean society, the expectations of Australian academe, and lived experiences as an international student in Australia. These findings are analysed within the context of the study in terms of 'inadequate' preparation prior to traversing the Western/non-Western divide, despite over 80 per cent of students indicating the use of books, magazines or articles prior to arrival. In de-constructing and re-constructing these findings utilising Appadurai's (1996:31) conception of the imagination as "social practice", international students have, by accessing books, magazines and articles or media, utilised the globalised world's "new resources ... for the construction of ... imagined selves and imagined worlds" (1996:3), thus rendering the unfamiliar known via the imagination. This is further supported by the education consultants interviewed within the study who stated that "many Koreans believe that Australian and American cultures are the same and ... there is no need to learn about Australia" (Armitage 1999:68), indicating that the American culture is considered familiar or known within this non-Western nation, existing as the archetype for the broader category of Western, in the imaginary of the Korean student.

J. Kim (2002) broadly explored the themes underlying the relationship between learning English and the subjectivity and socialisation of Korean undergraduate students within the Korean context. Importantly, in developing her analysis, Kim (2002) 'located' learners, and indeed the classroom itself, within both the broader Korean and global contexts. Interestingly, Kim (2002) found that, despite being enrolled as English students, participants perceived learning English and moves to locate English as an official language of Korea as a threat to

national identity and indigenous Korean language, indicating a heightened nationalism of students within the Korean context and a seeming appropriation of the discourse of externalisation outlined in Chapter Two. Students also indicated concerns that the linking of English proficiency with social and economic success had become a divisive element within Korean society, while consistent exposure to Western mass media had created a tendency in Korean youth to “admire or even worship American culture to a great degree” (Kim, J. 2002:159). Thus, although students acknowledged and were critically aware of the ramifications of Western cultural products and learning English for social, cultural and national subjectivities, the ‘dominance’ of international and national discourses privileging speakers of English and holders of ‘Westernised’ subjectivities was such that students continued to pursue English proficiency and negotiate new subjectivities around such proficiency regardless. Critical however, is the question of how Kim’s ‘position’ as a Korean citizen and postgraduate student living in America who has “[gone] through Americanisation” (Kim, J. 2002:55), influenced student responses. In facilitating group discussion within the tri-weekly study group (Kim, J. 2007, pers. comm., 7th February), Kim’s American-informed subjectivities may have shaped the student discourse used as ‘findings’ within the study, leading to concerns about the validity of responses.

Additionally, T-Y. Kim (2006) developed a motivational and attitudinal profile of the Korean learner of English. While the study relied upon a relatively homogenous sample of high school students – acknowledged by Kim as a key limitation of the research – the findings, particularly those indicating the presence of anti-American sentiment and negative attitudes towards English learning despite compulsory English language lessons throughout schooling, are supported by J. Kim’s (2002) research with a university student sample. Thus, although students indicated a desire for English competency, with the most frequently cited motivations being “because I should survive in the future world” and “because English is a

world language” (Kim, T-Y. 2006:174), this competency appeared to engage many students in a contradictory relationship with the target language, involving a disjuncture between attitude or beliefs and educational action. This is supported by the significant number of responses citing external factors as motivational influences for pursuing English language acquisition. Such results appear to indicate the pervasiveness of necessitation discourses positioning English acquisition as central to survival, communication and individual success within this context. In addition, these results further substantiate Norton Peirce’s (1995a:17) contention that the term ‘investment’, in capturing the learner as engaged in a “socially and historically constructed relationship ... to the target language”, allows for a more situated analysis of the learner and language, as compared with the term ‘motivation’.

Traversing the ‘trans-national’ divide, J-e. Rhee (2006) further examined the situated subjectivities of two Korean women positioned as researcher or student within the American higher education system. Contrasting the ‘Self’ as located in Korea, with the trans-national ‘Self’ located in American academe, J-e. Rhee (2006:598) found evidence of engagement with “multiple, contradictory and shifting identities” within each narrative. As Koreans in “highly competitive, class-divided, patriarchal” (Rhee, J-e. 2006:599) Korea, each participant constructed subjectivities strongly centred on perceived academic and social competency. An American higher education, for each participant, was “imagined, desired and pursued” (Rhee, J-e. 2006:600) as a means of locating the ‘Self’ as “Master/Expert” within these social and local classifications, indicating the pervasiveness of global discourses equating ‘Western’ knowledge with power/wealth within the Korean context. Despite similarities in both the imagined and actual ‘journey’ of each participant, the construction of a trans-national ‘Self’ involved highly individualised responses, with one participant accepting the subordinate position constructed for her within the hierarchy of Western knowledge ‘ownership’, while resisting cultural and social positions as a member of the ‘West’. The alternative ‘Self’ of the

other participant indicated the broad appropriation of Western cultural, social and academic positionings as a form of resistance to her construction as ‘less-than’ within her ‘native’ Korea. The unique response of each participant to the conjunction of their Korean ‘Self’ and trans-national ‘Self’ provides further support to the modern (re)construction of the learner as individual, as belonging but not defined exclusively by ‘membership’. Although not specifically focused on the Korean student as a learner of English, J-e. Rhee’s (2006) work provides a valuable insight into the ways in which the ‘Korean national’ negotiates subjectivities while located trans-nationally.

Previous research has provided, in broad brushstrokes and in varying degrees, an outline of the Korean learner of English, their attitude toward the English language, their broad ‘investment’ in English education, their ability (in-ability?) as a ‘category’ to adapt or adjust to trans-national contexts. Emerging therefore is a Korean learner of English who, regardless of location, is broadly experiencing contestation and conflict between the subjectivities and nationalist sentiment of a Korean ‘Self’ constructed within externalisation/necessitation discourses, the global ‘Self’ and the discourses engaged with or engaging such learners during English education. Interestingly, providing impetus to the trans-national movement and educational pursuit of Korean learners within prior research was an ‘imagining’ or the work of the imagination which is an area of focus within this current research project.

Initially therefore, this chapter developed a broad overview of the complex and multi-dimensional forces and flows of globalisation, forces that irrevocably shape modern global and national contexts. While previous research has described such forces in terms of their irregular structural and material effects upon national/local contexts – that is, as a homogenising influence; as enabling of hybrid interpretations; or as facilitating a re-assertion of the local – this research, following Luke and Luke (2000:275), will utilise “situated, local and self-critical analyses” to render visible the “mutually constitutive” juxtapositions between

local/national/global “flows of knowledge, power and capital ... and of local histories that ... embed ‘the new’ in existing and generative material-economic and cultural conditions” within the non-Western context of Korea. This third ‘space’ of juncture and ambiguity thus forms the contextual and discursive ‘background’ for the imagining and pursuit of English competency, in national and trans-national locations, by Korean learners. In theoretically and empirically ‘locating’ such learners within this globalised third space – and the discourses speaking of and for learners within this space – this research diverges from previous research within the second-language education field, thus enabling an initial exploration of the implications of national/global positionings for the construction of ‘Self’ as a learner of English. The following chapter, Chapter Four, will outline the methodological approach of this research project.

## *Chapter Four*

### (RE)PRESENTING THE GLOBAL, THE NATIONAL AND INDIVIDUAL – RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In investigating how Korean learners of English (re)present an existence that “stretches along the hierarchy of the global and the local” (Bauman 1998:121), this study focuses upon three key analytical fields: the global and national discursive contexts for English learners and Korean learners in particular; and the narrated storylines of those positioned within the broad trans-national grouping of Korean learner of English. In un-covering those global/national discourses that speak of and for the second-language learner, this critical research focus further enables a reflexive ‘questioning’ of the possibility and potentiality inherent to, and the contestations/contradictions between and within such discourses. In this way, the notion of individual existential ‘freedom’ or agency and the assumption that English language competence is a necessary precursor to ‘choosing’ a global/local existence can be problematised. This chapter describes the methodological approach of this research project through an explication of the dual methods of data collection employed and the framework for data analysis. The chapter will conclude with a critical interrogation of the global/national/local positioning of the researcher and the constitutive force of this ‘location’ – in history, in society, in culture – upon this research, and its ‘imagined’ outcomes.

### QUESTIONING THE GLOBAL/NATIONAL/INDIVIDUAL: AIMS AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

With grounding in the critical approach, this study is based on four research aims:

- To examine how Korean learners of English engage with and use global and national discourses about English.

- To explore the global and national discourses speaking of and for the English language and the position of 'learner' and 'learner of English' within the non-Western nation of Korea.
- To compare the construction of Korean learners of English within global, national and local discourse with the lived subjectivities and storylines of such learners.
- To facilitate a critical awareness of the consequences of global and national discourses of English for non-Western students.

Fundamentally, this research project asks: How do Korean learners of English engage with global and national discourses of English in constructing the 'Self as a learner of a second-language?' Of further interest to this study are questions of:

- What are the implications of this 'engagement' for the post-colonial subjectivities of Korean learners and the second-language learner?
- What broader discourses bind with discourses of English in speaking of 'learners' and 'learning' and, in particular, Korean learners of English?
- What are the consequences of these findings for the theoretical framing of this research, non-Western learners of English as a second language and the global position of English?

## DISCOURSE AS A FOCUS OF ANALYSIS

As an entirety of textual statements – oral, written, symbolic and graphical – about a subject or field, a discourse is comprised by references that interplay or remain familiar intertextually and as such share “conditions of existence” (Foucault 1972:42; Nannes 2004, Luke 1999). As “socially and culturally produced patterns of language” (Francis 1999:383) dependent upon use and exchange by those spoken of and for (Luke 1995), discourses serve to modify social relations and institutions (Foucault 1972); construct what knowledge is valued while controlling access to such knowledge (Youngblood Jackson 2001; Luke 1999); alter power relations (Mehta and Nannes 2003); and position the individual as a ‘subject’ able to be and act in a prescribed manner (Weedon 1987). Thus discourses “create not only knowledge but also the very reality they appear to describe” (Said 1978:94). While Chapter Three provided a theoretical overview of ‘discourse’ and its associated concepts within the poststructuralist paradigm, this section will explore the various models of determining and analysing ‘discourse’ while briefly outlining the analytical approach favoured by this research.

While discourses construct and produce, discourses themselves are constituted through the nexus between power relations that influences or acts upon an-Other (Foucault 1982) and knowledge embedded within the field of discourse use and exchange (Luke 1999). As an ‘instrument’ of the interaction between power relations, discourse (re)presents the ideological assumptions and privileged ways of knowing of the ‘dominant’ (Bottomley 1992; Fairclough 2001; Foucault 1982), while producing and maintaining the power-full truths deemed valuable within a particular social, cultural and historical context (Simons 1995). These ‘truths’ and the power relations of the production of ‘truth’ in turn inform and are informed by fields of knowledge that “render the social world into a form that is knowable and governable” (Simons 1995:27) and “natural [and] obvious” (Weedon 1987:77). The triad of ‘influence’ constructed by the discourse, power relations and knowledge nexus has both “disciplinary”

and “disciplining” effects (Luke 1999:163) upon contexts, structures and ‘subjects’. In centralising the concept of discourse, this poststructuralist research project will therefore explore the ideological assumptions and power-full ‘truths’ underpinning the global and national discourses of and for the non-Western nation-state of Korea and the Korean learner, and the globalised contextual conditions producing and maintaining such discourses. In rendering the assumptions and ‘truths’ of global/national discourses visible and thus knowable, an “interpretive and reflective ... analysis” (Ainsworth & Hardy, 2004:237) of constituting ‘textual statements’ (discourses) and “discursive events” (Price 1999:583) is critical. The field of discourse analysis, a field encompassing a broad range of micro and/or macro approaches and methods,<sup>45</sup> thus broadly supports the research aims and poststructuralist framing of this research project.

Shaping the analysis of data within this current research project is critical discourse analysis (CDA), an analytic model within the discourse analysis methodological ‘umbrella’. Drawing its theoretical bases from the field of poststructuralism, the work of Bourdieu and “neo-Marxist cultural theory” (Luke 1999:167), CDA provides a theoretical and empirical ‘tool’ for developing an “account of intricate relationships between text, talk, social cognition, power, society and culture” (van Dijk 1993:253). While the approach is marked by divergent models and a range of analytical methods (Bloome & Talwalkar 1997; Fairclough & Wodak 1997; Luke 1999), the various techniques within the CDA ‘umbrella’ render visible broader social

---

<sup>45</sup> Focusing on individual language use, both naturally occurring and contrived (Gee, Micheals & O’Connor 1992; Potter, 1997), a micro discourse analysis examines discursive effects upon, and evident within text; uncovering this ‘structuring’ influence through such means as analysis of turn-taking (Kogan 1998); syntax and morphology (Fairclough 2001; Gee, Micheals & O’Connor 1992); or non-verbal contributions, pausing and tone (Davies & Harre 1990; Potter & Wetherell 1987). Bridging micro analysis with a consideration of macro influences, a situated or ‘triangulated’ approach to discourse analysis shifts from an explication of the “formal properties of text” (Fairclough, 2001:21) to an ‘awareness’ of a text as occurring within broader textual/interactional/institutional circumstances and contexts (Davies & Harre 1990; Fairclough 2001:21; Gee & Green 1998; Weiss & Wodak 2003a:22). Further, macro forms of discourse analysis examine the structure of text for thematic or topic cues (Paasche 2006; van Dijk 1995) to determine how meaning is made (Søndergaard 2005), utilising text as a “platform from which to conduct macro ideological analysis” (Bhabha 1994; Said 1978; Tamatea, Hardy & Ninnes 2008).

and ideological processes in their “deconstructive” turn (Fairclough 1995; Luke 1999:168; Mulderrig 2003), while, in the “constructive” moment enabling a redressing of inequitable power relations (Luke 1999:168; van Dijk 1993). The critical method of ‘doing’ discourse analysis therefore, in contrast to other models, requires an empirical ‘connection’ between the local text and the workings of power and ideology inherent to the broader social, historical, cultural and economic context in which the text, or its local site of appropriation and use, is located (Bloome & Talwalkar 1997; Luke 1999:167).

In light of the ‘text-within-context’ focus of the aims of this research project, the use of micro- and macro-level CDA methods within this study enabled an empirical ‘connection’ to be established between the three discursive domains under consideration, while uncovering the workings of power, knowledge and discourse within these fields. As Fairclough (1995:189) states, CDA “mediates the connection between language and social context, and facilitates more satisfactory bridging of the gap between texts and contexts”. In contrast to alternative approaches to discourse analysis, the two-fold deconstructive/constructive capabilities of CDA, resulting from its foundations in poststructuralist thought (Luke 1999) and ‘critical’ orientation, enable the empirical ‘pursuit’ of the various aims of this research project, as discussed earlier. The following section will outline in further detail the ways in which the CDA approach was used within the context of this, and previous, research.

## THE CRITICAL FRAMEWORK

A critical approach to social inquiry broadly “takes into account how our lives are mediated by systems of inequity” (Lather 1992:87) and as such focuses on individual experience as located within a broader historical and social context (Norton Peirce 1995b:571-572) – orienting itself towards “transformative goals” (Lather 1992; Pennycook 2001:161). By delving into and ‘behind’ language itself, by illuminating the silences, the whisperings, and the

threads that structure and inform the production of oral or written language, its use and dissemination, critical researchers question how discourse as language, and its use within global, national and local contexts, shape such contexts and the individual ‘actors’ within them. While the poststructuralist approach, as outlined in Chapter Three, encourages a research focus upon the “constitution of social practices ... cultural patterns ... and ... processes of subjectivation” (Søndergaard 2002:188), the use of poststructuralism with a ‘critical’ lens orients research towards transformation, or as Davies (2000:48) states “reinscri(ption) ... inver(sion) ... invent(ion)”, through critical awareness and knowledge of those discourses and structures that serve to limit and define. To this end, the use of critical discourse analytical techniques within this poststructuralist research project facilitates an explication of both macro contextual discourses and the micro responses of learners (Ninnes 2004:50), enabling a critical understanding of the social, structural and material constraints upon the Korean learner of English arising from discursive participation (Fairclough 2001; Price 1999; Tamatea 2008). The following section focuses upon the methodological ‘model’ of critical discourse analysis in further detail, explicating the various research techniques and critical concepts of the CDA framework.

## CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

The critical discourse analytical approach aims to “theoretically and empirically” connect analysis of discursive practices and language-in-use with a critical “understanding of power and ideology in broader social formations and configurations” (Bloome & Talwalkar 1997; Fairclough 1993; Luke 1999:167). Working from the assumption that disparities in individual access to social ‘capital’ such as knowledge and language are the result of imbalances of power and resources embedded within language-in-use, CDA addresses the hegemonic structures and processes, or the material effects of discourse (Ainsworth & Hardy 2004:244), that name, locate and depict individuals as unequal ‘subjects’ (Luke 1995). By problematising

the everyday workings of power through multi-level and systematic analysis and promoting the equitable allocation of linguistic and social resources, the critical discourse analytic research process also appropriates discourse as a device for individual agency and social change (Ainsworth & Hardy 2004; Fairclough & Wodak 1997; Luke 1999; Woodside-Jiron 2003).

#### MACRO- AND MICRO-LEVEL ANALYSIS

As a critical method of ‘doing’ discourse analysis, the field of CDA is seemingly fraught by the methodological ‘flexibility’ and diversity of approaches of the broader discourse analytical field (Fairclough & Wodak 1997; Luke 1995). Fairclough & Wodak (1997), for example, outline several approaches to CDA spanning a diversity of disciplinary and interdisciplinary research. In reviewing these diverse approaches, Pennycook (2001:81) argues that, despite disciplinary differences, each approach can be broadly grouped into one of two “domains” – the critical analysis of power and ideological (re)production, or the critical analysis of power within “linguistic interactions”. This methodological differentiation, alternatively referred to as “macro approaches to discourse [and] ... microanalytic text analyses” (Luke 1995:10) or the study of “processes at both the macro level and the micro level” (Ainsworth & Hardy 2004:241) provides a practical means for reviewing the broad field of critical discourse analysis techniques.

A macro-level approach to the critical analysis of discourse broadly critiques the institutional and contextual processes that construct and produce a body of textual statements (Luke 1995) or an “assembly of discourses” (Ainsworth & Hardy 2004:241) as naturalised (Fairclough 1995) and “self-evident” (Bauman 1998:7), resulting in material effects and social practices that are incontestable, uncontested, and therefore deemed common-sense. Tamatea, Hardy & Ninnes (2008), for example, utilised a macro-level analytical approach to uncover the

construction of the discursive category of ‘student’ – and its associated subjectivities – within the on-line discourse of international schools. By grouping such statements under the broad themes of student-as-individual, student-as-community member, and student-as-global citizen, the authors rendered visible the inherent contradictions of such (re)presentations within a globalised world space dominated by neo-liberal discourse. Common to macro-level discourse analysis, therefore, is an emphasis upon illuminating the broader processes of discourse construction and production, operationalised by an analysis of recurrent themes (Tamatea, Hardy & Ninnes 2008); an identification of structures within and between discourses, and the relations of power at a contextual, institutional and societal level shaping such discourse(s) (Fairclough 2001:135-138); or, tracing historical ‘narratives’ within a broad corpus of language-in-use (Luke 1997). As Foucault (1972:55) recommends, such research must “discover the law operating behind all these diverse statements and the place from which they come”.

In contrast, a critical micro-level analysis of discourse comments upon the interplay of power and discourse within micro instances of language-in-use, or to borrow Gee’s (1996) conceptualisation, small ‘d’ discourse. While this analysis is highly local and at times individual in nature, the critical and poststructuralist orientation of the method requires a ‘locating’ of such text within the specific context of its use. For example, Codd (1988:245), in a critical ‘deconstruction’ of an education policy document emerging from a national curriculum review in New Zealand, delved ‘behind’ or ‘within’ the text to illuminate the discursively-informed organisation and linguistic structure of the document, and the strategies by which the language-in-use (re)produced power-full discourses within the context of the text’s emergence. Codd (1988) further linked such analysis with a critique of the discursively-informed processes historically, socially and culturally enabled to produce such text. Such analysis requires attention to the linguistic features of the text itself, and the text-

in-use, through such methods as highlighting the use of specific words and their collocative environment (Mulderigg 2003); recurring language and “argumentation strategies” (Ainsworth 2001:40); the surface, meaning and local coherence of individual statements (Fairclough 2001:118); and the ‘embedded’ narratives structuring positionings within text (Davies 1989).

While the theoretical ‘framing’ of critical discourse analysis encourages an empirical link between language-in-use and its broader social, historical, cultural and economic context, establishing an analytical connection between the micro-text and the macro-context has proven problematic within CDA research (Luke 1995:10; van Dijk 1993). Stromquist (2002:vii) however, asserts that “simultaneous analysis and interventions at both levels” are of fundamental importance. This research project therefore unites critical analysis of the micro (as personal) or the English education ‘storylines’ of Korean learners of English, with macro-analysis of particular discourses speaking of and for the Korean context and the discursive category of ‘learner’ within the broader national and global ‘space’. Enabling both top-down discussion of ‘available’ discourses and their material effects within national/local contexts and a tentative connection between the discourse of the global/national and the storyline of the language learner, the construction of this research has also facilitated a grassroots discussion of the lived experience of a positioning as a ‘Korean learner of English’ in a modern, globalised world. Before the methodology of this research is developed in further detail, the concepts critical to, and shaping, the methodological approach of this current project will be discussed next.

## CRITICAL CONCEPTS: A GLOBALISED WORLD, STORYLINES AND THE DISCURSIVE SUBJECT

This research project is located in a geographical/historical/cultural ‘moment’ in which space and time, being and belonging, are relentlessly (re)configured and (re)stratified (Bauman 1998:70). Within this ‘moment’ the delineation between the national and the global, or the nation-state and the ‘system’ (Appadurai 1996:19), is increasingly blurred by the increased physical and ‘imaginary’ border-crossing of the individual, the political, the economic and the cultural (Appadurai 1996; Bauman 1998; Bhabha 1994). The use of CDA techniques with their empirical and theoretical focus upon the present and the current (van Dijk 1993) in conjunction with a broader poststructuralist framing, enabled this research project to, it is argued, engage with the shifting boundaries and fluid nature of this global context. This section will outline the way in which concepts critical to this research, namely the ‘discursive subject’ and the concept of storylines, are conceptualised within this poststructural/CDA ‘juncture’.

For the individual ‘subject’ located by a globalised context, this ‘openness’ and “global freedom of movement” seemingly enables an existence characterised by global/local possibilities – both real and desired via the work of the imagination (Appadurai 1996; Bauman 1998:121, 2006). However, within a poststructuralist (re)framing, the ‘subject’- the Korean learner of English- is constituted by the multiple global/national discourses in which he or she is positioned (Søndergaard 2002); discourses that are simultaneously constructing the globalised social reality that the individual actor or ‘subject’ exists within (Davies 2000; Luke 1999). While there is potential to be positioned as an agentic and power-full ‘subject’ within the multiplicity of discourses constructing ‘reality’, the ‘free will’ of the ‘subject’ to exist independent of or in contrast to discourse is, within poststructuralism, deemed “fundamentally illusory” (Davies 2000:60). As Davies (2000:60) states,

... the subject's positioning within particular discourses makes the "chosen" line of action the only possible action, not because there are no other lines of action but because one has been subjectively constituted through one's placement within the discourse to *want* [original emphasis] that line of action.

Thus, 'global freedom' – both real and imagined – is, within poststructuralism, the result of a positioning as agentic and 'free' within globalisation discourse, rather than 'actual' freedom. By contrast, CDA posits that there exists discursive 'space' between and/or within the multiplicity of discourses positioning the individual; a space in which the 'subject' is enabled to construct the 'Self' as agentic via selective appropriation of and/or resistance to such discourses (Ainsworth & Hardy 2004:238; Hardy & Phillips 2004). The 'subject' is therefore positioned by and able to position 'Self' within, not outside of, discourse. Further, the multiple positionings arising from the global, national (local) discourses of this globalised world space are conceptualised by CDA as able to provide the individual 'subject' with the discursive 'space' to resist and negotiate between and within discourses, facilitating agentic behaviour and as such, actual, rather than illusory, 'global freedom'.

This 'divergence' between the poststructuralist 'deterministic' framing and the critical (re)framing of 'the subject' with potential has led to questions about the ability of CDA research to be constructive, or promote "change through critical understanding" (van Dijk 1993:252), when shaped by a poststructural theoretical focus (Fairclough 1995; Hardy & Phillip 2004), as within this research project. Davies (2000) however asserts that, within the poststructuralist framing of 'the discursive subject', there exists potential for agency, and therefore 'change', borne from knowledge and awareness – or critical understanding – of those discourses positioning the 'Self' as a contradictory and in-process/progress 'subject'. Interestingly, Davies (2000:60) posits that such knowledge facilitates discursive and agentic 'movement' within and between those discourses positioning the individual 'subject', allowing the actor to,

... use the terms of one discourse to counteract, modify, refuse or go beyond the other, both in terms of her [sic] own experienced subjectivity and in the way in which she speaks in relation to the subjectivities of others.

Thus, while the ‘agentic’ subject of the CDA framework is inherently en-abled to choose those discourses to appropriate and/or resist, the ‘agentic’ subject of the poststructuralist paradigm requires knowledge and awareness to produce such discursive ‘movement’. As a poststructuralist project utilising a CDA methodology, this research is positioned such that the implications of this dual framing of ‘agency’ can be problematised and discussed with reference to the lived experience of a collective of language learners “no longer tightly territorialized [or] spatially bounded” (Appadurai 1991:191) and spanning the globe in their desire to access English education.

Of further importance is the conceptualisation and (re)presentation of the constituted ‘subject’ within this current research. Within both poststructural and CDA frameworks, the ‘Self’ of the individual ‘subject’ is contradictory and fluid – in motion, never fixed – constituted by the various discourses by which the ‘subject’ is positioned (Ainsworth & Hardy 2004; Davies & Harre 1990). It is from the manifold and shifting standpoints of these multiple positions that fluctuating and conflicting subjectivities are constructed and negotiated (Ainsworth 2001; Ajayi 2006; McCarthy et al. 2003; Somers 1994), from which the individual is able to know (Davies 2000), to make sense of experience, and to define themselves and others (Sowell 2004). While, as discussed in Chapter Three, much previous ESL research has (re)presented the language learner within this poststructuralist framing, this current research offers some departures from this body of work<sup>46</sup>, with its use of the concept

---

46 One exception in the field of international education is Koehne (2005:106) who examines the “ways that international students are constructing their storylines about who they are as international students and, in the process, reconstructing storylines about self”.

of storylines, a term drawn from feminist poststructuralist theory (Davies & Harre 1990; Davies 1999:15; Koehne 2005; Søndergaard 2002).

In its broadest sense, the concept of storylines refers to a “condensed version of a naturalised and conventional cultural narrative” (Søndergaard 2002:191) embedded within and shaped by discourse (Davies 1992:51). As a required and/or desired “sequence of actions” constructed for the individual subject, the ‘collective’ storyline provides a culturally-shaped framework for the ‘Self’ and for knowledge of an-Other (Brandth & Haugen 2005; Davies 1992; Søndergaard 2002:191). Located by a plethora of power-full discourses and the collective storylines and positions available within such discourses, individual ‘subjects’ are able to negotiate and construct individual storylines, and multiple and hybrid subjectivities, that cumulatively construct “who they are, and who they are becoming” (Koehne 2005:105). For the Korean learners of English of this research project, this construction necessitates a “suture(ing)” (Hall 1996a:5) or juncture between the global discourses and the collective storylines of the ‘Other’, the ‘learner’, and the ‘learner of English’ constituted by the West and the national discourses and collective storylines of their non-Western ‘home’. This point of ‘suture’ or, as Bhabha (1994:3) refers, the “borderline engagement” of the subject with “the borders between home and world” (1994:13) broadly constructs a subject that “represents a hybridity, a difference ‘within’, [who] inhabits the rim of an ‘in-between’ reality” (1994:19). The use of the concept of storylines within this research project therefore enables this study to critically examine the potential and inherent ‘tension’ both between the collective storylines available within global/national discourses and the lived individual storylines of the learner, and within the subjectivities and storylines of such learners.

This section has, therefore, broadly outlined the theoretical and empirical ‘tool’ of critical discourse analysis, explicating the macro and micro focus of methods within the CDA ‘corpus’, and the value of this methodological framework with its responsiveness to the ‘now’

particularly in relation to learners of English. Thus, in an interconnected and globalised world space (Martinelli 2005) whereby second-language learners are increasingly locating the ‘Self’ globally, and are, in turn, located by the broad discourses of the global world space, the critical analytical focus, concepts and poststructuralist framing of this research project has, as will be shown in the following chapters, enabled an illumination of the discourses, collective storylines, positionings and possibilities available to the ‘Korean learner of English’ at a global and national (local) level. These critical analytical concepts are summarised in the table below.

**Table Three: Summary of critical analytical concepts**

Critical Concept	Relevance to context under investigation
Discourse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exists within contextual fields shaped by power relations and as such are used and exchanged globally, nationally and locally</li> <li>• Positions the ‘subject’ (the ‘Korean learner of English’) it speaks of and for within such power relations and as such, influences the subjectivities (the construction of ‘Self’) of individual ‘subjects’</li> <li>• Rendered visible within this research through critical discourse analysis</li> </ul>
Critical Discourse Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aims to render visible the workings of discourse, power/knowledge within contextual fields</li> <li>• Enables an analytical linkage between text (global/national discourses of learning and the learner; the storylines of the individual learner) and the workings of power within the context of their production (a modern, globalised context in which English is constructed as <i>the</i> global language)</li> </ul>
Storylines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Required and/or desired ‘sequence of actions’ embedded within discourses for the collective and the individual</li> <li>• Rendered visible through critical discourse analysis</li> <li>• Enables analytical comparison between the globally and nationally desire-able storylines for ‘the learner’, ‘the learner of English’ and ‘the Korean learner of English’ and the individual and lived storylines of such learners.</li> </ul>

## QUALITATIVE DATA COLLECTION

In developing a 'holistic' understanding of both participant and context, qualitative methods are designed to convey the richness and depth of experience through language, and as such provide a broad corpus of 'rich' data for analysis. The overwhelming 'task' of data collection within this research project therefore was, as J-e. Rhee (2006:598) states, to "create a trans-national research/field site".

### THE SAMPLE, THE SETTING

While previous research, as outlined in Chapter Three, utilised participants from specific national/cultural groupings located in specific geographical locations<sup>47</sup>, this research contends that such a methodological focus fails to capture the complexity and diversity of the varied 'locations' and experiences of second-language learners within such 'groupings'. The 'global' definition of 'Korean learner of English'<sup>48</sup> adopted by this research was operationalised by involving participants who embodied a variety of ways that Korean adult learners acquire and use English while located in Korea or Australia. Specifically, this collective included participants learning English in Korea and participants living a temporarily international and 'Western' existence in Australia. Reflective, rather than representative of the myriad of geographical locations in which Koreans learn English, the inclusion of learners in both national and trans-national locations, it was felt, provided a breadth and 'richness' to the research process.

---

47 Kanno's (2003) research with border-crossing Japanese students is a notable exception.

48 While a seemingly essentialist reference to participants, the continued emphasis upon such a 'category' as discursively constructed and thus contest-able, and the understanding that such learners are not represented by this 'belonging' alone, distinguishes this usage of the term Korean learner from the essentialist focus of research discussed earlier.

Korean participants in both Korea and Australia were therefore invited to 'opt-in' to the study through posts on a global language exchange website, an advertisement in a private English institute in Korea and an English language centre based in a university in Australia, and contact with a local English conversation group for migrants or sojourning Koreans. In light of the Korean cultural belief discouraging openness with others, especially in regards to personal details and experiences (Pak 2006:46), invitations were extended to Korean learners with a prior relationship with the researcher and to those introduced through a mutual acquaintance. Pak's (2006) study of the dual-cultural identity of three Korean-American women supports the use of such measures in working with Korean nationals. Further Banister et al. (1994) maintain that the use of participants with whom the researcher has a previous relationship aids the research process, encouraging greater disclosure and reflexive commentary. One participant responded to the 'invitation' on the global language exchange website.

Thirteen participants (nine in Australia and four in Korea) responded to these requests and provided consent to participate<sup>49</sup>. The participants represent a broad cross-section of adult learners of English, including students completing their undergraduate study internationally; students of trans-national English language institutes; mother's sojourning overseas for their children's English education or their husband's work; and individuals accessing English education within Korea for the purposes of cross-cultural personal communication, career enhancement, and/or personal development. To ensure participants were fully informed about the research process, the information sheet and consent form were provided in English and in Korean. Participants were encouraged to communicate with the researcher if difficulties arose during the interview process. Participants were provided, if desired, with a

---

49 It is important to note that three additional participants, although giving consent, did not finish the on-line interview. In each case, initial questions were completed and then no further contact was made despite repeated requests on the part of the researcher. These responses have not been included in analysis.

complete copy of their responses. If possible and/or desired, contact was maintained with participants after the interview process<sup>50</sup> to ensure they remained informed about the progress of the project and to seek clarification or additional information.

Although there exists “little agreement about how to proceed ethically in a virtual area” (Mann & Stewart 2003:247), Meho (2006) argues that core ethical principles can be met during on-line ‘human’ research through a commitment to honest representation of the purpose of the communication, careful and detailed use of consent forms, and ongoing communication with participants about expectations during on-line interviewing. Within the context of this research project, a commitment to such ethical principles was intrinsic to contact with participants both prior to and throughout the data collection process. Ethics approval was obtained for the research instruments on 3 May 2007 (UNE Approval no: HE07/105).

## METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

In reflexively questioning the influence of the qualitative research process upon identity construction and ‘Othering’ of participants, Pennycook (2001:161) proposes “modes of working” that facilitate critical inquiry, orienting research toward “transformative goals”. Such an approach necessitates the use of research methods that illuminate the richness and depth of participant’s lives without recourse to “essentialist categories”, while focusing upon the broader workings of power over/within participant’s experiences (Norton Peirce 1995b; Pennycook 2001:161). Within a globalised world space, qualitative research, as Appadurai (1996:55) asserts, needs to account for both the apparent and the possible within participant’s lives or, more specifically, examine the role broader possibilities (or storylines) presented to individuals play in shaping “specific life trajectories” and subjectivities. In order to capture

---

<sup>50</sup> Two participants who completed their interview questions as a hard copy chose not to provide email addresses.

the complex contextual and individual nature of a position as ‘Korean learner of English’ within this globalised world space, this research utilised a multi-method qualitative approach, using two of the four qualitative strategies identified by Wolcott (1992) – namely archival research and asynchronous (e-mail) interviewing.

#### ARCHIVAL RESEARCH

The critical orientation of this research (re)formulates the milieu or context in which participants are located as a “complex site constructed by and through discourses expressed in various texts” (Luke 1999:165). The archival research method enables the relationship between texts, interactions and broader structures to be analysed through the identification of key texts within the context in question (Fairclough 2001:21). Of primary importance to this process is the selection of a research site that “provides naturally occurring texts and talk as data”, supporting the focus and theoretical assumptions of the project (Ainsworth 2001:33). In selecting a research ‘site’ for this research, initial considerations focused upon the need for texts that spoke of and for the English language, learners of English as a second language, and the national context of Korea. It was essential that the research site provided equal access to global texts – or texts originating from intergovernmental organisations involved in the Korean context – and texts written in English arising from the Korean context itself<sup>51</sup>. For these reasons the public ‘archive’ of the Internet was chosen as the primary site of investigation.

Online data collection occurred from June 2006 to June 2007 and focused on texts published or released between 1996 and 2007 available on the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the World Bank and United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) websites. The year 1996 was selected as a

---

51 The focus upon texts in English is due to the researcher’s minimal language competence in Korean.

suitable beginning point for data collection due to its importance in the ‘internationalisation’ of Korea, representing as it does, the year Korea joined the OECD (OECD 1999); while the three intergovernmental organisations were chosen due to their global positioning as ‘authorities’ in the area of education and knowledge, and their historical relationship with the Korean nation-state, as outlined in Chapter One. Preliminary key word searches used terms such as “Korea” or “Republic of Korea” to yield six relevant policy and/or education review texts speaking of and for the national context and learners in question. This ‘corpus’ of six texts was then categorised thematically, using the three themes of ‘knowledge or knowledge economy’, ‘the social actor’ and ‘globalisation’. Texts were subsequently sorted by organisation and date within each category, enabling an initial ‘awareness’ of the consistency, or lack thereof, within and between organisational discourse speaking of and for the context of Korea over time.

The collection of national data also occurred from June 2006 to June 2007 and also focused on texts released or published over the period 1996 to 2007. In light of the increasing ‘international’ focus of the nation during this period, these eleven years represent a time of social, political and economic change, involving a (re)imagining of Korea as a nation and its role in global or international affairs within popular discourse. As Bhabha (1994:19) argues, this “in-between reality”, or the period between the historical/national and the modern/global, proffers the possibility of ‘resistance’ and contradiction, and as such, provides a point whereby the interplay of power relations is potentially exposed (Foucault 1982:211). Preliminary data searches using the keywords “English”, “education”, “learning English” or “English education” therefore focused upon four key areas: presidential speeches translated into English; educational policy texts, research and discussion released in English by the Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development (MOEHRD); newspaper articles and opinion pieces in on-line Korean newspapers; and blog submissions or opinions

discussing education in the Korean context, learning English or the English language available in Google Groups. This search yielded eighty texts providing a representative, rather than exhaustive sample of the formal and informal ways in which ‘English’, ‘education’ and the ‘learner’ are spoken of and for within the Korean national context.

While national texts were initially classified according to the ‘positioning’ of English within the text, it was found that such classifications did not accurately represent or account for a large portion of the data collected. Data was subsequently re-categorised using key themes arising from a preliminary analysis of intergovernmental data, including ‘knowledge and language’ (31 texts), ‘the social actor’ (16 texts) and ‘globalisation’ (17 texts). A further category – the ‘nationalisation project’ (16 texts) – was developed to reflect the ‘nationalist’ and cultural focus of particular texts. This ‘similarity’ between the categorisation of global and national data facilitated comparisons between global discourses of, and associated with, English and education within each theme, and the (re)presentation of such discourses within the national context, by theme. This comprised a process facilitating an awareness of,

... what is left out ... what is covered over; [the] kind of construction [that] is taking place, [the] kind of reading ... being privileged ... What readings are not privileged, what is not there, what questions can’t be asked?  
(Gunew in Spivak 1990:61)

Texts were subsequently sorted by date and genre within each category to facilitate the identification of discourses and discursive shifts within each theme, and the types of national texts that ‘engaged’ with global discourse.

#### INTERVIEWING FROM A DISTANCE – THE ASYNCHRONOUS INTERVIEW

While the macro-level data collection discussed previously relied upon ‘naturally occurring’ text, the collection of data at the micro-level of the individual learner necessitated the collection of text-in-use, in particular text that enabled an understanding of the types of

discourses engaged with by the learner while illuminating his/her 'English education' storyline. To this end, a series of "loosely formulated questions" were developed with the intention of "elicit(ing) a free-flowing story of life events and occurrences" (Holstein & Gubrium 1995:47), albeit within the bounds of narrating the individual 'pursuit' of English language competency. Due to the inherent difficulties involved in managing face-to-face interviews with a sample located in Korea and Australia, 'asynchronous' on-line interviews<sup>52</sup> were chosen as a primary method for administering questions and interacting with participants in this study.

Traditionally, in-depth, face-to-face interviewing has played an integral role within qualitative research due to the dynamic and meaning-laden nature of the verbal and non-verbal data obtained (Holstein & Gubrium 1995; Meho 2006). In light however, of the time, space and financial constraints imposed by such interviews and the increasingly electronic nature of communication globally, researchers have begun to utilise "on-line asynchronous interviewing", or e-mail interviews, to access the lived experiences of a diverse variety of groups (Meho 2006:1285; Mann & Stewart 2003). Although it is argued that a lack of tacit communication, direct probing and scrutiny detract from the legitimacy of email as a medium for interview (Hart 2006; Selwyn & Robson 1998), several benefits have been identified which are of particular relevance to this research. Denscombe (2003 cited in Meho2006:1299), for example, in comparing interview data obtained on-line with that of more traditional interview methods, found that email responses were of a comparable quality and richness, despite the lack of non-verbal and paralinguistic cues available. The availability of editing functions and increased time to consider replies also resulted in more focused and relevant participant responses (Meho 2006). Further, Kim et al. (2003), using email interviews to study the adaptation experiences of Asian American college students, found that the method

---

52 A lack of reliable Internet access meant that the on-line interview was not used for all participants.

mitigated 'loss of face' for participants describing potentially sensitive topics. This is of particular relevance within the context of this study, due to the reliance upon a participant sample required to disclose personal information in a second-language with varying levels of competence.

The collection of interview 'data' occurred from May 2007 to November 2007. After obtaining consent, eight participants located in both Korea and Australia were emailed interview questions, with four participants initially emailed each section of questions individually to minimise the overall disruption to personal work/study schedules. Due to time constraints, however, four participants were emailed the complete interview after consent was given. In addition, to enable the participation of five Korean learners of English located within Australia and without regular access to the Internet, a 'hard copy' of the interview questions, the information sheet and consent form was developed. In keeping with the 'asynchronous' and non-face-to-face nature of the e-mail interview process, this 'hard copy' was provided to participants by a third party known to both the researcher and participants. The interview was subsequently completed by these participants within the allotted time period.

The interview questions provided to all participants comprised six parts (*Appendix A*). The first section, titled "Life Overview", asked participants to 'story' their life by thinking about the title, integral 'characters' or experiences and the highs and lows of this story. Section Two, "Personal Experiences" required participants to describe themselves as the central character of their 'story' and to consider whether learning English has influenced or led to changes in the 'construction' of this story. The third section "Learning English", and fourth section, "Value of English" asked participants to reflect upon their English education storyline – past, present and future – and reflect upon the English language. Section Five, "Personal Goals", asked participants to 'imagine' their future and describe the options and possibilities of this

future story. Lastly, Section Six, “English and South Korea”, questioned the ‘fit’ between the English language and their national context, the social and cultural aspects and influences upon this context both now and in the future.

While it was anticipated that the ‘abstract’ nature of the interview questions and the need for an average competency in English could potentially be problematic<sup>53</sup>, participants responded positively to the open-ended nature of questions, providing ‘rich’ and often detailed responses. Feedback was received from several participants after the interview process, expressing gratitude for the opportunity to reflect upon and position their pursuit of English within their broader ‘life-story’. Two participants approached the researcher post-interview asking for guidance about the English education materials available in Australia to assist with the development of their ‘written’ skills.

#### DATA ANALYSIS WITH A CRITICAL FOCUS

The discursive construction of the subject – in this instance, the second-language learner – involves the interplay of constitutive forces at a number of levels. In undertaking discourse research, several analytical tools have been formulated to ‘unpack’ or expose the nature of such interactions and their ability to position individuals in multiple and differential ways. Adopting the framework of critical discourse analysis (CDA) and drawing from the work of Fairclough (2001), Codd (1988) and Davies and Harre (1997), this research uses both macro- and micro-level techniques to illuminate how Korean learners broadly, and Korean learners of English in particular, are spoken of and for within global and national discourses, and to compare this ‘construction’ – its collective storylines and positionings – with the individual storylines and subjectivities of such learners.

---

53 One participant was unable to complete Sections Three, Four and Six in English, providing her responses in Korean. Her responses to Sections One, Two and Five were included within the data for analysis.

## GLOBAL AND NATIONAL DISCOURSE

Critical analysis of both global and national data broadly occurred in two stages. The first stage of analysis – thematic analysis – highlighted the persistent themes structuring text, with individual passages relevant to each identified theme subsequently added to a thematic ‘spreadsheet’ for further analysis. During the thematic analysis of intergovernmental discourse speaking of and for the Korean context, within each of the three broad ‘classifications’ established during the data collection process, it became increasingly apparent that, within these broad classifications, particular themes ‘clustered’ and recurred consistently both between and within such discourse. Subsequently, the initial classifications of ‘knowledge’, ‘the social actor’ and ‘globalisation’ were (re)framed as discourses of ‘the commodification of knowledge’, ‘roles and relations of consumption among social actors’<sup>54</sup> and the ‘globalise or perish agenda’. An additional discourse, ‘lifelong learning for all within a learning society’, was also identified, providing the broad ‘vision’ for education within the ‘modern society’ advocated by the three organisations throughout the data under consideration. Due to the large amount of national data under consideration, national texts were also analysed within the broad ‘classifications’ established during the data collection process. Emerging and recurrent themes in these broader classifications similarly ‘clustered’ within each grouping, with each heading (re)named to reflect these themes. Thus, the discourses of ‘the knowledge economy’, ‘the intellectual assets of the nation’, the ‘globalise or perish agenda’, and ‘narrating the national storyline’ emerged from analysis of this national data set.

The second stage of data analysis examined the micro-level properties of passages highlighted during initial analysis. Utilising Fairclough’s (2001:118-132) interpretive analysis framework as

---

54 The theme of “commodification of knowledge” draws from the work of Ball (1998:128), while the theme, “consumerisation of the social actor”, draws from Mulderrig’s (2003:online) work with education policy in the United Kingdom.

a broad guide, critical analysis shifted from an interpretative 'lens' initially focused upon the vocabulary and grammar of the text itself, to a broader consideration of the situational context of the document. Broadly, this stage of analysis questioned how themes were spoken and positionings constituted within texts, and "the strategies by which [text] masks the contradictions and incoherences of the ideology that is inscribed in it" (Codd 1988:245). At the text level, this detailed analysis highlighted the ideology (and therefore the power-full interests) within and behind discourse through a focus upon key and reiterated concepts and 'subject positions', individual words collocated with such terms, and the consistency of this (re)presentation both within and between organisations and national discourses. This process further illuminated how the broad positionings of 'non-Western nation', 'learner', 'learner of English', and more specifically, 'Korean learner of English' were constructed within global and national discourses, and the types of relationships, practices and storylines valued for such positions within global and national contexts. A broad comparison of the key concepts, positions and themes of the four global 'discourses' – the 'commodification of knowledge', the 'roles and relations of consumption among social actors', 'lifelong learning for all within a learning society', and 'the globalise or perish agenda' – and the four national 'discourses' – 'the knowledge economy', 'the intellectual assets of the nation', 'the globalise or perish agenda' and 'narrating the national storyline' – was conducted.

## INTERVIEW RESPONSES

Individual 'responses' to and engagement with global and national discourses, and the inherent positionings and possibilities of such discourses were then examined. The response of each participant was thematically classified to develop a broad corpus of themes, and this list of themes subsequently reviewed to ensure 'like' themes were grouped under a single thematic heading. Primary to this final stage of analysis was a questioning of the types of global and national discourses participants engaged with in narrating their pursuit of English.

The list of themes emerging from individual responses was subsequently compared with the themes of global and national discourses for evidence of overlaps, negotiations and contestations. The ‘types’ of themes evident within responses of participants located nationally, and those located trans-nationally were also compared.

In aiming to “illuminate [the] moments of thought and belief and ... [subjectivity] in action” (Sowell 2004:98) within the narration of each participant’s ‘English education’ storyline, this analysis additionally examined the global/national storylines and positionings shaping and ‘silenced’ within each narration; the apparent types of cultural/social affirmation received when positioned in ‘acceptable’ and ‘accepted’ ways; and the types of individual storylines and subjectivities available to and narrated by participants within the strictures of these discourses and collective storylines (Søndergaard 2002). Further, this research also considered the “countervailing language, narratives and myths” (Ainsworth & Hardy 2004:243), ruptures or potential challenges to the ‘common-sense’ assumptions of the global/national and the degree to which the participant constructed the ‘Self’ as agentic within these responses.

#### (RE)PRESENTING KNOWLEDGE AND ‘TRUTH’: LIMITATIONS AND CONSEQUENCES

By its nature, critical research is a highly selective and subjective process, structured as it is by the inherent bias and beliefs of the researcher (Cresswell & Miller 2000; Norton Peirce 1995b). Establishing the validity of critical research thus necessitates, as van Dijk (1993:252) advocates, the elucidation of the researcher’s “explicit sociopolitical stance”. Davies (1999:13) however, foresees a broader disclosure of both “personal [and] political motives” and an awareness of the discursive, historical and contextual location of the ‘Self’ as researcher to facilitate ‘recognition’ of the discursive ‘foundations’ of the research question/s under consideration. While, in line with van Dijk (1993) and Davies (1999), the personal and

political positioning of the researcher as Western ‘Other’ formulating a trans-national research project of those of the non-West was outlined in Chapter One, ‘unease’ regarding the inherent ‘power’ of a positioning as researcher (re)framed as “knowledge-producer” (Rhee, J-e. 2006:598) and the implications of such a location for data analysis and data (re)production remains.

In foregrounding critical knowledge and awareness as a catalyst for broad change and agentic behaviour (Davies 2000), the critical research process fundamentally positions the researcher as ‘liberator’, located such that she or he is em-powered to produce the ‘critical’ knowledge necessary to initiate individual and/or social change. As a researcher ‘of’ the West, working both within and located by the very discourses that ‘bind’ or position the non-West as ‘less-than’, there is, as Lather (1992:95) notes, an inherent ‘risk’ to this process, with its assumption that the ‘researched’ is invested in or desires emancipation by the ‘researcher’. In (re)framing this critically-constructed and ‘emancipatory’ role of the researcher as ‘producer of knowledge’, Lather (2001 quoted in Rhee, J-e. 2006:598) recommends a shift “to produc(ing) different knowledge and to produc(ing) knowledge differently”. Broadly, this research project, existing as it does within a ‘unique’ moment of ‘globalised’ time, initiated/implemented/influenced by a researcher with her own ‘unique’ storyline, and including the ‘unique’ voices of thirteen participants, thus provides but one of many possible ‘different knowledges’ of the global/Korean context. In ‘producing’ knowledge of the global and national discourses that position discourses of English and the ‘learner of English’ as incontestable and uncontested ‘truth’ (Foucault 1972) within the Korean context, it is hoped that this research project will – rather than emancipating learners from inequitable discourses – provide them with the discursive ‘space’ to re-read and/or re-view such discourses, potentially enabling individual “movement from one discourse to another” (Davies 1992:65).

While an ‘essentialist’ categorisation of ‘learner of English’ has been rejected within the context of this research project in favour of a definition that recognises the varied and multiple locations and positionings of the Korean national learning the English language, the (re)presentation of the narrative of this ‘collective’ within the bounds of this research necessitates a glimpse of parts, rather than an entirety, of the individual storyline. The validity of this ‘glimpse’, particularly its ‘truth’ as a (re)presentation of the Self, was established through a process of “member checking” (Cresswell & Miller 2000:127), with participants asked to re-view the interview response in its entirety to confirm the ‘accuracy’ and ‘richness’ of the account<sup>55</sup>. Ongoing email discussion was maintained with four participants in order to clarify particular elements of individual accounts and/or receive feedback on researcher interpretations. This research process, therefore, was not “an act of comprehending otherness but ... of recognising the difficult reworkings of agency in others” (Rhee, J-e. 2006:597) and illuminating, albeit through an analytical ‘lens’ focused upon English education, the lived and imagined experience of an existence as a learner of English in “modernity at large” (Appadurai 1996:23).

The following chapter (Chapter Five) presents the findings of the first level of analysis, outlining the various themes emerging from the globalised educational policy discourse of three intergovernmental organisations speaking of and for the Korean nation-state.

---

<sup>55</sup> Nine participants reviewed responses. Four participants, all of whom completed the interview in hard-copy and did not provide an email address for further contact, were not approached to re-view and/or clarify responses.

THE IMAGINED WORLDS OF THE ‘GLOBAL’ INSTITUTION

An existence in the “global now” (Appadurai 1996:2) demands contiguity and contact – both real and imaginary – with and between the individual, the local, the national, and the global. Such connections, established through the diminishing of borders (Bauman 2002) and cultivated by media and migration (Appadurai 1996), market forces and money (Rizvi & Lingard 2000) have led to the description of particular phenomena as ‘global’ or ‘international’. The English language is one such phenomenon; variously referred to as “Global English” (Bamgbose 2001:359), a “world language” (Phillipson 1992:1), or an International Language (Pennycook 1994:6). A multiplicity of discourses and ‘critical’ frameworks of English, as outlined in detail in Chapter Two, speak of and for the international expansion of this language and its positioning as the language of the ‘global now’ for nation-states and citizens alike. Of these, the liberal and colonial-celebratory discourses utilise the concept of ‘global’ as applied to English to illustrate the ‘applicability’ and use of English ‘throughout’ the world. Alternatively, the ecology-of-language and World Englishes frameworks define the statement ‘English is global’ as the use of English ‘in’ the world, or the embedding of English in multiple and local contexts of use and its (re)presentation using vernacular forms of expression.

For non-Western nationals, the ‘global’ position and inherent power of the English language ‘throughout’, and its status ‘in’ the world, present a potent incentive for English attainment. For non-Western nation-states, the value of English exists in its worth as an economic, social and political commodity ‘throughout’ the world and, in particular, the global marketplace. In problematising how and why this assumption has become ‘common-sense’, this chapter uncovers the ways in which discourses of ‘English as global’ have the potential to bind or link

with the global discourses of three intergovernmental organisations – the World Bank; the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD); and the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) – for legitimacy within the non-Western context of Korea. Globally endowed with the authority to speak of and for the Korean nation-state, each organisation establishes, within such global discourses, a compelling economic and political storyline for development embedded with the symbolic and political might of the economically and globally dominant (Bonal 2003; Bourdieu 1998; Tamatea 2008). However, as Said (1994:24) cautions,

The thing to be noticed about this kind of contemporary discourse, which assumes the primacy and even the complete centrality of the West, is how totalising is its form, how all-enveloping its attitudes and gestures, how much it shuts out even as it includes, compresses and consolidates.

This chapter, therefore, examines the (re)presentation of such global discourses/storylines within policy discourse about and for education and social conditions within the Korean context. While previous discussion examined the colonial and imperialist support for the growth of the English language and the discourses that accompanied the English language during this expansion, this chapter disentangles the broader educational policy discourses concomitant with or relevant to global/local discourses of English during the current era of globalisation reforms within the Korean context.

Initially, this chapter will examine the (re)presentation of the globalised world space and the role of education in supporting national ‘growth’ within such a space, in both the broad and Korean-specific educational discourse of each intergovernmental organisation. Although borne of differing economic and political agendas and with divergent mandates for global action and involvement, the World Bank, the OECD and UNESCO are today positioned as ‘authorities’ in the field of education with the ideological, economic and political ‘power’ to influence the educational policy agendas of nation-states (Fairclough 2001:27). As Said

(1978:20) asserts however, “authority can, and indeed must, be analysed”. Thus I ask is there evidence of convergence in the educational policy agendas of these organisations. This chapter will, then, critically explore the discourses of and for Korea produced by each organisation through a discussion of the themes that bind or “laws operating behind” (Foucault 1972:55) the formation and dissemination of these statements, and their binding or relevance to the discourses of English as global. The positions available for the Korean nation-state and learners within such discourses will also be considered.

### THE GLOBALISED EDUCATIONAL DISCOURSE OF THREE INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS

In line with the multi-directional currents of globalisation explored in Chapter Three, globalised flows of education policy cross national boundaries to be absorbed and implemented, revised or rejected (Luke & Luke 2000). As the shifting (re)presentation and interpretation of education’s past, present and future role in national development in an era of globalisation, education policy is a congregation of competing local, national and global discourses on knowledge, the individual, and power (Ball 1994; Luke & Luke 2000:291). While, in practice, the educational policy discourse of each organisation under consideration is just one of several within globalised policy flows; in reality, the global position and power wielded by each organisation imbues the (re)presentation of the global context and the ‘role’ of education within policy discourse with a status, seemingly compelling for the nation-state desiring a role on the “international stage” (Appadurai 1996:42). This ‘tension’ between the influence of the global and the response of the national and local, forms much of the polemic in discussions of globalisation and education policy. The following analysis will, therefore, explore this ‘tension’ as it unfolds within the general education policy of the World Bank, the OECD and UNESCO, and their educational analysis and policy recommendations for the nation-state of Korea.

The 'global arena' of the World Bank is:

- characterised by “changing technologies and economic reforms” (World Bank 1995:1).
- conceptualised as one in which a majority of the world’s governments are democratised, developing or operating market economies (World Bank 1999:1).
- “complex [and] fast-globalizing” (World Bank 2005:47).

Constructed by this framing of the global context as rapidly developing and primarily market driven, is a storyline of global ‘success’ for the nation-state; a storyline in which a position as a “dynamic, knowledge-driven, and cohesive” economy (World Bank 2005:5) is dependent upon,

... a healthy, skilled, and agile labor force ... the intellectual capacity to produce and utilize knowledge and promote learning throughout the life cycle ... and [the ability to] continually assess, adapt, and apply new technologies (World Bank 2005:48).

Within the ‘world’ of the Bank therefore, investment in education, by enabling the development of skills in the use, application and generation of the types of knowledge that drive “productivity, competitiveness, comparative advantage, and ultimately, economic growth” (World Bank 2005:123) becomes the critical foundation of the ‘dynamic economy’. Failure to ‘comply’ or to re-imagine and re-structure the storyline of the nation-state accordingly, has, within the World Bank construction, dire consequences, impacting upon “survival” (2005:47); “a country(s) hope to increase productivity and attract [the] private investment needed to sustain growth in the medium term” (2005:47); and “comparative advantage among nations” (2005:48). Importantly, the ‘synergy’ between education and market-driven economic growth – within a broader context of economic change – has

framed, and continues to frame, the education policy of the World Bank. Thus, while in 1995, the World Bank stated that,

Education - in particular, primary and lower-secondary education - is critical for economic growth and reduction of poverty, especially at a time when, as a result of technological change and economic reform, labor market structures are shifting dramatically (p.17);

in 2005, the Bank stated that,

Education plays a critical role in supporting knowledge-driven economic growth strategies in two complementary ways: (a) through the formation of a strong human capital base and (b) by contributing to the construction of an effective national innovation system (p.48).

Occupying the “hard extreme” of the educational policy continuum (Henry et al. 2001:17), the World Bank ideologically positions itself as a global actor “promoting an integrated world system along market lines” located at the “heart of an integrated world economy” (Jones 1998:152). This position, Jones (1998) notes, highlights a consonance between the World Bank’s economic, political and ideological objectives and the education policy responses formulated by the organisation. As an intergovernmental organisation imbued with the political and economic ‘power’ to operate within the ‘global’ context, the World Bank has the ability to “generate convergence in policy processes and ‘desirable’ policy goals” (Bonal 2002:4) through loan conditionalities and “forceful involvement in the framing of proposals” (Lauglo 1996:288) while establishing discursive limits on the ways of speaking about education reform and progress that have ‘value’ within a ‘fast-globalising world’ (Ball 1998). For those spoken of, and therefore positioned by, the discourse of the World Bank, compliance with the educational reform and progress policy of the Bank is constructed as both norm and normal, enabling all to “enter ... the age of knowledge as ... one world community” (2003:21). For the nation-state, compliance is constructed as both necessary for

global success and critical for economic survival – as imperative, rather than choice – and seemingly indicative of the limits to “state autonomy and national sovereignty” proposed by Torres (2002:363) in an era of globalisation.

Similarly the OECD conceptualises the global context as a “new world” (1999:132), the “global village” (1999:116), in which “the pace and scale of ... globalisation is without precedent” (2007a:5) and the “growth of the fast-changing knowledge economy” (2007b:2) poses unique opportunities and challenges for member and non-member countries alike. While World Bank discourse broadly refers to the “challenges and opportunities” (2003; 2005:32) of globalisation, the OECD (2006, 2007a) refers to globalisation – its management by governments and associated and ‘necessary’ national reforms – as both ‘positive’ and ‘negative’. While the benefits of globalisation are characterised by the OECD as long-term, uncertain, and widely dispersed as a result of the positive impact of reforms upon the economy as a whole (2007a), the costs are stated to be “highly visible ... for ... clearly identifiable groups” (2007a:26) due to ‘inevitable’ “employment loss and wage decline” (2007a:26). Continued prosperity, productivity and growth within this context however necessitates the implementation of reforms that ensure “well-functioning markets”, “openness to trade and investment” (OECD 2007a:24), and “economic policies ... to foster ... competitiveness” (OECD 2006:3). Individual economic and social success within this “rapidly-evolving knowledge-driven society” (OECD 2005:40) is therefore dependent upon the level and type of skills and knowledge acquired throughout life. Further, “it is believed that the competitiveness of national economies depends heavily on the capacity of societies’ to encourage and facilitate lifelong learning” (OECD 2007b:2).

Although the OECD occupies a shifting ideological ‘midpoint’ between the World Bank and UNESCO, increasing similarities between the direction and thematic focus of education policy in the OECD and the World Bank exist (Spring 2008:344). This is evident in the

global 'position' of each within organisational discourse. While the World Bank positions its-  
'Self' as the champion of the 'developing country', particularly in "helping countries to fight  
poverty" (World Bank 1995, 1999:iii, 2005), the OECD is (re)presented as the "hub of  
globalisation", working as a "strategic partner of decision-makers in the complex tasks of  
promoting structural reform, in the so-called political economy of reform" (Gurria 2007:6).  
Although OECD rhetoric advocates partnership and collaboration between the organisation  
and member governments, in practice the process of "mutual examination by governments,  
multilateral surveillance and peer pressure" exerts pressure upon member countries to  
"conform or reform" (Taylor & Henry 2000:489). Thus, the role of the 'nation-state' within  
OECD rhetoric is ultimately to implement intergovernmental policies designed to further  
weaken social, economic and political barriers to investment and trade – an outcome noted  
in Bauman's (1998) account of globalisation.

Occupying the 'soft' extreme of the education policy continuum (Henry et al. 2001:17), the  
'world view' of UNESCO both draws upon and diverges from, that of the World Bank and  
the OECD. The global context of UNESCO presents "ongoing and new global challenges"  
(2002:5) as a result of an "increasingly competitive international environment" (2002:2) that  
bestows its benefits selectively and unequally (Delors 1996). Within the "global village" of  
globalisation however (Delors 1996:16), the individual is perceived by the organisation as  
beset by tensions that arise from confrontations between the global and the local; the  
universal and the individual; the traditional and the modern; the long and the short-term, and  
the visible manifestation of such contests within national and local contexts (Delors 1996).  
Such manifestations, UNESCO notes, trend toward the homogenisation of education,  
science, culture and communication, and result in marginalisation for "weaker, economically  
less powerful but nevertheless equally important segments of the world" (2002:3).  
UNESCO's view of globalisation therefore, while contrasting with that of the World Bank

and the OECD is, in many ways, consonant with Bauman's account of "negative globalisation" as a force that overwhelms "vulnerable populations" (Bauman 2006:96), providing cogent support for the globalisation-as-homogenisation argument examined in Chapter Three.

While globalisation, its inequitable impacts and manifestations, presents difficulties for nations and nationals alike, the 'solution' as conceptualised by UNESCO lies in a global 'revolution' that coincides with the process of globalisation – the conversion to "knowledge-based societies" (UNESCO 2002:3). A belief in knowledge as "the principle force of social transformation" and the provision of education as the key to the equitable distribution of "requisite information and expertise" within and between developed and developing countries (UNESCO 2002:3) therefore drives the educational agenda of UNESCO. The role of education, and it seems UNESCO, as a 'panacea' for the ills of globalisation is further emphasised in the links established within organisational discourse between education and broad ranging areas including "human capacity development", the alleviation and eradication of poverty, growth of economies and employment opportunities, individual fulfilment and 'immunity' to ongoing global changes, civic participation, and ultimately, global peace (UNESCO 2006b:19; Watson 1999). With its core function being the promotion of education (UNESCO 2002), the global position of the organisation is thus contingent upon the eminence of education in global discourse and the perceived legitimacy of the organisational response. Watson (1999:15) however, questions this 'legitimacy' in light of ambiguity in the authority and role of UNESCO within a globalised context marked by shifting and fluid global relations.

As part of a growing network of organisations with an authoritative presence in the field of education, the World Bank, the OECD and UNESCO occupy various ideological positions along the educational policy continuum (Henry et al. 2001) with interesting implications for

each organisation’s (re)presentation of the vagaries of the global context and the role of the nation-state and education within this shifting environment. The educational policy discourse of each organisation however, increasingly shows thematic convergence in two key areas – the “commodification of knowledge” (Ball 1998:128), and “roles and relations of consumption among social actors” (Mulderrig 2003). Both of these themes are subsumed by the broader social policy of the learning society and, as such, provide impetus to a general ‘globalise or perish’ agenda. The table below shows the convergences and disparities in the construction of globalisation and education within the discourse of each intergovernmental organisation.

**Table Four: Convergence and Divergence in the Construction of Globalisation and Education by the OECD, the World Bank and UNESCO**

	<b>World Bank</b>	<b>OECD</b>	<b>UNESCO</b>
Globalisation as	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Market economy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge economy, knowledge-driven</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge-based societies</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technological and economic reform</li> <li>• Democratic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Global village</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trend toward homogenisation</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenges and opportunities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive benefits for whole economy and negative costs for groups within.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presenting ongoing and new challenges</li> <li>• Selective benefits of globalisation</li> <li>• Tension for the individual</li> </ul>
Education as	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education for the acquisition of skills and knowledges to drive productivity, competitiveness and comparative advantage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education as the ongoing acquisition of skills and knowledges throughout life (i.e. lifelong learning).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education as the acquisition of knowledge for transformation and equality within and between nations.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Synergy between education and economic growth of nation-state.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitates individual and national competitiveness and economic success.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education as panacea for ills of globalisation.</li> </ul>

In what follows, I explore the extent to which such links are made in intergovernmental social and educational reform discourse for and about the non-Western context of Korea in relation to the key themes of ‘commodification of knowledge’, ‘roles and relations of consumption among social actors’, ‘lifelong learning for all within a learning society’ and ‘the globalise or perish agenda’. It will be argued that such discourses form part of a broader neo-liberal storyline permeating the forces and flows of this globalised world, shaping national and local storylines through a dualistic assessment of the global context – us vs. Other; developed vs. developing; OECD vs. non-OECD – with implications for the types of subjectivities that are of ‘value’ for social actors in education, in particular learners.

## GLOBAL DISCOURSES OF AND FOR A NON-WESTERN CONTEXT

### THE COMMODIFICATION OF KNOWLEDGE

The representation of knowledge as a desirable commodity with economic and social worth or value – the commodification of knowledge – forms a prominent thematic thread throughout intergovernmental discourse of and for Korea. Knowledge and its acquisition are simultaneously viewed as a panacea for, and the foundation of, social and economic development in discourse reviewing Korea’s post-war economic growth, current national reform project and the global context of the nation. The OECD (2000:3), for example, refers to knowledge as a “key factor in economic and social development worldwide”, as knowledge is held to provide countries with “unprecedented possibilities”. Similarly, the World Bank (2006:2) asserts that knowledge provides “the key engine for economic growth”.

While the intergovernmental discourse under analysis is specifically about and for the Korean context, broad reference is made to the global context within which the Korean nation-state ‘operates’. This context is “based on knowledge and information” (OECD 1998) due to the “knowledge revolution” (World Bank 2006:3); characterised by accelerating technological and

workplace change and globalisation (OECD 1998; World Bank 2006) – a “global information society” (OECD 2000:3) or “society of information and globalisation” (UNESCO 1999). Potentially commenting upon the ‘shrinking’ nature of global horizons, or a perception of uniformity and cohesion among nation-states, the OECD (1998) further refers to this context as a “global village” or “global community”. The ‘members’ of this “new civilisation” (OECD 1998), it appears, are nation-states themselves among whom, intergovernmental organisations posit, exists “a growing stock of global knowledge” (World Bank 2000), a “global educational system” (OECD 2000), and a shared “language” for educational solutions (OECD 1998). This concept of a common educational policy language among members of the ‘global information society’ is of particular interest to this current analysis, with its connotations of a “postnational political order” (Appadurai 1996:22) that subsumes and overrides the national/local imperatives of individual nation-states, effectively silencing alter-native ways of knowing and learning ‘in’ the world. This assertion of ‘universality’ therefore implies consensus, dis-abling the voice of the ‘Other’, and impelling the non-compliant nation-state to the margins of the international ‘stage’ – with seemingly dire implications for social and economic growth. Further, at a more literal level, the concept of a shared language of policy-making that crosses national boundaries echoes the ‘English as valued global language’ due to consumer-demand sentiments of the liberalist discourse of English discussed in Chapter Two.

The ‘global knowledge’ of this trans-national community is characterised within OECD (1998) discourse as any knowledge that facilitates up-to-date theoretical and practical understanding of ongoing changes in technology, employment requirements and society, with knowledge of telecommunications and information processing of broad value. The constructed value of such ‘knowledge’ as a commodity is facilitated by elaborating its broad range of purposes and roles, in particular its ability to be “us(ed)” (p.134); “creat(ed)” (p.125);

“available” (p.105); “accessible” (p.105); “acquired” (p.66); “adapt(ed)” (p.116); “disseminat(ed)” (p.157); “transmitted” (p.140); “updat(ed) and extend(ed)” (p.106). While the particular elements of this broad corpus of knowledge are not explicated, the OECD (1998:139) encourages the Korean government to ensure graduates have acquired knowledge of an “OECD-standard” and are, therefore, able to match “economic competitors” (OECD, 1998).<sup>56</sup> From a Foucauldian perspective, however, knowledges that are excluded by, or silenced also provide a site of analysis (Mills 2003). In defining ‘knowledge’ almost exclusively in economic terms, that is knowledge as any information that enhances individual or national prosperity or success in a competitive environment, the OECD’s position excludes knowledge and the acquisition of knowledge that is not for direct economic benefit. An emphasis on those knowledges that are global – enhancing connectivity and modernity – excludes local and traditional knowledges from the global marketplace, positioning such knowledge as national curios rather than global commodities. In this way, acquirers, holders or owners of knowledge/s of global value – be they nation-state or individual – stand in direct economic contrast to the ‘Other’ – holders or owners of local or traditional knowledges – within this construction.

While the World Bank (2000:iv) and the OECD (2000:14) encourage Korea to “tap into” global knowledge and assimilate it to local requirements, the implication is that this ‘new’ knowledge should be sufficiently ‘global’ so as to provide the nation with a ‘commodity’ for exchange or sale in the global marketplace. This is further emphasised in an exhortation for Koreans to acquire knowledge of “foreign language and culture” (World Bank 2000:ii) through “education programmes with significant international dimensions” (OECD 1998:103) which, each organisation agrees, are necessary for participation and

---

<sup>56</sup> While the OECD speaks of competition between nation-states, Bonal (2003:165) and Robertson & Dale (2002) refer to the increasing “economic competitiveness” within nation-states resulting from neo-liberal ‘governance’.

competitiveness within the ‘global village’. Further, while the term “foreign language” is used within the broad educational policy discourse of the OECD (2006:3) and the World Bank (1995:143, 2002:x, 2003:6)<sup>57</sup>, in the joint review of the Korean education system conducted by the OECD and the World Bank this is re-defined as ‘the English language’ (OECD 2000:15, 69, 70, 124, 136; World Bank 2000:v, 54, 77, 117, 129) in recommendations to strengthen the English curriculum to facilitate “global communication and international links” (OECD 2000:15) through foreign investment; preparation for and participation in a “globalised world” (OECD 2000:15); and academic/knowledge flows. The OECD (2000:54, 69, 124) and World Bank (2000:28, 54, 117) assessment further concludes that a lack of English speaking ability amongst Koreans remains a “barrier” to international communication and knowledge transfers, thus (re)presenting the colonial-celebratory discourse of English discussed in Chapter Two, a discourse that draws from the expansionist rhetoric of the British colonial project (Phillipson 1992). Although couched as assistance for the national ‘good’, such statements establish the ‘centre’ as the English speaking ‘able’ and the margins as the English speaking ‘un-able’, thus positioning Korea as marginalised from the global. Importantly, the acquisition of English knowledge is constructed as a ‘panacea’ for marginalisation within this discourse.

The impetus for the ‘commodification of knowledge’ within intergovernmental discourse is the model of the knowledge economy or knowledge-based economy; a framework for development and growth that Ball (1998:122) asserts “serve(s) and symbolise(s) the increasing colonisation of education policy by economic policy imperatives”. The knowledge economy model – as conceptualised by both the OECD and the World Bank – positions the “sustained use and creation of knowledge ... at the centre of [the] economic development process” (World Bank 2006:2). In investigating the ways in which the ‘knowledge’ framework

---

<sup>57</sup> UNESCO (2008:28) refers instead to “linguistic diversity”.

is constructed within discourse of and for the Korean context, it is interesting to note the collocative environments of the nouns 'knowledge' and 'knowledge economy'. Within both OECD and World Bank discourse, 'knowledge' is consistently expressed as a driver of previous and future 'economic growth' or 'economic development' in the Korean context. The reiteration of this discursively constructed relationship, Fairclough (2001) notes, alerts us to an aspect of 'reality' that is potentially the focus of contestation. In this instance we are alerted to an ideological shift from an educational policy focus upon knowledge acquisition for individual growth and enhancement, to the more expansive and extrinsic argument of knowledge acquisition for the 'greater' or, it seems, economic good. The import of such an ideological shift from "the top-down and the bottom up" (World Bank 2006:30) is reiterated with such frequency as to permit the reading that Korea is (in fact) un-able to 'participate' or be 'competitive' within the 'worldwide', 'global' or 'international' economy without transition to a 'knowledge-based economy'.

Perhaps due to the privileging of economic 'goods' within the 'knowledge economy' framework constructed by both the OECD and the World Bank, UNESCO (1999) does not refer to the 'knowledge economy' throughout its Education for All assessment of Korea, preferring instead to use the term, the 'open learning society'. Like the 'knowledge economy', the 'open learning society' is founded upon ongoing knowledge acquisition or lifelong learning; however this is (re)presented as a means to personal fulfilment and social contribution (1999:4). Interestingly within this text, the single reference to 'knowledge' is within the context of a UNESCO entreaty to the Korean government to change its focus from the "quick adoption of advanced knowledge and skills from developed countries" (UNESCO, 1999). The collocation of the descriptors *advanced* and *knowledge* with *developed* and *countries*, reinforces a correlation between the ownership of knowledge and status as a

developed and therefore economically viable nation; presenting both a goal and a challenge to those nation-states, like Korea, positioned on the outside as ‘developing’.

## ROLES AND RELATIONS OF CONSUMPTION AMONG SOCIAL ACTORS

While ‘knowledge’ exists as a commodity of value within the global economy, as constructed by the discourse of the OECD and the World Bank, it is merely a product or good if not ‘consumed’ or utilised by social actors. In ‘consuming’ the commodity of knowledge, social actors both position themselves and are positioned by the specific and broad knowledge under consumption, and in relation to each other – establishing roles and relations of consumption. As Mulderrig (2003:online) notes the patterns of knowledge ‘consumption’ promoted by the ‘education for economic growth’ or knowledge economy global storyline orient governments and students towards an “extrinsic-value, instrumental rationality” where knowledge is to be acquired and used.

Who are the social actors of the knowledge economy? The OECD (2000:3) draws attention to “enterprises, organisations, individuals and communities” as key elements of the knowledge-based economy’s success. The World Bank (2006:3), within its ‘four pillars’ of a knowledge economy framework, nominates “an economic incentive and institutional regime”, “institutions”, the “labour force”, and “firms, research centres, universities, consultants and other organisations”. The primary role of the social actor within OECD and World Bank discourse is the creation and utilisation of knowledge. In contrast, UNESCO’s (1999) position – although acknowledging the relevance of education for national development – emphasises the individual human being as a beneficiary of education, rather than a consumer or user of the ‘products’ of the education process. The below table provides a summary of the social ‘actors’ identified by the ‘knowledge economy’ (OECD, World Bank) or ‘open learning society’ (UNESCO) discourses of the intergovernmental organisation.

**Table Five: The Key Social Actors of the Knowledge Economy or Open Learning Society within intergovernmental discourse speaking of and for the Korean nation-state**

World Bank	OECD	UNESCO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An economic incentive and institutional regime</li> <li>• Institutions</li> <li>• Labour force</li> <li>• Firms, research centres, universities, consultants and organisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enterprises</li> <li>• Organisations</li> <li>• Individuals</li> <li>• Communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual</li> </ul>

Of primary importance to this research project, however are the roles or positions, and relations valued and/or available for the individual within the global discourse of the intergovernmental organisation. As outlined in Table Six (below), the ‘individual’ of the knowledge economy/open learning society is variously represented as a “student” (OECD1998:140; UNESCO 1999:4; World Bank 2006:14); a “learner” (OECD 1998:160; UNESCO 1999:6); a “graduate” (OECD 1998:200; UNESCO 1999:17; World Bank 2006:31); “children” (OECD 1998:203; UNESCO 1999:17; World Bank 2006:15); “youth” (OECD 1998:17; World Bank 2006:31); “young people” (OECD 1998:55; UNESCO 1999:18); a “teenager” (OECD 1998:113); and an “adult” (OECD 1998:121; UNESCO 1999:18; World Bank2006:32).

**Table Six: Convergences and disparities in the description of the category of ‘learner’ by three intergovernmental organisations speaking of and for the Korean nation-state**

Individual as...	World Bank	OECD	UNESCO
Student	✓	✓	✓
Learner		✓	✓
Graduate	✓	✓	✓
Children	✓	✓	✓
Youth	✓	✓	
Young people		✓	✓
Teenager		✓	
Adult	✓	✓	✓

While the terms ‘student’, ‘learner’ and ‘graduate’ position the individual in relation to knowledge and the education system, the nouns ‘children’, ‘youth’, ‘young people’ and ‘adults’ are “generational categories”(Mulderrig 2003:online), primarily used within discourse to emphasise the “cradle-to-grave” (OECD 2000:60) nature of learning.. In this discourse, the ideal Korean *learner* or *student* is constructed as motivated, self-directed, in control of learning throughout their lifespan, creative, innovative, mobile, and discerning about which educational product or knowledge is required – a ‘consumer’ of knowledge within an educational marketplace. The learner-as-consumer thus ‘demands’ an educational and national system constructed in pastoral terms; a system that positions the learner and his/her needs at the centre, is equipped, accessible and open to new ideas, incentive-based, provides a range and choice of resources and programmes, and quality learning throughout the lifespan. As a *graduate* of this ‘market’, the model Korean should be flexible, multidisciplinary and empathetic; creative and entrepreneurial; educated and skilled; able to create and use knowledge; willing to contribute and prepared to participate in the economy that has supported their individual growth and development. Thus, within the intergovernmental discourse of each intergovernmental organisation, a three way, mutually beneficial relationship is constructed between the individual learner-as-consumer; the education system

characterised by institutions, education agencies and teaching staff offering an educational ‘product’ for consumption; and the economy – or for UNESCO (1999) the nation-state and the individual – as beneficiary.

While the individual and lifelong learner is a consistent character in OECD and World Bank discourse, the primacy of the relationship between economic growth and the national population is emphasised in the frequent referral to this citizen body as *human resources*<sup>58</sup>. As a broad mass, the human resource is constructed as *skilled* and *creative*, at the service of, and critical for, the success of the ‘knowledge economy’. For those positioned as ‘human resource’ by a discourse with benevolent, almost parental overtones, the valued storyline is one of development and growth<sup>59</sup> through the consumption of those knowledges and skills critical to the social and economic ‘development’ of the broader nation. The human resource, however, is also constructed by the OECD (2000:134) and the World Bank (2000:126) as an unaccepting and unwilling ‘subject’, almost sceptical of the ‘required’ structural, economic and social reforms; requiring reassurance of the merit of the knowledge economy through “a greater effort of dissemination, explanation and consultation” to ensure ‘buy-in’ or acceptance of a positioning as ‘human resource’. The Korean ‘human resource’, although considered a strength of previous economic growth is, in the context of an internationalised and globalised climate, (re)presented as “inadequate” (OECD 2000:124; World Bank 2000:116), lacking the high-level skills, including the technical and research expertise, language ability and cultural appreciation, required to attract the quintessence of the global market – foreign direct investment. Interestingly, the ‘utopian’ lens of the neo-liberal discourse underpinning the storyline of the human resource, with its imagining of the “pure and perfect market” (Bourdieu 1998:online; Tamatea 2008), ensures that nation-state and

---

<sup>58</sup> The term ‘human resource’ is not used within the UNESCO (1999) review of the Korean education system.

<sup>59</sup> The storyline of the ‘human resource’ has similar overtones to the storyline constructed for the ‘national economy’ within the discourses of the intergovernmental organisation.

national are in-process/progress, moving towards this 'utopia', such that they remain perpetually 'inadequate'. Luke (1997) further questions the apparent 'benevolence' of the human capital or human resource model highlighting its underlying supposition that the skills, proficiencies and knowledges of economic value are those obtained through formal education, thus denying that traditional forms of knowledge transmission, consumption and cultural relations between holders of knowledge are of global worth or value.

Emerging from the global discourse of the three intergovernmental organisations therefore is a specific construction of the Korean learner as individual, and as a member of a broader 'human resources' collective. The primary storyline of the learner is one of an individual committed to knowledge acquisition in the fields of global and national significance through the considered consumption of educational products and services throughout his or her lifespan. Within this storyline the individual is positioned by the quality and quantity of knowledge obtained and is thus constructed as agentic, in control of the means of acquiring and creating individual wealth – the “enterprising Self” of the neo-liberal agenda (Bonal 2003:166). Juxtaposing this storyline, however, is that of the Korean human resource, a collective with global and national obligations, contributing to the greater global and national 'goods' of wealth and success, cohesion and unity, communication and understanding through knowledge acquisition. In this way, the position of *learner* is (re)presented by both individual and collective storylines – a (re)presentation with the potential for contradiction or ambivalence.

#### LIFELONG LEARNING FOR ALL WITHIN A LEARNING SOCIETY

The discourse and concept of lifelong learning for all – or an engagement by all citizens, regardless of age, in learning throughout the lifecycle (World Bank 2003) – provides an overarching discourse that draws upon and contributes to the discourses of

‘commodification of knowledge’ and ‘roles and relations of consumption among social actors’, structuring much of the educational reform agenda of the three intergovernmental organisations. As the OECD (2007b:2) states, “lifelong learning for all has become a widely shared policy objective among OECD countries and beyond”. UNESCO (2006b:63) also concedes that “lifelong learning [is] a guiding and organising principle for educational policy and reform in developing and industrialised countries”, allowing individuals to “develop her/his full capacity and to participate fully in development at the personal, social and national levels”.

The pervasiveness and indubitable position of the discourse of ‘lifelong learning’ in the global context is (re)produced in the increasing convergence between each organisation’s lifelong learning ‘agenda’, and the positioning of lifelong learning policy as a panacea for educational and social ills within broad educational policy. Thus, while intergovernmental analysis of the Korean education system applauds its “quantitative expansion” and its achievements on international comparisons (World Bank 2006:10); the nature of the “current school regime” (OECD 1998:127) is considered fundamentally flawed from a ‘lifelong learning’ perspective due to its emphasis upon routine, rote memorisation, uniformity and teacher-centredness. Such recommendations however, (re)present the inherent contradiction between the broad neo-liberal “business agenda for education”, an agenda that constructs as critical the need for “compliant, ideologically indoctrinated, pro-capitalist, effective workers” (Hill 2003:online) produced by an education system characterised by regulation and control (Tamatea 2008), and the lifelong education required to create an “enterprising self” (Bonal 2003:166) or the “highly skilled, motivated and adaptive learning society” (Mulderrig 2003:online) required for the competitive strength of the nation-state. Therefore, while Korean students are highly ranked on international assessments of basic knowledge, they are considered, by these intergovernmental organisations, as ill-prepared for the unique conditions of a globalised

world – conditions that require “all students [to be equipped] with enough theoretical understanding to master future changes in technology, employment opportunities, and social conditions” (OECD 1998:113). The reform required within a lifelong learning agenda is an increased emphasis on “creativity” (OECD 1998:128, 2000:127; UNESCO 1999:7; World Bank 2000:121) and the “centrality of the learner” (OECD 1998; World Bank 2000:42). Creativity, as the critical concept shaping recommendations for Korean educational reform, applies to both the curriculum and the existing educational ethos of the nation-state (OECD1998) and is acknowledged by each organisation as a necessary precondition for creating a Korean workforce with the skills and ‘thinking’ required by a successful ‘knowledge economy’. Within intergovernmental discourses therefore, the Korean education system is (re)presented as failing to “nurture creativity and initiative”, in producing students who “continue to be inadequately creative” (World Bank 2006:31). It is important to note however, that despite reiteration of the term ‘creativity’ throughout this policy discourse, explication or definition of the term was not evident. This is seemingly indicative of an accepted-ness by such organisations of the (Western?) construction of the concept as global ‘self-evident’ truth, positioning non-Western constructions of creativity as un-desirable – and thus undesired.

#### THE GLOBALISE OR PERISH! AGENDA

The inherent tension between economic goals and social and individual ‘good’ within intergovernmental education policy discourse encapsulates, as Codd (1988) notes, the contradictions and conflicts between the context and the ideologies such discourse claims to represent. The incongruities and inconsistencies of the OECD and World Bank’s contextual and ideological positioning are manifest in discourse speaking of and for Korean educational reforms, in particular within injunctions for Korea to become more ‘internationalised’.

Korea's global 'position' as separate to and divided from the collective 'world economy' is consistently reinforced by both the World Bank (2000) and the OECD (2000, 2007c). Positioned in-between as better-than *developing* and not-yet *developed* (World Bank 2000), integrating but not-yet integrated (OECD 2007c), progressing but not-yet in line with "international labour standards" (OECD 2007c:161), Korea seemingly occupies a 'third space' in the international context; a space that distinguishes it from many of its Asian neighbours, but marks it as different from 'successful economies', "notably [the] United States, but also small countries such as Singapore and Ireland" (OECD 2000:123). In order to integrate with and belong to the advanced global economic 'collective', it is incumbent upon Korea as a nation-state to open its doors to this collective, and actively strive to become fully internationalised (OECD 1998, 2000; World Bank 2000, 2006). While, for example, the OECD (2007c:150) acknowledges that the 'openness' of the Korean nation-state has improved, the "level of integration with the world economy" – namely the "penetration" of globalised flows of capital, products and workers – is deemed insufficient to take "full advantage of globalisation" as a 'developed' nation. Such statements (re)present the internationalising agenda of the discourse of neo-liberalism (Hill, 2003); a discourse impelling nation-states to become globally competitive, able to survive and thrive in a globalising world by 'opening up' to market forces, and creating conditions that enhance national 'attractiveness' for global capital forces and flows<sup>60</sup>. For Korea therefore, ambivalent views of globalisation within the national context<sup>61</sup> and the desire of the nation-state to retain nation-hood through 'defence' of the national (local) via the regulation of the 'foreign' is (re)cast within this neo-liberal discourse as behaviour inconsistent with the global context, resulting in minimised international success and a positioning in-between.

---

<sup>60</sup> Such conditions include privatisation, reductions in public expenditure, and restructuring within a corporate managerial framework (Bonal 2003:263; Hill 2003; Tamatea 2005:317)

<sup>61</sup> The lack of consensus regarding globalisation within the Korean context was discussed in the context of the discourses of English evident within the nation-state in Chapter Two.

Mulderrig (2003:online) argues that the ‘power’ of globalisation discourse lies in its construction as an “abstract challenge to be met”, rather than as a by-product of capitalism. This sense of challenge or contest permeates the Korean reform project, compelling the government to respond to the call for reforms deemed ‘necessary’ within a globalised context or risk economic and social annihilation. To reiterate the consensual, urgent and necessary nature of these reforms, the globalised context is constructed as a quasi-arena in which only the economically and socially ‘fittest’ – the developed/advanced knowledge-based economy – can compete and survive. As Bourdieu (1998:online) notes, the continued existence of this neo-liberal “Darwinian world” shaped by endemic struggle and competition, is due to the widespread “complicity of all the precarious arrangements that produce insecurity” (Bourdieu 1998:online) and a pervading “logic of fear” (Torres 2002:363). As the OECD (2000:3) states:

Developing countries that successfully make the transition to the knowledge-based economy will have unprecedented possibilities to become more competitive in world markets and to participate in the global information society.

While the storyline of the ‘global competition’ equates the creation of wealth with membership in the ‘winning team’, ‘qualification’ for such membership necessitates active participation by competitors equipped with particular knowledge, information and skills. Such ‘requirements’ include global communication skills and understanding of developments in science and ICT (OECD 2000; UNESCO 1999; World Bank 2000); a willingness to be open, even welcoming, to the economic forces and flows of other competitors (OECD 2004); and “constant restructuring” (World Bank 2000:12) to meet shifting contextual needs and the ‘rules’ of the ‘competition’. The challenge for Korea therefore, as a nation with “a tradition of insularity, [and] few strong associations with the outside world” (OECD 2000:20), is to further open and internationalise or, as Torres (2002:340) states, to “put global logic first”. Under question however, is the likelihood that Korea, as a non-Western nation-state positioned as in-between by intergovernmental discourse, will be considered as ‘developed’

by such organisations after such reform, when particular interests are served by the global success of development remaining the exclusive right of the Western ‘centre’ – a ‘centre’ who requires an ‘Other’ or a periphery for its constitution (Spivak 1990:40).

For the developing nation-state therefore, ‘success’ within the global context is – to borrow Bauman’s (1998:13) terminology – far away or distant. By contrast, the global context itself is, within intergovernmental discourse, constructed as both near and familiar, thus reducing the distance or unfamiliarity of the ‘global’ and rendering its aspects ‘known’ through an association or consonance with the everyday: “Korean society is part of the global village” (OECD 1998:127). Within such discourse, the ‘global village’ is constructed as cohesive and consensual, uniting nations with a “global educational system” (OECD 2000:15); by sharing global knowledge and “global norms” (OECD 1998:126); and utilising “global best practice and reform experiences” (OECD 2000; World Bank 2000:129, 2006), in response to the “global questions” being asked by all using “language [that] has also become global” (OECD 1998:156). Thus the question must be asked – whose language, whose education and whose best practices and reforms are the ‘norms’ of this village?

This intergovernmental construction of the ‘global community’, a community with no sense of place or location (Meyrowitz 1985 quoted in Appadurai 1996:29), also resonates with Anderson’s (1991:6) notion of the imagined community, a community in which an “image of ... communion” is constructed and conveyed through discourse. With its connotations of unity and success, the construct of the ‘global community’ activates the imaginations of nation-states and nationals alike with an image whose existence is “real to the extent that one is convinced of it, believes in it and identifies with it emotionally” (Wodak et al, 1999:22). As Bunyan (1999:1) notes, this disconnection between the sign and the ‘reality’ – or the ‘sign’ of the global community and “a real that can be produced” – is endemic in the postmodern world. Despite ‘belonging’ to the ‘global community’, the nation-state of Korea is also

represented within global discourse as separate from; positioned outside of the global ‘inner circle’ of the advanced, yet with the possibilities and potential, the human resources and education ‘culture’ necessary to transition to a ‘developed’ country. Impeding this transition, however, are cultural factors unique to Korea, namely a tendency toward introvertedness<sup>62</sup> or a “high ... sensitiv(ity) to foreign influence” (Joo 1996 quoted in Lee, C-J. 2000:193), and an education system with historical foundations in the Confucian tradition. By facing outward, acting as a conduit rather than barrier to knowledge and reforming the education system or, endorsing its membership as one of the ‘global community’, intergovernmental discourse affirms that Korea will be positioned within the storyline of the developed nation, a storyline of success and wealth amongst the global power-full.

In summary therefore, this chapter has critically examined the (re)presentation of the Korean nation-state and the Korean learner within the educational reform discourse of three intergovernmental organisations. In delving ‘behind’ such statements, the four themes of the commodification of knowledge; the roles and relations of consumption among social actors; lifelong learning for all within a learning society; and the globalise or perish agenda were identified – themes that this analysis has shown bind with, or are of relevance to, the discourses of English as global language. Interweaving with each of the discourses emerging from this analysis, however, is the neo-liberal storyline of ‘success’, a storyline speaking of the Korean nation-state as in-between, developing capabilities but not yet developed, able to transition to the global economic ‘centre’ with a re-form process founded upon establishing educational, social, cultural, and linguistic ‘conditions’ – or a knowledge economy – conducive to global economic flows. Mirroring this storyline of development and global ‘growth’ imagined for the Korean nation-state within intergovernmental discourse is that

---

62 In work exploring cultural meta-narratives (re)presented by the Korean government at a World Fair, Walker-Dilling (1998:168) refers to the national concept of *juh'e*, or self-reliance – of “we want to do it on our own this time without outside help” – as one of several unofficial themes structuring the Korean exhibition at the Expo. Such ‘narratives’ have potential implications for the engagement of the nation with the ‘foreign’.

constructed for the Korean learner, a human ‘resource’ integral to national re-form, and whose own re-visioning seemingly enables individual success. Critically for both the Korean nation-state and the Korean learner, intergovernmental discourse of and for the Korean nation-state, with its inherently contradictory neo-liberal underpinnings, constructed robust binaries demarcating the global ‘centre’ from an-Other, including distinctions between global knowledges and local/traditional knowledges; the English speaker and the non-English speaker; the developed and the developing. Positioning both the nation-state and the national therefore in contradiction with and distinct from that which is globally desired/desire-able, such constructions have potential implications for the subjectivities of Korean learners.

In developing a broad overview of the themes and positionings emerging from intergovernmental discourse speaking of and for the Korean context, this chapter has outlined the globalised policy context within which the Korean nation-state, and national, is located. Offering strong imperatives and incentives for compliance, intergovernmental discourse seemingly (re)presents a compelling argument for re-form of the Korean context. The following chapter (Chapter Six) will, therefore, examine national discourses emerging from the Korean nation-state for evidence of ‘engagement’ with such imperatives, layering the national upon the global to explore the convergence and divergence in the (re)presentation of both nation-state and national between these two discursive domains.

## *Chapter Six*

### THE IMAGINED LOCAL AND GLOBAL WORLDS OF THE NATION-STATE

Bauman (2006:96) produces an account of the modern global context as one physically, economically, culturally and spiritually exposed to “negative globalisation”; a context in which the actions or inactions of an individual, a nation, and/or an organisation can shape those of an-Other. Within Bauman’s borderless, open, and thoroughly ‘modern’ world, global economic, social, political, ideological and cultural agendas flow unchecked across national boundaries, founding a “postnational political order” (Appadurai 1996:22) and hastening the rewriting of the nation-state’s role within national and global political and economic contexts.

As Bauman (1998:65) states:

The very distinction between the internal and the global market, or more generally between the ‘inside’ and the ‘outside’ of the state, is exceedingly difficult to maintain in any but the most narrow, ‘territory and population policing’ sense.

Dr. Ee-gyeong Kim (2001:2), Director of the International Cooperation Team at the Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI) concurs, stating that:

Under the banner of globalization, aggressive penetration by developed countries into less developed countries’ economic, political, social, and cultural sectors has rendered them no longer protected, which in turn, make less developed countries more vulnerable to the interests and power of the developed.

In accordance with Bauman (1998, 2006) and Kim’s (2001) account therefore, the neo-liberal and colonial-celebratory discourses of English, as global discursive flows, encounter few significant obstructions when entering the non-English speaking<sup>63</sup> context of Korea, shaping

---

63 The use of the phrase ‘non-English speaking’ refers to the non-official status of English within Korea. It does not refer to a lack of usage of the English language within the Korean context.

the discourses of the seemingly power-less nation-state. Of interest in this current analysis is the extent to which such flows, in particular those of neo-liberalism and knowledge economies, and the colonial-celebratory and liberalist discourses of English-as-global are, in actuality, flowing across Korean physical, social and cultural borders. Thus I ask, in this chapter, in relation to the extent to which such discourses are available, is there evidence of ‘take up’ within the discourses of the Korean nation-state, in particular those speaking of and for the English language and the position of ‘learner of English’?

In what follows therefore, I explore the concurrence and juxtaposition between those discourses emerging from the analysis of intergovernmental discourse of and for the Korean nation-state in Chapter Five (the commodification of knowledge; the roles and relations of consumption among social actors; lifelong learning for all within a learning society; and the globalise or perish! agenda), and the broad discourses of educational reform and transition evident within the national context. Utilising the key themes of the ‘knowledge economy’, the ‘intellectual assets of the nation’, the ‘globalise or perish agenda’ and the ‘narration of the national storyline’ to highlight the thematic convergence/divergence between the global and the national, this chapter reveals an appropriation, adaptation and translation of global policy within the discourses of this non-Western nation-state. It will be further argued that the juxtaposition between the global and national and the traditional and modern within the national discourses under consideration, in conjunction with the ‘in-between’ space constructed for the nation-state within global and national discourses, has unique implications for the storylines and subjectivities (re)presented as of ‘value’ for the individual Korean learner of English.

## THE GLOBAL/NATIONAL DISCOURSES OF THE KOREAN NATION-STATE

The power-full correlation between English competency, the acquisition of knowledge, and global economic and political ‘success’ within global discourse has strong implications for the education policy of the non-Western nation-state and the construction of both the ‘learner’, and specifically, the ‘learner of English’ within such policy. In responding to this “new orthodoxy” (Ball 1998:122), the discourses of the Korean nation-state broadly ‘cluster’ around four key themes: the ‘commodification of knowledge’, in particular knowledge of the English language; the ‘intellectual assets of the nation’; the ‘globalise or perish’ agenda, constructed as a need for individual and national openness; and ‘narrating the national storyline’.

### THE KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY

Knowledge, in particular the acquisition of globally competitive knowledge of value, is (re)presented within intergovernmental discourse as a panacea for Korea’s ‘less-than-developed’ global status. In positioning the attainment of knowledge as a foundation for social, economic and educational progress, such discourses provide an alluring storyline for the non-Western nation-state desiring global success – a storyline appropriated by the discourses of the government, business and the national media of Korea. While such convergence is seemingly indicative of policy homogeneity, reinforcing the position of the globalisation-as-homogenisation argument outlined in Chapter Three, this section will examine the (re)presentation of the ‘commodification of knowledge’ discourse within the national discourse of the ‘knowledge economy’ for evidence of hybridisation and translation. Of further interest to this analysis is the position constructed for the English language within such discourse, a positioning that elucidates the nexus between power-full discourses of

English-as-global traversing the Korean nation-state and those of the national/local context within which the English language is both foreign and familiar, welcomed and shunned<sup>64</sup>.

The Korean ‘knowledge revolution’ is constructed as an ongoing project. Launched after the financial crisis of 1997 and implemented through the Knowledge-Based Economy (KBE) Master Plan or Strategy Report in 1999/2000, the ‘knowledge revolution’ has progressed from a political buzzword to a basic tenet of policy reform across two political administrations (Woo 2005:6). Integral to the knowledge revolution and the success of related economic, social and educational reform, the Korean population as a collective is (re)presented within national discourse as pre-disposed to such reform, with a “passion for education” (*Hankyoreh* 21 October 2005), “K-potential” and a “will to learn” (Woo 2006:7) – reaffirming the intergovernmental assessment discussed in Chapter Five. By contrast, the Korean educational system, although also integral to such re-form, is constructed within national (and intergovernmental) discourse as inadequate, as failing to provide students with an “up-to-date and alive” (Choi 2006:5) (globally value-able?) education, and thus un-able to equip learners with the “dispositions and abilit(ies) that are of the highest quality by ... global standard(s)” (Kwak 2001:2). (Re)producing the dual emphasis upon – and the inherent tension between – economic progress and social ‘good’ within the intergovernmental ‘commodification of knowledge’ discourse, this educational ‘reconceptualisation’ (Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation, 2000) and re-visioning thus aims to,

... concentrate on raising the quality of education while breathing in a human touch, pursuing information-oriented education, as well as enhancing welfare and openness to improve the quality of education (MOEHRD 2005c:9).

It is proposed therefore that educational reforms, including “self-directed learning, life-long learning, information and communication technology education, *foreign language education*,

---

64 The discourses of English evident within the Korean context were reviewed in Chapter Two.

problem solving, [and] cooperative learning” (Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation 2000:online) be enacted. Such reforms, it must be noted, are largely founded upon international knowledge-based educational reforms, and appropriate the re-form process advocated by intergovernmental organisations. While viewed as global ‘best practice’, the adoption of alter-native educational ‘models’ emphasising individualised education and instruction potentially positions Korean education policy in opposition with the traditional Korean system of education – a system strongly reflective of “collectivistic perspectives on education”<sup>65</sup> (Im 1998; Kim, Lee & Lee 2005:8).

As the crux of the Korean “knowledge revolution” (Woo 2005:56; Jeon 2006:1) and the national transition to a “knowledge-based economy” within a broader “global knowledge economy” (Kim, G-J. 2004:1-6), knowledge is constructed within national discourse as “essential for creating value” (Jeon 2006:1) and for meeting the “new demands emerging in today’s knowledge and information society” (Choi 2006:12). Critically however, in delineating and defining those knowledges ‘required’ to enhance the future worth of both nation and national, the discourse of the ‘knowledge economy’ embodies disparity and divergence. The Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation (KICE) (2000:online) for example, refers to “life-oriented knowledge, meaning-oriented knowledge, future-oriented knowledge and human relationship-oriented knowledge”, while E-g. Kim (2003:3) proposes “information processing ability, communication ability and creativity” as critical knowledges for the future. S. Chung (2006:online) further emphasises the need to study “science and technology to build ... economies”, a view also supported by the Korean Educational Development Institute (Kim, E-g. 2003:online). While highlighting the varied social, economic and political interests engaged in the production of Korean education policy, this lack of consensus

---

65 In a survey of public perceptions of education, Im (1998:2) found that one-fifth of parents reported “hostile” feelings towards individualised modes of instruction within the Korean secondary education system, preferring a system based on ‘equity’ rather than ‘competition’.

further indicates the ambiguity of the ‘commodification of knowledge’ discourse appropriated by the Korean nation-state, an ambiguity that has enabled diverse readers to produce diverse meanings (Codd 1988:246).

As a ‘commodity’ of global worth, the broad purpose and role of global knowledges are clearly demarcated within intergovernmental discourse. Such specificity is further reflected within the Korean context, with the knowledge economy discourse referring to the need for knowledge to be “shared” (Planning and Coordination Division 2007:11); “disseminated” (Huh et al. 2005:15; Kim, E-g. 2003:2); “accumulated” (Choi 2006:3; Lee, B-H. 2006:1; Planning and Coordination Division 2007:11); “delivered” (Choi 2006:5; Kim, G-J. 2004:19); “used” (Choi 2006:9; Jeon 2006:3); “created” (Jeon 2006:1; Kim, E-g. 2003:2); and “exchanged” (Choi 2006:12). Despite this consensus between the discourses of the national and intergovernmental, there is a key absence within the national discourse surveyed – the necessity of *assimilating* and *adapting* global knowledge to local needs in order to create a new knowledge commodity with exchange value in the global marketplace (OECD 2000; World Bank 2000). While this may simply be the result of the scope of discourse sampled, such discursive silence may also provide insight into the power-full position of global knowledge within national discourse, a position that serves to locate the Korean national ‘Self’ outside of the global knowledge ‘centre’, or more specifically as a learner, rather than leader of global knowledge. Further indicative of the presumed ‘truth’ of this peripheral global status is the appropriation of alter-native models for educational reform within knowledge economy discourse, necessitating ongoing reference to the ‘knowledge holder’ or intergovernmental organisation, for information, evaluation and opinion (Bok 1998 cited in Park, J.S-Y. 2004:67; Roh 2006a). The Korean ‘Self’, as periphery-dweller, is also constructed within national discourse as separate to others positioned peripherally by virtue of its ‘ownership’ of distinct knowledge in the field of educational ICT, knowledge that is of global import, although not

sufficient to enable the transition to global ‘centre’: the “development of educational ICT has earned Korea [a] reputation as an e-Learning leader” (Choi 2006:3). Interestingly, this positioning within the ‘third space’ between knowledge-holders and knowledge-desirers reflects the third space constructed for Korea within global discourse.

#### THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AS ‘CRITICAL’ KNOWLEDGE

Binding with and drawing from the neo-liberal discourse and its connotations of success and global power, the colonial-celebratory discourse of English, outlined in Chapter Two, positions English language acquisition as a critical means of obtaining advantage in the highly competitive global economy. As discourses flowing across national borders and additionally (re)presented within the ‘commodification of knowledge’ discourse of the reviewed intergovernmental organisations, both the neo-liberal and colonial-celebratory discourses construct English proficiency as an essential precursor to foreign investment and global ‘success’, due to the economic ‘attractiveness’ of English speaking human resources and the modern and global skills and knowledges such ‘resources’ might access with communicative competence. Within the mutual construction of the neo-liberal and colonial-celebratory discourses therefore, the nation-state of speakers of languages *other* than English is positioned as ‘less than’, hindered in both the implementation of neo-liberal reforms, and the ability to compete with advantage in the global arena. In light of the emphasis upon the acquisition of English language ‘knowledge’ of within intergovernmental discourses speaking of and for Korea, and the exhortations of the neo-liberal and colonial-celebratory discourses, this section will explore the positioning of the English language within the national ‘knowledge economy’ discourse.

Thematically central to discussions of ‘required’ knowledge within official, business and media discourse of the Korean nation-state, the acquisition and mastery of the English

language is (re)presented as necessity, rather than choice. Various descriptions include “influential” (Jeon 2006:1); the “global standard” (Bok 1998 cited in Park, J.S-Y. 2004:66); “economically enticing” (Um 2000:1); “crucial” (Song 2000:1), a means of “survival” (Kim, Y.M. 2005:3), “the language of national management” (*Chosun Ilbo* 19 January 2000) and “indispensable” (Choi 2006:11), the English language is simultaneously constructed as a panacea for the ‘ills’ that drove the 1997/8 financial crisis (Song 2000); a tool for “conducting global communication” (Choi 2006; Chung, S. 2006; Jeon 2006:1); and the prerequisite to “compet(ing) in the global market” with influence (Park, C-Y. 2000:1). Korean discourse thus advises that: “English is crucial for economic growth and competitiveness in an increasingly globalised world” (Song 2000:1); with “increasing global competition [there is a] need for ... English” (Kim, G-J. 2004:12); and “English is indisputably a major tool for promoting international competitiveness” (Jeon 2006:1). In this way, English language ability is constructed within national discourse<sup>66</sup> – in line with the colonial-celebratory discourse discussed previously – as a ‘gatekeeper’ to the “global knowledge network” of ‘quality information’ (Jeon 2006:3), “information on the Internet” (Bok 1998 cited in Park, J.S-Y. 2004:66), “scientific knowledge” and “intellectual journals” (Jeon, 2006:1); and “international commerce” (Chung, S. 2006:online). As S. Chung (2006:online) notes:

... English is the language of international business and communication. Beyond the realm of commerce, it’s also a tool with which nations regulate their relations with other countries, study science and technology to build their economies, and shape social and political institutions based on global standards.

---

66 J.S-Y. Park (2004:76), in an analysis of the (re)presentations of the English language and English competency within a corpus of texts, scripts and interactions in Korean language, rendered ‘visible’ the discourse of “necessitation”, a discourse attributing the “necessity of English” to the vagaries of existing within a “globally interconnected world” whereby English is constructed as the “basic mode of communication”. The necessitation discourse seemingly binds with the broad discourse of ‘the knowledge economy’ explored in this current analysis.

The Korean population's relative lack of English proficiency<sup>67</sup> is therefore constructed as a critical factor in the nation-state's position outside of the 'global inner circle'; a group variously belonging to the "American or European" (Park, C-Y. 2000:1), the OECD Committee or advanced countries with an "understanding of global economics" (Kim, Y-j. 2000:online). Thus, as S. Chung (2006:online) states, "one must accept that today, global standards are those set by the English-speaking world". In this way, Korean discourse both appropriates and adopts the binary classification of 'us' and 'Other' inherent to intergovernmental discourse, positioning the national 'Self' as a peripheral collective of "bad speakers of English" (Park, J.S-Y. 2004:143). The inherent presumption here, however, is that national English proficiency, rather than native speaking ability, equates with global inner circle 'membership'. This construction is highly problematic in its failure to acknowledge the inherently hierarchical and economic, rather than linguistic, nature of such global binaries.

The encounter between the 'global', embodied in this instance by the intergovernmental 'commodification of knowledge' discourse with its neo-liberal and colonial-celebratory overtones, and the national (local) discourses of the Korean context, has therefore resulted in a national discourse that un-critically (re)produces that of the intergovernmental in its construction of an economy based upon the production and exchange of 'knowledge' as necessity, its advocacy of educational reform and its ambiguity regarding what knowledge is 'required' knowledge. Critically, however, national discourse appropriates the assumption that knowledge in general and of English in particular, is critical to obtaining advantage in a 'highly competitive' global economy and transitioning from the 'margins' to the global 'centre'. Thus national discourse, appropriates and (re)produces the neo-liberal construction

---

<sup>67</sup> The Samsung Economic Research Institute estimates that in 2005, Koreans spent a total of 14.3 trillion Won (approximately \$16 billion AUD) annually on English language tuition and an additional 700 billion Won (approximately \$800 million AUD) on assessing English proficiency (Jeon 2006:2). Despite this investment, Koreans were ranked as the "worst communicators in English" in a survey of 12 Asian countries (Jeon 2006:3).

of the globalising world as a ‘quasi-arena’ within which only the ‘economically fittest’ – or developed nation – can survive. An in-ability to communicate in English is therefore equated within the national knowledge economy discourse as an inability to create, access or exchange knowledge of global value, a situation of critical importance in a globalising context where a ‘knowledge economy’ is constructed as a crucial means of acquiring the “competitive strength required in today’s global economy” (Curriculum Policy Division 2007:1). The non-English speaker is constructed by this discourse as a negation or less than, unable to obtain critical knowledge required for global and national participation, and fundamentally in contravention of ‘responsibilities’ as a Korean national. Due therefore to compliance with the discourse of neo-liberalism, the colonial-celebratory discourse, and the discourse of globalisation – discourses arising from intergovernmental organisations and the ‘West’ – a strong binary is constructed between English haves and English have-nots within the Korean national context, with implications for both individual and national success – and failure.

## THE INTELLECTUAL ASSETS OF THE NATION

Intergovernmental discourse (re)presented in Chapter Five speaks of and for the ‘social actor’ as an individual learner existing in relation to knowledge and the education system, and in broad terms, as an element of the ‘human resources’ collective. By contrast, Korean discourse, perhaps reflecting the “collectivistic perspectives on education” of traditional Korean culture (Kim, Lee & Lee 2005:8), predominantly locates the social actor as a ‘member’ of various collectives, including that of “human resources” (Kim, E-g. 2001:1; Kim, Y.C. (n.d.); MOEHRD 2005a:1; Planning and Coordination Division 2007:6; Policy Supervision Division 2006:1), “social assets” (Kim, E-g. 2001:30, 2003:2), “citizens” (Kwak 2001:4; Ministry of Education 1996:3; Policy Supervision Division 2006:1); “people” (Ministry of Education 1996:3) or “human beings” (Ministry of Education 1996:3). In lieu of the compliance and mimicry identified above, this section will explore the construction of one

such collective – the ‘human resource’ – within Korean national discourse, and the concomitance or contradiction between this construction and the global ‘human resources’ of the intergovernmental organisation.

Concomitant with the discourse of the knowledge economy in Korean national policy discourse is the discourse of the ‘human resource’ or ‘human resource development’. Framed as an economic and social imperative essential for “future survival and prosperity” (Kim, E-g. 2003:1), the discourse of the ‘human resource’ positions the “dispositions and ability”, “quality” (Kwak 2001:1) and “intellectual assets” (Ministry of Education 1996:67) of social actors as the “core strategy for national development” (MOEHRD, 2007:online), and thus integral to the ‘global position’, and success or failure<sup>68</sup>, of the nation-state:

For the Koreans to change its [sic] country as a more competitive player in the global arena, then it must challenge the common people to take up [the] mission of bringing Korea [to] the helm of the 21st Century (Korean Culture and Information Service 2007:online).

The privileged and consensual nature of the discourse of the ‘human resource’ within national consciousness is reinforced from the top down, as evidenced by former President Roh Moo-Hyun’s (2007a:online) Lunar New Year directive for all citizens to “direct ... our strengths into doing without delay what needs to be done day-by-day, [so] even greater success will dawn on this nation”. In its edict to ‘act’, this statement aligns both government and citizen in collaborative and cooperative action with an urgent call to the national ‘we’. Of further interest is the seemingly self-evident nature of the required action/s and the types of success sought within the directive, indicating the presumed ‘truth’ of the human resource

---

68 This inherent and mutual ‘dependency’ of the human resource and the nation-state is further (re)produced within national discourse, in the consistent collocation of the terms human resource or citizen with references to national development, survival and prosperity.

discourse within the Korean context – and the broad accepted-ness within the nation-state of its neo-liberal underpinnings.

As a collective whose quality, or lack thereof, can generate “economic downfall and loss of international competition” (Kwak 2001:4) or the “rise of the nation” (Ministry of Education 1996:online), it is thus incumbent upon the national ‘we’ – both government and citizens – to ensure human resources are “on a par with [the] global standard” (Kwak 2001:2) and “top notch” (Planning and Coordination Division 2007:6). In further clarifying and defining this notion of quality, Korean policy discourse refers to the need for: “creative” (Kim, E-g. 2001:3; Kim, Lee & Lee 2005:13; Kwak 2001:4; Ministry of Education 1996:24, MOEHRD 2005a:1, 2005b:1); “intelligent”, “industrious”, “diligent”, “self-reliant” and “healthy” (Ministry of Education 1996:6-24) human resources; “not passive receivers of education” (Kwak 2001:6), but rather “autonomous”, “self-driven” (MOEHRD 2005a:1, 2005b:1) and “competitive” (Kim, E-g. 2003:2). Juxtaposing this highly neo-liberal lexicon – or checklist for an “ideologically compliant but technically skilled workforce” (Hill 2003:online) – is a concurrent emphasis within policy discourse upon the development of values promoting social cohesiveness and ethical behaviour within national education, shaping a “civic character” who is “responsible” (Kwak 2001:4), “cooperative”, “open-minded” and “morally sound”, with a “coordinated communal spirit” (Ministry of Education 1996:6-24). While the promotion of ‘social cohesion’ is central to the educational reform agenda of intergovernmental organisations, such discourse paradoxically perceives such ‘unity’ as the corollary of neo-liberal educational reform, rather than necessitating its own suite of reforms. By contrast, the Korean (re)presentation of such re-forms positions moral and academic education as equally critical and valuable, reflecting the Confucian principle of the ‘ideal state’ inculcated through “moral education and a social goodness” (Robertson 2002:2), and rejecting the subordination of the “intrinsic value of education ... to its extrinsic value for the

economy” (Ball 1998 cited in Mulderrig 2003:online). Thus, the Korean ‘human resource’ discourse, while appropriating global discourses in its construction, (re)writes or amends the global, to reflect and adapt to the desire of the national, in the process constructing a divided global/national, Western/non-Western storyline for those positioned as ‘human resource’ within the Korean context. This duality is further reflected in E-g. Kim’s (2001:4) summary of the Korean human resource discourse, stating that,

‘Human resources’ [as] conceptualised by the Korean government refers to the abilities and characteristics of every citizen, which are valuable to the improvement of his/her quality of life and which lead to social and national development, including new knowledge and skills, computer skills, not to mention moral standards.

The position of the ‘human resource’ within Korean discourse therefore juxtaposes the right of citizenship, with the responsibility of acquiring knowledge and skills; the tradition of moral education, with the modern and the technological; and the individual reward with the national. While this discourse has a particularly contemporary flavour, resonating with the intergovernmental emphasis upon consumption among social actors, the emphasis upon national ‘good’ and morality seemingly reproduces the ancient Confucian discourse of “the learning” (Lee 2002 quoted in Robertson 2002:2), a concept unifying virtue and education. Within Confucian thought therefore, national elevation to an ‘ideal state’ is accomplished through ethical education, social goodness and the “tool of constant learning” for and by citizens (Robertson 2002:2). In its current incarnation, however, as the Korean discourse of the ‘human resource’, the interdependency between the nation-state in its desire to be ‘ideal’ and the citizen as the ‘human resource’ is encapsulated in the national vision that “by securing a pool of creative human resources at the national level, the nation should equip itself with the potential to be a leader in world trends in material and mental aspects” (Kim, E-g. 2001:6). This use of the descriptor ‘creative’ – and the ongoing use of a variety of near-synonyms for the terms diligence and autonomy – within ‘human resource’ discourse is also

of interest, resonating with the intergovernmental discourse of lifelong learning and its uncritical (re)presentation of the 'inadequacies' of the Korean learner. Further, the reiteration of such characteristics may additionally highlight the struggle between the 'dispositions' deemed critical for the global/national 'citizen', a Korean cultural and social educational tradition that promotes formality, obedience, and acceptance of knowledge (Han 2005:204), decision-making based upon external determinants, rather than inner determination (Han 2005:204), and the flexible, adaptable, student-centred, creative (though not critical) education system conceptualised by the intergovernmental organisation.

In revealing the layers of imagery and utterance inherent to the discourse of the 'human resource' as articulated within the Korean context, the previous discussion has uncovered a synchronicity between the traditional Confucian conception of continuous learning for moral and national 'good', and the thoroughly modern and global discourse of lifelong learning for individual and national development. Thus, despite Foucault's (1972:23) contention that 'tradition' creates a "background of permanence" against which the 'original' and the 'current' can be positioned and contrasted, the local 'tradition' of moral education has shaped, to some extent, the modern Korean interpretation of the lifelong learning discourse and the global construction of the 'human resource'. Further, the resonance of the Korean 'moral' tradition with discourses of national uniqueness and identity, pride and culture imparts a moral and social imperative for the development of the 'human resource'. While such results are indicative of the globalised and border-crossing flows of global education discourse as characterised by Bauman (1998, 2006), there is also evidence within the Korean context of adaptation or amendment of such flows within the discourse of the 'human resource', adaptations that bind the global and modern with the national/local and traditional.

## THE GLOBALISE OR PERISH! AGENDA

In (re)presenting the modern, global context of the Korean nation-state, national policy discourse produces an account of a world in which space is compressed: “the world [is] shrinking to a global village and nations [are] brought closer to one another” (Ministry of Education 1996:59)<sup>69</sup>. Although increasingly ‘familiar’, the global context is also constructed as an ‘infinitely’ competitive (and risky) place. China and Japan pose an ongoing ‘threat’ to Korea’s economic security (Roh 2006a; Chung, M-S. 2006:online). Globalisation is “almost analogous to Westernisation, Anglo-Americanisation, or flat out, Americanisation” (Yang 2006:2). Trade relations with the U.S. market – the “largest and best market” – are paramount (Roh 2006a:online). The national cost of a failure to adjust and succeed however is high: “our country has to enhance her competitiveness in order to preserve her survival as an independent community in the open, internationalised world” (Kwak 2001:35). Within such a context, the Korean nation-state, as S.S. Kim (2000a:247) states, is ‘forced’ to embrace “constant adaptation to the logic of globalisation dynamics and quickening economic, cultural and social product cycles”. This section will explore the broad ‘globalise or perish’ agenda evident within Korean discourse, and the global location constructed for the Korean nation-state by this agenda. Of further interest, is the degree to which the imperatives of the intergovernmental discourse of ‘globalise or perish’ are appropriated and deployed to reinforce the urgency and inevitability of the internationalisation project within national discourse.

Reflecting the intergovernmental exhortation to ‘globalise or perish’, the Korean market-opening reform project, described as an economic, social and political imperative within

---

<sup>69</sup> The contraction and familiarity of the global context and its increasing incursion into the Korean context is evidenced by the broad use of the word ‘global’ as a descriptor within Korean discourse: “global needs of our youth” (Choi 2006:3); “global standards” (Bok 1998 cited in Park, J.S-Y. 2004:66; Chang 2000:1; Choi 2006:3; Chung, S. 2006:online; Kwak 2001:1); “global communication”, “global talent pool”, “global knowledge network” (Jeon 2006:1-4); “global etiquette” (Subjedi 2007:2); “global pride”, “global education” (Yang 2006:2); and “global citizens” (Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation n.d.).

national discourse, presents the ‘abstract challenge’ of globalisation (Mulderrig 2003:online) as a national test, imbued with notions of hope, pride and potential. Although (re)presented as an innate characteristic of the modern global context, globalisation is both a process and an end-result (Mulderrig 2003); a set of economic, social and political practices emerging from the global neo-liberal agenda that demands deregulation for international participation (Bonai 2003:163), and conversion to the “free trade faith” (Bourdieu 1998:online). It is therefore a discourse that simultaneously cajoles and justifies (Mulderrig 2003:online). Tightly bound with discourses of human resource development, lifelong learning, the knowledge economy and English-as-global language, the neo-liberal master narrative, and the globalisation ‘turn’, are spoken with the global ‘might’ of the West, proffering narrative ‘owners’ and ‘users’ global status.

While initially constructed as a reform imposed upon Korea by the conditionalities of IMF lending (Rhee, K.R. 1997), the market solution to economic vulnerability – the removal of regulatory barriers to trade and investment, or internationalisation (Hill 2003) – has been (re)presented within modern Korean discourse as the central economic and social imperative of all nations within an era of globalisation (Song 2000) and “times of internationalisation and open markets” (*Hankyoreh* 21 October 2005:online), indicating the pervasiveness of the neo-liberal ‘truth’ within this non-Western nation-state. Interestingly however, a distinction is made within such discourse between the obligatory and externally controlled ‘openings’ experienced by nation-state and national during colonisation<sup>70</sup>, and the empowered modern ‘choice’ of the nation-state to (re)open. Kim (1994 quoted in Lee, C-J. 2000:175), for example, asserts that:

---

<sup>70</sup> The reference to colonisation refers to the occupation of Korea by Japan. It is important to note however that American aid and ‘involvement’ in the political and economic affairs of the Korean nation-state, as discussed in Chapter One, necessitated a suite of neo-liberal reforms designed to ‘open’ Korea to foreign trade and investment. Shorrock (1986:1207-1210) refers to the rise of “anti-American rhetoric and actions” within the Korean nation-state in response to perceptions of American neo-colonial dominance.

A century ago we failed to internationalise on our own initiative and were thus forced by others to open up our own country ... Instead of deploring the fact that our doors are unlocking, we should ourselves throw open the doors and march out into the wide world.

Roh (2006b) further adds,

Market opening is our survival strategy ... In the past, there was much opposition and concern every time we opened doors. However, it always proved to be another new opportunity for us.

In light of the desire-able/neo-liberal storyline of the success-full nation-state advocated by global discourses, particularly those of the intergovernmental organisation, the perception of 'choice' in resolving to internationalise is seemingly illusory, requiring "the only possible action" in a globalised world, rather than a "chosen line of action" (Davies 2000:60).

The globally 'accepted' and consensual nature of the internationalisation process and its position as a national pre-requisite for success in a globally competitive environment is reinforced by the (re)presentation of market reforms as: an "irresistible trend", an "opportunity to advance our economy" (Roh 2006a:online); and a catalyst for "deeper integration", collaboration and connection among global citizens (Yang, 2006:2). This modern reform imperative, national discourse affirms, 'requires' a second opening and a more active 'welcoming' of market forces, rather than the reluctant and half-hearted nature of previous attempts (Chang 2000; Roh 2007b). As former President Roh Moo-hyun (2005:online) maintains,

What should be opened up should be opened, and regulations that should be eased should be drastically deregulated ... However, the industrial and economic characteristics of education ... should be developed at the same time.

The pervasiveness of this project is further indicated in E-g. Kim's (2001:10) conclusion that Korean human resource development policy must also move beyond "narrow and closed

perspectives” towards more open, wide-reaching policy to facilitate the creation of human resources with the skills and knowledge necessary to entice “core units of the leading multinational companies” (Jeon 2006:3), or global economic flows, to the Korean market. Thus, English competency, in conjunction with an ‘open’ national market, is (re)presented as the critical prerequisite for global economic success, or global failure: “if Korea successfully creates an English-friendly business environment, it can qualify as a hub for global business” (Jeon 2006:6). The ‘self-evident’ nature of this discourse is further (re)produced in the assertion that “everyone recognises the need to better English proficiency in these times of internationalisation and open markets” (*Hankyoreh* 21 October 2005). This ‘binding’ of the discourse of the global market with that of the English language within the discourses of this non-Western nation-state highlights the implicit global/national strength of this discursive linkage, and the ease with which a perception of non-compliance with the ‘tenets’ of the hegemonic discursive coupling is viewed as a justification for the periphery status of the nation-state within the global economy.

In (re)presenting the various ‘actors’ of the global context, national discourse establishes a ‘shifting’ global position for the Korean nation-state, with the national ‘Self’ positioned as either learner or leader, in relation to a Western or non-Western ‘Other’. The globally privileged ‘Other’ – the advanced/developed and ‘Western’ nation positioned at the ‘centre’ of global economics and global knowledge (Bok 1998 cited in Park, J.S-Y. 2004:66) – is (re)presented as internationalised and open, with “dynamic technology and capability” (Korean Culture and Information Service 2007), world leading responses to global challenges (Yu 1998), and continuous growth and social integration (MOEHRD 2005a). As a privileged image within Korean discourse, this desire-able ‘Other’ is both a potent symbol of ‘success’ and a goal or vision for the future; a collective whose combined characteristics, imbued with the power and privilege of the neo-liberal construction of economic development, shape

social and economic agendas. In situating the Korean nation-state in relation to this powerful 'Other', national discourse, in line with the intergovernmental discourse outlined in Chapter Five, positions Korea as not-yet developed, outside of and not belonging to the 'centre', learning from, not leading. Such membership is however constructed as inevitable, with the nation working to "leap into the ranks of the advanced nations of the world" (Roh 2006a:online); "poised to join the advanced countries" with an adjustment to "thinking and behaviour" (Roh 2005:online); and "taking off as one of the world's first rate countries by 2020" (KBS Global News 2006:online). The Korean nation-state is not yet, however, the desired 'Other'.

Contrasting this construction of privilege and power within Korean discourse is an-'Other' – the developing/less developed country. Inclusive of nations trying to "open up in earnest" (Kim, Y.S. 1996:1), this collective is constructed as "vulnerable" (Kim, E-g. 2001:2) and dependent (Bok 1998 cited in Park, J.S-Y. 2004:66), including countries that "no one envies" such as the Philippines, India and Pakistan (*Hankyoreh* 21 October 2005). This (particularly Asian) 'Other' therefore, is constructed in colonial terms (Said 1978); 'backward' as opposed to progressive and modern; 'needy' and in-need; 'inferior' to, rather than superior than. While national discourse acknowledges the nation's previous positioning within this collective: "Korea is no longer a developing nation" (Roh 2007b:online); modern Korea is constructed, as affirmed by global discourse, as a better-than developing country, a "respected nation" (Korean Culture and Information Service 2006:online) with the ability and willingness to "share its accumulated educational experiences and know-how with developing economies" (Lee, B-H. 2006:online). Within this discourse therefore, Korea's 'transformation' from poverty to the "world's tenth largest economy" (Lee, B-H. 2006:online), is "a model for the developing countries around the world" (Roh 2006a:online). Thus, the national 'Self's' position in the 'third-space' of not-yet developed, yet better-than developing, is constructed

within discourse as a unique position symbolising its own power-full status as a “bridge between advanced and developing countries” (Kim, Y.S. 1996:online), as ‘holder’ of valuable knowledge of developmental and global worth and the embodiment of the ‘power’ of the neo-liberal reform process – simultaneously ‘Other’ to the centre and periphery.

The discourse of the Korean nation-state, therefore, appropriates both the globalising ‘agenda’ of the intergovernmental organisation, and the global position constructed for Korea within such discourse. In (re)presenting intergovernmental discourse however, Korean policy discourse speaks of a world space in which the ‘opening’ up of the nation-state to global forces is inevitable – a globally accepted consequence of belonging to the ‘global village’ – indicating the ease with which the globalising and neo-liberal imperatives of the global organisation are appropriated to justify national transition and transformation. Addressing both intergovernmental concerns about the commitment of the nation-state to internationalisation and a local predilection toward seclusion and nationalism, national discourse further (re)presents the ‘globalise or perish’ agenda as a national choice rather than imperative, distinguishing the modern ‘opening’ from those of the nation-state’s colonial history and invoking local nationalist support for change. Contradicting this notion of ‘agency’ and national ‘free will’ within national discourse is the implicit ‘threat’ to both nation and national of non-compliance with this global injunction<sup>71</sup>. Although national discourse (re)frames the globalising discourse of the intergovernmental organisation within a national(ist) storyline, the global agenda of such organisations, an agenda strongly bound with the neo-liberal storyline of success, is appropriated, with little adaptation, by this non-Western nation-state.

---

71 Interestingly, the conjunction of both national opportunity and threat within the ‘globalise or perish’ discourse resonates with the ‘mobilisation’ of the nation against communism during the 1960’s (Cho Han 2000:59).

## NARRATING THE NATIONAL STORYLINE – PAST AND FUTURE

Threading through each of the ‘global’ themes within the national discourse of the Korean context is a narration of national identity (Hall 1996 cited in Wodak et al. 1999:23); a sub-text alluding to an indomitable national spirit, and storylines of the past, present and future. Such narration weaves the ‘finite boundaries’ of the national imaginary (Anderson 1991), distinguishing ‘us’ from ‘Other’ and forming an ‘imagined community’ (Anderson 1991) or a “community of sentiment” based upon shared imaginings and emotions (Appadurai 1996:8). This construction of ‘home’ or ‘homeland’ via the collective imagination (Appadurai 1991, 1996) requires both a re-memory and a re-membering (Rhee, J-e. 2006:597) simultaneously positioning those it speaks of by defining and including, or disregarding and excluding (Popkewitz 2000). Such a construction relies, however, upon five discursive strategies<sup>72</sup>, namely a narration of common and connected ‘destiny’; an “emphasis on origins, continuity, tradition and timelessness”; a shaping of the misunderstanding and uncertainty of history into a coherent tradition; a narration of the national ‘origins’ or foundations; and, the “fictitious idea of a pure, original people” (Hall 1996 cited in Wodak et al. 1999:23-24). While Hall’s work is of interest to this discussion, this section also draws upon the classification developed by Kolakowski (1995 cited in Wodak et al. 1999:25-26) to explore the national ‘narrative’ that permeates the discourse under consideration.

With its history of seclusion and isolation, repeated invasion, colonialism and neo-colonialism, the “national spirit” (Kolakowski 1995 quoted in Wodak et al. 1999:25) of Korea is imbued with themes of struggle and resistance, unity and collective mobilisation (Cho Han 2000). Capturing this spirit is the notion of “*kukmin* or member of the nation”, a concept associated with “passionately defensive nationalism”, group-centredness, and exhortations of national sentiment (Cho Han 2000:51-60). Historically bound with the concept of *segyehwa*, or

---

<sup>72</sup> Wodak et al. (1999:25) note that this list is, as stated by Hall, in no way exhaustive.

globalisation (Shin 2003:11), such passionate patriotism or an awareness and understanding of ‘Self’ as a national citizen embedded within a national tradition and culture is constructed as the foundation of global citizenship: “Only when the national identity is maintained and intrinsic national spirit upheld will Koreans be able to successfully globalise” (Kim 1996 quoted in Shin 2003:11). In this way, globalisation, or global citizenship, is one element of a nationalist and Korean-centric storyline within this national context (Shin 2003), echoing the liberalist discursive assumption of global culture/language for global citizenship, and local culture/language for local citizenship. Paradoxically, such patriotism also provides impetus to discourses positioning the economic and linguistic interests of the global as incongruent with and detrimental to the national<sup>73</sup>.

The ‘national spirit’ of *kukmin* is primarily deployed within modern national discourse to incite collective mobilisation and action toward the economic and educational goals of a lifelong learning society, human resource development and a knowledge economy: “The lofty spirit and noble sense of grand unity is throbbing in our heart ... Let us rally our collective strength and wisdom. Let us fulfil our duties with a sense of responsibility” (Roh 2007c:online). With global ‘success’ constructed within such discourses as dependent upon the degree to which citizens ‘buy-into’ the reform project, the framing of such reforms as objects of national pride and potential highlights the strength of an invocation of ‘national spirit’ or *kukmin* within this context. Woo (2006:7) for example, refers to the “huge dynamic energy and K-potential of Korean people”, and the nation’s “huge learning potential” in his discussion of the ‘Knowledge Revolution’; while the Korean Culture and Information Service (2007:online) refers to the international assessment that gave “high credits to Korea’s potential”. In addition, former President Roh Moo-hyun, seemingly alluding to an inherent

---

73 J.S-Y. Park (2004:35) refers to one such discourse in his discussion of the discourse of externalisation, a discourse prevalent within Korean popular culture that “views English as a language in opposition to Korean, incongruent with a Korean identity”

communal tendency towards self-deprecation<sup>74</sup> and under-estimation, encourages Koreans or the collective ‘we’ to “have confidence in our own potential” (2005, 2006b, 2007b:online):

When viewed globally, few countries have a brighter future than Korea. The rest of the world admires us. We seem to be the only people who look at our own future pessimistically. This may be due to our high achievement motivation, and there is no doubt that this will serve as a catalyst for further progress. It is not desirable to underestimate our own achievements. Let us continue to march toward an advanced Korea with positive thinking and confidence (Roh 2005:online).

Building upon the nationalisation/globalisation dichotomy constructed during Korea’s initial drive towards ‘internationalisation, the global implications of this national ‘potential’ are also emphasised: “The potential of the Republic and the Korean people is expanding to the international arena” (Roh, 2006a:online). Critical to this expansion and the (re)positioning of Korean culture and tradition as a ‘commodity’ both accessible and ‘appealing’ within the global arena (Bok 1998 cited in Park, J.S-Y. 2004:68) is the English language – and national English proficiency. Jeon (2006:4), for example, maintains that “if Korea’s cultural productions were produced in English ... or were accompanied by superb English translation their global appeal would certainly increase”. The liberalist construction of the English language as a global language for global purpose is therefore strongly bound with the narration of the national ‘storyline’ within this context – a construction positioning the English language as both saviour and purveyor.

In describing the discursive ‘threads’ of the narration of national identity, Hall (1996 quoted in Wodak et al. 1999:24) refers to the importance of a historical perspective – or “origins ... tradition, and timelessness” and a notion of “pure, original people” – in creating a national storyline that is unbroken and enduring. Assertions of historical ‘purity’ and the uniqueness

---

74 J.S-Y. Park (2004) explores this self-deprecation discourse (Chapter Two) in relation to the English language, a discourse that views Koreans as “lacking sufficient competence to use English meaningfully, despite the abundance of English education they receive”.

of the Korean population provide a discursive framing for many of the national discourses under consideration. Song (2000:3), for example, asserts that Korean ‘national pride’ is “shaped by centuries of invasions and the memory of colonisation by Japan”. In addition, Yang (2006:1) refers to the historical loss of “national statehood” after Japanese colonisation in his discussion of globalisation and education, while Roh (2006a) alludes to the “historical memory” (Kolakowski 1995 quoted in Wodak et al. 1999:25) of collective anguish and prevailing over adversity<sup>75</sup>. Bhabha (1994:55) however, problematises such assertions, maintaining that “all cultural statements and systems are constructed in [a] contradictory and ambivalent space of enunciation”. Thus, the contention that the Korean ‘Self’ is culturally ‘pure’ is fundamentally flawed and essentialist, involving a (re)presentation of an inherently hybrid (Bhabha, 1994) national storyline, that (mis)represents a “proper sense of historicity” (Foucault 1977 cited in Bhatnagar 1986:5) for political and ideological purposes.

Nonetheless, the Korean education system, as a system strongly bound by its historical and cultural foundations (Ministry of Education 1996), draws upon this ‘founding spirit’ in its ‘modern’ national/global educational discourse, and construction of the ‘ideal’ Korean as an educated person:

The objectives of Korea’s education are, under the ideal of *hongik-ingan* (... the founding spirit of the first kingdom in Korean history), to assist all people in perfecting their individual character, to develop the ability to achieve an independent life and acquire the qualifications of democratic citizens, and to be able to participate in the building of a democratic state and promoting the prosperity of all humans (Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation, n.d.:online).

The pervasiveness of the emphasis upon ‘national before global’ within the national(ist) storyline is further evident within the educational goals of the national curriculum for students at each stage of schooling. Elementary students, for example, are required to

---

75 A broad outline of the historic storyline of the Korean nation-state was provided in Chapter One.

“develop attitudes for the understanding and appreciation of tradition and culture” (Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation, n.d.:online.). By contrast, middle school students must “foster an attitude to take pride in and develop tradition and culture, while high school students are “encourage(d) ... to work to develop our traditions and culture in a way appropriate for the global setting”<sup>76</sup> (Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation, n.d.:online). In this way, it is not until high school that educational thinking, particularly in the area of moral/civics/cultural education, moves from ‘introversion’ and cultural transmission, to a more ‘global’ perspective. Thus, development, within the Korean conceptualisation, is seemingly a blend of the global and the national, the modern and the traditional – a potentially ambivalent positioning for the non-Western nation-state, and learner.

Despite the discursive and ideological assumption that nationalism and globalisation can co-exist harmoniously within the nationalist storyline of the Korean context, the reality Kim (1996 quoted in Shin 2003:6) explains, is a “Korea [that] remains mired in the cocoon of exclusive cultural nationalism, act(ing) as a powerful and persistent constraint on the *segyehwa* drive”. Such exclusive ‘nationalism’ is also constructed within national discourse, and intergovernmental discourse, as a liability, a hurdle to a reality of internationalisation or ‘true’ market opening and national English language competency. Song (2000:3), for example, states that “one significant barrier threatens to stymie English’s advance in Korea: a fierce national pride”. Similarly Chang (2000:1) believes that the “un-open, un-globalised mindset of Korean people” invoked by *kukmin* is the “single most important deterrent to Korean advancement”. While not apparent within the discourse under consideration, several authors also refer to a persistent belief that the emphasis upon English acquisition and the ‘opening

---

76 This cultural ‘balance’ is further illustrated by Hurt’s (2006b:5) reference to an illustration in a Korean moral education textbook of the scales of “the construction of a developed society”, balancing “our traditional morals” or Korean morals, with “Western ethics”.

up' of the Korean market is a threat to "native language", culture and values (Bok 1998 cited in Park, J.S-Y. 2004:67; Song 2000; Subedi 2007:2), echoing the ecology-of-language framework outlined in Chapter Two.

Thus, while this analysis of national discourse has 'uncovered' evidence of the appropriation of intergovernmental discourse, particularly within the discourses of the 'knowledge economy' and the 'globalise or perish' agenda, and adaptation/translation within the 'intellectual assets of the nation' discourse, such discourses are also inscribed by a 'narration of the national storyline'. This narration alternates between domination/colonisation and collective adversity, and liberation, perseverance and strength; a plot whose totality has irrevocably shaped a proud and strong national spirit that unites and binds those it speaks of and for. While historically the national storyline has been primarily self-contained and introspective, the more 'modern' storyline of the nation has had to adjust to the 'plot twists' introduced by power-full global actors. These twists, and the new, more global setting for this national 'narration' has compelled the (re)writing or (re)vision of the 'pure' national 'self', as distinct from the North Korean 'Other', and the introduction of concepts of 'advanced', 'developed' and globalisation (*seggyehwa*) into the imagery of a global/national character. Seemingly assisting this transition to global nationhood is the English language, bound to each of the discourses under consideration and positioned as central to global success – on both global and national terms. The centrality of English to such discourses is further evidence of the power-full positioning of the English language within this non-Western nation-state.

#### THE GLOBAL VERSUS KOREAN CONSTRUCTION OF THE ENGLISH SPEAKER

While the above analysis examined the various ways in which the English language is constructed within national discourse, this section explores the ways in which the speaker of

English is constructed, and the types of storylines and subjectivities available to English speakers within such discourses.

The global position 'speaker of English' is constructed as one of privilege and power, domination and decisiveness, an agentic<sup>77</sup> position in which access to global knowledge, global wealth, and global choices ensures individual and national success. Flowing across Korean physical, social and cultural borders entwined with globally power-full discourses, this 'positioning' has imbued the Korean speaker of English with national status and power within local contexts, "acknowledg(ing) the global hegemony of English and subordinat(ing) the Korean speaker to that hegemony" (Park, J.S-Y. 2003:online). The national storyline for the Korean English speaker is therefore constructed as one of "power and prestige" (Kim, J. 2002:27), shaped by "class mobility (or maintenance) and cosmopolitan strivings" (Park, S.J. & Abelman 2004:647); a story whose central 'character' experiences stress and a sense of urgency in learning English to "gain an upper hand in getting jobs ... being promoted" (Kim, Y.M. 2005:online) and to "enter college" (Lee, D. 2006:14). The power-full distinction made between English haves and English have-nots within the Korean context, despite the lack of official status of the English language is evident in Kim's (2000 quoted in Park, J.S-Y. 2004:91) observation that:

The problem is that this need is exaggerated to the extent that English is forced upon those who do not necessarily need it and people are intimidated into feeling that they will not get jobs and fall behind if they don't learn English.

This discursive collocation of cultural dimensions, in particular the ownership of foreign cultural 'symbols' such as English language competency, with economic factors has produced strong structural and material effects within this non-Western context. Lim and Jang

---

<sup>77</sup> Davies (1990:344) defines agentic as a "contingent element, depending upon the particular discursive practices in use and the positioning of the person in those practices".

(2006:454), for example, refer to the increasing disparity between the “trans-national homogeneity” of the middle and high classes, and the im-mobility of ‘Others’ within contemporary Korea. The national/local status of such symbols, particularly those obtained via trans-national education, is further emphasised by J-e. Rhee (2006:597) in a narration of her own ‘desire’:

My leaving home to be schooled in the US was already anticipated in Macaulay’s prophesy: ‘one taste / Of Western wisdom surpasses / All the books of the East’ (Seth 1994 cited in Gandhi 1998:13). I gladly left home to learn how I could ... be defined ... by the omnipresent speaking, writing and discoursing language of the West.

Such national constructions however (re)present the dichotomies established by colonialism (Pennycook 1998) discussed within Chapter Two – dichotomies (re)produced within the colonial-celebratory discourse of English – indicating the broad appeal of global discourses promoting global/national mobility, and the subsequent appropriation of globally established hierarchies with national determiners of socio-economic status within this non-Western context.

While the storyline for the Korean English speaker appears to end with individual prestige and fulfilment of collective responsibilities, global/national citizenship and global ‘agency’, the capacity of the Korean speaker of English to communicate fluently and appropriately with ‘foreigners’ is constructed as problematic within national discourse: “Korean government employees have limited English speaking ability and lack experience in free discussions” (Kim, Y-j. 2000:online). Such ‘limitations’ further occur in spite of increasing public and private investment in English education: “74.2% of [Koreans] polled said that [they] had difficulty communicating in English”<sup>78</sup> (Jeon 2006:3). This ideology of “self-deprecation”, J.S-Y. Park (2004:86) states, is broadly due to a general Korean “failure to

---

<sup>78</sup> These results are from a survey conducted by the Seoul metropolitan government in 2003.

master English” and a pervasive belief that Koreans are “bad speakers of English (2004:36), further empowering competent and fluent speakers of English in the Korean context. While J.S-Y. Park (2004) views the ideology of ‘self-deprecation’ as an extension of a national belief in an ‘inherent’ or general inability, this analysis contends that the problematisation of Korean English ability within national discourse also draws from global discursive flows positioning non-Western speakers of English as ‘less than’, or subordinate to the ‘global English speaker’. Echoing the native/non-native binary of the colonial-celebratory discourse, this ‘positioning’ as globally incompetent or inferior is encapsulated by Y.M. Kim’s (2005:online) statement that “if we compare native speakers of English to sophisticated urbanites, Koreans are provincials with thick accents in rural mountain areas”.

In this way, the position of ‘speaker of English’, while constructed as both desire-able and power-full in global discourse, embodies contradiction as a positioning within national discourse. (Re)presenting the power of this global construction, the position of Korean speaker of English is both desire-able and desired, a position endowed with social status and prestige, an enabler of mobility on a global/national scale – a juxtaposition of the ‘West’ and ‘non-West’. For the Korean speaker of English, such ‘power’ is however contingent upon individual linguistic competency as compared with that of the ‘native’ speaker, a global/national comparison that perpetually positions the skills of the ‘non-native’ speaker as subordinate to, or less than, the English speakers of the ‘West’. For the Korean learner therefore, the acquisition of the English language represents both a global/national opportunity for mobility and success, and a re-positioning of the ‘Self’ in relation to, or a relation of power with, the ‘native’ speaker of English.

This analysis has, therefore, uncovered evidence of a ‘take-up’ of global discourses within the discourses of this (Korean) non-Western nation-state, as outlined in the table below.

**Table Seven: Convergence between the global and the national within the discourses of the Korean nation-state**

National discourses	Global discourses	Global discourses of English
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Knowledge Economy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commodification of knowledge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Colonial-celebratory</li> <li>Liberalist</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Intellectual Assets of the Nation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roles and Relations of Consumption among Social Actors</li> <li>Lifelong learning for all</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Colonial-celebratory</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Globalise or Perish! Agenda</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Globalise or Perish! Agenda</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Colonial-celebratory</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Narration of the National Storyline</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Liberalist</li> </ul>

While such ‘take-up’ has, to an extent, involved an ‘appropriation’ of the global and its un-critical (re)presentation within national discourse, indicating the ‘power’ of a storyline of global success for the not-yet-developed nation, the additional ‘power’ of the national(ist) storyline for the Korean ‘We’ has resulted in a (re)framing and/or adaptation of facets of the global discourses under consideration. Such findings problematise the assumption that the weakening of impediments to globalised discursive flows within the modern world space inevitably equates with nation-state economic, political, social and cultural homogenisation, providing further support for the globalisation-as-hybridisation position. Critically however, the colonial-celebratory and liberalist discourses, discourses positioning English competence as the precursor to global/national (colonial-celebratory) or global (liberalist) economic opportunity, are bound with each of the national discourses under consideration; simultaneously (re)presented as inherent to educational and human resource reform within the ‘knowledge revolution’; as critical to global success and thus a transition from the global margins to desire-able ‘Other’, and a crucial means of (re)positioning local and traditional

knowledge/s as value-able within the global arena. The English language therefore, in spite of an association with the ‘West’ and its historical foundations in colonialism, is constructed as all power-full by this non-Western nation-state, a positioning maintained by global and national interests within the Korean context, seemingly unquestionable and unquestioned.

In summary, this chapter has delineated, in broad brushstrokes and with reference to national discourses of educational and social reform, an outline of the discursive context within which the Korean learner of English is constructed and positioned. Juxtaposing the national and the global, this analysis has un-earthed a Korean ‘Self’, located in the ‘Third Space’; a hybrid global ‘Self’ willing to accommodate the exigencies of the power-full and desire-able global ‘Other’ by (re)shaping national policy, and a national ‘Self’ of fixedness and tradition, discursively aligned although potentially in contradiction with the global. What however are the implications of this national hybridity, and a discursive context shaped by appropriation and adaptation, for the Korean learner of English, a position in itself (re)presenting a conjunction of the national ‘non-West’ and the global ‘West’? Emerging from the reviewed national discourse is a construction of the Korean learner of English as a power-full social actor whose storyline is shaped by global/national mobility and thus global/national success, an actor whose competency is perpetually in question yet whose pursuit of English realises individual responsibilities as a human resource and a contributor to the Korean ‘knowledge economy’. Thus I ask, is this construction an accurate (re)presentation of the storylines and lived experiences of the Korean learner of English? This question is explored in the following chapter (Chapter Seven) through a discussion of the varied ways in which Korean learners of English engage with the global/national discourses of the Korean context.

## *Chapter Seven*

### THE STORYLINES OF THE KOREAN LEARNER OF ENGLISH – IMAGINED WORLDS AND GLOBAL/NATIONAL POSSIBILITIES

In a world space typified by breadth momentarily spanned, and opportunity effortlessly imagined (Appadurai 1996; Bauman 1998, 2002), the boundaries of a modern existence are perpetually in motion. No longer as limited by physical or local proximity, the modern citizen has an inimitable freedom to redefine the ‘near’ or known, and reconfigure the ‘far’ or unknown (Bauman 1998) in order to contemplate “a wider set of possible lives than ... ever ... before” (Appadurai 1996:53). The inhabitation and realisation of such possibilities is however constrained by those discourses of the global and national context that speak of and for the modern citizen; discourses that position particular citizens in particular ways and mediate access to ‘possible lives’ of global and national significance. The broad global and national discourses of English outlined in Chapter Two, for example perform such a function, positioning the acquisition of English language skills as symbolic of a global, modern existence for nations and nationals alike. Such discursive constructions have generated a burgeoning demand within non-Western contexts for English language education, adding further momentum to the border-crossing flows of this world space – from the ‘native’ and ‘non-native’ English language teachers seeking employment in universities, schools and language institutes; to the non-English speaking students and families moving nationally or trans-nationally to access English education; or the cultural products, written texts, curriculum and policy that ‘support’ such education.

For the non-Western learner of English, the pursuit of English has become an imperative – the precondition for individual wealth and happiness, a key responsibility of citizenship and nationalistic behaviour, and the precursor of a life (or possibilities) spanning the local to the global. Delving behind the façade of this power-full storyline (Foucault 1972) and scrutinising

the assertions and assumptions upon which it is based reveals, however, a conglomeration of historic and contemporary discourses bound with and maintaining the linguistic ‘domination’ of the English language (Bamgbose 2001). Those discourses speaking *for* English in the world (re)present the ‘voices’ of Western and non-Western contexts in blatantly congratulatory (colonial-celebratory) and conditionally supportive (liberalist) terms, actively promoting English as the global language for modern times. Bound with such discourses are the discourses of development, progress, modernity, capitalism and neo-liberalism, discourses speaking *of* the world and privileging citizens with English competency, in conjunction with the discourses of democracy and globalisation that construct English as a right of all. Broadly linking these discourses *for* English and *of* the world is an assiduous promotion of the West and its linguistic, cultural, economic, political and social symbols and structures. In particular, such discourses speak of and appeal to freedom – the freedom to be or the freedom to belong – presenting an evocative and alluring alternative for non-Western nations and nationals.

The power of such appeals is evident in the appropriation, adaptation and absorption of those discourses speaking *for* English and *of* the world in non-Western contexts, as shown in Chapter Six. Within the non-Western context under consideration – the nation-state of Korea – the appropriation and adaptation of such discourses has established English language education as a national obsession (Park, S.J. & Abelmann 2004), creating language-based social hierarchies and initiating policy and systemic reforms. Thus, for nationals of Korea learning English while located locally or abroad, identification and representation becomes problematic within surroundings shaped by the interplay between the global possibilities represented by learning the English language and its implied discourses; national discourses endorsing and/or resisting global and local futures and languages; and the local possibilities articulated within social, cultural and linguistic traditions (Pennycook 1994).

In preceding chapters, this study explored the global discourses of three intergovernmental organisations speaking of and for the nation-state of Korea, and the concurrence and juxtaposition between such discourses and national discourses that construct education, English learning and the learner within this context. This chapter will, in light of the discursive ‘background’ established previously, broadly examine how thirteen Korean learners of English located locally or trans-nationally use such discourses when constructing subjectivities and (re)presenting ‘Self’ as a second-language learner. This chapter will therefore outline the plethora of global and national discourses this group of learners is engaged with, and the positionings, potentialities and possibilities for the imaginary embedded within such discourses.

#### ARE KOREAN LEARNERS OF ENGLISH ENGAGED WITH THE GLOBAL DISCOURSE/S OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATION?

In developing an understanding of the global construction of the broad category of ‘learner’ and specifically the category of ‘Korean learner of English’, this research has previously reviewed the social and educational reform discourse for and about the nation of Korea produced by three intergovernmental organisations, namely the World Bank, the OECD and UNESCO. By speaking of and for the Korean nation-state and national, these discourses “systematically form the object of which they speak” (Foucault 1972:54), delineating the positions, subjectivities and relationships that are accessible and obtainable by such ‘actors’ (van Dijk 1997 cited in Ainsworth & Hardy 2004:240) in order to secure the ongoing viability and efficacy of global political and economic systems (Mills 2003:37). The ‘success’ of such systems, and thus the enduring power of the intergovernmental discourse reviewed is reliant however, upon the social actor, in this case the Korean learner of English, “taking up the forms of subjectivity and the meanings and values which it proposes and acting upon them”

(Weedon 1987:34). Thus, this section will discuss the intergovernmental global discourses that such learners engage with while located nationally or trans-nationally.

## THE NEO-LIBERAL STORYLINE OF SUCCESS

Analysis of the Korean social and economic re-form discourse of each intergovernmental organisation in Chapter Five revealed a strong and consistent clustering around the four key themes of ‘commodification of knowledge’, ‘consumption among social actors’, ‘lifelong learning for all’ and ‘globalise or perish’. This seeming coherency between the reforms advocated for the Korean nation-state by each organisation points strongly to the existence of a master storyline underpinning the global work of each organisation. This storyline, identified as that of “global neo-liberal Capitalism” (Hill 2003:online), positions the pursuit of wealth as the key imperative of the nation and the national. By directly correlating the acquisition of wealth with possession of the skills and knowledges deemed necessary to fulfil ongoing obligations as a member of society, this storyline provides impetus to the broad themes identified within intergovernmental discourses. Further, in positioning the quest for wealth as an international, rather than purely domestic, endeavour, the neo-liberal storyline compels the nation and national to ‘globalise or perish’. However as one participant notes, this ‘quest’ is highly combative and competitive, with admission mediated by English competency: “The world is [a] war of the information. So particularly we have to study English” (Jude, Australia). The ‘bounded-ness’ of these discourses and their global positioning as ‘truth’, rather than a ‘construction of the West’, is evidenced by their reproduction within Korean learners ‘talk’ of the English language.

For the participants surveyed, the pursuit of English ‘knowledge’ through national and/or trans-national education was framed as a means of acquiring a ‘commodity’ of individual, national and, for some, global value or worth; a position in line with the global

‘commodification of knowledge’ discourse. While valued by participants, the attainment of English language knowledge was not constructed as an end in itself, however. Rather, English competency was viewed as the key to an alternative and, more highly valued ‘end’; the means of accessing knowledge from diverse sources (Mey, Korea; Rosa, Korea; Myungjoo, Australia; Elijah, Australia; Songya, Australia; Kyoungji, Australia; Jude, Australia); accessing subject-specific knowledge (Berg, Korea; Youngmo, Australia; Nick, Korea; Daniel, Australia); or supporting individually prized endeavours (Mey, Australia; Yeonok, Australia; Sarah, Australia). As Songya states,

English is not just a foreign language ... Speaking English gives us lots of benefit in the world. If I understand English, then I can enjoy amount of English contexts, for example, American movies and TV shows etc.

In positioning the English language as ‘gatekeeper’ to knowledges deemed necessary for individual ‘growth’ and success, these participant responses (re)produce global discourses of primarily colonial and imperial origins, discourses that maintain English as the global language for modern times. Simultaneously however, such responses serve to position the individual ‘Self’ of these learners as developing and ‘not modern’, requiring access to and competence in English to acquire those knowledges necessary for development, modernity and global participation.

The pervasiveness of global discourses positioning global (Western) knowledges as advanced and thus worth pursuing for the developing non-Western nation and national is evidenced by Daniel’s (Australia) statement about the role of English in his future:

It [English] will be a very big thing in the story of my life, because I want to be a doctor and all the terminology to become a doctor will come from English language ... .

For Daniel, those knowledges enabling individual success in his chosen career are solely those mediated and ‘owned’ by the West. His desire for and acquisition of English has

facilitated access to those knowledges via a trans-national existence, potentially at the expense of the 'local' knowledges of his country of birth, further reinforcing Western/English hegemony. The acquisition of English has, for another participant, (Youngmo, Australia), facilitated access to knowledges in a field "not famous yet in Korea":

My major is ceramics which is like material science ... I needed to study hard and to read a lot of English dissertations, but I could not understand them and I could finish reading one of them for one month.

Thus, for Youngmo, the acquisition of English skills is imperative in order to achieve his imagined global future. Kyoungji (Australia) further adds:

More and more people are studying and working abroad. Learning advanced technology and culture and earning foreign money can help Korean society developing.

The description of the increased and predominantly one-way flows of the Korean national abroad within this account constructs such flows as a national good (Kyoungji above), enabling Korea to develop in accordance with the more 'advanced' models provided by the (Western?) 'Other'. In engaging with these discourses, this participant has also seemingly appropriated the subject positions inherent to such discourses, positions that locate the West as an 'advanced' culture with ownership of globally and nationally value-able knowledge, in contrast to the 'developing' non-West. Kyoungji further positions the agentic behaviour of the individual, or the pursuit of knowledge by the social actor, as behaviour strongly consistent with the goals of the nation, or collective storylines. Interestingly, English competency in conjunction with a trans-national existence has also enabled, for two participants, access to knowledges that have led to questioning of and/or resistance to the construction of international relations advocated by nationalist discourse within Korea. Therefore, in contrast to Kyoungji's response positioning the acquisition of 'Western' knowledge and trans-national movements as a national 'good', for both Elijah (Australia) and

Youngmo (Australia), the acquisition of alternative knowledges within a trans-national location have undermined nationalist ‘desire’, fostering contradiction and resistance, an area explored further below.

The global context constructed by the discourse of each intergovernmental organisation is characterised by its connectivity and competitiveness – a “fast-globalising” (World Bank 2005:47) and “fast-changing” (OECD 2007b:2) environment that presents “ongoing and new global challenges” (UNESCO 2002:5) for social actors. Within intergovernmental discourse, the vagaries of this ‘new’ world space are positioned as the impetus for social and educational reforms in non-Western nations and the acquisition of globally valuable and exchangeable knowledges, such as the English language, for non-Western nationals. For the Korean learners surveyed, the engagement with intergovernmental discourse within the context of discussions about the influence of English and English learning upon personal storylines was limited to assertions made by four participants about the English language. For each of these participants, English and its acquisition was, following intergovernmental discourse, an imperative strongly linked to the ‘globalised’ nature of the current world space:

I think it is important to speak English. The world is connected altogether and globalized. English fits both of them. (Jude, Australia)

English is very important in international society (Youngmo, Australia).

It’s not an option [non-English speaking]. To live in a globalized world (Nick, Korea).

I think English is a necessary language to achieve globalization (Myungjoo, Australia).

Two participants also used the term ‘global’ as a descriptor for modern lifestyles, “global living” (Kyoungji, Australia); and the “global person” as the individual produced by English competency and communication (Songya, Australia). Additionally, in line with

intergovernmental (neo-liberal) discourse emphasising English language competency for ‘openness’ and internationalisation, two participants referred to such outcomes as resulting from English education: “I see the world impartially with open mind” (Mey, Korea); and trans-national movement: “I experienced new culture and people that I’ve never met before in Australia. It extended my way of thinking” (Nick, Korea).

For the participants, the neo-liberal storyline of success as (re)presented by intergovernmental discourse provides an evocative frame for seeking English education, and more broadly each learner’s pursuit of both alternative and subject-specific knowledge(s). The engagement with and uncontested (re)production of such assertions by these participants indicates an acceptance of the “self-evident truths”, or truisms, of the intergovernmental organisation (Bauman 1998:7). In imbibing ‘global’ discourses, the types of subjectivities available to or valued by these ‘discourse users’ are those shaped by “globally defined fields of possibility” (Appadurai 1996:31), although with the potential for contradiction with those subjectivities available to these learners within national(ist) discourses.

#### (RE)POSITIONING KOREA

A predominance of the economic, social, cultural and political signs of the West within the power-full discourses of the global world space has imbued those who (re)present such discourses with a “positional superiority” that enables the collective interests of the West to relate, and exist in relation to, the non-West “without ever losing him [sic] the upper hand” (Said 1978:7). The West therefore is empowered “not only to manage the [non-West] ... but also to own it”; to render “it”, the collective ‘Other’, as different to and at variance with “us” and “ours”, able to be spoken of and for with authority (Said 1978:108)- with the assumption that what is spoken is both wanted and welcome. As a collective assuming and presuming the

authority to speak of and for the nation of Korea, the intergovernmental organisations under consideration (re)present the hegemony of the West and position the-‘Self’ as ‘Western’, thus positioning Korea as the ‘non-West’ or periphery. The Korean nation, however, is broadly rendered within the reform discourse of these organisations as an ambivalent member of the non-Western ‘Other’ – willing to become yet resistant to change; open to the concept of reform yet shut to the realities of the reform process; a developed and developing nation with ‘potential’. The consistent (re)presentation of the nation of Korea within intergovernmental discourse as ‘outside’ the inner circle of the West and therefore ‘developing’ and ‘in progress’ has potential implications for the subjectivities of the Korean learner of English.

Although articulated variably due to an engagement with varied facets of intergovernmental discourse, five participants (re)produced the positionings of the global ‘West’ in their survey responses. For two learners in particular, the crossing of the trans-national ‘divide’ has resulted in a critical and highly ‘Western’ evaluation of the economic status and social functioning of the Korean nation. Elijah (Australia), for example, explains the contradiction between the ‘popular’ view of Korea and the ‘Western’ assessment of its status:

At the moment, Korea is still developing country, but a lot of Korean people are misunderstanding that Korea is well developed country. I disagree about that.

In appropriating the positionings inherent to the global discourse of development as (re)produced by intergovernmental organisations as his own, Elijah positions Korea as ‘developing’ and ‘not quite’, simultaneously establishing distance between Korean nationals and the positioning of him-‘Self’. Elijah further elucidates the re-forms necessary for identification as part of the global collective of ‘developed’ nations:

Korean country still need(s) to investigate and develop about inside of the country, such as welfare of the people, education system, stabilized developing town. After that, Korea will become world developed country.

Elijah's statement, in appropriating both intergovernmental and national discourses, implicitly assumes that the successful implementation of a suite of re-form automatically equates with a shift in national status – from better-than-developing to 'developed' nation-state. Such statements fail to acknowledge the contingent nature of 'development' discourse however, as an "invention and strategy" (Escobar 1992:22) reliant upon the shifting economic and political 'desire' of the 'West'. Youngmo (Australia) also emphasises the 'inferiority' of the Korean system in contrast to that of the 'developed' nation: "I think that Australia is better than Korea about everything, such as, social and political systems, social welfare and so on". In addition, the 'power' of this collective and its 'nationals', as signified by ownership of and fluency with the English language is emphasised by both participants:

... English spoken countries are more powerful than other countries from long time ago in many branches such as politics, economy, industry, and so on (Youngmo, Australia).

I thought I can talk with foreign people even through not perfect, and I had never thought about I can argue with foreign people and win from that argue (Elijah, Australia).

Thus, for Youngmo, engagement with intergovernmental discourse positioning the English speaking 'West' as superior and power-full provides impetus to his own desire to acquire and master English. For Elijah however, this engagement is framed in terms of resistance and wonder; mastery of English is deemed necessary to fulfil a desire to communicate and establish him-'Self' as equal to or better than the empowered and foreign 'West', and wonderment at the potential and relative 'power' of such positioning.

For other participants, varying degrees of engagement with intergovernmental discourse were apparent in their reflections upon Korean culture and society, both current and future. Nick (Korea) (re)produces the intergovernmental and neo-liberal 'globalise or perish' imperative in his assertion that Korea "can't live alone in the world ... because of lack of resource and

small territory”. The Korean nation therefore is constructed as vulnerable to the vagaries of a competitive global market due to a lack of ownership of commodities of global ‘worth’, and a positioning outside of the economic ‘inner circle’. By developing economic connections with the ‘foreign’, this national vulnerability is presumably diminished. As Nick states, “economy will be kept as the biggest influence (in the future) as well as now”. In comparison, Rosa (Korea) constructed ‘openness’ in highly cultural terms, responding that the global technological flows of the modern world space would entice Korea towards receptivity and heterogeneity: “Korean culture and society will be more open to the other countries’ culture due to the internet. Hence there would be more cultural diversities in Korea”. Mey (Korea) however, questions the preparedness and/or willingness of the Korean population for such change, stating that the Korean culture and society of the future will be “not much different. We are so conservative, aren’t we?” In (re)producing the ambivalence constructed for Korea within intergovernmental discourse, Mey simultaneously positions her-‘Self’ as a member of the Korean collective “we”, while aligning this ‘Self’ with the constructed-as-critical and contrasting ‘Other’ - the researcher of the ‘West’ with experience of the Korean context.

Whose voice imbues the neo-liberal master storyline and its bound discourses with global power (Foucault 1972), enabling such assertions to obtain the status of “self-evident truth” (Bauman 1998:7), able to be (re)presented without contestation in, and maintained by, the discourses of the intergovernmental organisation? This ‘voice’ is resoundingly that of the ‘West’. The (re)presentations and positionings of this ‘master storyline’ are however increasingly echoed, appropriated and adapted by nations and nationals in non-Western contexts (Astiz, Wiseman & Baker 2002; Luke & Luke 2000; Tickell & Peck 2003). In variably engaging with the discourses of the neo-liberal master storyline while reflecting upon the role of English in their individual ‘story’, these Korean learners of English demonstrate the pervasiveness of such discourses, and the strength of their association with English

education, for those of the ‘non-West’. While uniform and consistent engagement with these discourses by each participant was not evident, those learners who (re)produced aspects of global discourses seemingly utilised such discourses to negotiate a positioning for ‘Self’ that spanned the national and the global, justifying their ongoing pursuit of English competence. Interestingly such negotiations were apparent among learners located both nationally and trans-nationally.

#### WHAT GLOBAL DISCOURSES/FRAWORKS OF/FOR ENGLISH ARE KOREAN LEARNERS OF ENGLISH ENGAGED WITH?

Bound with the hegemonic neo-liberal master storyline produced and proffered by the collective ‘West’ (Foucault 1972), intergovernmental discourse speaks of a thoroughly ‘Western’ storyline of success, and it appears many of the Korean learners of English surveyed are ‘listening’. By questioning the assumed and presumed ‘power’ of these discourses for the ‘non-Western’ English learner, it is evident that such discourses, in addition to their (re)presentation in English, are also bound with discourses that serve to promote the English language. These discourses – namely, the colonial-celebratory discourse and the liberalist discourse of English as outlined in Chapter Two – encourage the acquisition of English for global and individual success. Resisting these discourses, the ‘critical’ frameworks of World Englishes, linguistic imperialism and ecology-of-language, also discussed in Chapter Two, provide an alternative construction of the English language that problematises the assumption of linguistic ‘choice’ (linguistic imperialism); positions English as a threat to linguistic diversity (ecology-of-language); and redefines the boundaries of the English language to include those Englishes emerging from non-Western localities (World Englishes). Thus, for the learner of English, engagement with the colonial-celebratory and liberalist discourses seemingly provides impetus to, and justification for, the acquisition of the English language as part of an agenda of national and individual ‘development’. The

alternative ‘critical’ frameworks, however, problematise this ‘pursuit,’ while advancing the varied linguistic interests of the non-West. Thus, how do Korean learners of English, as learners of the ‘non-West’ pursuing the language of the ‘West’, engage with and negotiate the potential contradiction of these global discourses and frameworks of English? In seeking to answer this question, this section will explore the discourses of English, or discursive combinations, Korean learners engage with and the ways such (global) discourses/frameworks were (re)presented within this research project’s survey responses.

### THE COLONIAL-CELEBRATORY DISCOURSE

As a discourse grounded in the colonialist and imperialist expansionism of the English-speaking nation, the colonial-celebratory discourse positions English as the language of the global now. With an assumedly ‘unrivalled’ linguistic and practical superiority, the English language is constructed by this discourse as the primary tool of the national and global actor, leading to the acquisition of cultural and material benefits for nation and national alike. Elijah (Australia) (re)presents the ‘English as global’ construction of the colonial-celebratory discourse in his reflection that English is an:

... international language, so it is very useful language. If I can speak English well, I do not have to worry about travel foreign country, even Asian countries. As a result, people can save time to study every different languages.

Elijah’s construction of English, following that of the colonial-celebratory discourse, emphasises the presumed practical applications of language competency in both Western and non-Western contexts, and encapsulates a primary criticism of the colonial-celebratory discourse – the unerring focus upon the advancement of English globally, at the expense of linguistic and local alternatives. For Elijah, English has become “very useful and amazing skill and part of me” and of “intangible value” to his trans-national existence, an existence in

which “English fits almost every part of my life”. Thus, by appropriating the colonial-celebratory discourse, Elijah’s own trans-national storyline has developed global dimensions, justifying the pursuit of English education as the means of attaining an “unexpected unlimited challenge life”.

Elijah’s (re)presentation of the colonial-celebratory discourse ‘valuing’ of English is echoed throughout responses from either side of the trans-national divide:

English is very important and valuable in my life for the future (Youngmo, Australia).

First of all, in my generation, we have to speak English very well. At schools, companies and so on, English is one of the most important things (Songya, Australia).

Within these accounts, English education is framed as an imperative for the non-English speaking individual, albeit an imperative with globally desire-able benefits, which is seemingly indicative of a lack of linguistic ‘free choice’. For Nick (Korea), the English language is strongly bound with his construction of ‘Self’, enabling the achievement of global/national desire:

[The English language is] a necessity. I can’t work without it at all. And I can’t realize my dream. If I wouldn’t have learn(t) English from the beginning, I’m nothing now (Nick, Korea).

Resisting the colonial-celebratory construction of English as an indispensable, rather than desire-able language, Mey (Korea) states “English is considered TOO important. I don’t know. It seems everyone thinks learning English is important”.

For this varied collective of Korean learners of English, the colonial-celebratory assertion that English competency predetermines global/national success (material benefits) and happiness (cultural benefits) presents an evocative and compelling position. Constructed as

gatekeeper: “if I am good in English, I can have more opportunities” (Berg, Korea); tool: “to get a job in the future” (Yeonok, Australia); and key: “depend on my future English skills, I could get good job or succeed in my business” (Elijah, Australia), the English language is perceived as life-altering, and thus subject forming: “It [English] will make my life better and it will make my life happier” (Yeonok, Australia). For students located trans-nationally, the acquisition of English in conjunction with exposure to an-Other culture has been behaviour-modifying, presenting new opportunities and desires, in contrast with that of their Korean ‘Self:

Learning English is going to be a turning point in my life. I am studying not only English but also Australian culture at the same time. I begin to start a new life with this experience (Youngmo, Australia).

Learning English have influenced me in my life, they made me more an active person than before (Yeonok, Australia).

Learning English will build up confidence which will change my character and enrich my life in the future (Myungjoo, Australia).

Learning English has a strong confident (Jude, Australia).

[English can] help me getting self-confidence (Kyoungji, Australia).

The ‘power’ of such constructions for the English speaker from the ‘non-West’ context is encapsulated by Rosa’s (Korea) reflection that: “When I have conversation with them [foreigners] in English, I feel as if I were a very important and great person”. As Songya (Australia) asserts: “in these day, someone can speak English very well means someone have more power, especially in non-English speaking countries”.

In engaging with the colonial-celebratory discourse, these participants are, to varying degrees, positioned such that their pursuit of English education – either nationally or trans-nationally – is thoroughly validated as the acquisition of the keys or tools required to ‘unlock’

global/national possibilities. Problematic however is the assumption that the English language is the only linguistic option available to these learners, a construction that is indifferent to alter-native languages, while curbing the ‘worth’ of such languages beyond increasingly local settings. By (re)presenting desired/desire-able national and global possibilities as ‘near’ regardless of location, the colonial-celebratory discourse also provides impetus to the ‘work of the imagination’ and thus the acquisition of English for these learners. While Appadurai (1996:6) discusses the deployment of the imagination in terms of mobility and motion, for these participants the ‘Selves’ and ‘lives’ imagined via English and engagement with the colonial-celebratory discourse are unbound by locality, that is, there exists an inherent belief that, with English competency, any-thing or any-Self is possible – anywhere.

#### THE LIBERALIST DISCOURSE

The liberalist discourse also emphasises the global and instrumental value of the English language, although this ‘worth’ is constructed as the result of global market forces, rather than an inherent ‘superiority’, as per the colonial-celebratory construction. The English language therefore, within this construction, is a language with global significance existing among a corpus of languages that serve equally significant local purposes for nations and nationals. (Re)presented as an ideologically neutral discourse, despite its apparent binding with global and thoroughly Western discourses, the liberalist discourse, as Pennycook (2000a) notes, is an evocative discourse for advocates and teachers of English language education. Within this discourse therefore, acquisition of English language skills is for global market purposes, enhancing the national and global value of the individual as a ‘human resource’. Yeonok (Australia) summarises the liberalist ‘ethos’ succinctly in her assertion that English is “the most important second language”.

For several Korean learners of English surveyed, the liberalist construction of English as the global language was recognised as self-evident truth:

English is already a public language of international society and I'm sure it won't be changed in my life at least (Nick, Korea).

English is the language being used in many parts of the world. So it is very useful and important in global living and career (Kyoungji, Australia).

English is the global language absolutely (Berg, Korea).

While Berg acknowledges the 'absolute' (constructed) truth of English as global, he further adds: "But if our Korean be the global language, the world will be more happy. Maybe", indicating a contradictory relationship with this liberalist construction. This contradiction is echoed by Yeonok (Australia) who agrees that English is a "world-wide language", but also experiences feelings of "envy" and "hate" due to the financial and educational 'costs' of this 'status' for Koreans. For the following learners, the assertion that English is 'global' was indicative of a need/desire to communicate with the global, not only Western, 'Other':

... it is common language so we have to learn English and to know to speak it (Youngmo, Australia).

By use English I can talk with not only English speakers, but also other international people, because it is international language (Elijah, Australia).

It's been an important language to communicate internationally (Mey, Korea).

First of all, we can speak together [in English] without nationality (Jude, Australia).

For Rosa (Korea) and Songya (Australia) the global communication 'possibilities' of English were framed in terms of an ability to connect both individually: "now I have a few foreign friends. I really want to connect with them freely in English" (Songya); and globally: "It is a

global language which can make everyone in the world connect” (Rosa). Therefore, although the liberalist discourse encourages English communication for practical purpose, in particular the facilitation of knowledge transfers, the engagement of these learners with the ‘English as global’ assertion of this discourse is for primarily personal reasons, enabling the establishment of individual connections and interactions with a previously inaccessible ‘Other’.

One participant, however, strongly engaged with the inherently economics-driven agenda of the liberalist discourse, framing his English acquisition project and the associated cultural learning as “a kind of method of developing my value” (Nick, Korea). For Nick, English is both “useful and helpful”, the “essential method of the process” of “realiz(ing) my dream”; a dream of employment that requires inter-national negotiations. English therefore, within Nick’s liberalist construction, is the pathway to knowing the “thinking” and culture of the foreign customer and as such is a tool that enables his desired/desire-able national/global future. This ‘knowledge’ however is considered by Nick as separate to and with no bearing upon the ‘Self’, despite English being strongly bound with his construction of ‘Self’, as discussed previously.

Although engagement with the colonial-celebratory discourse provided impetus to the acquisition of English for several participants, the liberalist discourse, with its linguistic distinction between English for global purposes and alter-native languages for alternate purpose, was variably (re)presented. While a high proportion of this varied grouping of Korean learners, following the liberalist discourse, positioned English as the global language, this positioning was, unlike the economic focus of the liberalist construction, framed largely in terms of contact and connection, as a language enabling interactions of a previously un-imagined scope. In this way, for some participants, engagement with the liberalist discourse was primarily for the elucidation of the imagined communicative and utilitarian benefits of

competency in English as a second language, while for others this potential benefit provided impetus to their pursuit of English education.

## LINGUISTIC IMPERIALISM

Resisting the self-evident assertions of the colonial-celebratory and liberalist discourses, the ‘critical’ framework of linguistic imperialism asserts that the expansion of English is a highly ideological process involving the allocation of material resources to English and therefore English speakers, at the expense of other languages and non-English speakers. The comparative ‘might’ of such resources, within the linguistic imperialism construction, establishes a global climate whereby the non-English speaker is impelled to, rather than chooses to, pursue English education.

For many of these English learners, their quest for English competency is founded on a sense of obligation: “we have no choice for learning English” (Berg, Korea). While the linguistic imperialism framework indicates that such constructions have highly global origins, for these participants learning English is compulsory and increasingly necessary; for survival in trans-national contexts (Daniel, Australia); for “getting high mark in school, entering into superior university, studying mechanical engineering, doing my work” (Nick, Korea); and for “my job, its value is high” (Rosa, Korea). As Songya (Australia) comments: “in Korea English is overvalued. Due to this environment, we regard English as one of the most important things”.

The survey responses of one participant however encapsulate the power-full interests and structures promoting and maintaining the position of the English language within the Korean context, interests that compel even the most ambivalent of learners to acquire a measure of competency. When asked to reflect upon his experience learning English, Berg (Korea), referred to the language as “only one subject to me ... I think this subject don’t match to

me”, stating that “if I think about the world of no English, maybe there is no big change to me”. Despite this dis-interest, the reality of “social circumstances” (“but I had to go on to enter ... University and live in this world”) has resulted in an ongoing English education, particularly as “English is one of basic abilities” of his chosen profession. As Berg summarises, “I just be flowed here. We must do it. So I do it as much as others do”. This ambivalent response to the position promoted by the discourses of English within the Korean context is, as the linguistic imperialism framework maintains, the result of individuals being compelled to acquire English as a result of structural and cultural imperialism (Phillipson, 1992), rather than enabled to exercise free choice.

Interestingly, while the above example is indicative of the ‘power’ of structural factors in impelling learners to acquire English competency, there is also evidence that this ‘necessity’ has the potential to be mediated by individual ‘imaginings’ of ‘Self’ and ‘future’, albeit imaginings that are highly local and as such constructed as globally (and nationally?) undesirable. As Sarah (Australia) indicates:

I learn to English from high school to a junior college but I didn't use speaking English. That time I didn't know about important of English. I was normal officer so I don't need talking to English. Maybe [if] I live continuously in Korea, I don't learn ... English.

Thus while there was evidence within responses, as the ‘critical’ framework of linguistic imperialism suggests, of individuals feeling compelled, or urged, to learn English, this compulsion was constructed as resulting from national structural and cultural ‘forces’, rather than emanating from ‘interests’ within the global context. While it can be argued that this national emphasis upon English education is strongly connected to power-full global ‘interests’, this was not the reality conveyed by these students.

## ECOLOGY-OF-LANGUAGE AND WORLD ENGLISHES

The ecology-of-language ‘critical’ framework views the incursion of English into non-English speaking contexts as perilous to the ‘linguistic human rights’ (Pennycook 2000a) and local language(s) of the nation. In contrast, the ‘critical’ framework of World Englishes constructs a broad definition of the English language that is inclusive of the ‘Englishes’ emerging from both Western and non-Western contexts, rejecting the narrow construction of ‘what is English’ promoted by the West. Thus, while both frameworks broadly resist the hegemony of the English language, this resistance ranges from condemnation of the ‘introduced’ linguistic ‘species’ (ecology-of-language) to the promotion of hybrid languages emerging from the local appropriation and adaptation of this ‘introduced language’ (World Englishes). Both frameworks will be considered within this section.

The notion of Hangul, the Korean language, as a ‘threatened’ species, increasingly subsumed by the English language is an ecology-of-language construction engaged with by participants:

We already use many English words in our conversation ... Eventually, the portion of English word in conversation is growing up continually (Berg, Korea).

Sometimes when they [young people] speak in English it is easier for them. So most of them usually speak in English without speaking Korean. Many words will change into English (Jude, Australia).

More and more Korean words will be like English, but I cannot say how much and to what extend [sic] it will affect Korean society (Daniel, Australia).

I think in the future, many Korean words will be getting disappeared (Songya, Australia).

As Berg further adds, the increasing use of English in the Korean context has led to changes in the grammatical structure of the Korean language:

For example, there is no ‘passive sentence’ in Korean originally. We always used the people as ‘the subject’. But we have face with many English documents and had to translate them. In that process, the passive sentences are used widely.

Interestingly, for each of these participants, the expansion of English and English education within their national context, and the subsequent impact upon the linguistic structure of the Korean language, is positioned as inevitable and uncontested for the collective ‘we’ – Korean society, and as such does not contradict their own pursuit of English. Additionally Jude, attributes blame for this ‘threat’ to the collective ‘they’ or youth who have, within her construction, rejected Hangul in favour of English, positioning her own use of English as acceptable and accepted. Thus while the ecology-of-language assertion that languages are being ‘absorbed’ by English is engaged with by participants, the problematic construction of this within the ecology-of-language framework is not supported by this collective of Korean learners of English.

In addition, two participants refer to the hybrid Korean-English, or Konglish, that is increasingly apparent within the Korean context. As Elijah (Australia) notes: “these days English is uses not only its own value, but also mix with Hangul in many Korean culture/society area, such as TV ads or brand names”. Thus, while English has its own assumed worth, the Korean-English hybrid, in line with the World Englishes framework, also presents a potent and equally compelling lure for the Korean consumer. Songya (Australia) however questions the validity of this use of Konglish, particularly where an applicable Korean word exists:

When we make a name of something, we usually use a English name.  
Some of them are grammatically wrong or sounds very silly for natives.  
We can use the Korean word though. Even the government is the lead.

For Songya, the divergence of Konglish from the norm as spoken by the ‘native’ English speaker positions Korean-English as an object of ridicule, indicating the power of the

colonial-celebratory construction of what is ‘proper’ English, as distinct from an-Other language. Thus, despite the World Englishes assertion that languages such as Konglish are a legitimate appropriation of English for local purposes, this legitimacy is not uniformly acknowledged by those of the non-Western context of Korea.

For these five participants, the introduction of English has wrought increasing changes to their national language; changes apparent within vocabulary and grammar, as per the ecology-of-language framework, and the construction of alter-native Korean-English, as per the World Englishes framing. This collective of learners, however, largely viewed such statements as indicative and unproblematic. As current learners of the English language for diverse reasons in varied locations, such responses are indicative of the mounting ‘value’ of English for the non-English speaker and the non-Western context, increasingly at the expense of national/local language, and as such are constructions that facilitate their pursuit of English education without contradiction. For the additional eight participants, the discursive ‘silence’ regarding the incursion of English within their national context is also of interest.

In summary, this section has examined the extent to which this collective of Korean learners of English engaged with global discourses speaking of and for the English language. While each learner engaged in differing degrees with either a single or several discourses of English, the position of ‘English speaker’ and the individual and global possibilities (re)presented within the storyline of this positioning by the colonial-celebratory discourse, provided an alluring justification and motivation for the pursuit of English by these learners. For this group of learners, ‘success’ and ‘happiness’ broadly equated with the opportunity to be and become – to imagine a life with connections, communications and possibilities of a global scope; contrary to the narrow economic interpretation constructed by the liberalist discourse. In this way, the English language and English education, as constructed via the colonial-celebratory and liberalist discourses, are equated by these learners with agency and activity, a

shortening of the distance between ‘near’ and ‘far’, prompting an imagining of trans-national crossings:

I hope to continue to study abroad and live different countries (Mey, Korea).

I’m still not sure about my future life, but I vaguely want to find a job which is related to foreign countries. I positively think of that live in or work in foreign countries (Songya, Australia).

... living in different countries and learning that culture (Daniel, Korea).

If I earn much money, I would like to travel another country. So I would like to learn another culture, various activities and to make friends (Jude, Australia).

These findings, therefore, broadly substantiate Appadurai’s (1996) hypothesised relationship between agency and global possibility as mediated by the imagination – with one addition. To access the “images, scripts, models and narratives” embedded with the ‘global possibilities’ essential for the work of the imagination (Appadurai 1996:6) within a world space of flows primarily produced by and emerging from the English speaking ‘West’, the non-English speaker or non-Western national requires English competency. Thus, for the non-Western learner, it is the English language that mediates between national/local potential, agency and global possibility and provides impetus to the work of the imagination.

The construction of English as the global language and its positioning as the only language able to facilitate the beyond-local ‘imaginings’ of the non-Western national is highly problematic, potentially diminishing the usefulness of the national/local language. While it was hypothesised that engagement with global discourses speaking for or ‘critical’ frameworks of English provided potential for contradiction, this collective of learners negotiated elements of resistant discourses to ensure congruence with their pursuit of English. For many learners this included an acknowledgement of the detrimental influence of

English upon the vocabulary and grammar of the national/local language, however this was positioned as a concern separate to, or larger than, their own desire.

#### WHAT NATIONAL DISCOURSES ARE KOREAN LEARNERS OF ENGLISH ENGAGED WITH?

In examining the educational storyline of Korean learners of English positioned either side of the trans-national divide this analysis has unearthed evidence of engagement with, and acceptance of global discourses simultaneously positioning the English language as a globally valued and value-able commodity, while positioning the non-Western ‘Self’ as English language learner in globally desired and desire-able ways. In addition to those discourses both of and from the ‘West’, Korean learners of English are subject to and constituted by discourses emanating from and constructed by the national context of Korea, namely the discourses of ‘the knowledge economy’, and the ‘intellectual assets of the nation’, in conjunction with the underpinning narration of the national storyline<sup>79</sup> (re)presented in Chapter Six. As learners of the English language, these participants are additionally spoken of and for by the national discourses of English, in particular, the ‘necessitation’, ‘externalisation’ and ‘self-deprecation’ discourses (Park, J.S-Y. 2004) outlined in Chapter Two. Embedded within a multiplicity of discourses (Ainsworth & Hardy 2004) of both ‘Western’ (global) and ‘non-Western’ (national) origins, these learners are positioned by this plethora of discourses in potentially complimentary and/or contradictory ways. In light of this possibility, Korean learners are potentially “able to play one discourse against another or draw on multiple discourses” (Ainsworth and Hardy 2004:238). This section will, therefore, explore how this collective of Korean learners of English engage with and use the discourses available within their national context.

---

79 Participant use of the ‘globalise or perish’ discourse was reviewed as part of the discussion of engagement with global discourses earlier in this chapter. As a result, the ‘globalise or perish’ agenda will be considered in conjunction with the national storyline within this section.

## THE KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY – ENGLISH-AS-CRITICAL

At a national level, the discourse of ‘the knowledge economy’ provides impetus to a reform agenda that, in line with global discourses, emphasises the acquisition of ‘future-oriented’ knowledges of global worth, particularly in the field of science and technology. Positioning the Korean nation as both knowledge-holder and knowledge-desirer, this discourse further constructs the pursuit of English as the critical means of obtaining ‘essential’ or ‘required’ global knowledges within a global space where only the knowledge-able thrive. Implicit to this discourse, therefore, is an urgency pervading both the national and individual pursuit of knowledges, particularly knowledge of the English language; with the consequences of ‘failure’ constructed as dire and fear-provoking. By speaking of the English language as a commodity ‘freely’ available for acquisition and exploitation by this non-Western nation<sup>80</sup>, the knowledge economy discourse positions English as both desire-able and acquire-able, rendering it known or know-able for Korean nationals.

Indicating the broad accepted-ness of the knowledge economy positioning of English within the Korean context and the pervasiveness of globalised flows of information of the ‘West’, Nick (Korea) reflects that “English is not strange or unfamiliar any more”. With “more than 50% of new product [being] named in English and students ... learning English even in elementary school or kindergarten” (Nick), the English language is increasingly familiar for the Korean national. Although rendered known and available, several participants commented on the material effects of the English-as-critical construction of the knowledge-economy discourse<sup>81</sup>: “[the] Korean environment make(s) me study English, so I have to learn English hard” (Songya, Australia). Broadly, the contextual factors shaped by this

---

80 Although constructed as ‘freely’ available to the Korean learner within national discourse, the analysis in Chapter Six showed that, in reality, this positioning of English is contested.

81 It is important to note that although treated as an individual discourse for the purposes of this section, the knowledge economy discourse, as examined in Chapter 6, draws heavily on and binds with a plethora of discourses of primarily global origins.

construction of English and therefore shaping the pursuit of English by participants were Korean education, particularly university entrance (Rosa, Korea; Berg, Korea; Myungjoo, Australia; Nick, Korea; Kyoungji, Australia); social activity and standing (Rosa; Youngmo, Australia); well-paid or choice of employment (Youngmo; Berg; Songya, Australia; Myungjoo; Yeonok, Australia; Nick; Kyoungji; Elijah, Australia); access to non-Korean cultural ‘products’ (Jude, Australia) and, the enthusiasm for English in Korea (Rosa). Two participants additionally framed their discussion of the ‘material effects’ of the English-as-critical construction in terms of increased choice and freedom via agentic behaviour:

It is more easy to change company and job, if I am fluent in English ... I want to be a man who have many ways to go, and who can pick up the best one. English ability, technical base and wide human network can help me (Berg, Korea).

If I could speak it [English] well, the more chances I could have (Mey, Korea).

The agentic behaviour of the individual was however constructed by one participant as problematic and contrary to ‘public interest’, indicating opposition to the neo-liberal underpinnings of the knowledge economy discourse:

Korean education has some problems. Actually we have studied to get a good job, to earn much money and to spend more comfortable life. Continuously we have competed one another. Sometimes this caused social problems (Jude, Australia).

The inherent threat of the knowledge economy discourse was both implicitly and explicitly engaged with by participants. Berg (Korea), in particular, strongly engaged with the knowledge economy ‘warning’, in spite of his often ambivalent relationship with the acquisition of English, stating that: “there is a probability that I experience some serious situation by lack of English ability”.

Further, the global (and increasingly national/local) 'benefits' of English acquisition within the knowledge economy construction have afforded the English language and those associated with English a 'privileged' status, withheld from speakers of only the Korean language. As Songya (Australia) summarises, "it's a common communicating tool, but in Korea English can be a tool of estimating person's ability". For one participant, this correlation between English acquisition and overall ability had consequences for her-'Self': "it was difficult to improve my English as much as I want. It was one of the reasons I couldn't be self-confident" (Kyoungji, Australia). The local power of this construction is further emphasised by the reflections of two participants on the hiring practices of Korean companies:

All companies employ people who can speak English even if another language [is used] more such as Japanese and Chinese (Youngmo, Australia).

Many companies want to seek employees who have a high score of English test, whether they use it or not after being employees (Songya, Australia).

Interestingly, even an association with the sign 'foreign language' within the Korean context, seemingly renders the 'signified' an unparalleled status and 'superiority'. Two participants, for example, refer to the benefits of attending a 'Foreign Language High School', an institution "where excellent students gathered" (Rosa, Korea). Historically, such schools were "not for educating foreign language" (Berg, Korea), rather the Foreign Language High School was broadly considered a "top level high school to enter [a] top level university" (Berg). The corollary of this empowering of English and English speakers, as maintained by the knowledge economy discourse, is however an implicit de-appreciation of Hangul, the Korean language: "People tend to regard Korean as less important" (Songya, Australia). Berg however indicates that:

... there was a culture that if one uses English word or makes name of shop or product in English, it looks better or something like that. Now that culture is almost disappeared but it remains in some situation.

The pervasiveness of this construction of English and English speakers within the Korea context, and its robustness despite trans-national re-location, is further evidenced by Elijah's (Australia) discussion of his changing 'stereotype' of "East Asian people". Within the reviewed national discourse, as discussed in Chapter Six, the south east Asian nations of the Philippines, India and Pakistan were (re)presented as nations that "no one envies" (*Hankyoreh* 21 October 2005). Similarly, within individual discourse, the "East Asian" worker in Korea is (re)presented as "working illegally and making crime as well" (Elijah), and therefore 'Other', 'backward' – the 'unknown' – to be feared and avoided<sup>82</sup>. Elijah however, in reflecting upon the changes he has experienced due to his trans-national re-location, indicated that in Australia:

... they [East Asian people] are different with in South Korea. Even though they can't speak Korean well, they can speak English better than ordinary South Korean people and work and study legally.

In addition, Elijah commented that the "Indian guys" he worked with "can speak English very well". The inherent contradiction, therefore, between the valuing of English competency and the positioning of nationals from nations 'no one envies' – as constructed by national discourse/s – has afforded Elijah the discursive 'space', in conjunction with his new 'location', to question and selectively resist this nationalist discourse (Weedon 1999 cited in Ainsworth & Hardy 2004:238).

More broadly, however, two participants reflected critically upon the appropriation of English and its construction within the Korean context. Songya (Australia), for example, responded that "English is the most powerful language in the world" due to its value in

---

<sup>82</sup> Elijah (Australia) uses the collective term "East Asian" to specifically denote workers of Indian origin. As such nationals are more commonly referred to as 'south east Asian', both terms have been used.

global communication, yet was also critical of the appropriation of English and its construction within the Korean context, claiming that in Korea “English has been overvalued and used carelessly”. Likewise, Berg (Korea) states:

To our Korean, English is such a big obstacle. And in the same time, it can be a great weapon. That’s the main reason of prosperity of English education market.

While engaging with the knowledge economy discourse and acknowledging its material effects, some participants indicated a highly ambivalent relationship with this discourse, questioning the ‘burden’ or cost of social expectations and the seeming obligation to acquire English of a high standard within their national context. For Rosa (Korea), this ‘burden’ has pursued her throughout her school education: “English is an important subject in school work and I should get high score as well”; to her current employment:

I majored in English and English literature in the university, so other’s expectation to my linguistic ability in English is quite high and it makes me feel burden about it.

For Songya (Australia), the ‘pressure’ of this expectation has shaped her personal storyline, an expectation alleviated only when located trans-nationally:

So far, the high point of my life story is when I was in Nanjing (China). At that time, I was really happy, there was no pressure that I had had and will have in Korea.

More broadly, the ‘cost’ for Korean society of the “time and money [spent] learning English”, as Kyoungji (Australia) notes, is the increasing “difficult(y) to focus on fundamental studies”. Thus, for these learners of English located both nationally and trans-nationally, it is the social expectation surrounding their English acquisition facilitated by discourses such as that of the knowledge economy, rather than the acquisition of the language itself, that fosters this ambivalence.

Bound with the English-as-critical construction of the national knowledge economy discourse, the necessitation discourse of English constructs the acquisition of English communicative competency as a crucial endeavour for the Korean national. Primarily (re)presented within the “Official English” debates<sup>83</sup>, this discourse has been both vociferously and selectively supported (and opposed) within the Korean context. While none of the participants advocated the ‘Official English’ stance, each selectively engaged with the necessitation assertion that English competency is critical for communication, both globally and nationally. For participants, English acquisition enabled communication with “native speakers” (Kyoungji, Australia); and a broad range of people from different countries (Myungjoo, Australia; Mey, Korea; Elijah, Australia; Yeonok, Australia; Rosa, Korea; Songya, Australia). While other participants emphasised the importance of English for global communication, Daniel (Australia) referred to the increasing use of English words within the Korean context, and the need for competency: “if we erase them it will be very hard for us to communicate, so it fits well and in an important position”, providing further evidence of a disempowerment of the Korean language. The power of this construction of communicative competency as valued and value-able within the necessitation discourse is further illustrated by the presumed status of those able to ‘speak’ English proficiently: “it’s funny but I think others may envy that I talk in English fluently” (Rosa, Korea). Songya (Australia) further adds:

Sometimes because I can speak English ... I can feel proud of myself.  
Especially, when I’m with someone who can’t speak English and there is a  
chance to speak English.

Additionally, Kyoungji (Australia) (re)produced the necessitation assertion that the English language can be appropriated by the Korean population to improve the global ‘status’ of

---

<sup>83</sup> This debate was instigated by Bok Geoil’s (1998 cited in Park, J.S-Y. 2004) assertion that English should be endowed with the status of official language of Korea.

Korea and its unique culture: “English can be a great help to let Korean culture known to people all around the world”.

For these participants, the pursuit of English education is, in line with global and national discourses, broadly constructed as the primary means of accessing and/or acquiring knowledges or resources of global, national or individual ‘value’<sup>84</sup>. Within the Korean context, the English language is additionally constructed by the discourses of the knowledge economy and necessitation as a critical ‘knowledge’ in its own right and thus desire-able across all domains. The material effects of this dual English-is-critical construction have established clear local distinctions between the position of English-have and that of English have-not, and cultivated broad social expectations about the level and type of English competency ‘required’ by the learner. Thus, it seems, the juxtaposition of the category non-English-speaker with the broad discursive category of ‘learner’ as constituted by the discourses of the knowledge economy and necessitation, is increasingly unavailable for the Korean national (Søndergaard 2002:189-190). For this collective of Korean learners of English, an acceptance of such constructions and expectations has positioned them in a manner that has compelled their pursuit of English. For some learners, however, the ‘burden’ of expectation inherent to these various positionings has resulted in an at times ambivalent engagement with the knowledge economy discourse.

#### THE INTELLECTUAL ASSETS OF THE NATION

Concomitant with the knowledge economy discourse of the Korean context is the discourse of the ‘human resource’, a discourse positioning the intellectual development of Korean nationals as central to the economic and social success of the nation. While the knowledge economy discourse primarily speaks of and for the types of knowledges of value for the

---

<sup>84</sup> The relationship between the pursuit of English and knowledge acquisition for these participants is discussed earlier in the chapter.

Korean economy and therefore the Korean national, the 'human resource' discourse constructs the discursive category of 'learner' by juxtaposing the responsibility to pursue such 'knowledges' as a corollary of Korean citizenship. As Elijah (Australia), states: "Korea has not got enough natural resources, therefore Korea has developed human resources", thus positioning this discourse as a highly national, rather than global, production. The increased national emphasis on the acquisition of knowledge within a global/national environment characterised by change and flux has also facilitated, in line with global discourses, the construction of the national discursive category of 'learner' as a collective urged to engage with learning and develop knowledge throughout the lifespan.

Interestingly, as discussed in Chapter Six, the modern global/national discourse of 'human resources' strongly mirrors and binds with the traditional Confucian discourse of "the learning" (Lee 2002 quoted in Robertson 2002:2). While both discourses (re)present education and the discursive category of 'learner' as an essential prerequisite for success; within the human resource construction, this success is couched in highly global and therefore outward-looking and material<sup>85</sup> terms. By contrast, within the Confucian construction of the 'ideal state', the notion of success through learning is introspective and symbolic<sup>86</sup>, advancing learning for its own worth, and for the 'elevation' of the nation according to its own terms. As coalescing global/national discourses that jointly inform the construction of the discursive category of 'learner', there are seemingly strong moral, cultural and traditional foundations for the pursuit of learning existing in conjunction with highly modern, economic, social and political constructions within the Korean context. For this group of learners, therefore, there exists power-full material and symbolic imperatives to

---

85 The use of the term 'material' borrows from Norton Peirce's (1995a:18) use of the term 'material resources' to refer to "capital goods, real estate and money".

86 The term 'symbolic' refers to the acquisition of resources such as "language, education and friendship" (Norton Peirce 1995a:18).

pursue or, as Norton Peirce (1995a) states, invest in education. This section will explore the ways in which participants engage with the modern 'human resource' discourse and/or the traditional Confucian discourse when positioning the 'Self' as a learner of English.

For the eight participants within this research project who engaged strongly with the 'human resource' discourse when constructing them-'Self' as learner of English, it was the 'utilitarian' and highly material benefits advocated by this discourse that motivated their educational pursuit. Importantly, these findings resonate with the results of T-Y. Kim's (2006) research. Citing primarily external obligations and the structural effects of this discourse as 'motivating' influences, the pursuit of English for these participants is, as Nick (Korea) states, primarily for enhancing personal worth or, as Daniel (Australia) notes, "to survive". These factors included: its status as a compulsory subject in middle school (Nick); the need to communicate while located trans-nationally (Yeonok, Australia; Daniel; Sarah, Australia); the stipulations and recommendation of significant others, in particular family members (Jude, Australia; Myungjoo, Australia; Sarah); and social circumstances (Berg, Korea; Youngmo, Australia). Further, contradicting Norton Peirce's (1995a:18) assertion that an 'investment' in language education equates with an investment in subjectivity, Berg indicated that his motivation to learn English is highly contingent upon 'material' influences, seemingly indicative of minimal investment of 'Self' in the learning process: "if English become less serious in my job, I will stop to study English". In addition, Nick positioned his instrumental pursuit of English as separate to his construction of 'Self' – "I have been learning English as a kind of method of developing my value. So it doesn't change or influence my self-identity itself". This is despite Nick's prior assertion that without English "I'm nothing now", indicating a distinct separation, in line with the poststructuralist paradigm, between Nick's English-informed, career-oriented subjectivity and the subjectivity considered as best (re)presenting 'Self'.

Four participants, however, indicated a strong ‘symbolic’ investment in their pursuit of English education, seemingly via an engagement with the traditional Confucian discourse of ‘the learning’. In line with Norton Peirce’s (1995a) research, they acknowledged the ‘material’ benefits English competency bestows, but attributed their initial and ongoing ‘investment’ in language learning to an interest in English and broadly speaking, culture (Mey, Korea; Elijah, Australia; Kyoungji, Australia; Songya, Australia). Participants further cited self-satisfaction (Songya); pride in achievements (Elijah; Mey); the challenge of language learning (Mey); and joy in learning (Kyoungji) as symbolic resources attained via their investment in English language learning. While comparisons between participants located differentially are potentially fraught due to the under-representation of learners located nationally within the participant sample, these participants are primarily living trans-nationally. Interestingly, Mey – the only nationally-located participant within this group – indicated within correspondence that her ‘alternative’ approach to being educated in Korea signifies her as different to the Korean ‘we’, despite her ‘English-have’ status: “I have been told a lot ‘You are not like Korean’ both by Korean people and foreign friends”. Seemingly therefore, the symbolic connection with language and learning advocated with traditional discourse is (re)constructed within modern Korea as un-Korean and ‘Other’, indicating many ‘Others’ emerging from the positioning of the English language within this context. In constructing their view of learning and themselves as ‘learner’ in symbolic terms, these participants were also more likely to indicate an ongoing engagement with English education: “Maybe learning English comes with me until the end of my life story” (Songya); and “Even though I’m 38 years old, I still want to learn English more” (Kyoungji); “I keep trying to learn more. Thanks to English I can get information from more diverse sources and it helps me to understand other people better” (Mey), than participants pursuing English for instrumental reasons.

Lastly, for Rosa (Korea), whose positioning as ‘learner of English’ has been and continues to be via engagement with both the human resources discourse and the traditional Confucian discourse, the pursuit of education for alternately material and symbolic reasons has led to ambivalence and potential resistance. In narrating her storyline as a learner of English, Rosa initially described her desire for English competency in highly symbolic terms. The commodification of English within her national context and the increasing structural influences upon her pursuit of English through university and adulthood have (re)shaped this desire, reducing her ‘investment’ in English education: “I don’t have a strong motivation to learn English ... I am not so excited as when I learnt it at school, I am not so interested in English”. This is despite Rosa’s competency in the language being strongly connected to her-‘Self’: “I expect from learning English that I have sophisticated communication in English. It will help me to ... improve my self-esteem”. Interestingly therefore, a position as ‘learner of English’ constructed in symbolic terms has the seeming potential to be negatively influenced by the increasingly extrinsic imperatives for learning (re)produced by the ‘human resources’ global/national discourse within the Korean context.

Through an acceptance of the human resource discourse and its structural effects, eight participants were en-abled to position the ‘Self’ as agentic and in control of the acquisition of the material ‘resources’ of value. While other learners acknowledged the material benefits bestowed upon the position of ‘learner of English’ within the human resources construction, these ‘benefits’ were positioned as subordinate to the symbolic resources acquired by the individual via English education. As a construction alternate to the human resources discourse, this alternate emphasis potentially stems from an-Other discourse speaking of and for learners within the Korean context – the traditional Confucian discourse. Interestingly, this discourse also enabled a construction of the ‘Self’ as agentic, although potentially in conflict with the structures of the modern Korean context. In contrast, therefore, to Norton

Peirce's (1995a:17) use of the term 'investment' to capture the positive relationship between engagement with learning, the imagining of previously "unattainable resources", and the construction of 'Self' as learner; participants narrated a spectrum of investment responses. These responses ranged from high investment in attaining material resources via language competency and nil investment of 'Self', to low investment in ongoing language education and high investment in the 'Self' as learner. These findings do, however, support McKay and Wong's (1996:598) assertion that the link between subjectivity and language education is, at times, tenuous for language learners; with, as McKay and Wong note, 'agency-enhancement' rather than 'investment' a more accurate term for capturing the response of this research project's second-language learners. Such findings indicate the importance of a situated and critical analysis of language learning that views the learner as an individual engaged with multiple discourses both arising from and outside of the language 'classroom'.

#### THE NARRATION OF THE NATION – A NATIONAL STORYLINE AND THE GLOBALISE OR PERISH! AGENDA

Underpinning those discourses speaking broadly of learning and the learner within the Korean context is a sub-text alluding to the identity of the nation; a storyline of an indomitable nation, fiercely proud and strongly invested – economically and socially – in achieving global 'success' while maintaining national tradition and culture. While previous analysis highlighted the pervasiveness of this storyline within the broad 'talk' of the nation, the individual responses of participants provide an alter-native perspective. In examining such individual 'talk', this section will determine the degree to which participants – a collective who, as discussed earlier, are actively seeking global 'possibilities' – engage with the nationalist sentiments of the national storyline, and accept the individual global/national construction of 'Self' proposed by this storyline for national and trans-national Koreans. Further, while global/national discourses and the national storyline position the Korean

nation-state within a global in-between or 'third space', this section will explore the ways in which this group of learners positions the Korean nation within their discussion of English education.

In earlier analysis it became evident that the 'in-between' position constructed for Korea by the "statements" of global institutions was "transcribed" in the discourses of the national context (Foucault 1972 cited in Bhabha 1994:33). Such positioning was not, however, (re)produced within participant responses, with three participants positioning the Korean nation as a "strong nation of the world" (Youngmo, Australia) or potentially "famous throughout the world" (Yeonok, Australia). This 'strength', however, was limited to the "electronics industry" (Youngmo); the Internet (Elijah, Australia); and/or contingent upon the unification of North and South Korea (Yeonok, Australia). Additionally, for Youngmo this positioning was assured "in the future" as:

We have the fastest Internet service in the world and I can be conceited that electronics things like a semi-conductor, mobile phone, [and] computer goods are the best in the world at the moment and in future also.

The perceived 'superiority' of the Korean nation in an area constructed 'globally' as Western, and 'belonging' to the English-speaking 'West' is further reflected in Elijah's response:

Even though internet is made by western country people [English use], Korean people create new Internet word by English + Korean Hangul. Because, some parts of Korean Internet culture are developed than suzerain Internet countries, such as United States or UK.

While Elijah positions the Korean nation as 'better-than' the West in "leading technologies", this positioning is constructed as 'less-than' Japan<sup>87</sup>, although not inevitably so:

---

87 Elijah's response indicates the pervasive nature of the positioning of the Japanese as a national 'Other', initiated during the post-colonial period, indicating the multiple 'Others' constructed within and by the national discourse of this nation-state.

At the moment, Japan has most developed leading technologies, but Korean technologies keep chasing them and we will catch them and get far ahead of their technologies. Because, Korean people have very strong pride about themselves, especially toward Japan.

Contrasting the conditional ‘superiority’ bestowed upon the Korean nation by these participants, Nick (Korea) broadly positions Korea as highly dependent upon and a passive recipient of, the largesse of the “leading economic country” due to its “economy depending on foreign trade so much”. In tentatively tracing the global and national discursive threads that construct a position for the Korean nation, it appears that what resonates more than the assertions of these participants is the relative silence of others. In not engaging with these ‘threads’ – a salient element of the ‘globalise or perish’ discourse emanating from global and national contexts – ‘other’ participants are seemingly distancing the global positioning of the ‘Self’ as national or trans-national learner apart from or as irrelevant to the global positioning of the nation.

The strongly nationalistic sentiment evident within national ‘talk’ of and for the Korean context (Cho Han 2000) was not equally apparent within participant responses. One participant, Elijah (Australia), referred to the strength of nationalist thought pervading the Korean context when reflecting upon the changes he has experienced since his trans-national re-location:

Before I came to Australia the way of my think was very narrow and nationalistic, even racist (not so strong though) because of the army moral education ... [and the] strong nationalism and nationalistic atmosphere of Korean society.

Mirroring the national ‘Other’ constructed within the national discourse discussed earlier, Elijah further describes the pride that propels the national ambition to become an advanced and developed nation:

I like my Japanese friends but I cannot forgive Japanese government what they did past century. As a result as much develop as Japanese technologies, Korean technologies also will develop, because Korean people hate [being] beaten by Japanese people.

Thus, in narrating their English education ‘journey’ and broadly globalised futures, the participants did not appear to view such endeavours as a corollary of maintaining “national identity and intrinsic national spirit” (Kim 1996 cited in Shin 2003:11). Rather, the one participant who indicated a prior strong engagement with nationalist thinking positioned his learning of English education in a trans-national location as antithetical to popular thought ‘cultivated’ within the Korean context.

In constructing a model of ‘Korean citizenship’, the national storyline positions the Korean language as central to the continuity of Korean traditions and culture (Song 2000). Language therefore, as Nick (Korea) asserts, is broadly constructed within Korean discourse as a “mirror of culture”. In this way, the ‘inimitability’ of the Korean culture is reflected in the distinctive nature of the Korean language. As Berg (Korea) reflects:

... *hangul*, the Korean language is such a difference type of language to other language (It is the first language - letters or alphabets – of being made by one man and his fellow in the same era. And it is the youngest language that is really used in the world).

For the externalisation discourse, it is this ‘connection’ between language and culture that, with the increasing use and pursuit of the English language, is constructed as highly problematic for and a threat to, Korean culture and traditions. The war-like depiction of English and Western culture and the dire predictions constructed within the externalisation discourse are further mirrored in the participant responses:

[English] will also have negative influences like destroying of Korean language and absorption of western culture which will change the own culture and atmosphere of Korea (Myungjoo, Australia).

Korean culture and Korean society [will be] almost destroyed in the future. These days young people don't know well about courtesy. So older people has been worried about that (Jude, Australia).

[English] can have negative influence on Korean society and culture (Kyoungji, Australia).

... Korea culture and society will face a flood of English or western culture. We should keep our valuable culture ... we are getting lost our culture and forgotten our own holiday. Huge American major contents come through into the Asia with commercial mind. For money, a lot of Korean companies follow them. Some young people don't know about our own holidays or manners, but know well about western holidays and culture such as Halloween. Of course government and schools neglect this situation or even make worse (Songya, Australia).

In line therefore with J. Kim's (2002) research with undergraduate students, these participants, despite currently pursuing competency in English, construct the language as a broad threat to national identity. However, several resisted the constructions of the externalisation discourse:

I think that the basic of culture and language of Korea will remain intact ... [Although] ... Japanese culture will do greatest job ... almost all of our cultures are influences by Japanese already. American culture will do some job also (Berg, Korea).

In fact, I don't think English fit into Korean culture ... Cultural style/way of thinking is different (Rosa, Korea).

However English does not effect on Korean culture. Because Korean culture trends exclusive. It goes individual way (Youngmo, Australia).

Other participants narrated a non-emotive, acceptance of or response to the language/culture connection:

When I didn't know English at all, I couldn't understand western culture but now, although it's not perfect, I can (Nick, Korea).

Learning English means learning a new culture and experiencing the new custom ... I think [English] is a very interesting language. It is very different from my mother tongue. But maybe because I have learnt since I

was young I do not feel so different compare with Korean (Daniel, Australia).

As a discourse positioning the pursuit of English language competency as antithetical to national culture and tradition, the externalisation discourse (re)presents the preservation of linguistic and cultural tradition as a modern project for the Korean national. In engaging with this discourse, four participants positioned the ‘Self’ as Korean citizen in opposition to the ‘Self’ as English learner constructed within necessitation discourse, fostering contradiction and a potential for resistance.

The corollary of the externalisation construction is a belief that the pursuit of English by the Korean national is a futile endeavour due to an innate in-ability to acquire English competency, the presumed ‘difficulty’ of the language for the non-Western national and the failures of the national education system<sup>88</sup>. Several participants located both nationally and trans-nationally selectively engaged with this construction, indicating however, that although ‘different’, the acquisition of English presented a not insurmountable challenge:

... English is not so hard (but it is hard) (Daniel, Australia).

English is a difficult language to learn because the grammar structure is totally different from our language (Myungjoo, Australia).

English has different word order to Korean. So it is not easy to learn to our Koreans (Berg, Korea).

While, for this group of learners, the national self-deprecation discourse did not diminish their desire for or pursuit of English competency, the fear and doubt cultivated by this discourse are evident within the responses of participants. In narrating her English education

---

88 J.S-Y. Park (2004) refers to this discourse as the self-deprecation discourse, a national discourse speaking of and for the English learner and providing a power-full disincentive for such learners. Bound with the native/non-native binary constructed within colonial discourse, the Korean learner of English is positioned by this discourse as ‘less-than’ the native speaking ‘Other’.

'journey', Rose (Korea), for example, frequently referred to the trepidation she experienced during her own education: "I started to learn English when I was 4th grade... I feel afraid that my teacher gave me a call every morning because I could not remember how to read the book"; and the inexplicable fear surrounding the English language within the Korean context: "... I wonder why Koreans feel it difficult and afraid of it? – even though we frequently use English word in our life". Such fear, for Rosa, has led to doubts about her own competency in English: "I am afraid of teaching students because I don't think I am good enough to teach well". For Youngmo (Australia) however, fear, prior to his trans-national re-location, prevented him from engaging with the unknown 'Other' or foreigner:

I was afraid of foreigners before I came to Australia. When I was in Korea, sometimes foreigners asked some questions but I could not answer that, just avoided them. At that time, I thought they were frightful and dangerous. But I was wrong.

Both Songya (Australia) and Jude (Australia) also expressed reservations and doubts about their English ability.

This section has thus examined the extent to which this collective of Korean learners of English engaged with and used national discourses of the 'knowledge economy', the 'intellectual assets of the nation' and the 'national storyline' in narrating their pursuit of English competency. Importantly, regardless of national or trans-national location, participants broadly and, for most, seemingly un-critically, accepted a positioning as 'Korean learner of English' within national discourse. Such acceptance for some participants was due to, as per the knowledge economy, colonial-celebratory and liberalist constructions, a material desire for individual success. For others, however, this positioning was the result of a symbolic investment in English competency, a desire to 'know' strongly congruent with traditional Confucian discourse and the modern human resource discourse. In contrast, therefore, to the collective storylines constructed for Korean learners within multiple national

– and global – discourses, and despite evidence of engagement with these discourses by participants, the acquisition of English was overwhelmingly (re)presented by participants within this research project as an individual pursuit in response to individual desire, rather than the national ‘interest’. This discursive silence, while signalling a resistance by social actors from ‘within’ global/national discourses, additionally highlights the opposition and/or separation/distinction by participants between the ‘Self’ as English learner – an individualistic and agentic construction – and the Self as a modern Korean citizen. Thus, while national discourse speaks of the distinction between the ‘global’ and the ‘nationalist’ Korean ‘human resource’ as a rhetorically ‘harmonious’ duality, participants established clear demarcations between the ‘English speaking’ ‘Self’ and the ‘Self’ as a ‘nationalist’ Korean. Such findings, therefore, contradict nationalist rhetoric, highlighting discordance between the English language and Korean-ness, and the complexity of efforts to unite the global and the national for students of this non-Western context. It is important to note however that while, for these participants, a positioning as Korean learner of English results from an exercising of individual ‘free will’ in response to material and symbolic desire, the alignment of individual language acquisition ‘goals’ with the broad national ‘interest’ within national discourses, indicates the illusory and contrived nature of such ‘freedom’.

In (re)presenting the ‘Self’ as a Korean learner of English within individual storylines, participants therefore drew upon and engaged with, in a varied and disparate manner, multiple national discourses. Participant responses highlighted, however, the inherent contradiction between national discourses and the subjectivities available to Korean learners of English. Such contestations included the Korean citizen versus the English learner; the responsibilities of Korean citizenship constructed by the necessitation discourse and that of the externalisation discourse; engagement with the knowledge economy discourse and the individual burden/cost and social expectations of this ‘engagement’; the pursuit of English

and the in-ability/fear versus status/mobility associated with competency; the global ‘Self’ of the individual as distinct from the global ‘Self’ of the nation; and the presumptions of the nationalist storyline. The multiple subjectivities emerging from such varied discursive engagements in turn, have, for these participants, produced a plethora of highly unique ‘Selves’ as Korean learners of English – selves that are fragmented and contingent, at times congruent, on occasion contradictory, or existing in opposition with selves located in alternative storylines (Davies 1992:51). It is the seeming ‘opposition’ both within and between the subjectivities of this research project’s English learners and the alter-native selves available that is of further interest, indicating the involvement of the English language in the production of multiple ‘Others’ within this non-Western context, positioning the Korean learner of English as potentially (and at times simultaneously) in the centre and on the periphery, despite the presumed national status of the language acquisition ‘project’. Such findings broadly echo the constructions of colonialism, positioning the non-Western learner of English in multiple relations of power, and highlighting the ongoing complicity of modern globalising discourses available within the Korean context, with those emerging from colonialism.

In summary, therefore, this chapter has broadly examined the lived (and imagined) storylines<sup>89</sup> of a diverse collective of Korean learners for evidence of engagement with and (re)presentation of the discourses of the intergovernmental organisation, the national context, and global/national discourses of English. In constructing the position of ‘English speaker’ as valued; English acquisition as ‘tool’ and ‘key’; and English competency as the global ‘equaliser’, global discourses were variously appropriated and adapted by participants, with few seemingly offering resistance. Critically, as a result of this varied engagement and the

---

89 Davies (1990:328) makes reference to the ‘embeddedness’ of the imagined storyline within the storyline as lived by the individual, stating that “lived narratives take the form they do because we can imagine ourselves being a certain kind of person who utters certain kinds of words which lead to certain kinds of outcome”.

acquisition of English skills, participants were both ‘positioned’ and able to position the ‘Self’ in globally desired and desire-able ways, enabling a re-imagining of the ‘Self’ via ‘Western’ possibilities of global scope. Juxtaposing such global constructions, however, are the discourses of the national context – themselves a (re)presentation, appropriation and/or adaptation of the global – ambivalently positioning the ‘English learner/speaker’ simultaneously as ‘We/Us’ and ‘Other’; English acquisition as critical yet destructive; and English competency as both national saviour and national dis-ability. In variably engaging with and using such discourses, the pursuit of English has become, for these participants, a precursor of knowledge and knowing, of individual socio-economic and cultural mobility and success emerging from an educational journey imbued with national burdens and expectations, individual trepidation, and social/economic cost.

## *Chapter Eight*

### COGITATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The perpetually in-motion “global now” (Appadurai 1996:2) is a world space shaped by the “notoriously unintended and unanticipated” global/national (local) effects of the broad globalisation project (Bauman 1998:60). As a poststructuralist research project exploring the discursive ‘production’ of one such effect – the escalating desire of the non-Western Korean national for English competency – this study has accordingly spanned the global to the local in its critical analytical focus, aiming to capture and (re)present the modern conditions producing and maintaining discourses of English as ‘truth’, and the broad global/national discourses that give rise to such conditions (Foucault 1972). With the aim of determining how Korean learners of English engage with and use global and national discourses of English, this research project was based upon the following research questions:

1. How do Korean learners of English engage with global and national discourses of English in constructing the ‘Self’ as a learner of a second-language?
2. What are the implications of this engagement for the post-colonial subjectivities of Korean learners of English and the second-language learner?
3. What broader discourses bind with discourses of English in speaking of ‘learners’ and ‘learning’ and, in particular, Korean learners of English?
4. What are the consequences of these findings for the theoretical framing of this research, non-Western learners of English as a second-language and the global position of English?

In exploring such questions, this research project has traced discourse for and about the Korean nation-state and learner, through three fields of critical analysis – the globalising discourses of the intergovernmental organisation, the national discourses of the Korean context, and the varied ‘storylines’ of Korean learners of English.

#### GLOBAL/NATIONAL SUPPORT FOR THE PURSUIT OF ENGLISH

In questioning which broader discourses bind with discourses of English this research project identified, within Chapters Five and Six, both global and national discourses producing, (re)producing and maintaining the status of the English language within the Korean context. Although limited to consideration of one field of policy discourse, such discourses, imbued with the might and authority of the globally power-full, position the English language as central to broad national (neo-liberal) re-form, constructing an enticing storyline of development, of modernity, and of success for the non-Western nation-state and national.

Of fundamental import, is the production or (re)production of the broad discourse of ‘knowledge acquisition’ – a neo-liberal/colonial discourse equating the attainment of ‘Western’ knowledge/s, particularly knowledge of the English language, with myriad global/national/local rewards – within each discursive domain. For the intergovernmental organisation, this presumption has produced a homogeneous approach to educational and economic re-form, silencing alter-native ways of knowing and learning and positioning English education as central to the development of a national knowledge ‘economy’. Within such discourse, the Korean learner, as outlined in Chapter Five, is positioned as a ‘willing knowledge consumer’ but, without English capability and thus ‘inadequate’ in their grasp of the skills and knowledge necessary within globalised times – with potential, but peripherally positioned. For the Korean nation-state desiring re-location to the global economic ‘centre’, such presumptions further enable an un-critical appropriation of global ‘best practice’

educational models within policy discourse, constructing English competency as necessity, rather than choice.

Juxtaposing such acquiescence however is adaptation, or a re-defining of intergovernmental exhortations within the bounds of the nationalist narration of the nation (re)presented in Chapter Six, and a re-positioning of the Korean learner as dual global/national 'citizen'. Such nationalist constructions merge the right of national 'belonging' with global 'citizenship' and the responsibility of acquiring required global knowledge and skills; the tradition of moral education with English competency; and the individual 'reward' with the national interest. Thus, for the Korean learner of English, simultaneously positioned as peripheral and central within global and national discourses respectively, the acquisition of knowledge/s enabled by the pursuit of English is strongly bound with the advancement of the nation from global periphery to global centre, and a corresponding shift of the 'Self' from global 'knowledge' periphery to global 'knowledge' centre – from 'with potential' to knowledge-able.

Further emerging from this global to individual analysis is the pervasive assumption that internationalisation or an 'existence' of global scope, is the only desired and desire-able storyline available to the non-Western nation-state and 'citizen' in modern times. Assiduously endorsed within globalising neo-liberal discourses and by power-full global interests such as the intergovernmental organisations under consideration, the 'globalise or perish agenda' outlined in Chapter Five constructs internationalisation as beneficial to the 'growth' and 'development' of all, although "in fact serving [the] particular interests" of a few (Mulderigg 2003:online). Despite this constructed benevolence, internationalisation discourse is simultaneously underpinned and framed by a "culture of fear" (Tamatea 2005:320), constructing non-compliance as destructive to survival and success and as such, a non-choice. Positioned as critical to compliance or the key to global survival, to national/individual success and global possibilities within this discourse, is the English

language, the (constructed) ‘universal’ medium for communication and knowledge exchange. For the Korean nation-state, a non-Western context for whom both global ‘openness’ and English competency have been, and continue to be, constructed as lacking and thus responsible for economic marginality, this globally-constructed ‘storyline of fear’ seemingly has particular resonance, establishing a compelling argument for intergovernmentally-sanctioned economic, social and linguistic re-form. For the Korean learner of English, the resulting fear-full global and national globalising discourses speak of global possibility and a corresponding global/national obligation, concurrently and repeatedly positioning English competency as enabling of individual agency and achievement, yet a responsibility, and thus obligatory. Globalising English is thus simultaneously an object of fear and desire.

Such findings have, therefore, highlighted the broad complicity between global/national discourses and discourses for English, as highlighted in Table Eight below; a bounded-ness that has seemingly impelled the increasing desire for English competency within the non-Western context of Korea. In delving behind these ‘bound’ discourses and questioning, as Foucault (1972:55) suggests, what links the global discourses of English with those of this non-Western nation-state, an additional discourse, or ‘master’ storyline, emerges. This discourse – the globalising neo-liberal agenda – is therefore, despite political assertions to the contrary<sup>90</sup>, positioned as un-contested and un-contestable ‘truth’ within this context. This indicates, as the linguistic imperialist ‘critical’ framework discussed previously suggests, the pervading structural and cultural imperialism (Phillipson 1992) constructing the pursuit of English as the only linguistic option for the non-Western nation-state and learner.

---

90 Former President Roh Moo-hyun (2007d:online), for example, in a speech on Korea’s progressive values, asserted that he is “not a neo-liberalist”.

**Table Eight: Discursive linkages between global discourses and ‘critical’ frameworks of English and the global/national discourses of the Korean context<sup>91</sup>**

Global discourses and frameworks of English	Intergovernmental discourses	National discourses	National discourses of English (Park, J.S-Y. 2004)
<p><i>Colonial-celebratory discourse</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as critical knowledge</li> </ul>	<p><i>The Commodification of Knowledge</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as critical knowledge of global value</li> </ul>	<p><i>The Knowledge Economy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as critical knowledge of global value</li> </ul>	<p><i>The necessitation discourse</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as critical knowledge</li> </ul>
	<p><i>Roles and relations of consumption among social actors</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as knowledge to be acquired and used by the ‘human resource’</li> </ul>	<p><i>The intellectual assets of the nation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as critical knowledge for Korean ‘human resources’</li> </ul>	<p><i>The self-deprecation discourse</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as critical knowledge yet competency problematic for Koreans</li> </ul>
<p><i>Colonial-celebratory discourse</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as superior language for global communication</li> </ul>	<p><i>The Globalise or Perish! Agenda</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as ‘global’ language necessary for ‘openness’ of nation-state and citizen</li> </ul>	<p><i>The Globalise or Perish! Agenda</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as ‘global’ language necessary for ‘openness’ of nation-state and citizen</li> </ul>	
<p><i>The liberalist discourse</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as critical for global purposes only</li> </ul>	<p><i>The Commodification of Knowledge</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as critical knowledge of global value</li> </ul>	<p><i>The narration of the nationalist storyline</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English for global purposes, Korean language for nationalist/cultural purpose</li> </ul>	<p><i>The necessitation discourse</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as critical for global valuing of national culture</li> </ul>
<p><i>The ecology-of-language framework</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as linguistic threat to national and local context</li> </ul>			<p><i>The externalisation discourse</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English as linguistic threat to Korean language and culture</li> </ul>

<sup>91</sup> The ‘critical’ frameworks of linguistic imperialism and World Englishes were not bound with either global or national discourses within this research project and, as such, have not been included here.

## HOW DO KOREAN LEARNERS OF ENGLISH ENGAGE WITH GLOBAL AND NATIONAL DISCOURSES OF ENGLISH?

In outlining the interweaving of global/national discourses of English with broader global/national discourses of knowledge and internationalisation, this research project has aimed to render visible, albeit within one field of discourse<sup>92</sup>, the discursive ‘background’ for the pursuit of English by this group of Korean learners. Located by and within such discourses, the Korean learner of English, it is therefore presumed, will engage with and use various global and national discourses when (re)presenting this pursuit. Indeed, analysis of the individual ‘storylines’ of this group of learners in Chapter Seven indicated that such learners *do* engage with and use multiple global and national discourses – both about English and of learning and re-form – when narrating their English education journey, highlighting the increasing availability of global discourses within the Korean context. Of critical interest however, is *how* such learners used and engaged with available discourses. Emerging from this analysis therefore, is an awareness of the multiple and varied ways in which this group of learners, while positioned by and within, have used the reviewed discourses in constructing the ‘Self’ as a learner of English from the non-Western context of Korea.

As anticipated, each participant, as a desirer of English competency, positioned the English language as the critical ‘key’ to new possibilities within individual storylines, thus appropriating the constructions of both global and national discourses. Participants therefore, did not so much ‘resist’ a positioning within global/national discourse as an individual enabled to achieve an imagined future storyline via competency in this ‘target’ language, as use the terms of the reviewed global/national discourses to either validate the extrinsic nature of this positioning, or “go beyond” (Davies 2000:60) such terms to speak of intrinsic

---

<sup>92</sup> It is important to note that, while not considered within this analysis, these participants are additionally positioned within global/trans-national/national discourses speaking of and for them as a ‘Korean national’, a ‘university graduate’, a ‘mother’, a ‘traveller’, a ‘migrant’ to name a few. Consideration of such positionings was outside the scope of this research.

satisfaction. Overwhelmingly, despite a location within the globally and nationally constructed (sanctioned) 'boundaries' of their discursive positioning, these participants viewed the attainment of English as an individual endeavour, an agentic 'pursuit' with individual material, symbolic or cultural reward.

Though each learner broadly appropriated the terms of the global and national to speak of the 'Self' as a Korean learner of English as discussed in Chapter Seven, such engagement was not without ambivalence or contestation for some. Primarily, such learners utilised global/national discourses contesting English to problematise the increasing status of the English language within the Korean context, effectively demarcating between their personal (and accept-able) appropriation of the English-as-critical construction and its corresponding (and seemingly un-accept-able) (re)presentation within national discourses. Such demarcation is of interest due to the inherent contradictions and inconsistencies it constructs, effectively re-defining the terms and conditions in which the acquisition of English is endorsed by the individual learner, reiterating the distinction between the individual pursuit of English and national 'English', and establishing a clear division between the 'Self' as a Korean learner of English and the 'Self' as a Korean national. Further, in engaging with discourses both *for and* 'critical' frameworks *of* English, such participants spoke of English acquisition and competency in paradoxical terms, as simultaneously pride-filled and fear-full, as rewarding yet costly, as opportunity and burden – feared and desired.

Considered cumulatively, the findings of this research project confirm that this group of Korean learners of English strategically engage with and use the terms of both global and national discourses, in multiple and varied ways to (re)present the pursuit of English as an individual journey for individual 'reward', resisting or silencing those constructions that problematise their own individual storyline or serve to appropriate the individual 'desire' for competency as critical to the national 'interest'. Thus I ask, what are the implications of these

findings for the construction of a post-colonial subjectivity by such learners specifically, and the second-language learner in general?

Analysis of the English education storylines of this group of Korean learners has highlighted the complexity and inherent contradiction of this desired and desire-able 'journey', a journey foreseen by both global and national discourses and informed by national/trans-national educational and socio-economic structures. Positioned therefore in the discursive 'juncture' between both the global and the national (the 'Third Space') these English learners, post-colonial theory posits, "inhabit the rim of an 'in-between' reality" (Bhabha 1994:19) both spatial and temporal in nature. Enabled therefore to "negotiate and translate their cultural identities [subjectivities] in a discontinuous intertextual temporality of cultural difference" (Bhabha 1994:55), the post-colonial subjectivities formed by this 'location' are hybrids, shaped by movement and motion and responsive to the complex interplay between culture/s and societies within space and over time (Iverson 2002; McLaughlin 2002), as argued in Chapter Three. Indeed, the storylines of the Korean learners surveyed speak of such hybridity, of an appropriation of the terms and storylines of multiple global/national discourses to construct a hybrid 'Self', and the complex and negotiated/negotiable melding of such discourses to establish hybrid not-quite national, yet not-quite global, subjectivities and storylines<sup>93</sup>. Importantly, despite this strategic yet "(un)intentional distancing, rejecting, merging and adopting" (Rhee, J-e. 2006:609) from within and between discourses in order to (re)imagine the 'Self' as agentic and in-control, the narrated storylines of these learners consistently (re)present the signs, terms and storylines of global/national discourses for English, appropriating and therefore maintaining the power-full construction of English-as-global produced and maintained by the discourses of English identified in Chapter Two.

---

<sup>93</sup> These findings therefore support the globalisation-as-hybridisation perspective outlined in Chapter Three, indicating the existence of "two-way mutually constitutive dynamics" and "systematic as well as unsystematic and uneven effects" (Luke & Luke 2000:275) between global flows and the local and individual.

Further, unlike Bhabha's (1994:13) description of the "unhomely" location of the hybrid, post-colonial subject as a 'space' of 'dis-orientation' and 'dis-placement' discussed in Chapter Three, the experience of this 'in-between' was, for these post-colonial and second-language learning 'subjects', one of empowerment, namely the power to become any-one, any-where. Seemingly, therefore, the acquisition of the linguistic tools – and globalising neo-liberal discourses – of the (Western) 'master' has enabled a (re)presentation of the 'unhomeliness' of post-colonial subjectivity as desire-able and desired – as a 'familiar' position embodying a new, modern mode of 'belonging', in contrast to that which is traditional and territorialised. Thus, in spite of the posited 'unhomeliness' of his or her post-coloniality, the Korean learner of English has constructed the 'Self' – via global/national discourse – as one of "many members of [Western and non-Western] society ... searching for a sense of place" (Meyrowitz & Leiss 1990:132) in globalised times, as 'belonging' to an imagined 'community' with "no sense of place" (Meyrowitz 1985 quoted in Appadurai 1996:29)<sup>94</sup>. With the English language constructed as 'gatekeeper' to "bounty" and socio-economic privilege (Phillipson 1992:272) for members of this deterritorialised and thoroughly modern global 'community', the acquirer of the English language is seemingly en-abled to (re)imagine the 'Self' in powerful and agentic terms. While such findings have implications for the ability of the nationalist storyline to capture the 'imagination' of the English language learning 'citizen' in globalised times, these findings importantly allude to the co-existence of postnational and post-colonial subjectivity/ies within these Korean learners of English.

Further, as post-colonial subjects constructing a hybrid 'Self' within the bounds of contradictory and at times complementary global/national discourses, post-colonial theory posits that these learners of English are en-abled to exercise agency by "challeng(ing) the

---

94 Meyrowitz and Maguire (1993:48) refer to the involvement of electronic and print media in the formation of this imagined 'community', suggesting that the "current media system continues to corrode both ... old local identities and traditional notions of national identity".

colonisers [the West] in their own language” (Kumaravadivelu 1994:464), a theoretical ‘position’ problematised in Chapter Three. The findings of this research project, however, indicate that, despite the hybridity of the ‘Self’ as a second-language learner, desire for English competency and its imagined rewards has mitigated the ability and perhaps willingness of these learners to (intentionally) disrupt the authority of the ‘master’ (Bhabha 1984) and challenge the power-full ‘owners’ of that which is desired. Further, the perpetual and fixed marginal positioning of these non-Western learners as an-‘Other’ of many ‘Others’ within global discourses of English seemingly “negate(s)” the ability of these post-colonial subjects to “establish [their] own ... oppositional discourse” (Bhabha 1994:46). Rather, for these learners, the exercise of ‘agency’ equates with the ability of the individual to achieve imagined/desired rewards – not to dispute and resist – and as such (re)presents the terms of the global/national discourses that locate these learners. In supporting the assumptions of the poststructural paradigm, these findings therefore problematise the ‘authenticity’ of the post-colonial perception of agency.

#### (RE)IMAGINING RESEARCH IN A GLOBALISED WORLD SPACE

In (re)presenting the globalised storyline and subjectivities of the Korean learner of English, this research project was located within and by a broad body of prior poststructuralist research in the field of second-language education broadly outlined in Chapter Two. Critically, such research examines how contextual factors in particular the discourses, ‘exposed’ to and imbibed during language acquisition, ‘author’ the subjectivities of second-language learners (Ainsworth & Hardy 2004), thus acknowledging the multiplicity, context-dependency and fluidity of ‘selves’ available to such learners (Ajayi 2006; Kanno 2003; Koehne 2005, 2006; McKay & Wong 1996; Norton Peirce 1995a; Rhee, J-e. 2006). Unlike prior poststructuralist research, however, this research project has (re)defined this notion of the context of/for

language acquisition, from the description of immediate structural influences/effects characterising prior research, to a broader consideration of the discourses, effects and imagined possibilities available to and/or shaping such learners within the national (and trans-national) context. Importantly, within a global world space shaped by the multidimensional and border-crossing forces and flows of globalisation (Bauman 2002; Luke & Luke 2000; Singh 2002a; Torres 2002), this includes global discourses of learning and the learner. In responding broadly to the question of ‘who is a Korean learner of English?’ this research project additionally included a participant group (re)presenting the alter-native and in-formal ways in which the Korean national pursues (and is en-abled to pursue) English competency in globalised times. In representing therefore, a ‘shift’ of perspective within second-language learning research, this research project, and its findings, offer an alternative account of the influence of global/national discourses upon the subjectivities and storylines emerging from and enabled by the acquisition of English. This research, however, has not been without its own limitations, primarily arising from the physical and discursive location and linguistic in-ability of the researcher.

Of concern is the reliance of this research project upon national discourse published or produced in English. Thus, only those aspects of educational policy and/or practice deemed suitable for international ‘consumption’ were explored, while nuances and variations in the interpretation of English phrases, and their naturalisation within the Korean language were, unfortunately, undetected<sup>95</sup>. Further, in utilising a research instrument necessitating average English competency and thus including participants pre-disposed to a ‘valuing’ of English,

---

95 Although limiting the (re)presentation of the complete national contextual ‘picture’ for the acquisition of English by these learners, the distribution of both educational policy and ‘comment’ in English via the Internet, provides an indication of the extent to which the Korean nation-state and its citizens privilege the ideologies and knowledges of the English-speaking West. Furthermore, as the use of English is associated with ‘modern’ and ‘international’ within popular Korean culture (Kim, J. 2002), the use of English to disseminate policy and opinions by these social actors indicates the desire of such actors to be perceived both nationally and internationally, as modernised and power-full. In focusing purely on such discourses, this research project was therefore able to ‘track’ the extent to which the global hegemonies that position English as global language have influenced the discourses of this national context.

this research project has not given ‘voice’ to the Korean nationals marginalised by and/or resisting ‘popular’ assumptions about English acquisition. In failing to provide a counterpoint to the appropriations of these participants, it is felt that this research has been constrained in its ability to expose the interplay between the relations of power (Foucault 1982:211) and as such provide a more complete ‘picture’ of English language learning within the Korean context. An exploration of non-English discourses of English language learning and speaker responses to such discourses, while being beyond the scope (and linguistic ability) of this research project could, however, potentially form the basis of further studies. A further limitation, arising from the researcher’s physical ‘location’, was the small numbers of learners of English currently residing in Korea willing to participate in this research project, restraining the ability of this study to generate valid comparisons between the discursive appropriations and storylines of learners in each location. While the findings of this research indicate little variance between the storylines of national and trans-national learners, the small numbers of national learners involved and the prior trans-national ‘movements’ of such participants may have influenced these findings. Further research may therefore be warranted.

A last note of caution, or perhaps niggling un-ease, is borne from the research process itself, particularly the globally power-full position of this researcher as ‘knowledge-producer’ and ‘holder’ within this project, and the broader discourses reviewed. As discussed in Chapters One and Four, this research has been, through its inception and development, committed to disclosing the socio-economic-cultural position and personal motives of the researcher (Davies 1999; van Dijk 1993) and to producing knowledge ‘differently’ (Lather 1992; Rhee, J-e. 2006), yet un-ease remains. Did the relative positioning of this researcher as an English-speaker of the West influence participant responses? Did this positioning shape the analysis and (re)production of the ‘subjective’ and ‘individual’ truth of each participant within this dissertation? While the poststructuralist paradigm responds to such questions with a

resounding 'yes' – the responses of participants were formed through interaction (Davies & Harre 1990), albeit electronic interaction, and research is a subjective, value-laden and constructed endeavour (Kincheloe 2001) – the dis-ease of un-intentionally contributing to/perpetuating that which dis-empowers and marginalises participants, while intentionally rendering such discourses visible continues.

In conclusion, therefore, the layered approach and findings of this research project have highlighted the critical importance of situated and local analysis in capturing the nuances of lived experiences and the mutually-constructed dynamics of a globalised world space. While this research has primarily focused upon the pursuit of English by the second-language learner and the discursive engagement of such learners within a particular moment of space/time, the un-earthed evidence additionally alludes to and speaks of a 'bigger' picture. That is, a bigger picture comprising the second-language learner whose relationship with the English language is inherently beset by contradiction, in which, despite individual perception of 'control' and agency, the English language – and its power-full interests – are empowered by global/national discourses to "act upon" the actions of learners "which may arise in the presence or the future" (Foucault 1982:220). A bigger picture comprising a national context battling for a power-full position within the 'global now' by appropriating the economic, social, educational and linguistic 'rules' of global actors, and utilising the gaps or inconsistencies within such imperatives to retain and protect that which is presumed as uniquely national. And lastly, a bigger picture comprising a language – the English language – whose position as *the* global language of global times within discourses speaking of potential and promise, riches and rewards, presents a potent lure to the non-Western nation-state and national (re)imagining the 'Self' on a global scale.

## REFERENCES

- Abelmann, N. 1997, 'Women's Class Mobility and Identities in South Korea: A Gendered, Trans-national Narrative Approach', *The Journal of Asian Studies*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 398-420. Retrieved 13 April 2007 from JSTOR database.
- Ainsworth, S. 2001, 'The discursive construction of older worker identity: A reflection on process and methods', *Tamara: Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 29-47. Retrieved 14 November 2006 from ProQuest database.
- Ainsworth, S. & Hardy, C. 2004, 'Discourse and Identities', in *The SAGE Handbook of Organisational Discourse*, eds D. Grant, C. Hardy, C. Osrick & L. Putnam, SAGE Publications, London, pp. 153-173.
- Ajayi, L.J. 2006, 'Multiple Voices, Multiple Realities: Self-Defined Images of Self Among Adolescent Hispanic English Language Learners', *Education*, vol. 126, no. 3, pp. 468-481. Retrieved 14 November 2006 from ProQuest database.
- Amin, N. & Kubota, R. 2004, 'Native Speaker Discourses: Power and Resistance in Postcolonial Teaching of English To Speakers of Other Languages', in *Reimagining Comparative Education*, eds P. Ninnes & S. Mehta, Routledge Falmer, New York, pp. 107-127.
- Anderson, B. 1991, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and the Spread of Nationalism*, Verso, London.
- Appadurai, A. 1991, 'Global Ethnoscapes. Notes and Queries for a Trans-national Anthropology', in *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*, ed R. Fox, School of American Research, Santa Fe, pp. 191-210.
- Appadurai, A. 1996, *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalisation*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Appadurai, A. 1999, 'Globalization and the research imagination', *International Social Science Journal*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 229-238.
- Armitage, L-A. 1999, 'Factors Affecting the Adjustment of Koreans Studying in Australia', Master thesis, Swinburne University of Technology, Australia. Retrieved 1 November 2006 from [http://www.dfat.gov.au/akf/laa\\_images/laa\\_chapter2.html](http://www.dfat.gov.au/akf/laa_images/laa_chapter2.html).
- Arnone, R.F. & Torres, C.A. 1999, *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local*, Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham.

- Asgary, N. & Walle, A.H. 2002, 'The cultural impact of globalisation: Economic activity and social change', *Cross Cultural Management*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 58-75. Retrieved 26 May 2008 from ProQuest database.
- Astiz, F.A., Wiseman, A.W. & Baker, D.P. 2002, 'Slouching toward decentralisation: Consequences of Globalisation for Curricular Control in National Education Systems', *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 66-91.
- Baker, W. 2003, 'Should culture be an overt component of EFL instruction outside of English speaking countries? The Thai context', *The Asian EFL Journal*. Retrieved 7 September 2006 from [http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/dec\\_03\\_wb.pdf](http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/dec_03_wb.pdf).
- Ball, S.J. 1994, *Education Reform: A Critical and Post-Structural Approach*, Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Ball, S.J. 1998, 'Big policies/Small world: An introduction to international perspectives in education policy', *Comparative Education*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 119-131. Retrieved 19 May 2006 from ProQuest database.
- Bamgbose, A. 2001, 'World Englishes and globalization', *World Englishes*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 357-363. Retrieved 14 November 2006 from SwetsWise database.
- Bamgbose, A. 2003, 'A recurring decimal: English in language policy and planning', *World Englishes*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 419-431. Retrieved 14 November 2006 from SwetsWise database.
- Banister, P., Burman, E., Parker, I., Taylor, M. & Tindall, C. 1994, *Qualitative Methods in Psychology*, Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Bauman, Z. 1998, *Globalization: The Human Consequences*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Bauman, Z. 2001, *The Individualized Society*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Bauman, Z. 2002, 'Global solidarity', *Tikkun*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 12-16. Retrieved 26 September 2006 from ProQuest database.
- Bauman, Z. 2006, *Liquid Fear*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Bergeron, S. 2001, 'Political Economy Discourses of Globalisation and Feminist Politics', *Signs*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 983-1006. Retrieved 29 May 2008 from JSTOR database.
- Bhabha, H. 1984, 'Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse', *October*, vol. 28, pp. 125-133. Retrieved 19 July 2007 from JSTOR database.

- Bhabha, H. 1992, 'The World and the Home', *Social Text*, vol. 31/32, pp. 141-153. Retrieved 16 June 2008 from JSTOR database.
- Bhabha, H.K. 1994, *The Location of Culture*, Routledge, London.
- Bhabha, H.K. 1996, 'Culture's In-Between', in *Questions of Cultural Identity*, eds S. Hall & P. du Gay, SAGE Publications, London, pp. 53-60.
- Bhatnagar, R. 1986, 'Uses and Limits of Foucault: A Study of the Theme of Origins in Edward Said's 'Orientalism'', *Social Scientist*, vol. 14, no. 7, pp. 3-22. Retrieved 14 June 2008 from JSTOR database.
- Billig, M. 1997, 'Discursive, rhetorical, and ideological messages', in *The Message of Social Psychology: Perspectives on Mind in Society*, eds C. McGarty & S.A. Haslam, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, pp.36-53.
- Bloome, D. & Talwalkar, S. 1997, 'Critical discourse analysis and the study of reading and writing', *Reading Research Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 104-113.
- Bonal, X. 2002, 'Plus ca change: The World Bank Global Education Policy and the Post-Washington Consensus', *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 3-21.
- Bonal, X. 2003, 'The Neoliberal Education Agenda and the Legitimation Crisis: Old and New State Strategies', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 159-175. Retrieved 26 July 2007 from JSTOR database.
- Bottomley, G. 1992, 'Culture, Ethnicity and the Politics/Poetics of Representation', *Australia and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 208-223.
- Bourdieu, P. 1998, 'Utopia of Endless Exploitation: The essence of neoliberalism', *Le Monde Diplomatique*. Retrieved 19 May 2006 from [www.monediplo.com/1998/12/08bourdieu](http://www.monediplo.com/1998/12/08bourdieu).
- Brandth, B. & Haugen, M.S. 2005, 'Text, Body, and Tools. Changing Mediations of Rural Masculinity', *Men and Masculinities*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 148-163. Retrieved 7 September 2006 from <http://jmm.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/8/2/148>.
- Breen, M. 1998, *The Koreans. Who they are, What they want, Where their future lies*. Orion business books, London.
- Bunyan, M. 1999, *Cyber-worlds: (Dis)Simulation and power in cyberspace*, Keele Publishers. Retrieved 20 June 2008 from <http://www.virtualllearning.org.uk/elearning/cyberworlds.html>

- Burbules, N.C. & Torres, C.A. (eds) 2000, *Globalisation and Education: Critical Perspectives*, Routledge, New York.
- Canagarajah, A.S. 2000, 'Negotiating Ideologies through English: Strategies from the Periphery', in *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies*, ed T. Ricento, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, p. 121-132.
- Carspecken, P.F. & Apple, M. 1992, 'Critical Qualitative Research: Theory, Methodology, and Practice', in *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*, eds M.D. LeCompte, W.L. Millroy & J. Preissle, Academic Press, San Diego, pp. 507-553.
- Chambers, I. & Curti, L. (eds) 1996, *The Post-Colonial Question. Common Skies, Divided Horizons*, Routledge, New York.
- Chang, S.J. 2000, 'Korea Advised to Open Up to the World', *Korean American Science and Technology News*, 9 February. Retrieved 26 February 2007 from <http://www.duke.edu/~myhan/kaf0005.html>.
- Chang, J. 2006, 'Globalisation and English in Chinese higher education', *World Englishes*, vol. 25, no. 3/4, pp. 513-525. Retrieved 14 November from SwetsWise database.
- Cho Han, H-J. 2000, 'You are entrapped in an imaginary well: the formation of subjectivity within compressed development – a feminist critique of modernity and Korean culture', *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 49-71. Retrieved 13 April 2007 from Informaworld database.
- Choi, M. 1997, 'Korean Students in Australian Universities: Intercultural Issues', *Higher Education Research and Development*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 263-282.
- Choi, E. 2006, 'Korean Educational Policies and Current Issues', *AEF Professional Development Workshop*, 16 April, Chungbuk National University, Korea. Retrieved 25 May 2007 from [http://english.moe.go.kr/board/brd\\_svr\\_read.jsp?srchSel=&srchVal=&brd\\_no=51&cp=1&brd\\_mainno=254](http://english.moe.go.kr/board/brd_svr_read.jsp?srchSel=&srchVal=&brd_no=51&cp=1&brd_mainno=254).
- Chosun Ilbo. 2000, [Editorial] *English As Second Language*, 19 January. Retrieved 26 February 2007 from <http://english.chosun.com/w21data/html/news/200001/200001190381.html>.
- Chosun Ilbo. 2007, *Does Korea Gain from being a 'Republic of English'?*, 2 May. Retrieved 24 August 2007 from <http://english.chosun.com/w21data/html/news/200705/200705020009.html>.

- Chung, S. 2006, 'Improving Korea's English Language Instruction', *Samsung Economic Research Institute*, 13 September, Korea. Retrieved 22 June 2007 from <http://www.koreaeconomy.org/04/wldColumnV.html?mn=F&mncd=0103&key=200609120001>
- Chung, M-S. 2006, 'Why we chose Korea-U.S. FTA (Free Trade Agreement)? Special Planning on Korea-U.S. FTA – Door to the World', 18 July. Retrieved 4 March 2007 from [http://16c wd.pa.go.kr/cwd/en/archive/archive\\_view.php?meta\\_id=en\\_infocus&category=157&navi=infocus&id=2584bc3bc78cb13ab9214b0b](http://16c wd.pa.go.kr/cwd/en/archive/archive_view.php?meta_id=en_infocus&category=157&navi=infocus&id=2584bc3bc78cb13ab9214b0b)
- Codd, J.A. 1988, 'The Construction and Deconstruction of Educational Policy Documents', *Journal of Education Policy*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 235-247.
- Collins, S.G. 2005, 'Who's this *Tong-il*? English, culture and ambivalence in South Korea', *Changing English*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 417-429. Retrieved 23 September 2007 from EBSCOHost database.
- Creswell, J.W. & Miller, D.L. 2000, 'Determining Validity in Qualitative Inquiry', *Theory into Practice*, vol. 39, no.3, pp. 124-130. Retrieved 16 January 2007 from EBSCOHost database.
- Crystal, D. 1997, *English as a Global Language*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Dale, R. 1999, 'Specifying globalisation effects on national policy: a focus on the mechanisms', *Journal of Education Policy*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1-17.
- Davies, B. 1989, 'The Discursive Production of the Male/Female Dualism in School Settings', *Oxford Review of Education*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 229-241. Retrieved 15 January 2007 from JSTOR database.
- Davies, B. 1990, 'Lived and Imaginary Narratives and Their Place in Taking Oneself up as a Gendered Being', *Australian Psychologist*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 318-332.
- Davies, B. 1992, 'A Feminist Poststructuralist Analysis of Discursive Practices in the Classroom and Playground', *Discourse*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 49-66.
- Davies, B. 1993, *Shards of Glass. Children reading and writing beyond gendered identities*, Allen & Unwin, St. Leonards, Australia.
- Davies, B. 1999, 'What is Feminist Poststructuralist Research? Examining Texts of Childhood', in *Constructing Gender and Difference: Critical Research Perspectives on Early Childhood*, ed B. Kamler, Hampton Press Inc., New Jersey, pp. 13-31.
- Davies, B. 2000, *A Body of Writing 1990-1999*, AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek, California.

- Davies, B. 2004, 'Introduction: poststructural lines of flight in Australia', *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 3-9. Retrieved 23 September 2007 from EBSCOhost database.
- Davies, B. & Harre, R. 1990, 'Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves', *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 43-63. Retrieved 7 September, 2006 from <http://www.massey.ac.nz/~alock/position/position.htm>.
- deJong Lambert, W. 2006, 'UNESCO: Bridging Three World-Systems?', *European Education*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 82-94.
- Delors, J. 1996, 'Education: the necessary Utopia', *Learning: The Treasure Within. Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century*, UNESCO Publishing, Paris, pp. 13-36.
- Doecke, B., Howie, M. & Sawyer, W. (eds) 2006, "*Only connect*"...*English teaching, schooling and community*, Wakefield Press, Adelaide.
- Dorn, C. 2006, "The World's Schoolmaster': Educational Reconstruction, Grayson Kefauver, and the Founding of UNESCO, 1942-46", *History of Education*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 297-320.
- Dreyfus, H.L. & Rabinow, P. (eds) 1982, *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, Harvester Press, Brighton.
- Egerton, H.E. 1941, *A Short History of British Colonial Policy, 1606-1909*, Methuen, London.
- Escobar, A. 1992, 'Imagining a Post-Development Era? Critical Thought, Development and Social Movements', *Social Text*, vol. 31/32, pp. 20-56. Retrieved 16 June 2008 from JSTOR database.
- Escobar, A. 1995, *Encountering Development. The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Fairclough, N. 1993, 'Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: the universities', *Discourse & Society*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 133-168.
- Fairclough, N. 1995, *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*, Longman, London.
- Fairclough, N. 2001, *Language and Power*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, Pearson Education Limited, Essex.
- Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. 1997, 'Critical Discourse Analysis', in *Discourse as Social Interaction. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction, vol.2*, ed T.A van Dijk, SAGE Publications, London, pp. 258-284.

- Fanon, F. 1968, *Black Skin White Masks*, MacGibbon & Kee Limited, London.
- Fitzsimons, P. 2000, 'Changing Conceptions of Globalisation: Changing Conceptions of Education', *Educational Theory*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 505-520. Retrieved 24 May 2008 from ProQuest database.
- Foucault, M. 1972, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Tavistock Publications Limited, London.
- Foucault, M. 1982, 'Afterword: The Subject and Power', in *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, eds H.L. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow, Harvester Press, Brighton, Sussex, pp. 208-226.
- Fox, R. 1991, *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present*, School of American Research, Santa Fe.
- Francis, B. 1999, 'Modernist reductionism or post-structuralist relativism: can we move on? An evaluation of the arguments in relation to feminist educational research', *Gender and Education*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 381-393. Retrieved 23 March 2008 from ProQuest database.
- Gandhi, L. 1998, *Postcolonial Theory. A Critical Introduction*. Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, NSW.
- Gavin, M. & Rodrik, D. 1995, 'The World Bank in Historical Perspective', *The American Economic Review*, vol. 85, no. 2, pp. 329-334. Retrieved 7 December 2007 from JSTOR database.
- Gee, J.P. 1996, *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, Taylor & Francis, London.
- Gee, J.P. 2000-2001, 'Identity as an Analytic Lens for Research in Education', *Review of Research in Education*, vol. 25, pp. 99-125. Retrieved 29 November 2007 from JSTOR database.
- Gee, J.P. & Green, J.L. 1998, 'Discourse Analysis, Learning, and Social Practice: A Methodological Study', *Review of Research in Education*, vol. 23, pp. 119-169. Retrieved 29 November 2007 from JSTOR database.
- Gee, J.P., Michaels, S. & O'Connor, M.C. 1992, 'Discourse Analysis', in *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*, eds M.D. LeCompte, W.L. Millroy, J. Preissle, Academic Press, San Diego, pp. 227-292.
- Gikandi, S. 2006, 'Postcolonial Theory and the Specter of Nationalism', *Clio*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 69-84. Retrieved 14 June 2008 from ProQuest database.

- Giroux, H.A. & McLaren, P. (eds) 1994, *Between Borders: Pedagogy and the Politics of Cultural Studies*, Routledge, New York.
- Giulianotti, R. & Robertson, R. 2006, 'Glocalization, Globalisation and Migration. The Case of Scottish Football Supporters in North America', *International Sociology*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 171-198. Retrieved 5 December, 2006 from Swetswise database.
- Grant, D., Hardy, C., Osrick, C. & Putnam, L. 2004, *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Discourse*, SAGE Publications, London.
- Grossberg, L. 1994, 'Introduction: Bringin' It All Back Home – Pedagogy and Cultural Studies', in *Between Borders: Pedagogy and the Politics of Cultural Studies*, eds H.A. Giroux & P. McLaren, Routledge, New York, pp. 1-28.
- Guinnane, T., Sundstrom, W.A. & Whatley, W.C. 2003, *History Matters: Essays on Economic Growth, Technology, and Demographic Change*, Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, California.
- Gurria, A. 2007, 'Reaping the Benefits of Globalisation: The Importance of Public Policies', *Foreign Relations Commission, Chamber of Deputies*, 22 February, Rome. Retrieved 15 April 2007 from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/2/29/38144150.pdf>.
- Hahn, C. 1997, 'An Election Without Issues', *The 1997 Korean Elections*, Asia Society. Retrieved 24 June 2006 from, [http://www.asiasociety.org/publications/update\\_elections.html#Specialists](http://www.asiasociety.org/publications/update_elections.html#Specialists).
- Hall, S. 1991, 'Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities', in *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*, ed A.D. King, MacMillan Education Ltd., Hampshire, pp. 41-68.
- Hall, S. 1996a, 'Introduction. Who Needs 'Identity?'' in *Questions of Cultural Identity*, eds S. Hall & P. du Gay, SAGE Publications, London, pp. 1-17.
- Hall, S. 1996b, 'When was 'the post-colonial'? Thinking at the Limit', in *The Post-Colonial Question. Common Skies, Divided Horizons*, ed. I. Chambers & L. Curti, Routledge, London, pp. 242-261.
- Hall, S. & du Gay, P. (eds) 1996, *Questions of Cultural Identity*, SAGE Publications, London.
- Han, S-A. 2005, 'Good teachers know where to scratch when learners feel itchy: Korean learners' views of native-speaking teachers of English', *Australian Journal of Education*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 197-214. Retrieved 25 September 2006 from Expanded Academic database.
- Hankyoreh, 2005, [Editorial] 'Official English' and Growth are Unrelated, 21 October. Retrieved 26 February 2007 from [http://www.hani.co.kr/arti/opinion/english\\_editorials/73198.html](http://www.hani.co.kr/arti/opinion/english_editorials/73198.html).

- Hankyoreh, 2006, *Kindergarteners now part of English-test fever*, 6 January. Retrieved 26 February 2007 from [http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english\\_edition/e\\_national/182528.html](http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_national/182528.html)
- Hardy, C. & Phillips, N. 2004, 'Discourse and Power', in *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Discourse*, eds D. Grant, C. Hardy, C. Osrick, & L. Putnam, SAGE Publications, London, pp. 299-316.
- Hart, D. 1999, 'Creating the National Other: Opposing Images of Nationalism in South and North Korean Education', *Korean Studies*, vol. 23, pp. 68-93. Retrieved 1 November 2006 from ProQuest database.
- Held, D. & McGrew, A. 2007, *Globalisation/Anti-Globalisation: Beyond the Great Divide*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Henry, M., Lingard, B., Rizvi, F. & Taylor, S. 2001, *The OECD, Globalisation and Education Policy*, Pergamon, Amsterdam.
- Hill, D. 2003, 'Global Neo-Liberalism, the Deformation of Education and Resistance', *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, Retrieved 19 May 2006 from <http://www.jceps.com/?pageID=article&articleID=7>
- Holstein, J.A. & Gubrium, J.F. 1995, *The Active Interview*, SAGE Publications, California.
- Holstein, J.A. & Gubrium, J.F. (eds) 2003, *Inside Interviewing. New Lenses, New Concerns*, SAGE Publications, London.
- Hsieh, M-H. 2006, 'Identity Development of East Asian Female International Students with Implications for Second-Language Higher Education', *Education*, vol. 127, no. 1, pp. 3-16. Retrieved 14 November, 2006 from ProQuest database.
- Huh, K-c., Park, S-K., Min, Y-S., Lee, K-W., Lee, M-S., Jeong, Y-K. & Kim, J-S. 2005, 'Research for the Improvement of General Guidelines for the National Curriculum', *Abstracts of 2005 KICE Research Paper*, pp. 8-16. Retrieved 25 May 2007 from [www.kice.re.kr/kice/download?url=/eng/upload&filename=2005\\_31.pdf](http://www.kice.re.kr/kice/download?url=/eng/upload&filename=2005_31.pdf)
- Hurt, M. 2006a, *Thoughts on Minjok at The Matrix*. Retrieved 22 June 2007 from [http://metropolitician.blogs.com/scribblings\\_of\\_the\\_metrop/2006/02/thoughts\\_on\\_the.html](http://metropolitician.blogs.com/scribblings_of_the_metrop/2006/02/thoughts_on_the.html).
- Hurt, M. 2006b, *Attack of the clones*. Retrieved 22 June 2007 from [http://metropolitician.blogs.com/scribblings\\_of\\_the\\_metrop/2006/08/attack\\_of\\_the\\_c.html](http://metropolitician.blogs.com/scribblings_of_the_metrop/2006/08/attack_of_the_c.html).
- Hussain, T. 2007, 'Another look at Korea's education crisis', *The Korea Herald*, 16 March. Retrieved from <http://www.diamond-dilemma.com/tt/kor/40>.

- Im, Y-K. 1998, 'Public Perceptions about the Status of Education in Korea', *Korean Educational Development Institute*. Retrieved 26 February 2007 from [http://eng.kedi.re.kr/common/file\\_down.php?path=kedi\\_research\\_reports/C2.pdf](http://eng.kedi.re.kr/common/file_down.php?path=kedi_research_reports/C2.pdf).
- Iverson, D. 2002, *Postcolonial Liberalism*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Jeon, H-Y. 2006, 'The Economics of English', *Samsung Economics Research Institute*. Retrieved 22 June 2007 from [www.seriworld.org](http://www.seriworld.org).
- Jones, P.W. 1998, 'Globalisation and Internationalisation: Democratic Prospects for World Education', *Comparative Education*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 143-155. Retrieved 7 December 2007 from JSTOR database.
- Kachru, B.B. 1986, 'The power and politics of English', *World Englishes*, vol. 5, no. 2/3, pp. 121-140.
- Kachru, Y. 2006, 'Mixers lyricism in Hinglish: blending and fusion in Indian pop culture', *World Englishes*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 223-233. Retrieved 9 March 2008 from EBSCOHost Database.
- Kamler, B (ed) 1999, *Constructing Gender and Difference: Critical Research Perspectives on Early Childhood*, Hampton Press, Inc. New Jersey.
- Kanno, Y. 2003, *Negotiating Bilingual and Bicultural Identities. Japanese Returnees Betwixt Two Worlds*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, London.
- Kapoor, I. 2002, 'Capitalism, Culture, Agency: Dependency versus Postcolonial Theory', *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 647-664. Retrieved 19 June 2008 from JSTOR database.
- KBS Global News. 2006, *Vision 2030*. Retrieved 26 February 2007 from [http://english.kbs.co.kr/news/zoom/1413257\\_11781.html](http://english.kbs.co.kr/news/zoom/1413257_11781.html).
- Keeves, J & Lakomski, G. (eds) 1999, *Issues in Educational Research*, Pergamon, Amsterdam.
- Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation. (n.d.), *National Curriculum*. Retrieved 25 May 2007 from [http://www.kice.re.kr/kice/eng/info/info\\_2.jsp](http://www.kice.re.kr/kice/eng/info/info_2.jsp).
- Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation. 2000, 'A Basic Study for the Construction of School Curriculum in the Knowledge-Based Society'. Retrieved 25 May 2007 from [http://www.kice.re.kr/kice/eng/research3/research3\\_2000\\_1.jsp#1](http://www.kice.re.kr/kice/eng/research3/research3_2000_1.jsp#1).

- Kim, E-g. 2001, 'Human Resource Development Policy in the Context of Globalization: Visions and Goals in Korea', *International Forum on Educational Reforms in the Asia-Pacific Region*, 14-16 February, Hong Kong. Retrieved 26 February 2007 from [http://eng.kedi.re.kr/03\\_archives/reports\\_result.php](http://eng.kedi.re.kr/03_archives/reports_result.php).
- Kim, E-g. 2003, 'Educational Policy and Reform in Korea', *Korean Educational Development Institute*. Retrieved 12 December 2006 from [http://eng.kedi.re.kr/02\\_research/research\\_01.php?sub\\_num=22](http://eng.kedi.re.kr/02_research/research_01.php?sub_num=22).
- Kim, G-J. 2001, 'Education Policies and Reform in South Korea', *Secondary Education in Africa: Strategies for Renewal*, World Bank presentations at the December 2001 UNESCO/BREDA-World Bank Regional Workshop in Mauritius on the Renewal of African Secondary Education, pp. 29-40. Retrieved 26 February 2007 from [http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTAFRREGTOPSEIA/Resources/SE\\_strat\\_re\\_ch3.pdf?resourceurlname=SE\\_strat\\_re\\_ch3.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTAFRREGTOPSEIA/Resources/SE_strat_re_ch3.pdf?resourceurlname=SE_strat_re_ch3.pdf).
- Kim, G-J. 2003, 'Technology in Education and Lifelong Learning', *China-Korea Workshop on Lifelong Learning (World Bank)*, Seoul. Retrieved 6 July 2007 from <http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/19149/Documents%20and%20Settings/wb230542/Desktop/Seoul/e-LearningWB.ppt#1>.
- Kim, G-J. 2004, 'Educational Reform and LLL in the Global Knowledge Economy. The Case of Korea', *Lifelong Learning International Forum*, Shanghai Pudong, 15-17 December, pp. 1-33. Retrieved 1 November 2006 from <http://www.moe.go.kr>.
- Kim, J. 2002, *Globalisation and English Language Education in Korea: Socialisation and Identity Construction of Korean Youth*, PhD thesis, New Mexico University.
- Kim, K-J. 2006, *The Development of Modern South Korea. State formation, capitalist development and national identity*, Routledge, New York.
- Kim, K.S. 1999, 'A Statist Political Economy and High Demand for Education in South Korea', *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, vol. 7, no. 19. Retrieved 1 November 2006 from, <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v7n19.html>
- Kim, K.S. 2005, 'Globalization, Statist Political Economy, and Unsuccessful Education Reform in South Korea, 1993-2003', *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, vol. 13, no. 12. Retrieved 1 November 2006 from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v13n12/>
- Kim, S.S. 2000a, 'Korea and Globalisation', in *Korea's Globalization*, ed. S.S. Kim, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp.83-88.
- Kim, S.S. (ed) 2000b, *Korea's Globalization*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Kim, T-Y. 2006, 'Motivation and Attitudes Toward Foreign Language Learning as Socio-politically Mediated Constructs: The Case of Korean High School Students', *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 165-192.
- Kim, Y.C. (n.d.), 'The Background of School System Reform and Its Future Direction', *Korean Educational Development Institute*. Retrieved 26 February 2007 from <http://eng.kedi.re.kr/>.
- Kim, Y-j, 2000, 'OECD Rep. Calls for English as Second Official Language', *Chosun Ilbo*, 15 February. Retrieved 26 February 2007 from <http://english.chosun.com/w21data/html/news/200002/200002150503.html>.
- Kim, Y.M. 2005, 'Catch the comedy in Korea's English Craze', *OhmyNews International*, 25 February. Retrieved 6 July 2007 from [http://english.ohmynews.com/articleview/article\\_view.asp?menu=c10400&no=212707&rel\\_no=1](http://english.ohmynews.com/articleview/article_view.asp?menu=c10400&no=212707&rel_no=1).
- Kim, Y.S. 1996, 'Toward the Globalization of the Republic of Korea and Asia', *The Asia Society*, 9 May. Retrieved 25 May 2007 from <http://www.asiasociety.org/speeches/sam.html>.
- Kim, B.S.K., Brenner, B.R., Liang, C.T.H., & Asay, P.A. 2003, 'A qualitative study of adaptation experiences of 1.5-generation Asian Americans', *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 156-170.
- Kim, J., Lee, J-g. & Lee, S-k. 2005, 'Understanding of Education Fever in Korea', *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 7-15. Retrieved 16 March 2007 from <http://eng.kedi.re.kr/>.
- Kincheloe, J.L. 2001, 'Describing the Bricolage: Conceptualising a New Rigor in Qualitative Research', *Qualitative Inquiry*, vol. 7, pp. 679-692. Retrieved 25 October 2007 from SwetsWise Online Content.
- King, A.D. (ed) 1991, *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*, MacMillan Education Ltd, Hampshire.
- Koehne, N. 2005, '(Re)construction: Ways international students talk about their identity', *Australian Journal of Education*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 104-119.
- Koehne, N. 2006, '(Be)Coming, (Be)Longing: Ways in which international students talk about themselves', *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 241-257.
- Kogan, S.S. 1998, 'The politics of making meaning: discourse analysis of a 'postmodern' interview', *Journal of Family Therapy*, vol. 20, pp. 229-251.

- Kong, T.Y. 2005, 'Labour and Neo-Liberal Globalisation in South Korea and Taiwan', *Modern Asian Studies*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 155-188. Retrieved 26 May 2008 from Cambridge Journals Online.
- Korang, K.L. 2004, 'Where is Africa? When is the West's Other? Literary Postcoloniality in a Comparative Anthropology', *diacritics*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 38-61. Retrieved 14 June 2008 from ProQuest database.
- Korean Culture and Information Service, 2006, *Main Features*, 1 September. Retrieved 26<sup>th</sup> February 2007 from [http://www.korea.net/news/issues/issueDetailView.asp?board\\_no=13345](http://www.korea.net/news/issues/issueDetailView.asp?board_no=13345).
- Korean Culture and Information Service. 2007, *Vision 2030 Forum discusses Korea's strategy for the future*, 2 February. Retrieved 26 February 2007 from [http://www.korea.net/news/issues/issueDetailView.asp?board\\_no=15154](http://www.korea.net/news/issues/issueDetailView.asp?board_no=15154).
- Kramersch, C. 1987, 'Socialization and Literacy in a Foreign Language: Learning through Interaction', *Theory into Practice*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 243-250. Retrieved 28 August 2006 from JSTOR database.
- Kramersch, C. 1993, 'Language Study as Border Study: Experiencing Difference', *European Journal of Education*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 349-358. Retrieved 28 August 2006 from JSTOR database.
- Kramersch, C. 1997, 'The Privilege of Nonnative Speakers', *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, vol. 112, no. 3, pp. 359-370.
- Krishnaswamy, N. & Burde, A.S. 1998, *The Politics of Indians' English. Linguistic Colonialism and the Expanding English Empire*, Oxford University Press, Delhi.
- Kubota, R. 1998, 'Ideologies of English in Japan', *World Englishes*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 295-306.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. 1999, 'Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis', *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 453-484. Retrieved 8 March 2008 from JSTOR database.
- Kuznets, P.W. 1977, *Economic Growth and Structure in the Republic of Korea*, Yale University Press, London.
- Kwak, B-S. 2001, 'Leading the Future: Policy Directions and Tasks of Education in Korea', *Korean Educational Development Institute*. Retrieved 26 February 2007 from <http://eng.kedi.re.kr/>.
- Lather, P. 1992, 'Critical Frames in Educational Research: Feminist and Post-structural Perspectives', *Theory into Practice*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 87-99. Retrieved 16 January 2007 from EBSCOHost database.

- Lauglo, J. 1996, 'Banking on Education and the Uses of Research. A Critique of: World Bank Priorities and Strategies for Education', *International Journal of Educational Development*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 221-233.
- LeCompte, M.D., Millroy, W.L. & Preissle, J. (eds) 1992, *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*, Academic Press, San Diego.
- Lee, B-H. 2006, 'Welcome Address', *6<sup>th</sup> International Education Forum*, 15 June, Sejong Hall, Korea. Retrieved 1 November 2006 from, [http://english.moe.go.kr/board/brd\\_svr\\_read.jsp?srchSel=&srchVal=&brd\\_no=55&cp=1&brd\\_mainno=295](http://english.moe.go.kr/board/brd_svr_read.jsp?srchSel=&srchVal=&brd_no=55&cp=1&brd_mainno=295)
- Lee, C-J. 2000, 'South Korean Foreign Relations Face the Globalization Challenges', in *Korea's Globalization*, ed. S.S. Kim, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 170-195.
- Lee, D. 2006, *Globalization and South Korean Educational Reform in the Mid-1990's*, PhD thesis, Florida State University. Retrieved 22 February 2007 from <http://etd.lib.fsu.edu/theses/available/etd-01092006-202551/>.
- Lee, H-K. 1994, 'Attitudinal Reform Toward Globalisation', *Korea Focus*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 85-94.
- Lee, H-y. 2007, 'After revealing the FTA text: how much did Korea give up?', *The Hankyoreh*, 28 May 2007. Retrieved 26 June 2007 from [http://www.bilaterals.org/article.php3?id\\_article=8442](http://www.bilaterals.org/article.php3?id_article=8442).
- Lee, J-K. 2004, 'Globalization and Higher Education: A South Korean Perspective', *Globalization*, vol. 4, no. 1. Retrieved 28 August 2006 from <http://globalization.icaap.org/content/v4.1/lee.html>.
- Lee, J.S. 2004, 'Linguistic hybridization in K-Pop: discourse of self-assertion and resistance', *World Englishes*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 429-450.
- Lee, Y-H. 1997, *The State, Society and Big Business in South Korea*, Routledge, London.
- Lim, C. 1994, 'English For Technology – Yes! English For Culture – No!', in *The Politics of Multiculturalism in the Asia/Pacific*, ed D. Myers, Northern Territory University Press, Darwin, pp. 49-56.
- Lim, P.W. 2003, 'Path Dependence in Action: The Adoption and Persistence of the Korean Model of Economic Development', in *History Matters: Essays on Economic Growth, Technology, and Demographic Change*, eds T. Guinnane, W.A. Sundstrom & W.C. Whatley, Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, California, pp. 142-162.

- Lim, H-C. & Jang, J-H. 2006, 'Neo-Liberalism in Post-Crisis South Korea: Social Conditions and Outcomes', *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, vol. 36 no. 4, pp. 442-464. Retrieved 1 November 2006 from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- London, N.A. 2003, 'Ideology and politics in English-language education in Trinidad and Tobago: The Colonial Experience and a Postcolonial Critique', *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 287-320. Retrieved 14 June 2008 from ProQuest database.
- Loomba, A. 1998, *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*, Routledge, London.
- Luke, A. 1995, 'Text and Discourse in Education: An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis', *Review of Research in Education*, vol. 21, pp. 3-48. Retrieved 7 September 2006 from JSTOR database.
- Luke, A. 1997, 'New narratives of human capital: recent directions in Australian educational policy', *Australian Educational Researcher*, vol. 24, no.2, pp. 1-21.
- Luke, A. 1999, 'Critical Discourse Analysis', in *Issues in Educational Research*, eds J.P. Keeves & G. Lakomski, Pergamon, Amsterdam, pp. 161-173.
- Luke, A. 2000, 'Critical literacy in Australia: A matter of context and standpoint', *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, vol. 43, no. 5, pp. 448-462.
- Luke, A. 2003, 'Literacy and the other: A sociological approach to literacy research and policy in multilingual societies', *Reading Research Quarterly*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 132-142.
- Luke, A. & Luke, C. 2000, 'A Situated Perspective on Cultural Globalisation', in *Globalisation and Education: Critical Perspectives*, eds N.C. Burbules & C.A. Torres, Routledge, New York, pp. 275-297.
- MacEwan, A. 1999, *Neo-Liberalism or Democracy? Economic Strategy, Markets, and Alternatives for the 21st Century*, Zed Books, London.
- Maclure, M. 2003, *Discourse in Educational and Social Research*, Open University Press. Buckingham.
- Makoni, S. & Pennycook, A. (eds) 2007, *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*, Multilingual Matters Ltd., Clevedon, United Kingdom.
- Manathunga, C. 2007, "'Unhomely' Academic Developer Identities: More post-colonial explorations", *International Journal for Academic Development*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 25-34.
- Mann, C. & Stewart, F. 2003, 'Internet Interviewing', in *Inside Interviewing. New Lenses, New Concerns*, eds J.A. Holstein and J.F. Gubrium, SAGE Publications, London, pp. 241-265.

- Marginson, S. & Mollis, M. 2001, "The Door Opens and the Tiger Leaps": Theories and Reflexivities of Comparative Education for a Global Millennium', *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 581-615. Retrieved 20 September 2007 from JSTOR database.
- Martin, E. 2007, "Frenglish" for sale: multilingual discourses for addressing today's global consumer', *World Englishes*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 170-188.
- Martinelli, A. 2005, *Global Modernization. Rethinking the Project of Modernity*, SAGE Publications, London.
- McCarthy, C., Giardina, M.D., Harewood, S.J. & Park, J-K. 2003, 'Contesting culture: Identity and curriculum dilemmas in the age of globalization, postcolonialism, and multiplicity', *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 73, no. 3, pp. 449-465. Retrieved 7 July 2007 from ProQuest database.
- McGarty, C. & Haslam, S.A. 1997, *The Message of Social Psychology. Perspectives on Mind in Society*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.
- McKay, S.L. & Wong, S-L.C. 1996, 'Multiple discourses, multiple identities: Investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students', *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 577-609. Retrieved 1 December 2006 from ProQuest database.
- McLaughlin, J.M. 2002, 'Seeking Hybrid Identities through Ambivalence: A Postcolonial Interpretation of the Experiences of an International (Australia and Papua New Guinea) Secondary Education Project', *Proceedings of the 30<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the Australian and New Zealand Comparative and International Education Society*, 6-8 December, University of New England, Armidale.
- McMurtry, J. 1997, 'The homogenisation of planetary life: The inner logic of global market competition', *Canadian Social Studies*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 8-10.
- Meho, L.I. 2006, 'E-mail interviews in qualitative research: A methodological discussion', *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, vol. 57, no. 10, pp. 1284-1295. Retrieved 23 January 2007 from Wiley InterScience database.
- Mehta, S. & Ninnes, P. 2003, 'Postmodernism debates and comparative education: a critical discourse analysis', *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 238-257.
- Mey, J.L. 1985, *Whose Language? A Study in Linguistic Pragmatics*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam.

- Meyrowitz, J. & Leiss, W. 1990, 'On "The Consumer's World: Place as Context" by Robert Sack: Three Worlds of Strangers: Boundary Shifts and Changes in "Them" vs. "Us"', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol. 80, no. 1, pp. 129-133. Retrieved 2 February 2008 from JSTOR database.
- Meyrowitz, J. & Maguire, J. 1993, 'Media, place, and multiculturalism', *Society*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 41-49. Retrieved 2 February 2008 from ProQuest database.
- Mills, S. 2003, *Michel Foucault*, Routledge, New York.
- Ministry of Education. 1996, 'The Development of Education. National Report of the Republic of Korea', Presented to the 45<sup>th</sup> Session of the *International Conference on Education*, 30 September–5 October, Geneva.
- Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development, 2005a, 'Revised 7<sup>th</sup> National Curriculum: Goals and Contents', *Presentation to Thailand Education Ministry Delegation*, 9 September. Retrieved 11 January 2007 from <http://english.mest.go.kr>.
- Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development, 2005b, "Revised 7<sup>th</sup> National Curriculum" *Presentation to Japanese Delegation*, 6 December. Retrieved 9 September 2006 from <http://english.mest.go.kr>.
- Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development, 2005c, *Education in Korea 2005-2006*, Republic of Korea. Retrieved 25 May 2007 from <http://english.mest.go.kr>.
- Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development, 2007, 'Global Leaders Call for Innovation and Cooperation at 2<sup>nd</sup> Global HR Forum', *Dynamic-Korea.Com*, 29 October. Retrieved 15 November 2007 from <http://www.dynamic-korea.com/archives/view.php?main=PRS&uid=200700091201>.
- Mirchandi, R. 2005, 'Postmodernism and Sociology: From the Epistemological to the Empirical', *Sociological Theory*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 86-115. Retrieved 29 May 2008 from JSTOR database.
- Mitchell, T. 2006, 'South Korea's New English Town, English camp part of national strategy to reduce overseas education', *Ohmynews International*, 3 April. Retrieved 24 August 2007 from [http://english.ohmynews.com/articleview/article\\_view.asp?article\\_class=2&no=283209&rel\\_no=1](http://english.ohmynews.com/articleview/article_view.asp?article_class=2&no=283209&rel_no=1).
- Mongia, P. 1996a, 'Introduction', in *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory. A Reader*, ed P. Mongia, Hodder Arnold, London, pp. 1-19.
- Mongia, P. (ed) 1996b, *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory. A Reader*, Hodder Arnold, London.
- Moody, A.J. 2006, 'English in Japanese popular culture and J-Pop music', *World Englishes*, vol.25, no.2, pp.209-222. Retrieved 9 March 2008 from EBSCOHost Database.

- Morrow, R.A., & Torres, C.A. 1999, 'The State, Social Movements, and Education Reform', in *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local*, eds. R.F. Arnove & C.A. Torres, Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham, pp. 91-113.
- Mulderrig, J. 2003, 'Consuming education: a critical discourse analysis of social actors in New Labour's education policy', *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1. Retrieved 14 January 2008 from <http://www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=2>.
- Mundy, K. 1998, 'Educational Multilateralism and World (Dis)Order', *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 448-478.
- Mundy, K. 2002, 'Retrospect and prospect: education in a reforming World Bank', *International Journal of Educational Development*, vol. 22, pp. 483-508.
- Myers, D. (ed) 1994, *The Politics of Multiculturalism in the Asia/Pacific*, Northern Territory University Press, Darwin.
- Ninnes, P. 2004, 'Critical Discourse Analysis and Comparative Education', in *Re-imagining Comparative Education, Post foundational Ideas and Applications for Critical Times*, eds P. Ninnes & S. Mehta, RoutledgeFalmer, New York, pp. 43-62.
- Ninnes, P. & Mehta, S. (eds) 2004, *Re-imagining Comparative Education, Post foundational Ideas and Applications for Critical Times*. RoutledgeFalmer, New York.
- Norton Peirce, B. 1995a, 'Social identity, investment, and Language Learning', *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 9-31.
- Norton Peirce, B. 1995b, 'The Theory of Methodology of Qualitative Research', *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 569-576.
- O'Donnell, M. 2003, 'Radically reconstituting the subject: social theory and human nature', *Sociology*, vol. 37, no.4, pp. 753-771.
- Ohmae, K. 1995, *The End of the Nation State: The Rise of Regional Economies*, Free Press, New York.
- Olaniyan, T. 1993, 'On "Post-Colonial Discourse": An Introduction', *Callaloo*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 743-749. Retrieved 17 January 2009 from JSTOR database.
- 'Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development', 1962, *International Organisation*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 254-255. Retrieved 7 December 2007 from JSTOR database.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1998, *Reviews of National Policies for Education, Korea*, OECD, Paris. Retrieved 13 April 2007 from <http://www.oecd.org>.

- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1999, *The Future of the Global Economy. Towards a Long Boom?*, OECD, Paris. Retrieved 13 April 2007 from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/42/0/35394025.pdf>.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2000, *Korea and the Knowledge-based Economy: Making the Transition*, OECD, Paris. Retrieved 13 April 2007 from [www.oecd.org/document/18/0,3343,en\\_33873108\\_33873555\\_2007378\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,0\\_0.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/18/0,3343,en_33873108_33873555_2007378_1_1_1_1,0_0.html).
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2004, *Policy Brief: Lifelong Learning*, OECD Publishing, Paris. Retrieved 13 April 2007 from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/17/11/29478789.pdf>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2005, *OECD Annual Report 2005 edition*, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2006, 'Issues Paper', *Conference on Globalisation and the Knowledge Economy*, 9 October, Paris. Retrieved 13 April 2007 from [www.oecd.org/dataoecd/45/53/37591293.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/45/53/37591293.pdf).
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2007a, *Moving Up the Value Chain: Staying Competitive in the Global Economy. Main Findings*. Retrieved 22 June 2007 from [www.oecd.org/dataoecd/24/35/38558080.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/24/35/38558080.pdf).
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2007b, *Policy Brief: Qualifications and Lifelong Learning*, OECD, Paris. Retrieved 22 June 2007 from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/10/2/38500491.pdf>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2007c, 'Enhancing the globalisation of Korea', *OECD Economic Surveys: Korea*. Retrieved 22 June 2007 from [www.oecd.org/document/10/0,3343,en\\_2649\\_33733\\_38756234\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/10/0,3343,en_2649_33733_38756234_1_1_1_1,00.html).
- Paasche, K.I. 2006, *An Analysis of South Africa's Education Policy Documents. Self-Definition and Definition of the 'Other'*. The Edwin Mellen Press, Lewiston.
- Pai, H.I. & Tangherlini, T.R. (ed) 1998, *Nationalism and the Construction of Korean Identity*, The Regents of the University of California, Berkeley.
- Pak, J.H.C. 2006, *Korean American Women, Stories of Acculturation and Changing Selves*, Routledge, New York.
- Palais, J.B. 1995, 'A Search for Korean Uniqueness', *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 409-425. Retrieved 13 April 2007 from JSTOR database.

- Park, C-Y. 2000, 'English is Competence', *Chosun Ilbo*, 8 February. Retrieved 26 February 2007 from <http://english.chosun.com/w21data/html/news/200002/200002080123.html>.
- Park, H.J. 2003, 'The Origins of Faulted Korean Statism', *Asian Perspective*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 165-195. Retrieved 13 April 2007 from <http://www.asianperspective.org/articles/v27n1-f.pdf>.
- Park, J.S-Y. 2003, Global multilingualism in a monolingual society: Ideologies of English in South Korea, *The 9<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference on Language, Interaction and Culture*, 8-10 May, University of California, Santa Barbara. Retrieved 1 May 2007 from <http://www.geocities.com/jspark779/jspabs037.html>.
- Park, J.S-Y. 2004, Globalization, Language, and Social Order: Ideologies of English in South Korea, PhD thesis, University of California.
- Park, S.J. & Abelmann, N. 2004, 'Class and Cosmopolitan Striving: Mothers' Management of English Education in South Korea', *Anthropological Quarterly*, vol. 77, no. 4, pp. 645-672. Retrieved 3 June 2007 from ProQuest database.
- Peck, J. & Yeung, H. 2003, *Remaking the Global Economy*, SAGE publications, London.
- Pei, Z.Z. & Chi, F.W. 1987, 'The two faces of English in China: Englishization of Chinese and nativization of English', *World Englishes*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 111-126.
- Pennycook, A. 1994, *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*, Longman, London.
- Pennycook, A. 1998, *English and the discourses of Colonialism*, Routledge, New York.
- Pennycook, A. 1999, 'Introduction: Critical Approaches to TESOL', *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 329-348. Retrieved 1 December 2006 from JSTOR database.
- Pennycook, A. 2000a, 'Language, Ideology and Hindsight: Lessons from Colonial Language Policies', in *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies*, ed T. Ricento, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, pp. 49-65.
- Pennycook, A. 2000b, 'English, Politics, Ideology: From Colonial Celebration to Postcolonial Performativity', in *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies*, ed T. Ricento, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, pp. 107-119.
- Pennycook, A. 2001, *Critical applied linguistics: a critical introduction*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, London.
- Pennycook, A. 2007a, *Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*, Routledge, London.

- Pennycook, A. 2007b, 'The Myth of English as an International Language', in *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*, ed. S. Makoni and A. Pennycook, Multilingual Matters Ltd, Clevedon, UK, pp. 90-115.
- Peterson, E. & Coltrane, B. 2003, 'Culture in Second Language Teaching', *ERIC Digest*. Retrieved 7 September 2006 from [http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/digest\\_pdfs/0309peterson.pdf](http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/digest_pdfs/0309peterson.pdf).
- Phillipson, R. 1992, *Linguistic Imperialism*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Phillipson, R. 2000, 'English in the New World Order: Variations on a Theme of Linguistic Imperialism and "World" English', in *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies*, ed T. Ricento, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, pp. 49-66.
- Phillipson, R. 2001, 'English for Globalisation or for the World's People?', *International Review of Education*, vol. 47, no. 3-4, pp. 185-199.
- Phillipson, R. & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 1996, 'English Only Worldwide or Language Ecology?', *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 429-452. Retrieved 16 September 2007 from JSTOR database.
- Planning and Coordination Division. 2007, 'Ministry Announces Major Policies and Plans for 2007', *Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development*. Retrieved 25 May 2007 from [http://english.moe.go.kr/main.jsp?idx=070101&brd\\_no=30&cp=2&pageSize=30&srchSel=&srchVal=&brd\\_mainno=400&mode=v](http://english.moe.go.kr/main.jsp?idx=070101&brd_no=30&cp=2&pageSize=30&srchSel=&srchVal=&brd_mainno=400&mode=v).
- Policy Supervision Division, 2006, 'Second Five-Year National Human Resources Development Plan (2006~2010) Unveiled', *Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development*, Press Release, 11 January. Retrieved 31 May 2007 from [http://english.moe.go.kr/main.jsp?idx=070101&brd\\_no=30&cp=4&pageSize=30&srchSel=&srchVal=&brd\\_mainno=50&mode=v](http://english.moe.go.kr/main.jsp?idx=070101&brd_no=30&cp=4&pageSize=30&srchSel=&srchVal=&brd_mainno=50&mode=v).
- Popkewitz, T.S. 1988, 'Culture, Pedagogy and Power: Issues in the Production of Values and Colonialization', *Journal of Education*, vol. 170, no. 2, pp. 77-90.
- Popkewitz, T.S. 2000, 'Reform as the Social Administration of the Child: Globalization of Knowledge and Power', in *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*, eds N.C. Burbules & C.A. Torres, Routledge, New York, pp. 157-186.
- Potter, J. 1997, 'Discourse Analysis as a Way of Analysing Naturally Occurring Talk', *Qualitative Research. Theory, Method and Practice*, ed D. Silverman, SAGE Publications, London, pp. 144-160.
- Potter, J. & Wetherell, M. 1987, *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*, SAGE publications, London.

- Prey, R. 2005, How do you say 'Imperialism'? The English Language Teaching Industry and the Culture of Imperialism in South Korea, Masters Thesis, Simon Fraser University. Retrieved 28 November 2006 from <http://ir.lib.sfu.ca/dspace/handle/1892/2043>.
- Price, S. 1999, 'Critical Discourse Analysis: Discourse Acquisition and Discourse Practices', *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 581-595. Retrieved 14 November 2006 from JSTOR database.
- Rhee, K.R. 1997, 'Will the Proud Korean stand up please?', *Chosun Ilbo*, 29 December. Retrieved 26 February 2007 from <http://english.chosun.com/w21data/html/news/199712/199712290130.html>.
- Rhee, J-e. 2006, 'Re/membering (to) shifting alignments: Korean women's trans-national narratives in US higher education', *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 595-615.
- Ricento, T. (ed) 2000, *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies. Focus on English*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam.
- Rizvi, F. 2000, 'International Education and the Production of Global Imagination', in *Globalisation and Education: Critical Perspectives*, eds N.C. Burbules & C.A. Torres, Routledge, New York, pp. 275-297.
- Rizvi, F. & Lingard, B. 2000, 'Globalization and education: Complexities and contingencies', *Educational Theory*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 419-426.
- Robertson, R. 1992, *Globalisation: Social Theory and Global Culture*, SAGE Publications, London.
- Robertson, P. 2002, 'The Pervading Influence of Neo-Confucianism on the Korean Education System', *Asian EFL Journal*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 1-11. Retrieved 6 September 2006 from [http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/december\\_02\\_pr.php](http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/december_02_pr.php).
- Robertson, S. & Dale, R. 2002, 'Local States of Emergency: The Contradictions of Neo-liberal Governance in Education in New Zealand', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 463-482. Retrieved 29 May 2008 from JSTOR database.
- Roh, M-h. 2005, *Address on State Affairs Marking the Second Anniversary of His Inauguration*, 25 February. Retrieved 4 March 2007 from [http://www.korea.net/News/issues/NewsView.asp?serial\\_no=20051006020&part=101&SearchDay](http://www.korea.net/News/issues/NewsView.asp?serial_no=20051006020&part=101&SearchDay).
- Roh, M-h, 2006a, *Address by President Roh Moo-hyun on the 61<sup>st</sup> Anniversary of National Liberation*, 15 August. Retrieved 4 March 2007 from [http://www.korea.net/news/news/newsView.asp?serial\\_no=20060815009](http://www.korea.net/news/news/newsView.asp?serial_no=20060815009)

- Roh, M-h. 2006b, *President Roh Moo-hyun's New Year Address to the Nation*, 18 January. Retrieved 25 May 2007 from [http://www.korea.net/News/News/NewsView.asp?serial\\_no=20060119021](http://www.korea.net/News/News/NewsView.asp?serial_no=20060119021).
- Roh, M-h. 2007a, *Lunar New Year's Greetings to the Nation from President Roh Moo-hyun*, 16 February. Retrieved 25 May 2007 from <http://english.president.go.kr>.
- Roh, M-h. 2007b, *President Roh Moo-hyun's New Year Address to the Nation*, 23 January. Retrieved 25 May 2007 from <http://english.president.go.kr>.
- Roh, M-h. 2007c, *Address by President Roh Moo-hyun on the 88<sup>th</sup> March First Independence Movement Day*, 1 January. Retrieved 25 May 2007 from <http://english.president.go.kr>.
- Rose, N.S. 1999, *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Sarup, M. 1988, *An Introductory Guide to Post Structuralism and Postmodernism*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York.
- Said, E.W. 1978, *Orientalism*, Penguin Books, London.
- Said, E.W. 1994, *Culture and Imperialism*, Vintage, London.
- Samsung Economic Research Institute. 2006, *Improving Korea's English Language Instruction*. Retrieved 6 March 2007 from <http://www.koreaeconomy.org/04/wldColumnV.html?mn=F&mncd=0103&key=200609120001>
- Seargeant, P. 2005, 'Globalisation and reconfigured English in Japan', *World Englishes*, vol. 24, no.3, pp. 309-319. Retrieved 14 November 2006 from EBSCOHost database.
- Selwyn, N. & Robson, K. 1998, 'Using email as a research tool', *Social Research Update*, vol. 21, pp. pp. 1-4. Retrieved 23 January 2007 from <http://www.soc.surrey.ac.uk/sru/SRU21.html>.
- Shim, R.J. 1994, 'Englishized Korean: structure, status and attitudes', *World Englishes*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 225-244.
- Shim, R.J. 1999, 'Codified Korean English: process, characteristics and consequence', *World Englishes*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 247-258. Retrieved 9 March 2008 from EBSCOHost Database.

- Shin, G-W, 2003, 'The Paradox of Korean Globalization', *Working Paper Asia/Pacific Research Center (A/PARC)*, pp.1-24. Retrieved 28 August, 2006 from <http://APARC.stanford.edu>.
- Shin K-Y. 2006, 'The Citizens' Movement in Korea', *Korea Journal*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 5-34. Retrieved 1 November 2006 from <http://www.ekoreajournal.net/archive/detail.jsp?BACKFLAG=Y&VOLUMENO=46&BOOKNUM=2&PAPERNUM=1&SEASON=Summer&YEAR=2006>.
- Shohat, E. 1992, 'Notes on the "Post-Colonial"', *Social Text*, vol. 31/32, pp. 99-113. Retrieved 16 June 2008 from JSTOR database.
- Shorrock, T. 1986, 'The Struggle for Democracy in South Korea in the 1980s and the Rise of Anti-Americanism', *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 1195-1218. Retrieved 18 January 2009 from JSTOR database.
- Silverman, D. (ed) 1997, *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*, SAGE Publications, London.
- Simons, J. 1995, *Foucault & the Political*, Routledge, London.
- Singh, M. 2002a, 'The Uses of English Language Teaching: A Medium for Creating a New World of Learning?', in *Worlds of Learning Globalisation and Multicultural Education*, ed M. Singh, Common Ground Publishing, pp. 129-150.
- Singh, M. (ed) 2002b, *Worlds of Learning Globalisation and Multicultural Education*, Common Ground Publishing, Urbana, Illinois.
- Singh, M. & Han, J. 2006, 'Quality English teaching for a knowledge producing society: Inspiring robust hope, creativity and passion', in eds B. Doecke, M. Howie & W. Sawyer, "Only connect"...*English teaching, schooling and community*, Wakefield Press, Adelaide, pp. 42-65.
- Slemon, S. 1996, 'Unsettling the Empire: Resistance Theory for the Second World', in *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory. A Reader*, ed P. Mongia, Hodder Arnold, London, pp. 72-83.
- Sökefeld, M. 2005, 'From Colonialism to Postcolonial Colonialism: Changing Modes of Domination in the Northern Areas of Pakistan', *The Journal of Asian Studies*, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 939-973. Retrieved 14 June 2008 from ProQuest database.
- Somers, M.R. 1994, 'The narrative constitution of identity: A relational and network approach', *Theory and Society*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 605-649.
- Søndergaard, D.M. 2002, 'Poststructuralist Approaches to Empirical Analysis', *Qualitative Studies in Education*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 187-204.

- Søndergaard, D.M. 2005, 'Making Sense of Gender, Age, Power and Disciplinary Position: Intersecting Discourses in the Academy', *Feminism & Psychology*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 189-208.
- Song, J.A. 2000, 'Lingua Future', *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 2 March. Retrieved 25 May 2007 from <http://www.feer.com>
- Sonntag, S.K. 2000, 'Ideology and Policy in the Politics of the English Language in North India', in *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies. Focus on English*, ed T. Ricento, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, pp. 133-149.
- Sowell, S.P. 2004, *Doing Gender/Teaching Science: A Feminist Poststructural Analysis of Middle School Science Teachers' Identity Negotiations*, PhD thesis, Florida State University.
- Spivak, G.C. 1990, *The Post-Colonial Critic. Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*, Routledge, New York.
- Spring, J. 2008, 'Research on Globalization and Education', *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 78, no. 2, pp. 330-363. Retrieved 4 August 2008 from ProQuest database.
- St. Pierre, E.A. 2000, 'Poststructural feminism in education: An overview', *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 477-515. Retrieved 10 June 2008 from SwetsWise database.
- Stromquist, N.P. 2002, 'Preface', *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. iii-ix. Retrieved 16 May 2006 from Expanded Academic ASAP database.
- Stromquist, N.P. & Monkman, K. 2000a, 'Defining Globalization and Assessing Its Implications on Knowledge and Education', in *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestation across Cultures*, eds N.P. Stromquist & K. Monkman, Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham, pp. 3-25.
- Stromquist, N.P. & Monkman, K. (eds) 2000b, *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestation across Cultures*, Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham, Md.
- Subedi, R.R. 2007, *An English World Within Korea*, 6 June. Retrieved 22 June 2007 from [http://aone.kctpi.re.kr/eng/gallery/view.php?no\\_id=23&b\\_id=ge1&keyword=&st\\_art=40](http://aone.kctpi.re.kr/eng/gallery/view.php?no_id=23&b_id=ge1&keyword=&st_art=40)
- Synott, J.P. 2002, 'The Impact of Foreign Societies on South Korean Education', *Internationalizing Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Critical Reflections, Critical Times*, Proceedings of the 30th Annual Conference of the Australian and New Zealand Comparative and International Education Society, 6-8 December, Armidale, Australia, pp. 203-226.

- Tamatea, L. 2005, 'The *Dakar Framework*: constructing and deconstructing the global neo-liberal matrix', *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 311-334.
- Tamatea, L. 2008, 'George Bush's No Child Left Behind Education Policy: War, Ambivalence, and Mimicry – Online', *The Review of Education, Pedagogy and Cultural Studies*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 115-139.
- Tamatea, L., Hardy, J. & Ninnes, P. 2008, 'Paradoxical inscriptions of global subjects: Critical discourse analysis of international schools' websites in the Asia-Pacific Region', *Critical Studies in Education*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 157-170.
- Taylor, S. & Henry, M. 2000, 'Globalization and educational policymaking: A case study', *Educational Theory*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 487-504. Retrieved 24 June 2006 from ProQuest database.
- TESOL, 2008a, *What is TESOL?* Retrieved 9 March 2008 from [http://www.tesol.org/s\\_tesol/sec\\_document.asp?CID=3&DID=401](http://www.tesol.org/s_tesol/sec_document.asp?CID=3&DID=401)
- TESOL, 2008b, *TESOL's Mission, Values, and Vision*. Retrieved 9 March 2008 from: [http://www.tesol.org/s\\_tesol/sec\\_document.asp?CID=3&DID=220](http://www.tesol.org/s_tesol/sec_document.asp?CID=3&DID=220)
- Tickell, A. & Peck, J. 2003, 'Making global rules: globalisation or neoliberalisation?' in *Remaking the Global Economy*, eds J. Peck & H. Yeung, SAGE publications, London, pp. 163-181.
- Tokita, A. 2006, 'Kirogi omma and Korean overseas students in Melbourne', *Proceedings of the 16<sup>th</sup> Biennial Conference of the Asian Studies Association*, Wollongong, Australia. Retrieved 8 January 2007 from <http://coombs.anu.edu.au/SpecialProj/ASAA/biennial-conference/2006/Tokita-Alison-ASAA2006.pdf>.
- Tollefson, J.W. 1991, *Planning Language, Planning Inequality. Language Policy in the Community*, Longman, London.
- Tomlinson, J. 1999, *Globalization and Culture*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Torres, C.A. 1998, 'Democracy, Education, and Multiculturalism: Dilemmas of Citizenship in a Global World', *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 421-447. Retrieved 29 May 2008 from JSTOR database.
- Torres, C.A. 2002, 'Globalization, education and citizenship: Solidarity versus markets?', *American Educational Research Journal*, vol. 39, pp. 363-378.
- Tsui, A.B.M. 2004, 'Language Policies in Asian Countries: Issues and Tensions', *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 1-25.

- Tsui, A.B.M. & Tollefson, J.W. (eds) 2006, *Language Policy, Culture, and Identity in Asian Contexts*, Routledge, New York.
- Um, J.H. 2000, "On 'English is Competitiveness', a different view", *Chosun Ilbo*, 24 January. Retrieved 26 February 2007 from <http://english.chosun.com/w21data/html/news/200001/200001240302.html>.
- United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, 1999, 'Country Report. Education for All. The Year 2000 Assessment, Korea', United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, Paris. Retrieved 24 June 2006 from [http://www2.unesco.org/wef/countryreports/korea/rapport\\_3.html](http://www2.unesco.org/wef/countryreports/korea/rapport_3.html).
- United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, 2002, *Medium Term Strategy, 2002-2007*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, Paris. Retrieved 21 June 2007 from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001254/125434e.pdf>.
- United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, 2006a, *Member States*. Retrieved 3 September 2007 from <http://erc.unesco.org/portal/UNESCOMemberStates.asp?language=en>.
- United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, 2006b, *Approved Programme and Budget 2006-2007*, General Conference 33<sup>rd</sup> Session, Paris. Retrieved 22 June 2007 from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001449/144964e.pdf>.
- United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation. 2008, *Medium Term Strategy 2008-2013*, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, Paris. Retrieved 16 May 2008 from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001499/149999e.pdf>.
- van Dijk, T.A. 1993, 'Principles of critical discourse analysis', *Discourse & Society*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 249-283.
- van Dijk, T.A. 1995, 'Discourse semantics and ideology', *Discourse & Society*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 243-289.
- van Dijk, T.A. (ed) 1997, *Discourse as Social Interaction. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction, vol.2*, SAGE Publications, London.
- van Dijk, T.A. 2003, 'The Discourse-Knowledge Interface', in *Critical Discourse Analysis. Theory and Interdisciplinarity*, eds G. Weiss & R. Wodak, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, pp. 85-109.
- Walker-Dilling, M. 1998, 'The Marathoner and the Turtle', in *Nationalism and the Construction of Korean Identity*, eds H.I. Pai & T.R. Tangherlini, The Regents of the University of California, Berkeley, pp. 166-197.

- Watson, K. 1999, 'UNESCO's Vision for Education in the Twenty-First Century: Where is the Moral High Ground?', *International Journal of Educational Development*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 7-16.
- Weedon, C. 1987, *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Wehrs, D.R. 2003, 'Sartre's Legacy in Postcolonial Theory; or, Who's Afraid of Non-Western Historiography and Cultural Studies?', *New Literary History*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 761-790. Retrieved 24 June 2006 from ProQuest database.
- Weiss, G. & Wodak, R. 2003a, 'Introduction – Theory, Interdisciplinarity and Critical Discourse Analysis', in *Critical Discourse Analysis. Theory and Interdisciplinarity*, eds G. Weiss & R. Wodak, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, pp. 1-32.
- Weiss, G. & Wodak, R. (eds) 2003b, *Critical Discourse Analysis. Theory and Interdisciplinarity*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Wodak, R., De Cillia, R., Riesigl, M. & Liebhart, K. 1999, *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Wolcott, H.F. 1992, 'Posturing in Qualitative Research', in *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*, eds. M.D. LeCompte, W.L. Millroy & J. Preissle, Academic Press, San Diego, pp. 3-52.
- Woo, C. 2006, 'Korea's lessons Learned in Pursuit of a Knowledge Economy', *The World Bank BBL Presentation*, 3 May. Retrieved 8 September 2006 from <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/WBI/WBIPROGRAMS/KFDLP/0,,contentMDK:20909916~menuPK:461215~pagePK:64156158~piPK:64152884~theSitePK:461198,00.html>.
- Woodside-Jiron, H. 2003, 'Critical policy analysis: Researching the roles of cultural models, power, and expertise in reading policy', *Reading Research Quarterly*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 530-536.
- World Bank. 1995, *Priorities and Strategies for Education: A World Bank Review*, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Washington D.C.
- World Bank. 1999, *Education Sector Strategy*, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Washington D.C. Retrieved 21 June 2006 from <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTEDUCATION/0,,contentMDK:20201588~isCURL:Y~menuPK:282402~pagePK:148956~piPK:216618~theSitePK:282386,00.html>.

- World Bank. 2000, *Report No. 20346-KO. Republic of Korea. Transition to a Knowledge-Based Economy*, East Asia and Pacific Region, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Washington D.C. Retrieved 21 June 2006 from, <http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/137743/KoreaKE.pdf>
- World Bank. 2002, *Lifelong Learning in the Global Knowledge Economy: Challenges for Developing Countries*, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Washington D.C. Retrieved 21 June 2006 from [http://www1.worldbank.org/education/lifelong\\_learning/lifelong\\_learning\\_GKE.asp](http://www1.worldbank.org/education/lifelong_learning/lifelong_learning_GKE.asp).
- World Bank. 2003, 'Lifelong Learning and the Knowledge Economy', *Summary of the Global Conference on Lifelong Learning*, Stuttgart, Germany. Retrieved 28 June 2006 from [http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1099079877269/547664-1099079984605/lifelong\\_KE.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/278200-1099079877269/547664-1099079984605/lifelong_KE.pdf)
- World Bank, 2005, *Education Sector Strategy Update*, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Washington D.C. Retrieved 21 June 2006 from [http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/ESSU/Education\\_Sector\\_Strategy\\_Update.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resources/ESSU/Education_Sector_Strategy_Update.pdf).
- World Bank. 2006, *Korea as a Knowledge Economy: Evolutionary Process and Lessons Learned*, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Washington D.C. Retrieved 8 January 2007 from <http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/235384/KoreaKE-Overview.pdf>.
- Yang, S.C. 2006, 'English Language and Globalization'. Retrieved 25 May 2007 from [www.koreadis.ac.kr/bbs/pds/EnglishLanguageandGlobalization1\\_2.doc](http://www.koreadis.ac.kr/bbs/pds/EnglishLanguageandGlobalization1_2.doc).
- Yano, Y. 2001, 'World Englishes in 2000 and beyond', *World Englishes*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 119-131.
- Yihong, G., Ying, C., Yuan, Z. & Yan, Z. 2005, 'Self-identity changes and English learning among Chinese undergraduates', *World Englishes*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 39-51. Retrieved 14 November 2006 from EBSCOHost database.
- Yim, H. 2002, 'Cultural Identity and Cultural Policy in South Korea', *The International Journal of Cultural Policy*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 37-48. Retrieved 24 June 2006 from <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/APCITY/UNPAN015674.pdf>.
- Yim, S. 2006, 'Globalization and Language Policy in South Korea', in *Language Policy, Culture, and Identity in Asian Contexts*, eds A.B.M. Tsui & J.W. Tollefson, Routledge, New York, pp. 37-54.
- Youngblood Jackson, A. 2001, 'Multiple Annies: feminist poststructural theory and the making of a teacher', *Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 386-398.

Yu, H. 1998, 'Global Trand Analysis on Higher Education Reforms', *Korean Educational Development Institute*. Retrieved 8 August 2006 from [http://eng.kedi.re.kr/02\\_research/research\\_01.php?sub\\_num=63](http://eng.kedi.re.kr/02_research/research_01.php?sub_num=63).

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

**QUESTION ONE: LIFE OVERVIEW**

A. If you were to write the story of your life, what would be the title of the story?

---

---

B. List up to three events, people or other things (such as books, media) that have most influenced or changed your life story. If possible, can you write a short sentence about how each thing has changed or influenced your story?  
*EG. Beginning high school – I started learning another language and began dreaming and thinking about living in another country one day.*

---

---

---

---

C. What would be the high point and the low point of your life story?

---

---

---

---

**QUESTION TWO: PERSONAL EXPERIENCES**

A. How would you describe yourself as the main character of your story?

---

---

---

---

B. Has your experience learning English led you to change the way you describe yourself, or think about who you are?

*Please describe any changes you have experienced or are experiencing in the way you think about yourself and others (E.g. Family, friends) compared with before you started learning English.*

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### QUESTION THREE: LEARNING ENGLISH

A. Did anyone or anything influence your decision to learn English?

---

---

B. If so, who or what encouraged you to learn English and how?

---

---

---

---

C. Why do you think you were encouraged to learn English or why did you want to learn English?

---

---

---

---

**QUESTION FOUR: VALUE OF ENGLISH**

A. How does learning English fit in with the story of your life?

---

---

---

B. What is the value of English to you?

---

---

---

---

C. What role, if any, will learning English play in the future story of your life?

---

---

---

---

**QUESTION FIVE: PERSONAL GOALS**

A. What future life do you imagine for yourself? What has helped make this future life possible?

---

---

---

---

B. What other life options are available to you?

---

---

**QUESTION SIX: ENGLISH AND SOUTH KOREA**

A. What do you think of the English language?

---

---

---

---

B. Where does English fit into Korean culture / Korean society now? Do you think there will be any changes to how English contributes to Korean culture and Korean society in the future?

---

---

---

---

C. What will Korean culture and Korean society look like in the future?

---

---

---

---

D. What do you believe will be the biggest influence (positive or negative) on Korean culture and language in the future and why?

---

---

---

---