Special Feature

Korean History Education in the United States

Kim Jeom Sook

The Review of Korean Studies Volume 13 Number 2 (June 2010): 95-131

Introduction

Since the Treaty of Amity, Commerce and Navigation between the Great Joseon and the United States in 1882, the United States and South Korea have maintained an intimate relationship. The Pacific War was a turning point for Asian studies in the United States. In particular, the war necessitated studies of countries such as Korea, Thailand and the Philippines–countries, unlike China and Japan, which had been somewhat set aside from the focus of Asian studies. Since General MacArthur established American military control over Korea south of 38° north latitude on September 7, 1945, its interest in South Korea increased. The two countries strengthened their alliance when the United States and other United Nations members came to South Korea's aid in the Korean War and when the United States continued its military stationing in South Korea after the Korean War. This historical background enabled the development of Korean studies in the United States (Shin 2002; Kim 2006:152-158).

According to statistics provided by the Korea Foundation, there are 313 universities that have Korean studies programs. The United States has ninety-one of them. China has forty-one; Russia, twenty-two; and Japan, seventeen. There are forty-one Korean studies research centers (Korea Foundation). The largest number, ten, are located in the United States. The runner-up is China, with nine. The former Soviet Union has four, and Japan and Australia have three each. Just by looking at these numbers, it is sufficiently clear that the United States is the center of Korean studies in the world.

However, the result of a survey conducted among Korean American students attending Georgetown University and George Washington University, shows us another rather disappointing aspect of the current status of Korean history education in the United States. Seventeen of sixty questionnaires were returned. Among the twelve respondents who had completed all of their primary and secondary education in the United States, no one had been taught Korean history in classes at his or her school. When they were asked whether they were interested in learning Korean history, five answered "very much", another five "yes", one "so-

This work was supported by a Korea Research Foundation Grant funded by the Korean Government (KRF-2007-561-A00003).

so" and another "somewhat." They were interested in learning Korean history, but they were not given an opportunity to do so in the U.S. public education system.

When I asked them how they acquired information about Korean history, parents took first place, followed by school, books and TV, and then the internet. Considering the fact that those who responded were Korean Americans, it can be assumed that other children in the United States obtain a substantial part of their knowledge of Korean history through education in school.

The results of this survey inspired my interest in Korean history education provided by the U.S. public school system. In this article, I will examine the current status of Korean history education in the United States. I will first summarize the current trends in history education in the United States, and then examine Korean history education in primary and secondary schools. In the subsequent section, I will analyze Korean history education in U.S. universities.

Current Trends in History Education in the United States

Strengthening of History Education in Public Schools

Ever since 1916 when social studies became part of the standard curriculum in primary and secondary education, the emphasis on social applicability, practical solutions to contemporary sociological problems, and education in responsible citizenship resulted in the neglect of history education. History as a subject was, at that point, subsumed under social studies in primary and secondary education (Kang 2007:154).

Since the mid-seventies, conservative intellectuals in the United States have expounded the claim that public educational policies promoting equality through the philosophy of plurality and non-interference only resulted in the general degradation of the quality of education. They also urge that it is necessary to go back to traditional educational methods that put more emphasis on strengthening the basics such as English, mathematics, science, and social studies (Kim 2004:142).

In April 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education issued a report titled *A Nation at Risk.* The Commission declared that

the status of the United States in the international community was being challenged. The Commission attributed this decline, in part, to what they characterized as the U.S. educational system's mediocre results. As a result, the Commission urged that the United States adopt educational reforms to improve the quality of American education in order to redress its international prestige. In terms of education reform, the Commission made recommendations in five areas: curriculum content, standards and expectations for students, time devoted to education, teacher quality, and educational leadership and the financial support of education. This can be summarized as follows: strengthening the foundations of the basics by adopting a curriculum of four years of English, three years of mathematics, three years of science, three years of social studies, one-half year of computer science, and two years of a foreign language during their four years of high school; adopting "more rigorous and measurable standards, and higher expectations, for academic performance and student conduct"; raising four-year colleges' and universities' requirements for admission; and using the existing school day more effectively and lengthening the school day (National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983).

Combined with the sense of urgency people in the United States were experiencing from the economic downturn at the time, the report reinforced conservatives' insistence on reviving the more traditional educational system. Several other reports followed in the same vein, arguing for the urgent need for reform of the curriculum (Patrick 1989:37) These reports paved the way for educational reform (Patrick 1989:45fn3). State and local academic standards and standards-based testing began in the 1980s and 1990s; federal legislation required that states receiving federal aid for education have such academic standards and tests in certain grades (U. S. Department of Education 2008:3).

The California State Board of Education adopted the *History-Social Science Framework (Framework)* as the standard for history-social science disciplines for public school grades K-12 in July 10, 1987. The adoption of the *Framework* is considered the beginning of the revolution in history education. The *Framework* fundamentally changed social studies education, making history the focus of the social studies curriculum (Burstein 2004:5).

One year following adoption of the *Framework*, the Bradley Commission on History in Schools (Bradley Commission) issued its report *Building a History Curriculum: Guidelines for Teaching History in Schools*. The

Bradley Commission report also offered a statement on the importance of history and made major recommendations for changes (Zilversmit 2004:50). The Bradley Commission suggested that history become the core of the social studies curriculum. The recommendations were as follows: (1) historical studies should focus on thematic context and chronological perspective; (2) more curricular time should be allotted to history education; (3) the K-6 social studies curriculum should be history-centered; (4) students between grades seven and twelve should be required to take no fewer than four years of history education; and (5) this curriculum should include the historical experiences of peoples from all parts of the world and all constituent parts of those societies (Bradley Commission 1989:12-13). John J. Patrick wrote: "These recommendations about history in the secondary school core of common learning are in agreement with the comprehensive curriculum reform reports of the 1980s, which tend to recommend at least three required years of social studies in the four years of high school, with a heavy emphasis on history" (Patrick 1989:39).

In U.S. schools at that time, most children below K-3 did not receive any education in history, based on the assumption made in Piaget's theory of cognitive development that they are simply too young to understand history. Ever since the Bradley Commission report argued that social studies education of younger children also needs to be history-centered, the general consensus has been that history needs to be taught earlier (Kang 2007:174-188).

Building National History Standards and Establishing Standards-based Education

As the federal government began to emphasize history education, it also increased its direct and indirect intervention in education reform which, since the 1990s, centered on establishing content standards and assessment systems. In 1989, President George Bush convened an education summit of the nation's fifty governors in Charlottesville, Virginia to discuss measures for educational reform. They adopted six National Education Goals and insisted that they be achieved by the year 2000 (U.S. Department of Education 1994:39). On April 18, 1991, President Bush launched "America 2000," a "strategy" to implement the six goals (U.S.

Department of Education 1994:44). Appointed by Congress, the National Council on Education Standards and Testing (hereafter Council) issued a report on January 24, 1992 titled, *Raising Standards for American Education*. The report called for establishment of national content standards and a national assessment system as a basis for comprehensive reform of U.S. education (U.S. Department of Education 1994:42).

However, the law prohibits the U.S. Department of Education from getting involved in curricular decisions at the state and local level except in very special circumstances. The Council asked professional organizations to develop voluntary national standards in their own fields such as English, mathematics, science, history, and geography. Instead of direct involvement, the U.S. Department of Education gave grants to those organizations (U.S. Department of Education 1994:40).

When neo-conservative reformers like Lynne Cheney set out to rescue the nation from mediocrity, cultural relativism, and economic decline by reviving education in humanities in public schools, "history became the core discipline around which their entire program for the humanities was to be structured" (Symcox 2002:159).

In the spring of 1992, the National History Standards Project (NHSP) was launched by the National Center for History in the Schools (NCHS 2010a). The National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) led by Lynne Cheney and the U.S. Department of Education sponsored the project.

The national standards for history were developed through continuous debates. Carol Gluck, a member of the National Council for History Standards and the George Samson Professor of History of Columbia University, summarized the process as the following:

> Over more than two years, nearly 6,000 teachers, administrators, scholars, parents and business leaders had their say in the drafting. Thirty-five organizations, from the American Association of School Librarians to the Missouri Synod of the Lutheran Church, participated as advisers. Battalions of classroom teachers from all over the country wrote the actual standards in intensive workshop sessions. Nine focus groups from national organizations, including the Council of Chief State School Officers and the Organization of History Teachers, reviewed every word of the American history standards (three times) and the world history standards (four times). Each time the drafts were revised, then revised again (Gluck 1994:23).

As the result of the project, the *National Standards for History*

(Standards) were published on October 26, 1994 in three separate volumes: *National Standards for History for Grades K-4*, *National Standards for United States History,* and *National Standards for World History for Grades 5-12.* However, six days before the *Standards* were published, Lynne Cheney, former chairwoman of the NEH, denounced the *Standards* for "multicultural excess, political correctness, and neglecting America's many triumphs and heroes" in her article, "The End of History." With this article, she launched the National History Standards controversy called "the culture wars" which lasted eighteen months (Symcox 2002:127).

Conservative critics like Rush Limbaugh and Lynne Cheney claim that "the new standards were hijacked by politically correct liberals who diluted the American past with too much ethnicity and drowned the achievements of Western civilization in an excess of attention to the rest of the world" (Gluck 1994:23). On the contrary, advocates of the *Standards* like Charlotte Crabtree, Gary B. Nash, Joyce Appleby, Ross Dunn, and Linda Symcox emphasized that the *Standards* were produced through an admirable process of open debates.

The debate then moved to the political arena. The Senate passed Gorton's resolution condemning the *Standards* by a vote of 99-1 on January 18, 1995. Gorton called for the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC) not to approve the *Standards* and the NEH and the U.S. Department of Education not to give any federal funds to the NCHS for the project. In addition, due to the reaction against the *Standards* in the Senate, the NEH and the U.S. Department of Education had to submit to severe curtailments of budget for two years (Symcox 2002:137-147).

Linda Symcox, the NHSP's assistant director, described the process as "a kind of dialogue of the deaf … still continuing–across [a] yawning gulf between the practitioners of disciplinary and non-disciplinary knowledge" (Symcox 2002:160). According to her, the neo-conservative reformers, who initiated a discourse of educational crisis in the early 1980s, entrusted the task of drafting of the *Standards* to professional historians, who "did not fully understand what the crusading reformers expected of them" (Symcox 2002:160), and those historians drafted the *Standards* with the latest advances in historical methodology, social and cultural history.

Even though, on the surface, the main issues of the controversy were multiculturalism and the role played by the West in world history, Symcox

charged the conservative critics with distorting the *Standards* in order to further their political agenda of minimizing the role of government in education (Symcox 2002:164).

In the end, the *Standards* did not get approval from the NESIC. In 1996, after many fierce debates, the NCHS published the *National Standards for History, Basic Edition* (hereafter *Revised Standards*) which is composed of U.S. and world history content, and thinking standards for grades 5-12. The online version of the *Revised Standards* and the print version of the *National Standards for History, K-4* (Expanded Edition, 1994) are available at the NCHS Web site: http://nchs.ucla.edu. Despite the fact that many contentious parts were either revised or deleted altogether, the *Revised Standards* has been praised for its successful incorporation of multicultural and global perspectives in world history standards (Kang 2004:144). The *Revised Standards* recommends "comparative civilization," "civilizations in global context," "interregional history," and "thematic history" as the principles of understanding world history. Among these four principles, the ones that diverge most from the traditional world history that favors Western civilizations are "civilizations in global context" and "interregional history" (Kang 2004:145).

According to the homepage of the NCHS, the *Revised Standards* "have served as a template for the more than thirty states that have developed state standards such diverse projects as lessons accompanying National Park Service Web sites, the Military District of Washington's 'Spirit of America' curriculum, Oregon Public Broadcasting's upcoming Web-based series 'Turning Points in U.S. History,' the Thelonious Monk Jazz Institute history/jazz curriculum, lesson plans to accompany the Eisenhower archives, and many others" (NCHS 2010b).

Some critics question the effectiveness of the *Revised Standards*. For example, K. Ankeney from Houghton Mifflin/McDougal Littell, a company that is one of the four largest textbook publishers in the United States, stated that the *Revised Standards* were adopted by only a few states such as California and were practically ignored by states like Texas, Virginia, and New Jersey (Ankeney 2000:170).

The question of how many states actually adopted the *Revised Standards* requires another study. What needs to be emphasized here is the fact that NHSP and the *Standards* played an important role in pushing standards-based education as one of the major elements of education reform.

Korean History Education in Primary and Secondary Schools

Korean History in the History Content Standards for Grades 5-12

During primary and secondary education in the United States, Korean history is mainly taught as part of world history, world literature, and world geography in social studies. Since students acquire most of their knowledge about other countries in these classes, the content of these classes has great influence on their opinions of these countries.

Because of education reform, many states began to implement a standards-based educational system. Currently, there are more than twenty states with state-wide standards on content of textbooks, evaluation methods, and teaching methods (Lee and Choi 2006:11). It requires an impractical amount of time and effort to examine the policies in history education in the United States as a whole because the policies are mostly decided at the level of states and counties. Thus, my analysis in this chapter will be limited to three states' history standards for grades K-12 and the *Revised Standards*. The three states are Texas, Florida, and California which constitute 25% of the U.S. textbook market (Kang 2005:8). I will especially focus on content standards. In the state of Florida, since it approved the *Sunshine State Standards* as a means of identifying standards for student achievement in 1996, the State Board of Education has made an effort to develop Florida's academic standards for K-12 students. In 2008, the Florida legislature enacted Senate Bill 1908, which requires replacement of the *Sunshine State Standards* with its revised version, *Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS)*. As result of the bill, the *NGSSS* were adopted by the State Board of Education in the same year. The *NGSSS* are available in multiple formats at the Florida Standards Web site: http://www.floridastandards.org. The revision of *Sunshine State Standards* for social studies started in June 2007 and its revised version, the *NGSSS for Social Studies,* was approved on December 2, 2008 by the State Board of Education.

The *NGSSS for Social Studies* are organized by grade for grades K-8, and by strands for grades 9-12. There are six strands in social studies: American history, civics and government, economics, geography,

humanities, and world history.

Students in grades K-12 are expected to take forty-one credit hours of social studies. Among those hours, eight hours are allotted to American history and two hours to world history. Students start to learn history beginning in kindergarten in Florida. Students in grades K-1 learn about themselves, families, countries, and people in history. In grade 2, they look at the way early American society was formed by learning about Native Americans and immigrants. In grade 4, they study the history of Florida and start to study U.S. history in grade 5. They begin world history in grade 6 and then restudy U.S. history up to the Civil War in grade 8, and learn U.S. contemporary history and world history from grades 9-12.

The standards for world history as well as American history are arranged chronologically. The table below shows the standards for world history education:

Grade 6	Standard 1: Utilize historical inquiry skills and analytical processes.
	Standard 2: Describe the emergence of early civilizations (Nile, Tigris-Euphrates, Indus, and Yellow Rivers, Meso and South American).
	Standard 3: Recognize significant events, figures, and contributions of classical civilizations (Phoenicia, Greece, Rome, Axum).
	Standard 4: Recognize significant events, figures, and contributions of classical Asian civilizations (China, India).
Grades 9 thru 12	Standard 1: Utilize historical inquiry skills and analytical processes.
	Standard 2: Recognize significant events, figures, and contributions of medieval civilizations (Byzantine Empire, Western Europe, Japan).
	Standard 3: Recognize significant events, figures, and contributions of Islamic, Meso and South American, and Sub-Saharan African civilizations.
	Standard 4: Analyze the causes, events, and effects of the Renaissance, Reformation, Scientific Revolution, and Age of Exploration.
	Standard 5: Analyze the causes, events, and effects of the Enlightenment and its impact on the American, French and other revolutions.
	Standard 6: Understand the development of Western and non-Western nationalism, industrialization and imperialism, and the significant processes and consequences of each.
	Standard 7: Recognize significant causes, events, figures, and consequences of the Great War period and the impact on worldwide balance of power.
	Standard 8: Recognize significant events and people from the post World War II and Cold War eras.
	Standard 9: Identify major economic, political, social, and technological trends beginning in the twentieth century.

Source: Social studies standards with benchmarks and access points. 2008. Updated May 29, 2010 (http://www.floridastandards.org/downloads.aspx).

Korea is mentioned in the *NGSSS for Social Studies*: under the title "Examine causes, course, and consequences of the Korean War," as one of fifteen benchmarks for "Standard 6: Understand the causes and course of World War II, the character of the war at home and abroad, and its reshaping of the United States role in the post-war world" among American history standards for grades 9-12; and under the title of "Describe Japan's cultural and economic relationship to China and Korea," as one of twenty-two benchmarks for the second standard of world history for grades 9-12.

Next, in the state of Texas, the State Board of Education gained legislative authority to adopt the *Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS)* for each subject of the required curriculum in 1998. The *TEKS* is available at the following Web site: http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us. Social studies education in grades K-12 aims to build a foundation in eight strands of knowledge and skills that are essential in social studies. The eight strands, in addition to social studies skills, are history, geography, economics, citizenship, culture, science, technology, and society.

History education in Texas is similar to that of Florida. General history education begins in kindergarten. Students learn history focusing on national holidays and historical figures until grade 3. In grade 4, students then study the state history of Texas with an emphasis on influences from the Western Hemisphere. In grade 5, the students learn comprehensive U.S. history with a focus on colonial times through the twentieth century. In grade 6, they learn about people and places of the contemporary world. In grade 7, they relearn the history of Texas. In grade 8 they learn, in more depth, U.S. history from the early colonial period to Reconstruction. In grades 9-12, students are required, as a part of general requirements, to take one credit course in U.S. history since the Reconstruction to the present and another in world history.

The world history curriculum also includes many components of the eight strands of the social studies *TEKS*. In grade 6, students start serious study of world history. Students are expected to study a variety of societies chosen from the following regions of the world: Europe, Russia and the Eurasian republics; North America; Middle America; South America; Southwest Asia; North Africa; Sub-Saharan Africa; South Asia; East Asia; Southeast Asia; and Australia and the Pacific Realm.

In the second world history course in grades 9-12, students are expected to understand: traditional historical points of reference in world

history; how the present relates to the past; how, as result of the collapse of the Western Roman Empire, new political, economic, and social systems evolved, creating a new civilization in Western Europe; the influence of the European Renaissance and the Reformation eras; causes and effects of European expansion beginning in the sixteenth century; the major developments of civilizations of sub-Saharan Africa, Mesoamerica, Andean South America, and Asia; the impact of political and economic imperialism throughout history; causes and effects of major political revolutions since the seventeenth century; the impact of totalitarianism in the twentieth century; and the influence of significant individuals of the twentieth century.

Even though students are expected to understand Asian societies, these societies only include China, Japan and India. Korea, more specifically the Korean War, is mentioned in the *TEKS* as a part of the historical knowledge students are expected to learn in the U.S. history course taken some time in grades 9-12.

Third, in the state of California, the State Board of Education (SBE) adopted the *Framework* in 1987. The seventeen distinguishing characteristics of the *Framework* are listed in that document and can be summarized as follows: emphasizing history and geography as central subjects in the social studies curriculum and integrating history and geography with the humanities and the social sciences; enriching the content of the early grades; treating ethical ideas seriously; emphasizing the importance of both religious and secular ideas in human history; emphasizing multicultural perspectives and the concept of global interdependence; and dedicating three years to the study of world history (History-Social Science Curriculum Framework and Criteria Committee 1988:4-8).

In teaching multicultural perspectives, the *Framework* explains that "the history of community, state, region, nation, and world must reflect the experiences of men and women and of different racial, religious, and ethnic groups" (History-Social Science Curriculum Framework and Criteria Committee 1988:5). Emphasizing the concept of global interdependence, the *Framework* gives special attention to "the study of non-Western histories in recognition of the need for understanding the history and cultures of Asian and African, and other non-Western peoples" (History-Social Science Curriculum Framework and Criteria Committee 1988:6).

After adoption of the *Framework*, the state of California stipulated that students for grades 5-12 must take three years of world history study,

more than that of any other state curriculum in the United States.

Through a slight revision of the *Framework* in 1997, the California SBE adopted the revised *History-Social Science Content Standards for California Public Schools* in October 1998 (History-Social Science Framework and Criteria Committee 2005:v). Additionally, as blueprints for implementing the content standards adopted by the SBE, the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission developed the *History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools*; the 2005 edition is currently in effect. Both are available on the California Department of Education's Web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/.

According to the 2005 edition of the *Framework*, students are encouraged to extend their spatial, temporal, and causal understandings through "home base" plays from kindergarten to grade 3. In grade 4, students study geography and history of the state of California. From grade 5, students start to study U.S. history and world history in depth.

Students have three courses in U.S. history: Making a new nation in grade 5, U.S. growth and conflict from 1783 to 1914 in grade 8, and U.S. continuity and change from 1900 to the present day in grade 11.

Students also have three world history courses. In grade 6, they study ancient world history to A.D. 500 including various cultures of eight different regions: Middle Eastern and African civilization (Africa, Egypt and Kush), Western civilization (Rome, Greece, and Ancient Hebrew), and Asian civilization (China, India, and Mesopotamia). In grade 7, they continue to study world history through medieval and early modern times, A.D. 500-1789. Lastly, in grade 10, students study formation and major events of modern societies from late 1789 to the present day, focusing on the expansion of Western civilization as well as the increasing interdependence of different countries and cultures.

A unique feature of the *Framework* is that students have two elective courses in grade 9 which should be provided by the district and school with a subject selected from the following subjects: "Our State in the Twentieth and Twenty-first Centuries;" "Physical Geography;" World Regional Geography;" "The Humanities;" "Comparative World Religions;" "Area Studies: Cultures;" "Anthropology;" "Psychology;" "Sociology;" "Women in Our History;" "Ethnic Studies;" and "Law-Related Education" (History-Social Science Framework and Criteria Committee 2005:118-124).

Korean-related narratives in the 2005 edition of the *Framework* are as follows:

(1) "Describe the reunification of China under the Tang Dynasty and reason for the spread of Buddhism in Tang China, Korea, and Japan" (Grade 7).
(2) "Describe the significance of Japan's proximity to China and Korea and the intellectual, linguistic, religious, and philosophical influence of those countries on Japan" (Grade 7).
(3) "Understand the importance of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, which established the pattern for America's postwar policy of supplying economic and military aid to prevent the spread of Communism and the resulting economic and political competition in arenas such as Southeast Asia (i.e., the Korean War), Cuba, and Africa" (Grade 10).
(4) "Trace the origins and geopolitical consequences (foreign and domestic) of the Cold War and containment policy, including the following: …the Korean War…" (Grade 11).

In addition, in "Appendix A: Nationalism, Free Markets, and Democracy in the Contemporary World" in the context of alternative case studies for grade 10, Korea was referred as follows:

(1) "In considering Japan's remarkable economic development, students should analyze its evolving relationship with the United States as well as its rise as the leader of a potent Asian and Pacific trading bloc that includes South Korea, China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Singapore."
(2) "To gain perspective on the experience of the successful fledgling democracies described above, students should compare the recent histories of those democracies with those of three countries of the Pacific Rim, where remarkable economic development has occurred with an authoritarian government in power. These countries are South Korea, Singapore, and the Republic of China (Taiwan) … A fourth Pacific Rim power, Hong Kong, is important to study as well….Students should compare the economies of each of these four Pacific Rim nations to that of Japan and consider the advantages and disadvantages of their governments' roles in economic and political life. They should also examine the significance of the turn toward free elections in Taiwan and South Korea and consider the relationship in those two states between economic prosperity and the democratization of political life."

The first passages belong to the topic of "Japan and Mexico" and the second passages belong to the topic of "Modern Democracy and Development in the Contemporary World." According to T. Adams, when curriculums were revised in 1997, incorporating some newer research, the two topics were added and more attention was given to the Asian countries, such as South Korea, Singapore, and Taiwan, and Hong Kong (Adams 2000:211).

Last, let's move to the *Revised Standards* which are thought to challenge the traditional historical narrative that focused on nation-states, civilizations, or cultural regions, and which tried to reconceptualize the past from a very different perspective that emphasized civilizations in the global context and interregional history (Symcox 2002:113). The following is an overview of the content standards.

Standards in History for Grades K-4	Living and working together in families and communities, now and long ago
	The history of the students' own state or region
	The history of the U.S: democratic principles and values and the peoples from many cultures who contributed to its cultural, economic and political heritage
	The history of peoples of many cultures around the world
United States History Standards for Grades 5-12	Era 1: Three worlds meet (Beginnings to 1620)
	Era 2: Colonization and settlement (1585-1763)
	Era 3: Revolution and the new nation (1754-1820s)
	Era 4: Expansion and reform (1801-1861)
	Era 5: Civil War and Reconstruction (1850-1877)
	Era 6: The development of the industrial United States (1870-1900)
	Era 7: The emergence of modern America (1890-1930)
	Era 8: The Great Depression and World War II (1929-1945)
	Era 9: Postwar United States (1945 to early 1970s)
	Era 10: Contemporary United States (1968 to the present)
World History Standards for Grades 5-12	Era 1: The beginnings of human society
	Era 2: Early civilizations & the emergence of pastoral peoples, 4000-1000 BCE
	Era 3: Classical traditions, major religions, and giant empires, 1000 BCE-300 CE
	Era 4: Expanding zones of exchange and encounter, 300-1000 CE
	Era 5: Intensified hemispheric interactions 1000-1500 CE
	Era 6: The emergence of the first global age, 1450-1770
	Era 7: An age of revolutions, 1750-1914
	Era 8: A half-century of crisis and achievement 1900-1945
	Era 9: The twentieth century since 1945: promises and paradoxes
	World history across the eras

The standards for history in grades K-4 are organized by topics. The standards for U.S. history and world history for grades 5-12 are in chronological order, which is believed to foster appreciation of pattern and causation in history. Relating to instruction time, it is recommended there should be at least three years each of U.S history instruction and world history instruction for grades 5-12 (National Center for History in the Schools 1996)[1].

The passages relating to Korea in the content standards of the *Revised Standards* are as follows:

1) "Analyze the causes of the Korean War and how a divided Korea remained a source of international tension." (United States History Standards, Era 9, Standard 2A, for grades 7-12)
2) "Assess explanations for the spread and power of Buddhism in Tang China, Korea, and Japan." (World History Standards, Era 4, Standard 3A, for grades 7-12)
3) "Explain how Korea assimilated Chinese ideas and institutions yet preserved its political independence." (World History Standards, Era 4, Standard 3B, for grades 7-12)
4) "Explain China's self-concept as the "Middle Kingdom" and the character of its political, commercial, and cultural relations with Korea, Vietnam, and other societies of East and Southeast Asia." (World History Standards, Era 6, Standard 3A, for grades 7-12)
5) "Assess the influences of both new currents in Confucianism and Chinese art, architecture, and literary styles on cultural life in Korea, Vietnam, and Japan." (World History Standards, Era 4, Standard 5C, for grades 9-12)
6) "Assess the effects of the Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese wars and colonization of Korea on the world-power status of Japan. (World History Standards, Era 7, Standard 5C, for grades 9-12)
7) "Explain the causes and international and local consequences of major Cold War crises, such as the Berlin blockade, the Korean War, the Polish workers' protest, the Hungarian revolt, the Suez crisis, the Cuban missile crisis, the Indonesian civil war, and the

1. According to the *Revised Standards*, seventeen states provided three years of U.S. history for grade 5-12. Fourteen states provided two years or more of world history, six of which provided three years (National Center for History in the Schools 1996).

Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia." (World History Standards, Era 9, Standard 1B, for grades 5-12)

8) "Explain the emergence of the Pacific Rim economy and analyze how countries such as South Korea or Singapore have achieved economic growth in recent decades." (World History Standards, Era 9, Standard 2B, for grades 5-12)

These standards contain more issues involving Korean history than any other standards that were analyzed above. However, the standards were developed "to explicate the goals that all students should have the opportunity to acquire, if the purposes just considered are to be achieved." Accordingly, the question of which standard should be taught in which grade is a matter of curriculum planning within the jurisdiction of local schools. Instructional time also belongs to curriculum planning.

Having analyzed the curriculums in history for grade K-12 adopted by the above three states and the *Standards*, it is concluded that the curriculums are designated to lay foundations for historical understanding and perspective, and for thinking historically. It encourages children to broaden their focus from self to family, community, state, and nation during the early stage of education. To meet these goals, children's historical studies are centered around people who have lived in their own community, state, nation and the world. In grade 4, students study their state history. From grade 5, students begin to study U.S. history and world history in chronological order in depth. The U.S. history course starts in grade 5 and the world history course starts in grade 6 or higher. In relation to instruction times, both the *Revised Standards* and the *Framework* recommend three years of U.S. history and three years of world history during grades 5-12. The three states follow this recommendation on U.S. history, but they vary on world history. Only California stipulates three years of world history study. In the other two, two years is required.

Korean History in World History Textbooks Used in the United States

The content standards adopted by each state define what students should know about the histories of their nation and of the world. The content standards are designed to assist school administrators, district curriculum

development coordinators, and classroom teachers in their efforts to meet state-adopted standards that help them achieve the civic mission of the schools. In one sense, the standards do not directly affect the students because what they actually learn from are the textbooks that conform only to the set of standards their states have chosen to follow. Therefore it is necessary to review their history textbooks in order to figure out how much, and which parts, of Korean history that children in public schools study.

The Association for Asian Studies (AAS) and Columbia University carried out a project titled "National Review of Asia in American Textbooks 1993." The aim of the project was to examine wide array of textbooks published in the United States on world history, world culture, and world geography. The resulting report observed that world history textbooks tended to be structured mostly on the history of Western civilization and histories of non-Western regions were narrated from the perspective of the West. Therefore, it argued, textbooks on world history needed to include the perspectives of those native to Asia (Kang 2004:142).

After the *Standards* were published, Sunjoo Kang analyzed three textbooks[2] used in Texas, Florida, and North Carolina for students in grade 9 and higher in order to examine how the new standards were actually being incorporated into textbooks. She concluded that although these textbooks incorporated a multicultural perspective, they did not actively incorporate the principle of interregional history either in their classification of historical periods or in historical content. Rather, their narrations were mainly based on the concepts crucial only to Western history: democracy and modernization (Kang, 2004:150). She stipulated that although pluralism was acknowledged as the more appropriate perspective in understanding world history, it could not overcome the belief that the concept of modernity that sprang from the West was the only criterion that could measure the progress of diverse cultures.

According to Mark Peterson of Brigham Young University, who analyzed eighty-two textbooks used for secondary education, a new

2. The three textbooks are *World History: The Human Experience* published by McGraw-Hill/Glencoe (revised edition 1997), *World History: Connections to Today* published by Pearson/Prentice Hall in 2003, and *World History: Patterns of Interaction* published by Houghton Mifflin/McDougal in 2003. The second one is known as the most popularly used textbook in 2004.

textbook is made only once every eight to ten years (Peterson 2008:158). Therefore, we should take into consideration the fact that newly completed research takes time to be incorporated into textbooks even if we put aside the aforementioned debate.

After the uproar in Korea over China's distorted account of Goguryeo initiated by its Northeast Project and Japan's equally distorted account of Korean history in history textbooks used in Japan, many Korean scholars became much more interested in the way Korean history was being taught in other countries. This increased interest inspired additional research that analyzed world history textbooks of many different countries.

One example of such research is that conducted by the Center for Information on Korean Culture of the Academy of Korean Studies. As a part of their project to make Korea better known to the world, they have been continuously analyzing the way Korean history is taught outside Korea. Among these analyses, studies of world history textbooks used in the United States have been reported since 2006 (Lee and Choi 2006; Choi 2007).

They analyzed fourteen volumes of world history textbooks published by the four biggest publishing companies: Pearson Education, Houghton Mifflin, McGraw-Hill, and Harcourt Education Company. The two-year study concluded that Korean history tends to be narrated as supplementary information relevant to Chinese or Japanese history rather than as an independent chapter or section (Lee and Choi 2006:401; Choi 2007:183-188). Furthermore, the quantity of narration, as well as the presentation of supplementary materials such as photographs and tables, was much smaller than that which related to Chinese or Japanese history: the fourteen textbooks allot, on average, 5.7 pages for Korean history, 62.1 pages for Chinese history, and 30.4 pages for Japanese history (Lee and Choi 2006:408; Choi 2007:189).

Volume-wise, Korean history is practically non-existent compared to Chinese and Japanese histories. Compared to the eighty-two history textbooks which were published in the early 1990s, however, even this is a vast improvement. According to Mark Peterson, only one book used about 7000 words to describe Korean history, another one about 3000, and six others about 2000 (Peterson 2008:159).

Content-wise, the biggest criticism was of the exaggerated influence of China and Japan, and the elements of self-sufficiency and subjectivity of Korean history that were distorted by Eurocentric perspectives. Economic, democratic, and cultural advancements achieved by Korea

since independence were not depicted in any systematic way. Rather, they often portray a version of Korean history represented by looking only at the separation of North and South Korea, the Korean War, and nuclear weapons in North Korea.

For an accurate assessment of Korean history education in the United States, we also need to examine the way in which Korean history is actually taught in classes; a guideline, in the end, is only a guideline. Nor is it the case that all things mentioned in a textbook are actually taught in class; teachers are given much room to maneuver.

Ankeney claimed that most social studies teachers do not spend much time and effort teaching Korean history. He pointed out three different reasons for this. First, there simply is not enough time to cover all the things listed in the guidelines given to the teachers. Second, the teachers themselves do not have much knowledge of Korean history. Third, there is not enough available material and information of Korean history (Ankeney 2000:172).

Korean History Education at the University Level

General Overview of the Current Status of Korean Studies in the United States

On February 11, 2006, Columbia University held a workshop for the promotion of Korean studies in North America. The participants were Robert Buswell (religion), Carter J. Eckert (history), Burglind Jungmann (art history), Kyung Hyun Kim (media), David McCann (literature), and JaHyun Kim Haboush (history). They defined a center of Korean studies as a Korean studies program that is equipped with sufficient library resources, a well-balanced faculty, complete language courses (both in Korean and Chinese), a solid graduate program, and enthusiasm for Korean studies education. They concluded that three (UCLA, Columbia University, and Harvard University) met such criteria and five (University of Washington, University of Chicago, Stanford University, UC Berkeley, and University of Toronto) were yet to qualify, although they had much potential (Haboush 2006:302). The table below shows the present conditions of Korean studies in the seven universities referred to above, excluding University of Toronto.

Number of Faculty in Korean Studies by Major

	Art History	Communication	Ethics	Ethnomusicology	Folklore	Geology	History	Korean	Law	Literature/Linguistics	Politics	Religion	Sociology
UCLA	1	1		1#	1	1	3	1		1*		1	
Harvard							2			1			
Columbia							2			1/1*			
Chicago							1			2			
Washington							1		1		1		1^
UC, Berkeley			1							1	1/1*		1
Stanford							1						1
USC													
Total	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	7	3	1	3

Note: * indicates emeritus, # adjunct assistant professor, @ adjunct professor, and ^ affiliate professor

Sources: Korean studies centers' homepages

Peterson pointed out that the three main components of Korean studies program in the United States are language, history, and either literature or something in the social sciences (Peterson 2009:73). However, most universities run the Korean language program with many lecturers. As result, the field that contains the largest body of permanent faculty is Korean history with ten professors. Next in line is Korean literature with five professors.

Among the seven universities, UCLA has the largest Korean studies program in the United States, "with more than 2,500 undergraduates taking courses on Korea each year and more than 50 graduate students engaged in study and research related to Korea (UCLA Center for Korean Studies)." As we can see from the table above, UCLA has the largest faculty specializing in Korean studies of any university in the United States.

According to the Web site of the Center for Korean Studies, the Asian Languages and Cultures Department (ALC) at UCLA was the first on the U.S. mainland to offer undergraduate major courses in Korean language and culture. Academic programs of UCLA are summarized in the Web site of the Center of Korean Studies as follows: "UCLA offers two undergraduate degrees in Korean studies: a B.A. in Korean Language and Culture and an interdisciplinary B.A. in East Asian Studies (Korea

Emphasis). M.A. and Ph.D. degrees are also offered in Korean studies, with specialties including history, literature, linguistics, religious studies, art history, folklore, and the social sciences." ALC also offers an M.A. in Korean language and culture, and two Ph.D. degrees in Korean-related major fields.

At Harvard, the undergraduate program in Korean studies is administered mostly by the Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations (EALC) of Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS). According to the homepage of the EALC at http://harvardealc.org/home.php, EALC has thirty-five professors, including four senior preceptors: fifteen in Chinese studies, twelve in Japanese studies, four in Korean studies, one in Tibetan and Himalayan studies, one in Buddhist studies, one in the Vietnamese language, and one in the environmental history of East Asia. EALC offers courses in Korean language, literature, and history. EALC does not offer a master's program. The A.M. program is administered by the Committee on Regional Studies-East Asia under the Department of History and the program degree requirements are available at http://www.fas.harvard.edu/%7Ersea/program.html.

In addition to the EALC, the Korea Institute has supported a non-degree Korean studies program since the institute was first founded in 1981 as a part of the Fairbank Center for East Asian Research. In 1993, the institute was separated from the Fairbank Center (Korea Institute, Harvard University).

Columbia has been offering Korea-related courses since 1931 (Center of Korean Research Web site). In 1934, a Methodist missionary Dr. Eungpal Yun taught Korean for the first time at the university. The Korean studies program began when Dr. William E. Skillend, with a Ph.D. in Korean literature, was hired as a Korean language professor in 1962.

The instructional core of Korean studies is in the Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures (EALAC). Undergraduate students majoring or concentrating in East Asian studies have to choose an academic discipline among history, literature, anthropology, art history, economics, philosophy, political science, religion, and sociology (Columbia College 2009a). Also, they must select a regional specialty among Korean studies, Japanese studies, and Chinese studies. In addition to the courses in EALAC, there are Korea-related courses taught regularly in the departments of political science, anthropology, and economics, and in the law and business schools.

The M.A. and Ph.D. programs offered by the Graduate School of

Arts and Sciences offer various disciplines, including East Asian languages and cultures, history, and political science (Haboush 2003:4-6). The Weatherhead East Asian Institute also offers a new M.A. program in regional studies with Korean affairs as its major focus. The School of International and Public Affairs offers a two-year Master of International Affairs program. Students may choose to concentrate on East Asian regional affairs, which includes a Korea, Japan, and China track.

Columbia also has two non-degree-granting organizations devoted to Korean studies: the Center for Korean Research and the Center for Korean Legal Studies. The Center for Korean Research was founded as a part of East Asian Institute in 1988. The latter, established in 1994, is the first center in U.S. universities to be dedicated to the study of Korean law.

In the next section, we will examine the Korean studies courses offered by UCLA, Harvard, and Columbia with information derived from the three universities' homepages and a search of the three universities' online course catalogues. There will be two separate analyses: one of courses for liberal arts education and another of courses for a major or concentration. The former will include any courses related to Korea (except the language courses) since the increasing popularity of interdisciplinary courses makes it difficult to categorize them neatly. The latter, however, will include only Korean history courses.

Korean-related Courses in Liberal Education

Liberal arts education in U.S. universities can be divided into general education and core curriculum, depending on the aim and methods of implementation (Han, Kwon, and Joo 2003:95-96). General education is a system in which all college students take a certain number of classes in selected areas such as humanities, social studies, and science during their first two years. The main purpose is to make the students experience a broad undergraduate education.

UCLA provides an example of a general education program. General education requirements are available at http://www.registrar.ucla.edu/ge/. In the case of the College of Letters and Science, students must complete ten elective courses (or forty-eight credits) for the A.B. or S.B. degree (the Bachelor of Arts or the Bachelor of Science). The elective courses are divided into three groups: Foundations of the Arts and Humanities,

Foundations of Society and Culture, and Foundations of Scientific Inquiry. Among these, courses related to Korean studies are under the category of Foundations of Society and Culture. For the A.B. or S.B. degree, students need to take at least three courses in Foundations of Society and Culture. The foundations are in turn divided into historical analysis and social analysis. The students are required to take at least one course in each (UCLA Registrar's Office 2009).

According to the "College of Letters and Science General Education Requirements" at http://www.registrar.ucla.edu/ge/GE-LSFr09-10.pdf, there are two Korean-related courses among the general education courses: "Korean civilization" which is listed under the Foundation of Society and Cultures' subgroup "Historical Analysis," and "Politics, Society, and Urban Culture in East Asia: Special Topics" which is under the freshmen general education cluster program.

Searching on the Schedule of Classes of the UCLA Registrar's office website at http://www.registrar.ucla.edu/schedule/, in the spring of 2009, there were nine freshmen seminars titled "Politics, Society, and Urban Culture in East Asia: Special Topics." Three of them were Korean-related classes: "Seeing and Imaging Korea: Reckoning Korean Visual Culture with History, Society, and Culture (6/15)," "Inter-Korea Relations: Multiple Realities and Cinematic Depictions (12/15)," and "Modern Korean History as Viewed through Film and Literature (16/15)." During the summer semester of 2009, UCLA offered one more course titled "Korean Civilization (28/50)." The numbers in parentheses are numbers of students who enrolled in the class and the class capacities. Interestingly, most courses examine history and society through mediums like movies and literature, rather than historical documents.

Next, at Harvard University, liberal arts education has been going through a lot of changes. Unlike UCLA, Harvard adopted a core curriculum approach in 1978, which required all students to take courses in "core" subjects that are selected with an educational purpose. According to the core site at http://my.harvard.edu/icb/icb.do?keyword=core, there are eleven core subject areas: Foreign Cultures, Historical Study A, Historical Study B, Literature and Arts A, Literature and Arts B, Literature and Arts C, Moral Reasoning, Quantitative Reasoning, Science A, Science B, and Social Analysis. Students who entered Harvard College in 2008 or earlier need to pass one letter-graded course in seven of eleven areas, except for those students who switch to the new program in general education.

In May 2007, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS) decided to replace their thirty-year-old core curriculum with general education (Harvard University FAS Registrar's Office 2009:19). Under the new general education policy, students entering in September 2009 had to complete one letter-graded half-course in each of the eight categories in general education. According to the website of the core program at http://my.harvard.edu/icb/icb.do?keyword=core&pageid=icb.page29341, the eight categories are as follows: Aesthetic and Interpretive, Culture and Belief, Empirical and Mathematical Reasoning, Ethical Reasoning, Science of Living Systems, Science of the Physical Universe, Societies of the World, and United States in the World. One of these eight courses must also engage substantially with the study of the past. The class of 2013 will be the first to enter under the new requirements.

The courses offered during the academic year 2009-2010 are listed in Harvard's Current Courses of Instruction (2009-2010) at http://www.registrar.fas.harvard.edu/fasro/courses/index.jsp?cat=ugrad&subcat=courses. According to the instruction, under the core curriculum and the general education program, two Korea-related half courses were offered to students: "Historical Study A-75: the Two Koreas" (Spring 2010) and "AESTH INTP 35: Korea Indigenous" (Spring 2010).

Apart from the core curriculum and the general education program, all freshmen at Harvard College are also required to take one freshman seminar. FAS offered one freshman seminar related to Korean studies, "North Korea as History and Crisis (Fall 2009)" during the academic year 2009-2010.

Lastly, Columbia University has used the core curriculum approach since 1919. According to the Online Student Bulletin of Columbia University at http://www.college.columbia.edu/bulletin/requirements.php, the core curriculum has the following requirements: Literature Humanities (2 courses), Frontiers of Science (1 course), University Writing (1 course), Art Humanities (1 course), Music Humanities (1 course), Contemporary Civilization (2 courses), Science Requirement (1 course and 2 terms from the "List of Approved Courses"), Global Core Requirement (formerly Major Cultures, 2 courses), Foreign Language (4 terms), Physical Education (2 terms and a swimming test).

Courses related to Korean studies are listed under the Global Core Requirement (formerly Major Cultures), which "explores the globally influential and historically rooted cultures and civilizations of Africa, Asia,

and Latin America" (Columbia College 2009b). All students must take two courses from the "Major cultures approved course list," published at http://www.college.columbia.edu/bulletin/core/mc.php, for a letter grade. In the academic year 2007-2008, the list included courses in African Civilization, East Asian Civilization, Latin American Civilization, Middle Eastern Civilization, and Native American Civilization. In the year 2009-2010, courses in South Asian civilization were added to the list.

According to the "Major cultures approved course list 2009-2010," the Global Core requirement is divided into three tiers: List A includes "broadly introductory, interdisciplinary, and temporally extensive courses on a specific major culture or civilization. List A courses usually trace the particular civilization across more than one present-day country or region and focus on reading primary texts." List B includes "more advanced and specialized courses" on specific major cultures. List C includes courses that "address the manifestations in the United States of the major cultures of Lists A and B."

There are ten courses related to Korean studies that are listed in the "Major cultures approved course list 2009-2010": Introduction to East Asian civilizations: Korea; Introduction to East Asian civilizations: Korea-discussion; Arts in China, Japan, and Korea; Korean literature and film; The history of Korea to 1900; The history of modern Korea; Twentieth-century Korea; Culture and society of Choson Korea, 1392-1910; Korean politics; and Korean foreign relations. Eight of the ten courses are offered by EALAC. Two courses, "Korean politics" and "Korean foreign relations", are offered by the Department of Political Science. Among them, Korean history courses are offered most frequently except for language courses. Searching on the Columbia University Directory of Classes, the following six courses were offered during the academic year of 2009-2010 (Columbia University Registrar 2010). In the fall semester of 2009, four Korean history courses were offered and two courses were to be offered the following spring. The course titles are as follows: "Introduction to East Asian civilizations: Korea" (56/70); "Introduction to East Asian civilizations: Korea-Discussion (3 Classes)" (n.a./25); "Arts in China, Japan, and Korea (Art History and Archaeology)" (21/22, Spring 2010); and "Culture and society of Choson Korea, 1392-1910" (11/40, Spring 2010). The first number and second number in parentheses indicate the number of students who enrolled in the class and enrollment capacity during the fall semester of 2009, respectively.

Korean History Courses for East Asian Studies Majors or Concentrators

At UCLA, most Korean studies courses are affiliated with ALC. Fifty-six courses are listed on the website of UCLA Center for Korean Studies at http://international.ucla.edu/korea/programs/course.asp. According to the website, ALC offers forty-three of the fifty-six courses: ten Korean language courses, nine courses in Korean literature (graduate level), nine courses in Korean thought and religion, twelve courses in Korean history and culture, and three courses in Korean linguistics. Another thirteen courses are offered by several departments such as Anthropology (three courses), Art History (five courses), Folklore (two courses), Ethnomusicology (one course), and Sociology (two courses). Courses in Korean history are listed under Korean thought and religion and Korean culture and history. The course titles are as follows:

Course Title	Course Level	Academic Year, 2009-2010 (#En/EnCP)
Korean Civilization (with a discussion course)	Lower	Winter
Cultural History of Korea (three courses are divided: through 1259, 1260 through 1876, and since 1876)	Upper	Fall (30)
Introduction to Modern Historiography	Upper	
Topics in Korean Cinema	Upper	Fall (31)
Undergraduate Seminar (Variable Topics Research Seminar) in Traditional Korea	Upper	Spring(18/20)
Introduction to Modern Korean Thought	Upper	
Introduction to Traditional Korean Thought	Upper	
Introduction to Korean Confucian Texts	Upper	
Topics in Korean Christianity	Upper	Spring (35)
Undergraduate Seminar (Variable Topics Research Seminar) in Contemporary Korean Society and Culture	Upper	Fall (7)
Introduction to Korean Buddhist Texts	Upper	Summer
Thought and Society in Korea	Graduate	
Topics in Traditional Korean Cultural History (seminar, 2 courses)	Graduate	Winter /Fall(cancelled)
Topics in Modern Korean Cultural History (seminar, 2 courses)	Graduate	Spring(6/12) /Fall(4/12)
Thought and Society in Modern Korea (seminar)	Graduate	
Thought and Society in Traditional Korea (seminar)	Graduate	
Nineteenth Century Korea (seminar)	Graduate	Fall(5/10)
Korean Buddhism	Graduate	
Seminar in Korean Buddhist Texts (seminar, 2 courses)	Graduate	Winter /Spring(6/10)
Seminar: Korean Christianity	Graduate	Spring(cancelled)

The courses listed above are for ALC concentrators. They include not only the ones taught by professors specializing in Korean history, but also the courses in Korean religion taught by professors who specialize in Korean Buddhism or Christianity. The third column of the above table shows the result of a Web search on the Schedule of Classes of the UCLA registrar's office' website at http://www.registrar.ucla.edu/schedule/schedulehome.aspx. Three undergraduate courses and another three graduate courses were offered in the fall semester of 2009, and three in the following spring semester. The courses predominantly focus on social history, cultural history, history of religion, and history of thought, rather than political and institutional history. In the cases of the upper-level courses, there are three courses with more than thirty-five students.

Next, at Harvard University, Korean history courses are only offered by EALC, but many are cross-listed in History. Their titles are as follows.

Course Title	Course Level	Academic Year, 2009-2010
Traditional Korea	Undergraduates/ Graduates	Fall 2009
Social History of Premodern Korea	Undergraduates/ Graduates	Spring 2010
Readings in Premodern Korean History	Graduates	Spring 2010
Historical Research in Korea	Graduates	
Selected Topics in Premodern Korean History: Seminar	Graduates	Fall 2009
Modern Korean History: Pro-seminar	Graduates	Fall 2009
Modern Korean history: Seminar	Graduates	
Readings in Modern Korean History	Graduates	Year-Long 2009-2010
Reading and Research	Ph.D. candidate	Fall 2009

In addition to the courses listed above, there are four courses that are cross-listed under the core curriculum and freshman seminars. Students who choose the humanities track from EALC are required to take thirteen half-courses. Among these students, those who major in Korean studies are required to take at least one of "The Two Koreas" and "Traditional Korean."

The third column of the above table shows the results of web search of "*Current Courses of Instruction, 2009-2010*" at http://www.registrar.fas.harvard.edu/fasro/courses/index.jsp?cat=ugrad&subcat=courses. It seems that about three courses are offered every semester for concentrators. The undergraduate courses are mostly introductory courses divided into pre-

modern and modern periods while graduate courses tend to be centered around reading historical texts about a given topic.

Lastly, Korean history courses at Columbia University for East Asian Studies majors and concentrators are as follows:

Course Title	Course Level	Academic Year, 2009-2010 (#En/EnCp)
Introduction to East Asian civilizations: Korea (V2363)	Lower	Fall 2009 (56/70)
Introduction to East Asian civilizations: Korea-Discussion (3 Classes, V2366)	Lower	Fall 2009 (NA/25)
The history of Korea to 1900 (W3862)	Upper	
The history of modern Korea (W3863)	Upper	
Twentieth-century Korea (W3866)	Upper	
Culture and society of Choson Korea, 1392-1910 (W4860)	Upper	Fall 2009 (11/40) / Spring 2010
Colloquium on Korean History to 1900 (G8861)	Graduate	Fall 2009 (19/18) / Spring 2010
Colloquium on Modern Korean History (G8862)	Graduate	Spring 2010
Gender and Writing in China-Korea (G9861)	Graduate	Spring 2010
Seminar on Korean Historical Texts (G9860)	Graduate	
Research in Korean History (G8864)	Graduate	

Among the courses above, V2363, V2366, W3862, W3863, W3866, W4860 are cross-listed in the core curriculum and EALAC. In addition to the core curriculums mentioned before, one course was offered in the fall of 2009 and two more the following spring. Excluding "Introduction to East Asian civilizations: Korea" which had fifty-six students, most enrollments for these courses are less than twenty.

Korean history courses for majors that are offered by the three universities can be characterized as one of the following: a broad survey course usually divided into pre-modern and modern periods, a social history course, and a cultural history course. UCLA stands out by the fact that it offers many more courses that focus on social or cultural history.

Many professors who have taught in U.S. universities have continuously highlighted the importance of social and cultural history. As indicated in the aforementioned debate on the standards for history education, the main reason is that the paradigm of U.S. history scholarship is shifting from political and institutional history to cultural and social history. Most of all, it reflects the shift in the students' own interests. Professor Don

Baker from University of British Columbia is one of the professors arguing for such change. In an international forum on Korean studies held by the International Center for Korean Studies and Institute of Korean Culture in 2005, he made a forceful argument for the necessity of courses that put more emphasis on the cultural and social history of modern Korea. He stated, "We need more comprehensive survey histories of modern Korea, textbooks that introduce our students to all of the major changes that have occurred, not just in politics and economics, but in family and gender relations, in language, in religion, and in social structure" (Baker 2005:8).

Conclusion

The education reform of the 1980s resulted in an increased emphasis on history education. As part of that reform, the United States has made a continuous effort to standardize content in education and evaluation methods, and to implement those standards. The debate on the standards for history education is said to have attracted the public's attention by asking a more general question as to what should be taught in classrooms. Putting aside the political agendas, at the center of the debate was the position of European history in world history; the main disagreement was whether world history should be centered around European history (as it has traditionally been) or be restructured to better accommodate the kind of global perspective that springs from cultural relativism. The debate is still alive and will continue to be relevant as research in history continues to advance.

As is clear from the analysis of the standards of history education for grades K-12 in the states of California, Florida, and Texas, education in Korean history is still very much rudimentary compared to that of Chinese and Japanese history. This is also true of college education, as exemplified by the three U.S. universities with exceptional Korean studies programs (UCLA, Harvard University, and Columbia University).

There are continuous efforts to increase the interest in Korean history both in Korea and in the United States. The Korean government has been inviting high school history teachers and publishers and writers of world history textbooks that are widely used by grades 5-12 in order to promote general awareness and interest in Korean history. In addition,

academic departments relating to Korean studies in U.S. universities tend to develop and offer Korean-related courses that focus on cultural and social history to respond to their students' shifting interests. There also have been discussions on the necessity of publishing adequate textbooks.

References

Adams, Thomas. 2000. Miguk kelifoniaju yoksa-sahoegwahak gyoyuk gwajeongwi gujo mik hakmunjeok naeyonggijun sokwi Asia (Structure of the *History-Social Science Framework* and Asia in its content standards). *Yoksa Gyoyuk* 75:207-215.

Ankeney, Kirk. 2000. Miguk nae hanguk gyoyuke deahan jeonmang (The prospect of Korean studies education in the United States). *Yoksa Gyoyuk* 75:168-173.

Baker, Don. 2005. Needed: A cultural history of modern Korea. In *Current trends and future objectives of Korean studies*, 3-9. Proceedings of the International Forum on Korean Studies. International Center for Korea Studies and Institute of Korean Culture, Korea University. Seoul: Korea University.

Bradley Commission on History in Schools. 1989. Building a history curriculum: Guidelines for teaching history in schools. *History Teacher* 23(1): 7-35.

Burstein, Stanley M. 2004. History in the age of standards. *Social Studies Review* 43:5-7.

California State Board of Education. 1998. *History-Social Science Content Standards for California Public schools.* http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/documents/histsocscistnd.pdf.

Center for Korean Research. Korean Studies at Columbia. http://www.columbia.edu/cu/ckr/koreanstudies.html.

Choi, Jeonghee. 2007. Miguk junggodeunghakgyo segyesa gyogwaseowi hangukgwanryeon naeyong bunseok (Analysis of Korea-related narratives in the world history textbooks used in U.S. middle and high schools). Academy of Korean Studies. Unpublished.

Columbia College. 2009a. *Columbia College Bulletin 2009-2010*. http://www.college.columbia.edu/bulletin.

____. 2009b. Major Cultures Approved Course List 2009-2010. http://www.college.columbia.edu/sites/college/files/Major%20Cultures%20

Approved%20Course%20List%202009-2010.pdf.

____. 2010. The Core Curriculum. http://www.college.columbia.edu/core/.

Columbia University Registrar, 2010. Columbia University Directory of Classes. http://www.columbia.edu/cu/bulletin/uwb/.

Duncan, John. 2003. Summary report on the UCLA Korean studies program. http://www.kf.or.kr/.

Gluck, Carol. 1994. Dialogue: History according to whom? Let the debate continue. *New York Times,* November 19, p.23.

Florida Department of Education. 2008. *Next Generation Sunshine State Standards for Social Studies*. http://www.floridastandards.org/downloads.aspx.

Haboush, JaHyun Kim. 2003. Korean studies at Columbia: History and future vision. http://www.kf.or.kr/.

____. 2006. Challenges and strategies of Korean studies of arts and sciences in North America. In *International Korean Studies Encyclopedia*, 300-307. Seoul: Korea Foundation.

Han, Shinil, Youngsin Kwon, and Jungheun Joo. 2003. Migukdaehakwi gyoyanggwajeong bibyo bunseok (Comparative analysis of general education of America's top ten national universities 2002). *Bigyo Gyoyuk Yeongu* 13 (1): 91-119.

Harvard University. 2008. Introduction to the core curriculum. http://my.harvard.edu/icb/icb.do?keyword=core&pageid=icb.page43827.

Harvard University. Harvard University Course Catalog. http://coursecatalog.harvard.edu/icb/icb.do.

Harvard University FAS Registrar's Office. 2009. *Handbook for Students 2009-2010*. Massachusetts: The Office of the Dean of Harvard College. http://webdocs.registrar.fas.harvard.edu/ugrad_handbook/current/ugrad_handbook_single.pdf.

History-Social Science Curriculum Framework and Criteria Committee. 1988. *History-social science framework for California public school: Kindergarten through grade twelve*. Sacramento: California State Department of Education.

History-Social Science Curriculum Framework and Criteria Committee. 2005. *History-social science framework for California public school: Kindergarten through grade twelve*. http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/documents/histsocsciframe.pdf.

Jackson, Kenneth T. 1989. The Bradley commission on history in schools: a retrospective view. *History Teacher* 23 (1): 73-78.

Kang, Sunjoo. 2004. Migukwi segyesa gyeogwaseo naeyoung bunseok (Three world history textbooks: central themes and organization). *Sahoigwa Gyoyuk* 43 (2): 137-166.

Kang, Sunjoo, and Sanhoon Choi. 2005. Miguk segyesa gyeogwaseoe natanan nanguk (Korea in world history textbooks widely adopted in the United States). *Hanguk Yeoksa Gyoyuk Yeongu* 1:1-39.

Kang, Sunjoo. 2007. Migukwi yeosagyoyuk yeongu hyenhwang (Recent research on history teaching and learning in the United States). *Yeosa Gyoyuk Ronjib* 38:151-189.

Kim, Jeom Sook. 2006. Haebang ihu miguk jishikinwi hanguk insik (Understanding of Korea after its independence in U.S. scholarship: Centering on *Far Eastern Quarterly, Far Eastern Survey, Pacific Affairs). Yeoksawa Hyeonsil* 58:149-181.

Kim, Jongho. 2004. Miguk sahoigwa gyoyukwi choigwen donghang (A study on the contemporary trend of social studies education in the U.S.A.). *Hanguk Chodeung Gyoyuk* 48:131-151.

Korea Foundation. The Current Status of Korean Studies Worldwide. http://www.clickkorea.org/koreanstudies/.

Korea Institute, Harvard University. http://korea.fas.harvard.edu/about-korea-institute-harvard-university.

Lee, Kilsang, and Jeonghee Choi. 2006. Miguk sahoigwa gyogwaseowi hangukgwanryeon naeyong bunseok (Analysis of Korea-related narratives in social studies textbooks published in the United States). Academy of Korean Studies. Unpublished.

National Center for History in the Schools. 1996. *National Standards for History Basic Edition*. http://nchs.ucla.edu/standards/.

____. 2010a. About the National Standards for History. http://nchs.ucla.edu/standards.html.

____. 2010b. What is the National Center for History in the Schools? http://nchs.ucla.edu/about-catalog.html.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. 1983. *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. Washington D.C: U.S. Department of Education. http://www2.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/index.html.

Official Registrar of Harvard University. 2009. *Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Courses of Instruction, 2009-2010*. http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~korea/courses/fas.html.

Office of the FAS Registrar. 2009. *Handbook for Students 2009-2010*. http://webdocs.registrar.fas.harvard.edu/ugrad_handbook/current/

ugrad_handbook_single.pdf.

Patrick, John J. 1989. The Bradley Commission in the Context of 1980s Curriculum Reform in the Social Studies. *History Teacher* 23 (1): 37-48.

Peterson, Mark. 2008. Miguki bon hanguk: gyogwaseoe natanan ganguk (American perceptions of Korea: How Korea appears in U.S. textbooks). In *Hangukeul Baraboneun Tajawi Sigak* (Overseas perspectives toward Korea), 157-162. Seongnam: Academy of Korean Studies.

Peterson, Mark. 2009. Korean Studies in America. *Korean Studies in the World: Present and Future,* 69-78. International Conference Proceedings held 2009 by the Academy of Korean Studies, Seongnam: Academy of Korean Studies.

Symcox, Linda. 2002. *Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Texas Education Agency. 2000. *Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Social Studies*. http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter113/index.html.

UCLA Center for Korean Studies. Center Mission. http://international.ucla.edu/korea/mission.asp.

UCLA Registrar's Office. 2009. College of Letters and Science General Education Requirements. http://www.registrar.ucla.edu/ge/GE-LSFr09-10.pdf.

UCLA Registrar's Office. Schedule of Classes. http://www.registrar.ucla.edu/schedule/schedulehome.aspx.

U.S. Department of Education. 1994. *Progress of Education in the United States of America—1990 through 1994*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Department of Education. 2008. *A Nation Accountable: Twenty-five Years After A Nation at Risk*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/research/pubs/accountable/.

Zilversmit, Arthur. 1989. The Bradley Commission and American history. *The History Teacher* 23 (1): 49-51.

Kim Jeom Sook(jeomsk@mest.go.kr) is a research officer at the National Institute of Korean History in Gwacheon, Korea. She obtained both her M.A. and Ph.D. degree in modern Korean history from Ewha Womans University. Her research interests include Korea-U.S. relations focusing on economic affairs after 1945, and the history of Korean immigration to America.

Abstract

This article was written as a part of a project to design an introductory Korean history course conducted in English for foreign students. Normally, the lectures would have been tailored to accommodate the students' background knowledge in Korean history. Because of the diversity of the student population, however, it was difficult to measure their background knowledge in Korean history as a group. Therefore, we decided to focus on the way Korean history is taught in the U.S. public education system. I picked the U.S. since it is the nation where Korean studies is most advanced outside Korea.

Since the educational reform of the 1980s, the U.S. education system has emphasized importance of history education. Another part of the reform was the attempt to improve the quality of education by standardizing textbooks and evaluative methods. In addition, the debate on what should be taught in history classes offered by public schools began to attract more attention as the debate on how to structure the standard history textbooks intensified. Putting aside the political agendas, at the center of the debate was the position of European history in world history. In other words, the main disagreement was on whether world history should be centered on European history as it was traditionally done or be restructured to better accommodate the kind of global perspective that springs from cultural relativism. The debate is still alive and will continue to be relevant as research in history continues to advance.

Analysis of history education standards for K-12 in three relatively large U.S. states (California, Texas, and Florida) indicates that there is not enough time allocated for world history, with the exception of California. Again with the exception of California, Korean history also takes up only a miniscule part of world history education.

As shown in the examples of three U.S. universities with good Korean studies programs (UCLA, Harvard University, Columbia University), education in Korean history in U.S. universities is very much inferior compared with that of Chinese or Japanese history. An exception is UCLA which offers many more classes in Korean studies than others. The courses that they offer also tend to focus on social or cultural history rather than the more traditional forms of courses that focus on political, institutional, or economical history.

Keywords: world history education, Korean history, education reform, standards-based education, Korea-related courses

Submission: 2010. 5. 11. Referee/Revision: 2010. 5. 13. Confirm: 2010. 5. 26.