

CRITICAL OUTLOOKS AND INSTITUTIONAL EDUCATION: JAPANESE AND KOREAN AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS

OLHARES CRÍTICOS E ENSINO INSTITUCIONAL: O JAPONÊS E O COREANO COMO LÍNGUA ESTRANGEIRA EM DOCUMENTOS OFICIAIS

Milan Puh
USP
Sara Librenjak
Universidade de Zagreb, Croácia

Abstract: *This article is the result of an academic collaboration between one Brazilian and one Croatian university for and during an international event held in the year 2015. The research used, as the basis for the article, was conducted at the intersection between Critical Discourse Analysis(CDA) and Language Policies in order to understand and analyze the vision build around teaching of Korean and Japanese as foreign languages. We decided to study official documents published by the main educational institutions of two countries - the Japan Foundation and Korea Foundation – as well as some governmental documents. We consulted two authors of CDA: Wodak (1997), Fairclough (2001) and three within the area of Language Policy - Tollfson (2006, 2008), MCarthy (2011) and Hornberger (2008).Therefore, we present the main findings concerning the analysis of official discourse present in documents and images that form what is considered as an ideal student and/or teacher.*

Keywords: *Discourse Analysis. Language Policy. Japan. Korea. Education.*

Resumo: *Este artigo é o resultado de uma colaboração acadêmica entre uma universidade brasileira e uma croata durante um evento internacional realizado no ano de 2015. A pesquisa utilizada, como base para o artigo, foi realizada no cruzamento entre a Análise Crítica do Discurso (ACD) e Políticas Linguísticas a fim de compreender e analisar a visão construída em torno de ensino do coreano e japonês como línguas estrangeiras. Decidimos estudar os documentos oficiais publicados pelas duas principais instituições educacionais nos dois países - a Japan Foundation e a Korea Foundation - assim como alguns documentos governamentais. Consultamos dois autores da ACD: Wodak (1997), Fairclough (2001) e três na área de Política Linguística - Tollfson (2006, 2008), MCarthy (2011) e Hornberger (2008). Assim, são apresentadas as principais conclusões da análise do discurso oficial presente em documentos e imagens que se formam sobre o que é considerado como um estudante ou professor ideal.*

Palavras-chave: *Análise do Discurso. Políticas linguísticas. Japão. Coreia. Educação.*

Introduction

This article resulted from the academic collaboration between two universities (one Brazilian and one Croatian), as a joint research of two PhD students which was presented at an international event held in 2015. The event, as well as the collaboration between two doctoral students, is part of the wider academic project of the research group “Language Images: subject, displacement, knowledge and time”. The main objective of this academic project is to:

Investigate the discursive processes involved in setting up images of a language. Such procedures should be monitored by the analysis of a corpus of texts produced in argumentative instances about the language. - More specifically, the State, the Church, the School and the Local community (BARZOTTO, 2014, p.1)

In this sense, our research is linked with the wider project by the specific treatment, that is, the critical outlook that gives upon the State and its official production in order to better understand how its institutions form an image of the Japanese and Korean languages. Our main orientation is the fact that, by arguing about the language, not only a new image is created, but also a policy is made more evident and explicit. Methodologically, the analysis of arguments that create images

allows us to link the discourse analysis¹ and language policies², because when we look at how one builds and legitimizes his discourse by arguing, we can understand how language policy in the field of educational is created and meant to be applied. This means that the aim is to analyze how the argumentative instances act while constituting language images in order to suggest the contours considered appropriate in the ideal vision of the society. These images, in our view, focus on the delineation of subjects and the dislocations that they must take in time and space, and how they relate themselves to knowledge. Therefore, when deciding how one will deal with a language, or rather, write how it should be taught, an ideologically bias image is created, and that constitutes the official language policy. We decided to do a discursive analysis of four concepts, postulated by the collective research project which are as follows: subject, time, space and knowledge. We seeked to define the discourses in official documents of state institutions: Japan and Korean Foundation - responsible for education in the global context of the mentioned languages, together with the documents of State Departments and Ministries as we consider them as rich material where we can look and analyze different kinds of images and discourses and we also think this type of research has still not been explored within the field of education and especially language teaching. In this sense we believe that this way of analysis can bring an more innovative approach to how to better teach and learn an foreign language, because new methodologies and theories can be compared and discussed not only by looking at specific class or didactic material, but also while reading official documents and its propositions. So we consider that teachers of all levels should be stimulated to have a critical vision of the documents which are made in order to define their work, nor only by saying how distant they are from reality, but moreso, how it created different kinds of images and by that put new Language Policies in place.

Theoretical and Methodological Framework

We will began this work with the explanation of the two areas mentioned as central to the research: Discourse Analysis and Language Policies, because the study of discourse, its structures and types which are determined by the view that a country has of its language, is what allows us to link these two areas. Discourse Analysis (DA) is, in fact, interdisciplinary, because it is inspired in linguistic studies, but incorporates contributions from other areas, which established a very heterogeneous field of analysis and methodologies. However, the collected data will be analyzed within the instrumental and methodological procedures of Discourse Analysis in order to understand the construction of Language Policies.

The definition of discourse as a concept itself that we explicitly assumed is that the discourse is a political and ideological practice as advocated by Fairclough (2001). We acknowledge the idea of this author in his recognition of the dual role of discursive practices. As political practice, discourse establishes, maintains and transforms the relations of power and collective entities challenged by such relationships. As ideological practice, it is, naturalized, being maintained while needed and then transformed in order to the elaborate meanings about the world in various positions of power relations. Fairclough (idem) brings an important theoretical contribution by saying that social institutions are important for analysis of the political and ideological practices of discourse, as it rightly considers that these institutions are responsible for disseminating discourses marked by a relationship of power that reach and question individuals.

Certainly, there is a tension between the incorporation of the official discourse of public language and acceptance by the community when language teaching is in question (SCHLIEBEN-LANGE, 1993). This supposition makes us think that in the case of our research, there must be a difference as well as a tension between the politics of formal education of the Japanese and Korean language in an official state institution (in our case Japan and Korea Foundation), located within specific relations of power, and the education held effectively in school or in informal educational setting, which defines the need of the state to assert its position in a as generalist and all-embracing

1 We use this term as a common name for Critical Discourse Analysis and specially one of its proeminent scholars Norman Fairclough.

2 We use this term as a common name for Language Policies as they are defined by Eni Orlandi (Políticas de língua), being not an official policy or planing, but also a way of looking on language as such as a policy, having its definition extended to everything that has to do with it, from bottom to top.

way (for example, as a national issue even though highly hierarchical countries like Japan and Korea show their own special characteristics as we will partially show in this paper). As we see in Fairclough (2001), national identity and “self-identity” represent, for Discourse Analysis, important issues to explain the position of a language in a given socio-historical context.

Redirecting the discussion back to the field of education, we look upon Wodak (1997), whose vision of education is intertwined in power relations. The author states that the education should look language teaching as a symbolic value that is added to the linguistic identity of a community, (trans)forming its speakers and symbolic representations that they have of the world. Again, our study focuses on images that form a specific language, as we studied the concepts of subject, time, space and knowledge as key conceptions for formation of the linguistic identity of a speaker who is learning a particular language. So now we will take a theoretical approach in the field of language policy - specifying the concept to be used in the analysis, its relationship with the methodology of Discourse Analysis and methodological development in the last item of this work.

So we start with a definition of language policies by Orlandi (2007) who affirms that:

There is no possibility to have a language that is not affected by politics. A language is a symbolical-political body that is a part of relations between subjects in their life socially and historically. So, when we think about language policies, we are immediately thinking on social forms being signified by social and historical subjects, in their forms of existence, experience and in the political arena of their meaning. (2007, p.8)

We find this explanation of the Brazilian author interesting in the sense of being open to interpretations that see different kinds of phenomena as symbolical-political bodies that have a place and a time which define them, especially if we are speaking about official documents (in Education). At this point, it is necessary that we discuss shortly the relationship between the education and the area of language policies. As Wortham (2008) notes, all education is mediated by the use of language, which allows us to say that the language serves as a place for defining and mediation in which the individual is influenced by the multiplicity of linguistic contacts that determine his identity. In this perspective, while thinking about teaching and learning practices, it is important to realize that educators and speakers have information and opinions on the subject in question, as well as the affiliations with social groups within and outside the speech act. It is, therefore, essential for the official instances, in particular for the State, try define and dominate the way information and opinions will be published and shared in the society. And by this we can see an almost paradox situation where individual agency meets its institutional boundaries which try to impose themselves on each individual and the groups he constitutes.

In another publication, dedicated especially to the relationship between language policies and education, Tollefson (2002) supports the argument that the language policies in education not only address the issue of the choice of language as medium of instruction, but instead, they are often central to many social processes. This means that a theoretical and interpretative approach to language policies can not be concerned only with the formal environmental education, as if it were the place where truths are placed and where it is not possible to cast critical overviews. Often, we find personal and academic statements that put the analysis of official discourse outside the work effect of an educator, as he should be concerned about especially with its practice, without looking at the way it is also constituted by the view that is officially launched on the area.

Finally, we address our work within an analytical and methodological manner, which presupposes four core concepts - “subject”, “knowledge”, “displacement” and “time” due to multiple reasons. In the case of the category “subject”, it interests us to see how the language images made in a discourse take part in the construction of the identities of the speakers of a specific language. On the other hand, the “knowledge” on the language tends to work in the sense of belonging, present in the official discourse (of different kinds of institutions, governmental or non-governmental), they may show knowledge of different areas. Specifically, the academic and scientific knowledge can strengthen the discourse of the State, but also indicate the inadequacy of the speakers (teachers

and students) regarding the idealized vision of the knowledge of the language. When the language image offered in text differs from the speaker, then he himself is often associated with the creation of a need to “offset” the geographic or temporal position of the speaker. In geographical sense, it is understood that there are places where the language is spoken better and that is so, because there are forms that are need to be either replaced by those more appropriate to the present time, either replaced by old ones that “preserve” better the language.

Textually, we decided to identify the different views propagated by the official discourse which forms our corpus through textual interpretation postulated by Fairclough (2001): scheme, frames and script. The schemes dealing with content, let us take for example the activities and say that they are representing a particular type of activity with predictable elements in a predictable sequence, which means that there are certain ways to present activities (teaching and learning being more specific) that contain elements that have their own rules and logic. On the other hand, the frameworks can be used to understand what the content presented as topics, entities from diverse backgrounds (physical or abstract) that form a given world or system, hence the possibility of identifying the recurring themes. Finally, the script is a category in which the subject and its relation to the activities are addressed in a given space and time, predetermined by the scheme. These three concepts will allow us to find textual elements that make up the four categories of our discursive analysis of vision on teaching Japanese and Korean language.

The analysis

As we said earlier, our focus in this paper is to make a critical overview of the official documents of Japanese and Korean institutions in order to understand how discourses are being used to construct a specific language image about those who learn and teach. In this case, besides the standard documents emitted by the governments, we analyzed specially the documents of Japanese and Korean central institutions – Japan and Korean Foundation, because we consider that the State has an important role in defining the foreign language image, as their messages influence the perception of the proper language. We intend to show the way these two languages are presented in the official government and educational discourses by using schemes, frames and scripts, postulated by Fairclough (2001), in order to analyze our corpus. That means that we will look for linguistic elements that show us how and why certain activities appear, what they say about the entities and systems (educational, social, political etc.) and which logic is used to construct the time and space of given linguistic policies.

We will start by presenting the Japanese institution whose documents we took as material for analysis – the Japan Foundation (JF). It started working already in 1972 by a special Act made by the government. Its initial function was to disseminate the Japanese culture or as Kakazu affirms that “to enhance mutual understanding between Japan and other countries through various kinds of cultural activities which would effectively contribute to further human welfare worldwide (2010, p.1).

The same author says that the rise of the institution was the result of economic and political friction between Japan and the United States which made the country look for other partners. Its work was divided in three designated fields: arts and cultures, Japanese studies and Japanese-language education abroad. As we can see, the teaching of the Japanese language is one of the core activities of the foundation. Since 2003, the Japan Foundation is an independent administrative institution that has 22 offices outside Japan which can also be held as a considerable presence for a language that is spoken mainly in Japan (as a mother language of course). At the moment of its emancipation from the State we can look how the language is being used as the main contribution:

to the improvement of a good international environment, and to the maintenance and development of the harmonious foreign relationships with Japan by the efficient and comprehensive implementation of activities for international cultural exchange, which will deepen other nation’s understanding of Japan, promote better mutual understanding among nations, and contribute to the culture and other fields in the world. (Japan Foundation, 1972, p.1)

We can observe in this segment that the good language capabilities should be used primarily to ensure “a good international environment”, that is to improve the overall situation globally by keeping foreign relationships with Japan “harmonious” which seems to be one of the many “Japanese characteristics”. If we look at the reasons that made the foundation of JF necessary (instability and tension in the 1970s) that it is clearer that the apparent “japaneseness” of its proposition (it is almost common sense to say that the cultures like the Japanese one are more prone to be harmonious and collectivistic). The second part of the sentence contributes to the understanding between “other nations and Japan” can be made possible if other people, or better, nations learn to speak Japanese. Even though the scheme of this article is being constructed as expected (The Japanese being the harmonious nation), the frames in which we can insert this discourse is the one of cultural exchange, international relations and development of other fields as it is said. If we look at “The Program Guidelines of the JF” (a document which will be analyzed below), published in 2016, we can see that the three areas of activities are used to present the country in a determined way. Generally, the Arts and Culture Exchange programs show Japan as a modern and traditional home of arte, combining the two elements (past and present); the Japanese Language Education Overseas makes the Japanese appear as a world-wide important language and the Japanese Studies and Intellectual Exchange seek to show the country as highly developed. But, at the same time, the documents bring about the difficulties and problems concerning, for example: the low number of international students studying in Japan, the low number of non Asian learners of Japanese, the predominance of culture seeking language learners that focus on Japanese pop culture (films, cartoons, video games etc.). All of these, as we found them in official documents: “Outline of the Student Exchange System”, “The Program Guidelines of the JF” and “JF Standard for Japanese Language in Education, 2010”.

Especially interesting is the first document mentioned above as it show us a bit more where Japan puts its self, in international terms by affirming that International Exchange in “developed countries such as US, UK, Germany and France” is much greater than in Japan, putting it in comparison to other countries called “developed” and saying its “falling short”. This premise, like the other ones we exemplified, defines the general frame in which all decisions and visions about the Japanese languages are seen. That’s why all students, before they receive the “international students” status, are “screened and accredited by association for promotion of Japanese language education”, as the Outline says on page 5. And that is one of the specific scripts that are being elaborated within the educational discourse of the document, which means that the selection of the language student in Japan is still a State controlled activity, even though the Japan Foundation became an independent administrative institution. This means that the selection and the status of a student is a collectively made decision. Let us look more closely the process:

The diffusion of Japanese language education overseas is expected to motivate Japanese language students to study in Japan. As for the Japanese language education before enrollment provided inside Japan, Japanese government scholarship students receive pre-entrance Japanese language education at the international student center in national universities. Self – or otherwise financed students take preparatory Japanese language courses at universities (Special Course for International Students, see p.18) or private Japanese language schools (JAPAN FOUNDATION, 2010, p.16)

In this section we can observe that the Japanese language is used to attract students to Japan, being used as a main ideology the basic presumption of every state-nation in which the language is equaled to a nation. So, the relations in this framework are made to suit the idea that knowing the language is essential to studying in Japan. Also, the terms used are “language education” and not only language or education, which we see as one of the core concepts of a possible definition of Japanese foreign language teaching. The language is considered as a way of educating a student (and not a pre-requisite to study in Japan), so the students who intend to study in a country like Japan should know that they will be transformed through the education. A common

student or citizen does not know, but definitely he will start doubt some of the propositions or the education meant to be passed to him will not do it so effectively, therefore the institution needs to affirm that and put it as one of its goals through an official discourse. Also, that is not necessarily the case with those who are “self – or otherwise financed”, since they will not participate in the initial preparations to study in Japan. We can conclude that teaching a language in Japan is not a one-sided activity, as it sees the necessity to educate those who while being a part of the system (that is the name of the sub-section in which we located this segment). The State also sees as important to attract the language students in continuing their studies in Japan by making the assumption that “many of the students attending Japanese language schools intend to enter higher education institutions” in order to say that they will also eligible to receive scholarships, continuing the logic of the triangle: access to language – access to country – access to education. We found other important information in our exploration of the educational discourse in Japan concerning Japanese as a foreign language like the information about the “Examination for Japanese University Admission for International Students (EJU)” which changes its rules by permitting that the language exams are taken in other countries (formerly it was only permitted to take them in Japan), being another example of controlled decentralization of the language teaching practices which still need the permission of the State in order to be realized out of its reach.

In the “Program outlines of JP Foundation” we found, besides the initial frames about the three frames, other schemes of a framework being constructed, like the list of “advantages” in learning Japanese, which does not have a direct relation with the vision of how a student or a professor should be or behave, but rather the possibilities to expand our critical overview of the relations between language, education and other processes and concepts: immigration, medicine, high school education etc. Let take a closer look in the frame of the discourse and its different schemes and scripts. In the text “JF Standard for Japanese Language in Education, 2010”, we found one of the definitions which define what one should know in order to communicate in Japanese:

Competence in accomplishing tasks, which involves what a person can do by using a certain language, and competence in intercultural understanding, which involves understanding and respecting other cultures by expanding one’s horizons through encounters with various cultures (JAPAN FOUNDATION, 2010, p.1).

This basic definition, found in the Introduction, shows us that a speaker of a language should be able not only to express himself linguistically, but also, he should be able to understand different cultures, and again, respect them. Although this ideology which divides the language communication in linguistic and cultural is not itself completely new or specific to Japan, if we look at other documents analyzed in this paper, the idea that those who teach and those how learn the Japanese language should always integrate themselves as respectful and law abiding students. Of course, that did not come alone, as references about the initiatives that served as a base in developing the JF Standard are made clear, for example, the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) whose presence is explained by its importance in the “global scale”, even though it serves European languages. What definitely calls the attention is the fact that the concepts from CEFR were transported to the JF Standard in a simple affirmation that puts the two frameworks in the same level. In this sense, a student of the Japanese language can and should be thought to have the same capabilities as a student of any other European language, which shows the openness of the Japanese linguistic policy makers to incorporations of discourses that are found in places considered as “inspirational”. On one side, the Japanese way of learning and speaking is passed as a social fact, but as an universal idea and on the other, it seems that the frameworks and the scripts, by which the education discourse is elaborated, are inserted in a direct relation with the experiences and relations with other countries. So it seems that the student and the teachers are put in a tension between what they bring with themselves and what they should be accepting, but always controlled and maintained by the State vision of the language.

And now we will explore the documents published by the Korean Foundation (very similar to the Japanese by the history and the function) and by the Korean Government in order to discuss

how the State creates visions of Korean as a foreign language. The discourses we approached are inserted in the context of institutional definition of the teaching of the Korean Language, so we start with the opening word of the Korea Foundations "2010 Annual Report" that states this:

The Korea Foundation was established in 1991 to promote awareness and understanding of Korea, and to enhance goodwill and friendship throughout the international community. As a representative organization for Korea's public diplomacy, the Korea Foundation implements a variety of activities and programs, including support for Korean studies as well as intellectual and cultural exchanges (KOREA FOUNDATION, 2010, p.1).

As we can see, the Korea Foundation was created after the JF, but still in a period of great political and economical changes marked by the end of the Cold War and Real Socialism in Europe, the rise of "Asian Tigers" in the '80s and the computer technology. These, and certainly many other reason, led to the creation of an institution that is preoccupied with the "awareness and understanding of Korea", that is, the country should be known more and understood better in the first place. And in the second, just like in the initial description of the JF document we analyzed, their concern is to "enhance goodwill and friendship" in the international community which again show the preoccupation to have harmonious relationship with other countries and to be a "force" that will bring together other countries in the world. Korea Foundation is also defined as an institution dedicated to "public diplomacy", and that leads us to a reaffirmation of the idea that both State official discourses (the Korean and Japanese ones) do not have problems in creating schemes that openly show their political and diplomatic intentions.

Therefore, here we can extend this discussion to the teaching of the language (and even the culture) as elements which should promote the "koreaness" through its special "ambassadors": teachers and students, these intended to be transformed through specific scripts (activities and functions) in this process. Here we can see a particular relation of agency (governmental and individual), because on one side we see teachers and students implementing through practice a language policy that does not follow strictly the representation made by the State. On the other the State makes its own language policies and activities which try to coopt and use them to endorse and promote specific view of the country. Those activities should lead those who study Korea and its language to recognize Korea "as a country with a rich cultural heritage", starting with the generalization that the richness of Korean culture is not recognized in the international community so the Korean Foundation started to stimulate and establish Korean Studies and Korean Language Professorships and specify them in the Annual Report that we analyzed, as we said, doing it more openly than Japan and putting Korean in a position of agency. This means that statistics from other countries are not put as a model or a symbol of "lacking" Korean presence in the world, which is not the case in the Japanese education discourse.

Other activities are staged in this framework of "recognition" and "importance" of Korean language and culture, like the Korean Speech Contest (similar to the already existing Japanese one) which helps to "ensure the active participation of students from Korean language departments" (p.11), changing the vision of the language as being difficult to speak. Also, the proper teachers are put in the position of the official "simulators" that make sure that the student enrolls himself in the Contest, as well as the additional work put into preparing the students. It is also interesting to see how the main recipients of the Fellowship for Field Research in the year 2010 are from the Language and Linguistics department and Politics and International Relations, thus being the areas in which the State has the most interest. Or the use of the language for diplomatic service within the language program dedicated to diplomats who need to "develop their Korean language skills required for their Korea-related work, as well as to improve their overall understanding of Korea" (p.14), so again there are two main ideas to learning/teaching of Korean language: work and understanding. Besides that, we can say that the discourse puts the teachers in a position of a diplomat since they are responsible for the elaboration of projects that will make the Korean

more known and also prepare those interested in promoting Korea (students and diplomats). In this sense the teachers have the double function of putting Korea “out here” and helping those who want that, and for that they can apply to several scholarships and projects.

After the introductory analysis of a Korean Foundation document, we shall do a critical overview of the governmental documents which are made in close relationship with Korean Foundation. In the “2015 Korean Government Scholarship Program”, we found the “Guideline for International Students Enrolled in Graduate Programs” which turned out to be an interesting document to see how the educational discourse made by the State creates the image of an eligible or ideal student. He firstly should be from China or the United States since more than half of the quotas destined to financing of international students is dedicated to these two countries, showing a predominance of bigger economies and also Asian ones (the other three countries with most students are Indonesia, Russia and Vietnam) and that is not much different from the Japanese context that we observed. But all of the students have to upper-intermediate knowledge of the Korean Language or a one year language course before starting their studies in Korea in order to achieve the intermediate level. The proper evaluation (which is not the specific topic of this paper) is made to evaluate the excellence of the student by allowing him to pass to the next level only after completing 80% or more of the final exam. The student also must stay at the dorm of the language institution and he/she cannot invite family to live together, so the ideal student is preferably not married and not attached to his family and has his independence.

Another information that we used to analyze the official discourse about the language imagery was the use of the word “preference”, just like in the Japanese case, for those who know the language. This is the case with the scholarships, especially for those who are proficient in Korean, since they receive more funding than those who are not, therefore former language studying is stimulated. It is not only the financial aspect that is being considered, but the discourse framework constructed also includes the “fact” that the Korean universities have most of the classes in Korean, bringing in the necessity factor. The student is also expected to “abide” the NIIED (National Institute for International Education) policy regarding the learning of the Korean language (p.10), putting him in the control of the State, making its language policy a law to be respected. All of these elements make together a specific scheme in which the vision of a Korean language student is created, entering the personal level (no family), public level (recognition of the good students) and the official level (transforming the policy in law through a specific discourse).

Conclusion

In this paper, we presented the critical overview of educational policies regarding teaching Japanese and Korean as foreign languages. We analyzed the official State issued documents regarding global educational policies for each language, and presented the similarities, differences as well as critical outlook on such policies. Both languages show a high degree of State involvement in the process of depicting a language image to foreign learners. They also show some country-specific differences pertaining to an individual country ideology and the image which it wishes to project to foreign interested individuals.

In the case of Japanese language, the main institution concerned for global Japanese language education and standardized testing is Japan Foundation, an autonomous institution partially governed by Japanese Ministry of Education. We found that they strive to include both language and cultural education in their various programmes, and possess a positive, inspiring outlook on Japanese language – meant to motivate students with encouraging keywords such as “can-do” checklist. This encouragement is also visible between the lines, where we recognized the attitude that Japanese culture can only be thoroughly accessed if one possesses fluency in the Japanese language. It should also be noted that Japanese Foundation takes effort to include global language learning trends and country-independent standards, such as adopting CEFR and adapting it to the specifics of the Japanese language.

On the other hand, Korea Foundation, an institution under the Korean Ministry of Education, promotes Korean language and culture with a dose of solemnness and more of a serious attitude towards the learner. They concentrate more on the traditional aspects of Korean culture, with less value put on the Korean popular culture such as K-pop (Korean version of pop music), whereas JF

promotes Japanese language with anime and manga. This can be due to the fact that the Korean wave of popular culture is a more recent cultural phenomena than the Japanese wave of animation. KF is even stricter in stating the importance of Korean fluency for the life in Korea – they restrict the access to the scholarships, or refuse their continuation, in the case that an individual fails to prove his or her language skill. We noted a certain degree of national pride within KF documents, which was subtler in the case of JF. South Korea presented itself as a country proud of its cultural heritage and language, with the subtext of other countries lacking the proper knowledge and access to these Korean properties. One of the purposes of the language learning scholarships is to promote and spread such Korean image in the world.

Both countries possess language education policies which require learners to adapt to Japanese or Korean culture, and develop certain traits of “japanness” or “koreaness”. Language learning is inevitably a process of culture learning, but in the case of a greater cultural difference this can be a challenging task. Thus the official language documents provide the standardized framework within which an individual learner can be reach in an effective and unified way. It is not uncommon to notice changes in character in long-time learners of Japanese or Korean, whether only when speaking the language, or even in general behavior. Future studies and papers definitely will have to work on the discussion if such effect is an inevitable effect of cultural exposure when learning a language from a different cultural background, or is it enhanced and promoted by language policies analyzed in this paper, showing us the interaction and the effect of State policies. This is one of our future concerns within the main project of the research group and the manner how we perceive Subject, Displacement, Knowledge and Time as categories can help to create and define new and creative ways of analyzing Language Images.

Bibliography

CALVET, L-J. **As políticas linguísticas**. São Paulo: Parábola, 2007.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. **Discurso e mudança social**. Brasília: Universidade de Brasília, 2001.

KAKAZU, K. Retrospective and Prospects of the Japan Foundation Through its Activities in Thailand. **Japanese Studies Journal** 27.1, 2010, p.13-19.

ORLANDI, E. **Discurso em Análise. Sujeito, sentido, ideologia**. Campinas: Pontes, 2012.

TOLLEFSON, J.W. **Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues**. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2002.

SCHLIEBEN-LANGE, Brigitte. **História do falar e história da linguística**. Campinas, SP: Editora da UNICAMP, 1993.

WODAK, R. **Introduction**. In: **Language Policy and Political Issues in Education**. Vol1. Encyclopedia of Language Education. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997, p.335-370.

WORTHAM, S. E. F. Linguistic anthropology of education. In: MARTIN-JONES, M.; de MEJÍA, M.; HORNBERGER, N. (Orgs.). **Encyclopedia of Language and Education**, v. 3, Discourse and Education. New York: Springer, 2008, p. 93-103.

Official documents consulted

JF Standard for Japanese Language in Education, Japan Foundation, 2010.
https://jfstandard.jp/pdf/jfs2010_all_en.pdf, acessado em 12.4.2016

Outline of the Student Exchange System, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan, 2010.
http://www.mext.go.jp/component/english/___icsFiles/afieldfile/2011/12/14/1303740_1.pdf,

acessado em 12.4.2016

The Law of the Japan Foundation Independent Administrative Institution, Foreign Ministry of Japan, 2003.

<https://www.jpf.go.jp/e/about/result/ar/2010/pdf/ar2010-01.pdf>, acessado em 12.4.2016

The Program Guidelines of the JF, Japan Foundation, 2016.

<http://www.jpf.go.jp/e/program/index.html>, acessado em 12.4.2016

2010 Annual Report, Korea Foundation, 2010.

<https://en.kf.or.kr/?menuno=3736>, acessado em 12.4.2016

2015 Korean Government Scholarship Program, National Institute for International Education, 2015.

http://www.esteri.it/mae/resource/doc/2015/02/corea_linee_guida_studenti_internazionali.pdf, acessado em 12.4.2016

Recebido em 4 de novembro de 2016.
Aprovado em 16 de novembro de 2016.