

# Conflicting Discourses on Content Reduction in South Korea's National Curriculum

Kyunghee So<sup>1</sup> & Jiyoung Kang<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Education, College of Education, Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea

<sup>2</sup> Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Indiana University, Bloomington, USA

Correspondence: Kyunghee So, Department of Education, College of Education, Seoul National University, 1 Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu, Seoul 151-742, South Korea. Tel: 82-2-880-7641. E-mail: sohee@snu.ac.kr

Received: August 8, 2014    Accepted: September 11, 2014    Online Published: October 27, 2014

doi:10.5539/ies.v7n11p10

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v7n11p10>

## Abstract

This study examines the discourses on content reduction of South Korea's national curriculum shaped by policymakers and subject specialists, as well as compares the two discourses to uncover the differences between the two. For this purpose, the paper collected academic articles that discuss the issue of content reduction from the past thirty years and analyzed the statements enunciated in the articles. The resulting analysis shows that the policymakers' discourse tends to rely on inconclusive evidence to diagnose the problems in content reduction. Additionally, the discourse reveals that policymakers impose subject specialists to monolithic and coercive guidelines, while using a quantitative approach that emphasizes measurable and demonstrable figures. On the other hand, the discourse of subject specialists reveals certain differences. The specialists adopt a strategy of ignoring and rejecting the policymakers' guidelines by pretending to accept them; they instead emphasize the distinctiveness of each subject and value a qualitative approach to diagnose/solve the issue of content reduction. Based on these results, this paper suggests that the differences between the two discourses have been shaped by an underlying temporal and spacious condition of developing South Korea's national curriculum. This paper ends with the argument that there should be an effort by policymakers and subject specialists to understand the discourse of 'the other'; they should also establish an institutional environment that encourages mutual understanding between the two stakeholders.

**Keywords:** content reduction, Foucauldian archaeological approach, national curriculum, discourse analysis

## 1. Introduction

Balancing between breadth and depth in curriculum has been a persistent issue in educational reforms of many countries (Alexander, 2010; Hirsch, 2001). South Korea is no exception. South Korea's national curriculum has suffered an inveterate problem of valuing content breadth at the expense of in-depth understanding. To solve this problem, curriculum policymakers in South Korea have made a continuous effort to reduce the amount of subject content, as well as lower the level of difficulty. In spite of the policymakers' struggles, the issue of content reduction has continued to be a key item in the national curriculum revision agenda. Content reduction is still regarded as an unsolved problem in South Korean education even when it has been thirty years after its initial emergence in 1981 (Gim, 2003; Huh, Park, Kim, Choi, & Kim, 2000; Jung & Park, 2006; So, 2004). This can be attributed to different perspectives regarding content reduction by various educational stakeholders; among them are curriculum policymakers and subject specialists who have the most influential power. In South Korea, after policymakers develop guidelines for curriculum content reduction, subject specialists are expected to revise each program of study according to those guidelines. However, although policymakers have suggested a number of guidelines to reduce the amount of subject content, it has been reported that subject specialists did not apply the guidelines to the subject curriculum (Gim, 2003; Kang, 2005; Kim, 2012a; Lee, 2008).

The continuing inconsistency between policymakers and subject specialists requires further investigation on how they have produced different discourses on the same issue; it is possible for policymakers and subject specialists to produce different discourse systems due to how they identified problems and found solutions to content reduction. Therefore, a study is required to analyze and compare the discursive formation process of both policymakers and subject specialists.

The purpose of this study is to examine the core content reduction discourses in South Korea's national curriculum, which is shaped by policymakers and subject specialists. The two discourses are then compared in order to uncover the differences. To achieve this, the paper deals with the following research questions:

- 1) What are the core discourses about content reduction shaped by policymakers and subject specialists?
- 2) What are the differences revealed between the discourse of policymakers and that of subject specialists?

After dealing with two questions, the paper discusses with the socio-cultural conditions that caused the differences between the two discourses.

## **2. Context of South Korea**

In order to understand the discursive formation of policymakers and subject specialists on the issue of content reduction, this section delineates why the issue of content reduction emerged in South Korea and what the responses have been, as well as provides a description of the South Korean curriculum development context that embodies the content reduction discourse.

### *2.1 Struggles for Content Reduction of South Korea's National Curriculum*

Although a top-ranking country that receives high scores in international academic achievement tests such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), South Korea has suffered from an inveterate problem where many students feel overwhelmed by the high pressure from the burden of learning (So & Kang, 2014). This prompted attention to content reduction in national curriculum with the aim of reducing the learning pressure of students in South Korea.

The discourse on content reduction emerged first in the process of developing national curriculum guidelines in 1981. President Doowhan Jung, who seized the government by a military coup, carried out the "Education Reform in July 30." This act prohibited all types of private education from being added to regular curriculum. In the subsequent revisions of the national curriculum, policymakers criticized the prior curriculum for having a high level of difficulty, and argued for a decrease in the number of required subjects as well as the number of units and instructional time per year in compulsory education (Shin, Kwak, & Kim, 1981).

Notwithstanding these reforms, content reduction was still a challenge in the following five revisions of curriculum (in 1986, 1991, 1996, 2007 and 2009), where policymakers struggled to promote a number of different solutions to the issue. For instance, they proposed guidelines to subject curriculum developers, such as decreasing the number of required subjects in 1991, enforcing thirty percent reduction of the amount of subject content in all subjects compared to prior curriculum as well as carrying difficult content to the next grade in 1996. Nonetheless, policymakers are still looking for other solutions to solve the same problem as they recognize that the academic pressure on students never diminished.

With regard to the failure and struggles in content reduction, some Korean curriculum scholars attribute this to the fact that the general guidelines have not been fully applied to subject curriculum developed by subject specialists (Gim, 2003; Kang, 2005; Kim, 2012a; Lee, 2008). This implies there are conflicts between policymakers and subject specialists on the topic of content reduction; thus, there are considerations that need to be addressed in terms of the relationship between policymakers and subject specialists, as well as the environment in which the national curriculum is developed.

### *2.2 National Curriculum Development Process of South Korea*

South Korea's national curriculum has been developed within a context that frequently promotes revisions whenever new governments are in power. In other words, curriculum revision has been motivated by the political demands of new governments rather than by educational demands in schools (Gim, 2002). Since national curriculum revisions were accompanied with a five-year-cycle of regime change, there have been numerous ironic situations in South Korea where new curriculum are being developed even before the previous one has been fully implemented to all schools.

Furthermore, people involved in developing the national curriculum can be divided into two groups. One group would be the policymakers, who suggest the purpose, direction, and general guidelines of curriculum; the other group would be the subject specialists who are expected to develop each program of study according to said guidelines. Policymakers consist of administrators of Ministry of Education (MOE) and scholars selected by MOE, most of who major in general studies of education. Contrastingly, subject specialists are developers of each program of study (e.g. such as Korean Language Arts, Mathematics, Social Studies) and they usually major in specialized subject.

Furthermore, policymakers and subject specialists in South Korea have a hierarchical relationship in the process

of national curriculum development. After policymakers develop a general framework for subject curriculum, subject communities are then required to revise each program of study according to the policymakers' guidelines. This top-down process has resulted in various subject specialists to antagonize policymakers, so to identify with each other even though each subject differs in context from others. As a result, the discourse on South Korea's national curriculum development has been developed by confrontations between policymakers and subject specialists.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Foucault's Archaeological Approach

This study adopts Foucault's archaeological approach to examine content reduction discourses in the development of South Korea's national curriculum. Discourse refers to the collection of written/spoken documents, stories, texts or statements produced and distributed in society with particular perspectives or positions on important social issues (Barker & Galasinski, 2001; Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). Considering this definition of discourse, this study sees discourse on content reduction as a collection of texts or statements with particular perspectives and positions about the issues of content reduction produced and distributed in South Korean society. Different from other discourse analysis methods that emphasize the content of a document, Foucault's archeological approach focuses on identifying regularities among statements and defining the context/condition that formed these regularities. In this regard, Foucault's archaeology would be more helpful for revealing the complex network of meanings that is intertwined in the discourse of content reduction.

Foucault inquired into the ways and processes in which discourse shapes the subject, self, social relations and knowledge system; this is a "constructive" approach that believes discourses form social reality and events in an intertwined layer (Bevir, 1999). In his early study called *The Archeology of Knowledge* (Foucault, 1972), Foucault tried to understand episteme formation as "historical a priori" (p. 127) where the order of knowledge and system is constructed in a certain era, or as a kind of understructure, enabling epistemic horizons and cultural frames in a certain era. Here, archeology is an approach to regularity, such that the fundamental condition of knowledge production and discursive formation are shaped in historical collusion with power and knowledge; it aims to examine regularities delivered in the statements of historical studies and literature produced through a process such that a discourse emerges and is transformed.

According to Foucault, when knowing subjects represent objects, they follow a certain unconscious process that involves specific conditions of possibility (Foucault, 1981). The archaeology approach reveals these conditions of possibility (i.e. the a priori conditions). Furthermore, the conditions of possibility have two dimensions: the discursive condition where recognition occurs and the social condition constituting a background of knowing. An especially crucial point among conditions of possibility of recognition is the relations of interior linguistic condition to recognition and social condition exterior to recognition (Neal, 2006; Scheurich, 1994). Archeology occurs on the border of convergence of linguistic and social condition. Thus, the aim of Foucault's archaeology is to reveal how these conditions of possibility have been shaped in certain discourses and a certain era, and how they have been transformed according to the change in time and space.

#### 3.2 Data Collection and Analytic Process

This study employs Foucault's archeological approach in order to analyze two discourses from policymakers and subject specialists on content reduction. As Foucault never sought to apply a particular system or to allow his own heuristics to congeal into a fixed, formal method (Dean, 1994), it is difficult to find a complete archeological methodology in his writings. Thus, in designing the current study, we took the implied approach in *The Archeology of Knowledge* (Foucault, 1972).

According to Foucault (1972), in order to analyze statements as material existence, it is important to note when statements emerge as well as who may have produced each statement with what authority. In the purpose of analyzing statements as the "elementary units of a discourse" (Foucault, 1972, p. 131), we collected thirty-six academic articles that discuss content reduction in South Korea from the past thirty years; three articles were written in the 1990s, twenty-three articles in the 2000s, and ten articles in the 2010s. Furthermore, sixteen of the thirty-six articles were produced by policymakers, while the remaining twenty articles were written by subject specialists. Analysis on the collected articles followed the three steps suggested by Bourke, Ryan, and Lidstone (2012).

The first step of analysis involves looking for regularities in the statements about content reduction which Bourke et al. (2012) called "archaeological isomorphism or homogeneity in statements" (p. 2). The order and repeatability of the statements are noted by mapping the time when statements emerge and when new statements

begin to function (Foucault, 1972). We figured out which terms and words frequently emerged in each discourse and traced where they originated and how their meanings were shaped and reshaped by the change of time and space. By analyzing the usage, frequency and arrangements of words, we identified the tree of enunciative derivation of a discourse showing effectively which statements led to the derivation of other statements through. This process helped to find discursive regularities in the discourse of policymakers and subject specialists and eventually elucidated the core discourses shaped by policymakers and subject specialists respectively.

The second step of analysis identifies the discontinuities or distances between statements. Foucault (1972) refers to this as the analysis of contradictions. He argues that “contradictions are neither appearances to be overcome, nor secret principles to be uncovered” (p. 151); they are simply anything that needs to be described. Therefore, statements enunciated by policymakers and subject specialists were examined for “gaps or spaces of dissension between the statements” (Bourke et al., 2012, p. 2). In this process, cross-checking of statements from each discourse helped to figure out the differences and contradictions between the two discourses. More specifically, we focused on finding out differences and contradictions shown in the assumptions underpinning each core discourse and in the ways they are justified.

The final step in analysis identifies the conditions that enabled discursive formation and transformation. This step aims to examine how the discourses were shaped and transformed based on era changes (Lee, 2012). This goal can only be achieved by analyzing the dynamic relations of discursive formations and non-discursive domains, that is, relations between linguistic regularities described in academic literatures and social order regulating non-discursive practice. Therefore, we paid attention to how each discursive formation has been influenced by the change of time and space, especially related to the change of political and institutional environments in South Korea where the discourses on content reduction are embodied.

## 4. Results

### 4.1 Discourse on Content Reduction Prompted by Policymakers

#### 4.1.1 Diagnosis with Inconclusive Evidence

Content reduction has emerged as a key agenda in discourse of policymakers whenever national curriculum is revised. Policymakers requested subject curriculum developers to reduce the amount of subject content and the level of difficulty, arguing that content reduction would decrease the pressure of learning for students and restore meaningful learning in classroom (Hwang, 2004; So, 2004). This discourse assumes that prior curriculum led to excessive stress for students, as well as superficial learning in classroom due to a focus on memorization of dense contents; therefore, it is urgent to implement solutions that will decrease the amount of content and reduce student stress. This rationale embodies a diagnosis that overloads of students and rote learning in the classroom is due to the amount and degree of difficulty of contents in subject curriculum. However, it is noteworthy to recognize that this diagnosis was never substantiated with sufficient evidence.

*It has been pointed out that contents in some subjects, including Mathematics and Science, are too difficult for students to learn owing to overemphasis on the academic structure and inquiry-centered learning of subjects. It is said that this was caused by overemphasis on abstract knowledge without provision of basic knowledge in curricula (Shin et al., 1981, pp. 16-17).*

*The efficiency of learning among South Korean students is very low because they have to learn heavy content with only fragmentary information prescribed in national curriculum. What's more, students have to blindly memorize content, which they cannot even understand, through the night. Therefore, the new national curriculum will need to make a sharp cut in subject contents and be structured in a way that enables students to grasp the contents in-depth (Kwak et al., 1996, pp. 47-48).*

The above statements written by policymakers show they assume that the heavy and difficult content in South Korea's national curriculum has given rise to inefficient and cumbersome learning. The problem is, however, not in their assumption itself but in their justification or substantiation of the rationale. Policymakers make a hasty diagnosis and prescription without any significant evidence of the correlation between stressful learning of students and the amount of curriculum contents. In fact, their assumption relies on widespread recognition or subjective analysis rather than concrete evidence.

There are some studies that survey students and teachers by eliciting their views on the amount and difficulty of each subject's content (Kim et al., 1996; Kim & Park, 2003). However, the focus of survey was still to identify the areas students and teachers feel overloaded with and how much difficulty they face in a particular content, instead of conducting an in-depth investigation of what causes superficial learning and student stress. In other words, these studies still assume that the amount and difficulty of subject contents is to blame for all the

problems. This demonstrates that policymakers are not likely to closely examine the real context and situation of the classroom, but instead rely on *common sense*, subjective analysis, or superficial surveys. Policymakers' discourse reaffirms the fact that they justify content reduction guidelines with their own assumptions instead of forming a strong consensus with subject specialists.

#### 4.1.2 Monolithic Mandates to All Subjects

Although policymakers wrote general guidelines, their discourse reveals that it is assumed that the guidelines function as a coercive and monolithic mandate that requires subject specialists to faithfully implement them. The fact that words such as "should" or "be required to" frequently emerged in policymakers' statements shows policymakers' expectation that subject specialists will follow the guidelines when developing subject curriculum. This coercive nature of general guidelines is easily recognized by subject specialists:

*As an approach to content reduction, subject developers were required to reduce subject contents by 30% compared to prior curricula and make the contents easier than before. However, it was not rooted in clear rationale and consensus (Kang, 2005, p. 36).*

*The guideline on content reduction was not developed by consensus with researchers in subject communities, but delivered from the policymakers to subject developers in a one-sided way (Kim, 2012a, p. 24).*

By setting monolithic standards aimed to decrease the same amount of content from all subject curricula (regardless of different contexts of each curriculum), the statements also reveal that policymakers assumed the context of all subjects are identical. For example, the guideline published in 1996 required "the amount of contents in all subjects ... should be reduced 30% less compared to the prior national curriculum" (Kwak et al., 1996, p. 153); another guideline written in 2009 forced "all subjects to cut back on 20% of the contents compared to the prior national curriculum" (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology [MEST], 2011, p. 1). Differing only in terms of the range of cutback, these guidelines are very similar as policymakers are attempting to compel all subjects to reduce content by an identical amount.

Thus, policymakers have shaped a discourse not by respecting the distinctiveness and differences of each subject, but by taking it for granted that all subjects can be categorized under a uniform group. This contributes to the production of a coercive and monolithic way of thinking, one that asks subject specialists to obey given guidelines.

#### 4.1.3 Quantitative Approach

The discourse of policymakers also shows that they have a strong preference for a quantitative approach when dealing with content reduction. In other words, when it comes to prescribing solutions for learning burden of students, policymakers seem to be inclined to focus primarily on quantity.

More specifically, they attributed the cause of student stress to the huge number of required subjects and achievement standards. Policymakers concluded that decreasing the number of required subjects per semester and the corresponding achievement standards is the only way to disencumber students. Furthermore, they imposed measurable figures such as "less than eight subjects permitted for schools to open per one semester" (MEST, 2009, p. 15) and "twenty percent cutback of subject contents compared to the prior curricula for subject specialists" (MEST, 2011, p. 1).

This quantitative approach is clearly seen in the following policymaker's definition of content reduction: "reducing curriculum contents means adapting subject content to ensure most students (about 80% of all students) experience meaningful learning (understanding 80% of the contents)" (Gim, 2003, p. 111). In the above statement, abstract words of "most" and "meaningful learning" are respectively substituted into measurable figures of "80% of all students" and "understanding 80% of the contents." This implies that discourse of policymakers has shaped based on emphasis on measurable and demonstrable way of thinking.

### 4.2 Discourse on Content Reduction Prompted by Subject Specialists

#### 4.2.1. Rejection in Disguise of Acceptance

The first characteristic of the subject specialists' discourse is that they are inclined to ignore the policymakers' guidelines by pretending to accepting it. In their discourse, although subject specialists express their agreements to reducing the content, they seem to resist the solutions suggested by policymakers.

This resistance is due to subject specialists' perception that the guidelines were written by policymakers based on external demands, rather than the need of the subject. These specialists also expressed their negative feelings towards the top-down guidelines, describing the guidelines as "command of policymakers" (Kang, 2005, p. 38),

“strange task given from outside” (Lee, 2000, p. 121), or “delivered in a one-sided way” (Kim, 2012a, p. 24).

Nevertheless, subject specialists are expected to implement the guidelines without question. Consequently, this led subject specialists to show ostensible acceptance by fulfilling the minimum requirements. For instance, while they appeared to meet the required amount of content, they actually integrated two or three standards into one standard. This means that students still received the same amount of content in the classroom (Lee, 2008; Kim, 2012a). Finally, they have constructed their discourse in a direction against policymakers in a guise of following instructions with fidelity.

#### 4.2.2 Emphasis on Distinctiveness of Each Subject

Another salient feature in subject specialists’ discourse is their emphasis on the distinctiveness and uniqueness of each subject, especially concerning content reduction solutions. Rather than discussing how a fixed amount of content should be reduced unilaterally, the specialists’ discourse is full of statements arguing that the unique context of each subject should be respected. Frequent use of phrases such as “intrinsic purpose of subject [literature education]” (Kim, 2011, p. 71), “learning [Korean Language] in more intrinsic way” (Kim, 2012b, p. 158), and “relevance to the aim of subject” (Lee & Hong, 2007, p. 147) demonstrates that subject specialists focus on the uniqueness of each subject.

Highlighting the uniqueness of each subject can explain why subject specialists hid their rejection with ostensible acceptance. For subject specialists in developing subject curriculum, whether standards are developed well enough to achieve the objective and essentials of subject seems much more important than how many standards are in the curriculum; their priority is not in reducing the content, but rather in achieving the individual objective of each subject. As a result, the specialists find it unacceptable for the policymakers’ guidelines to cut back fixed amount of content regardless of the subject.

This difference in priority implies a difference in values. Whereas content reduction is crucial to policymakers, it is a secondary consideration for subject specialists as they focus on the objectives of their own subject. This is demonstrated by the fact that the proportion of content reduction research differs depending on the discourse. More specifically, the fact that this study consists of sixteen articles written by policymakers and twenty articles written by subject specialists suggests that vigorous studies were not conducted by subject specialists on content reduction, even though there is a much larger specialist community when compared to the number of policymakers. In other words, while policymakers view the issue of content reduction as an urgent one, the discourse of the subject specialists shows that they have been pushing it back on their list of priorities.

#### 4.2.3 Qualitative Approach

Subject specialists have a strong preference for a qualitative approach when dealing with content reduction. Their approach to disencumber students’ stress focuses much more on evolving organizational and instructional techniques, rather than just content cutbacks.

Above all, they argue that the dense content is not the critical pressure-inducing factor for students. The subject specialists feel that the pressure students experience should be understood not only in terms of the amount of learning content, but also in terms of the “distribution and arrangement of contents” (Kang, 2012, p. 10) and the organization of contents (Huh, 2010; Lee & Choi, 1999). In other words, the ways the curriculum is organized and instructional techniques in the classroom are much more essential than the amount of content.

Thus, based on this perspective, policymakers’ method for easing the stress of learning for students has limited effectiveness. The discourse of subject specialists has instead been dominated by arguments for organizational changes in the curriculum and textbook. The specialists asserted that it would be better to adopt a new approach, such as re-organizing the curricula and textbooks “based on problem-solving situations in order to demonstrate specific process and method for problem-solving” (Huh et al., 2000, p. 123), or “centered on practical case in real situation” (Lee & Choi, 1999, p. 114).

### 5. Discussion and Conclusion

To summarize the findings in the discourses of policymakers and subject specialists, there are several apparent differences between the two discourses. Firstly, policymakers tend to rely on *common sense*, subjective feelings, or superficial surveys to justify content reduction guidelines instead of substantiating concrete evidences. Subject specialists, on the other hand, disguised their rejection of the guidelines with ostensible acceptance. The policymaker’s discourse reveals that they presume all subjects are contextually identical by suggesting monolithic and coercive guidelines to all subjects, whereas discourse of subject specialists focuses on the uniqueness of each subject and realizes it through the program of study. Finally, when it comes to diagnosing and finding solutions to high pressure of learning felt by students, discourse of policymakers emphasizes quantitative

approach of requiring demonstrable and measurable figures, while the discourse of subject specialists demonstrates a qualitative approach of suggesting organizational change of curriculum contents instead of simply reducing the number of contents.

Based on Foucauldian archaeology, which focuses on how discourse and its underlying social conditions have been transformed according to the change of time and space, we can discuss the non-discursive practice that affect discursive formation of policymakers and subject specialists on the issue of content reduction by using the dimensions of time and space.

In the temporal dimension, the hasty environments for curriculum redesign have significant effect on discursive formation of policymakers and subject specialists respectively. In South Korea, national curriculum is revised whenever a new government takes over, and each government has a strong tendency to realize its educational policies within its term of office. As a result, rather than investigating diverse needs of educational stakeholders regarding prior curriculum and discussing in-depth about solutions, administrators estimate the date of notification at first and then plan curriculum development process backward. This limits the time for research and development of curriculum. More specifically, the period given for the research/development of guidelines and subject curricula is about between 6 to 10 months (Gim, 2002; Lee, 2000; Kang, 2005).

This hasty environment for curriculum revision provides limited discursive formation of policymakers and subject specialists. The pressure of realizing new educational policies leads policymakers to value quantitative ways of thinking, emphasizing demonstrable short-term outcomes rather than promoting fundamental improvement. Furthermore, the limited time makes it difficult to gather abundant data on previous curriculums. Policymakers consequently do not have time to listen to voices of teachers and students regarding content reduction, so they instead justify their arguments solely on subjective feeling or common sense. Similarly, since subject specialists have to develop subject curriculum in a limited amount of time, it is inevitable that most of the time is spent on discussing the urgent issues each subject is facing; content reduction thereby becomes a secondary issue and can be ignored (Lee, 2000; Kang, 2005).

In the space dimension, it seems that mutual exclusion and isolation of policymakers and subject specialists has influenced their respective discursive formation. During the guideline development process, broad guidelines are only written by general educationalists, while the subject curricula are written only by subject experts. This divided development structure has potentially eliminated the opportunity for discursive interaction between policymakers and subject specialists. As a result of this exclusion and isolation, a deep-rooted antagonism arose between policymakers and subject specialists. Each discourse has consequently been formed exclusively from each other; this can be seen by policymakers defining subject specialists as “fettered by tradition and greed only aimed for extending the power of their own major” (Kim, 2006, p. 44) and by subject specialists defining policymakers as a group who are “regulating and restricting subject curriculum development” (Kim, 2012a, p. 7).

In spite of the tensions between the two discourses, the fact that the conflicting discourses began in the same condition of time and space shows that it may be possible to initiate a conversation that may facilitate an alternative discursive formation between the policymakers and subject specialists. As Young (1990) points out, “the similar can be noticed only through difference. Difference, however, is not absolute otherness, a complete absence of relationship or shared attributes.” (p. 98). Until now, the hasty environment and isolated structure of South Korea’s curriculum development meant that curriculum policymakers and subject specialists have not been offered an adequate time and space to understand each other. As a result, they were preoccupied with shifting the responsibility of failed content reduction onto the other’s shoulders, thus intensifying emotional strife without recognizing that they shared similar institutional conditions beneath the conflicting discourses. Therefore, in order to appropriately approach the issue of content reduction, it is necessary for Korean policymakers and subject specialists to make an effort to understand discourse of “the other” as well as to establish institutional conditions conducive to consistent communication between both stakeholders.

### Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (NRF- 2013S1A5A2A01016734).

### References

- Alexander, R. (2010). Towards a new curriculum. In R. Alexander (Ed.), *Children, their world, their education: Final report and recommendations of the Cambridge Primary Review* (pp. 237-278). London: Routledge.
- Barker, C., & Galasinski, D. (2001). *Cultural studies and discourse analysis: A dialogue on language and*

- identity*. London: Sage.
- Bevir, M. (1999). Foucault and critique: Deploying agency against autonomy. *Political Theory*, 27(1), 65-84. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0090591799027001004>
- Bourke, T., Ryan, M., & Lidstone, J. (2012). Reclaiming professionalism for geography education: Defending our own territory. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(7), 990-998. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.05.005>
- Dean, M. (1994). *Critical and effective histories: Foucault's methods and historical sociology*. London: Routledge. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203414217>
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, trans.). London: Tavistock.
- Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying the text: A post-structuralist reader* (pp. 48-78). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Gim, J. C. (2002). A critical examination of the Korean national curriculum research and development system. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 20(3), 77-97.
- Gim, J. C. (2003). A comparative study on the reduction discourses of educational content in the 4<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> national curriculum R & D reports. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 21(2), 105-122.
- Hirsch, E. D. (2001). Seeking breadth and depth in the curriculum. *Educational Leadership*, 59(2), 22-25.
- Huh, K. C., Park, K. M., Kim, H. W., Choi, D. H., & Kim, W. K. (2000). Analysis of the amount and difficulty level of the middle school mathematics curriculum and textbook. *Korean Journal of Educational Research*, 38(4), 203-224.
- Huh, S. M. (2010). Consistency between the curriculum of social studies and the characteristics of social studies textbook revised in 2007. *Research in Social Studies Education*, 17(3), 109-127.
- Hwang, G. H. (2004). Criteria for the appropriateness of curriculum coverage and depth. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 23(3), 1-25.
- Jorgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage.
- Jung, Y. K., & Park, S. K. (2006). A study on the relevance of contents in national curriculum. *The Journal of Educational Idea*, 19, 1-25.
- Kang, D. H. (2005). A basic study on the analysis framework for the relevance of contents in Social studies. *Social Studies Education*, 44(2), 35-57.
- Kang, W. S. (2012). Inconvenient truth of the 2009 social studies curriculum. *Research in Social Studies Education*, 19(1), 1-13.
- Kim, G., Moon, Y., Park, S., & Gim, J. (1996). *Survey on demand of elementary and secondary schools regarding curriculum revision*. Seoul: Council of Research for Curriculum Revision.
- Kim, J. B. (2006). Investigation on enhancing the efficacy of textbook policy in Korea. *The Journal of Education*, 26(2), 21-64.
- Kim, S. J. (2012a). The acceptance and refraction of the discourse about 'reduction of educational content' in the history national curriculum and textbooks. *The Korean History Education Review*, 121, 1-42.
- Kim, S. J. (2012b). Research of optimization of educational content in 2011 language arts curriculum which is based on the 2009 revised curriculum. *The Journal of Korean Arts Education Research*, 20, 157-178.
- Kim, S., & Park, S. (2003). A study of the elementary and middle school teachers' perceptions on the amount and the degree of difficulty of contents in the textbooks. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 21(2), 51-72.
- Kim, W. J. (2011). The level and range of literary prose in Chinese character education. *Journal of Korean Classical Chinese Education*, 36, 49-76.
- Kwak, B. S., Ku, J. U., Gim, J. C., Park, S. K., Shin, D. R., Ryu, K. S., . . . Hong, H. J. (1996). *Curriculum 2000 development report: Design for elementary and secondary school curriculum*. Seoul: Korean Educational Development Institute.
- Lee, B. G. (2008). A critical understanding of the new curriculum of the Korean language education in the field of grammar. *Journal of Elementary Korean Language Education*, 37, 247-273.
- Lee, H. K. (2000). An ethnographic study on the 7th amendment of social studies curriculum. *Anthropology of*



- Education*, 3(3), 89-139.
- Lee, J. W. (2012). Journey of Foucault's thought and commentary of terms. In J. W. Lee (Trans.), *The order of discourse* (pp. 57-172). Seoul: Joongwonmunhwasa.
- Lee, J., & Choi, H. H. (1999). The study about the device of solution on the problem in instructing the general science of high school. *Studies in Science Education*, 30(1), 99-116.
- Lee, K., & Hong, S. M. (2007). A study on the relevance of contents in moral subject at elementary school. *Korean Elementary Moral Education Society*, 23, 143-170.
- Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. (2009). *General guideline of national curriculum*. Seoul: Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. Retrieved from <http://ncic.re.kr/english.kri.org.inventoryList.do>
- Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. (2011). *Direction for subject curriculum revision*. Seoul: Ministry of Education, Science and Technology.
- Neal, A. (2006). Foucault in Guantánamo: Towards archaeology of the exception. *Security Dialogue*, 37(1), 31-46. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0967010606064135>
- Scheurich, J. J. (1994) Policy archaeology: A new policy studies methodology. *Journal of Education Policy*, 9(4), 297-316. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0268093940090402>
- Shin, S. H., Kwak, B. S., & Kim, J. B. (1981). *Research and development of general guideline of national curriculum*. Seoul: Korean Educational Development Institute.
- So, K. H. (2004). A critical examination on the reduction discourses of educational content: Focusing on physical education, music, fine arts, and practical arts (technology, home economics). *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 22(3), 27-47.
- So, K. H., & Kang, J. Y. (2014). Curriculum reform in Korea: Issues and challenges for twenty-first century learning. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*. Published online 18 January 2014. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40299-013-0161-2>
- Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

### Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).