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This study was concerned with examining the process of educational policy-making at the central government level in the Republic of Korea through an application of systems analysis.

The purposes of this study were (1) to examine the relationship existing between politics and education; (2) to construct a systems analysis for examining the process of educational policy-making; and (3) to identify problems and limitations in the educational policy-making process in the Republic of Korea. To accomplish these purposes analytic and descriptive methods were used as a research technique.

The sources of data include Korean government publications; Korean Education Law and bylaws; decrees of the President of Korea on education; unpublished theses and dissertations; current books on educational decision-making; research reports; articles in current professional journals relating to systems concepts; reports of UNESCO and Korean educational research institutes; *The Dong-A Ilbo* (Korean daily newspaper); and informal discussions with Korean scholars in the United States.

To develop an understanding of the political behavior in educational policy-making, the relationship between politics
and education was examined. This examination of their mutual relationship has revealed that politics and education are closely interrelated to each other. Education is a creature of polity, and also it is one of the most potent political institutions.

To identify major forces involved in the educational policy-making processes in the Republic of Korea, and to examine their interactions in the national educational system, Sharkansky's systems model was applied. According to his model, the important features of the policy-making processes are considered as part of an input-conversion-output process. Through an application of his systems model, the major forces affecting educational policy-making in Korea were divided into two broad categories—(1) societal inputs and (2) governmental withinputs.

Since the governmental policies on education affect many aspects of peoples' lives, many groups attempt to influence policies on education. Out of those groups, professional groups, such as the Korean Federation of Education Associations; educational research groups, such as the Central Education Research Institute and the Korean Educational Development Institute; the Teaching Profession's Meetings, political parties and social groups were identified as the major societal inputs on the Korean national educational system.

Educational policy-making at the central government level in Korea necessarily utilizes the existing structure of the government. The President, the State Council, the National Assembly and the Ministry of Education have important roles to
play in decisions affecting educational policies. These are major governmental inputs on the Korean national educational policies. Particularly, the structure of the central government, procedures of decision-making, and personal and professional experiences of the policy-makers are major factors affecting educational policy-making in Korea.

The examination of the educational policy-making process in Korea through an application of systems analysis has revealed that there are many factors hindering rational decision-making by the policy-makers. Those factors are largely due to limited public participation in the decision-making process, limited professional advice, and insufficient compromises among decision-makers and major interest groups. These arise from the fact that the policy-making system itself is a relatively closed one.

This study concludes that the Korean educational system, if it is to meet the changes occurring in its society, must be open to change in the future. These changes will in turn mean that the traditional methods of determining educational policies need drastic revision to meet the impact of educational innovations.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since regaining her independence in 1945 the Republic of Korea has realized that education is the key to success in socio-economic progress, and that the undeveloped state of the nation could be overcome only through education. In consequence, national enthusiasm for education has gained ever greater momentum (13, p. 1).

Even though education in Korea has expanded phenomenally since her political liberation from Japanese colonial rule in 1945, a sharp criticism among Korean educators is that the accelerated quantitative growth of Korean education has been achieved by a deterioration in the qualitative aspects of education (15, p. 1). The quality of education, therefore, is a matter of great national concern at the present.

It is a well known fact that quality education depends largely upon sound educational policy in any society. Educational policy may be conceived of as a set of guidelines which give direction to the development of educational programs. It is also a key concept in any discussion of educational administration. According to Daniel Griffiths, the concept of the educational policy-making process is construed to mean not only the making of decisions, but also the acts necessary to put the
decisions into operation and so actually to affect the course of action of a system (4, p. 140).

Since the Republic of Korea has been and is a highly centralized government system, most of the educational policies are formulated by the central government structure and, in particular, by the Ministry of Education, the chief educational policy-making agency in Korea. During the two and a half decades since the establishment of the Republic of Korea in 1948, educational policies have been revised or changed frequently. Whenever revisions or changes occurred in major educational policies, there was a severe criticism among educators and lay people on the inconsistency of the policies.

Many educators believe that the traditional approaches to education have become inadequate to the challenge and needs of the present. Public policies must support new approaches to education that depart from the traditional. Despite the growing needs for a study of educational policy in the new age, there has been little research on the educational policy-making process in Korea.

It is a major purpose of this study to examine the educational policy-making process at the central government level in the Republic of Korea through an application of systems analysis. It is believed that a rational or objective scientific basis for comprehending the overall process involved in educational policy-making and problem solving must be developed
before constructive action can be undertaken in improving educational policy-making in the Republic of Korea.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to analyze the educational policy-making process in the Republic of Korea through an application of systems analysis to the role of the central governmental structure in the educational policy-making process.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study are (1) to examine the relationship existing between politics and education; (2) to construct a systems analysis for examining the process of educational policy-making; and (3) to identify problems and limitations in the educational policy-making process in the Republic of Korea.

Background and Significance of the Study

Dramatic changes have taken place in education in the Republic of Korea over the past two and a half decades since the establishment of the new Republic in 1948. Perhaps the most significant and far-reaching of these changes is to be seen in the quantitative growth of education which has been achieved by a deterioration in the qualitative aspects of education (15, p. 1). In other words, much development has been achieved in quantity, but little in quality. Accordingly, continued efforts have been made by the Korean people themselves to resolve many problems facing education, but there are still a
number of improvements yet to be made before a reasonable standard of education is attained.

Korean education is founded upon the democratic principle of granting every citizen equal educational opportunities according to ability regardless of differences in religion, sex, or social and economic status. This is clearly stated in the Constitution of the Republic of Korea—Article 27 (7, p. 37). The current school system in Korea is organized in accordance with the 6-3-3-4 pattern. It has been strongly influenced by many of the fundamental principles of democracy and of the American educational system. Therefore, most patterns of Korean educational administration are theoretically quite similar to American patterns. However, in actual practice there are many contradictions of the democratic process in educational administration as a result of the social, cultural and political impact on the major educational policies.

The educational administration in Korea holds that its ultimate objective is to evolve itself organizationally into a system which ensures neutrality and independence from politics (5, p. 375). Independence and political neutrality of education are guaranteed in Section 4, Article 27 of the Constitution (10, p. 199). For the past quarter century, since the establishment of the new Republic in 1948, Korean educators have advocated that education must be separated from politics. Despite their credo that "schools must be kept out of politics" and the Constitutional guarantee, it is an inescapable fact
that education always has been intimately interrelated with politics in Korean society.

In Korea, with a unitary form of government, the central government exercises direct control over the school system. Establishment and organization are under the authority of the Ministry of Education; all other aspects of education, such as curriculum, school finance, and school personnel policy, are determined by laws made in the political arena.

Korean educational policies have resulted in a highly centralized system in school organization and administration. The policies provide that education be controlled, to a large degree, by civil officials with no provision for keeping education from the exploitation of pressure groups and political parties (19, p. 5). As a result, every aspect of the operation of the educational system is affected by politics.

Many Korean educators believe that the traditional approaches to education have become inadequate to the challenge and needs of the present and the future (8, p. 63). There is a general agreement among the professional educators that public policy must support new approaches to education that depart from the traditional and that will provide alternatives for learning and personal development. Despite the growing need for a study of educational policy in the new age, there has been little research on the educational policy-making processes in the Republic of Korea (14, p. 110). There may be no more urgent need in Korean education today than the need for critical analysis of the problems in educational policy-making.
Educational policy may be conceived as a set of guidelines which give direction to the development of educational programs. It is also a key concept in any discussion of educational administration. According to Daniel Griffiths, the educational policy-making process is construed to mean not only the decision, but also the acts necessary to put the decision into operation, and thus affect the course of action of a system (4, p. 140).

John Thompson explains the "policy-making theory" as follows:

Major educational policies must be made regarding to who will attend school, what will be taught and who will teach, how will the educational system be governed and administered and how will education be financed. How these questions are answered depends upon the interaction of a host of economic, cultural, social, psychological, and political variables (18, p. 26).

These are the major factors which influence educational policies in any society. Differences in societal conditions or changes in one or more of the variables will result in different educational policies (18, p. 31). The educational policy in Korea is no exception. It has been constantly affected by such variables as social, political, economic and cultural factors.

During the two and a half decades since the establishment of the Republic of Korea in 1948, educational policies have been revised or changed frequently. The major policies concerning the entrance examination, organization of higher institutions, compulsory education, curricula, and private schools are those which have been revised or changed frequently for the past twenty-four years (2, p. 211). Out of many educational
policies, some of them have contributed to the development of Korean education. However, in certain cases, policies have had to be revised or changed without having been implemented due to severe criticism from educators and lay people (9, p. 2). Some of the former policies did not coincide with the latter decisions. As a consequence, the discrepancies brought a disturbance of educational administrative order. This type of inconsistency apparently reflects one aspect of the weakness of educational policy-making in the Republic of Korea.

It is, therefore, very important to determine and examine the major problems in the educational policy-making process. Have the problems occurred as a result of mistakes made by educational policy-makers, or have they been due to the deficiencies of the educational policy-making processes? One approach to finding answers to this question is through a systems analysis.

Donald R. Miller explains the systems analysis as follows:

Systems analysis is a generalized and logical process for identifying and breaking down, into as many carefully distinguishable parts as possible, the structure, parts and interactions of a system (12, p. 14).

According to Miller's view, systems analysis can be construed as a logical process for analyzing the structure, parts, and interactions of a system.

E. S. Quade justifies systems analysis as follows:

Systems analysis and operations research are successful aids to policy determination in areas... where there is no accepted theoretical foundation precisely because they are designed to make systematic and efficient rather than haphazard and unguided
use of judgement by specialists or experts in the fields of interest. The essence of their method is to construct a "model" appropriate to the problem; such a model. . .introduces a precise structure and terminology that serve primarily as an effective means of communication, and, through feedback. . . helps the expert to arrive at a clear understanding of the subject matter and the problem (16, p. 153).

Therefore, a systems analysis can be used in developing a methodological approach to educational policy-making.

Without a clear understanding of how educational policy is formulated at the central government level, educators can hardly hope to influence the direction of national educational policy. Hopefully, this study will contribute to our understanding of the educational policy-making process in the Republic of Korea through an application of systems analysis. One way in which the study may be helpful is in identifying major forces which seem to play an important role in the educational policy-making processes, and how they are interrelated in the decision-making process.

It is believed that there will be more radical changes in the future and these changes will in turn mean that the traditional methods of determining educational policy need drastic revision to meet the impact of the educational innovations.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study the following definitions have been formulated:

Educational Policy--A set of guidelines which give direction to the development of an educational program.
Politics--Politics is public, not private, in the sense that its aim is the influencing of decisions relating to public issues within a political system (6, p. 215).

Politics of Education--The process of making basic educational decisions of nation-wide significance.

System--A system, as defined here, is an array of components designed to accomplish a particular objective according to plan.

Systems Approach--A way of analyzing a problem by identifying objectives and resources and determining alternatives in using resources to attain objectives (11, p. 563).

Systems Analysis--A generalized and logical process for identifying and breaking down, into as many carefully distinguishable parts as possible, the structure, parts and interactions of a system (12, p. 14).

Inputs--The array of resources of various types made available to achieve certain ends.

Withinputs--The features of the conversion process that influence the action of policy-makers. Since they originate within the conversion process, they are called withinputs (17, p. 7).

Outputs--The products actually created by the system, and not simply those hoped for.

Feedback--The portion of the output of a system which is fed back to the input and affects succeeding outputs, and which has the property of being able to adjust future conduct by past performance.
Limitations of the Study

This study, designed to analyze the process of educational policy-making in the Republic of Korea, is limited to the period of 1948 through 1972.

The focus will be placed upon the role of the central government structure and, in particular, on the role of the Ministry of Education which is the chief educational policy-making agency in the Republic of Korea. The study will exclude the examination of the educational policy-making process at the local government level.

Procedures for Collection of Data

1. In order to secure fundamental theories for educational policy-making and an applicable type of system for examining the educational policy-making process, current books on educational decision-making, research reports, unpublished dissertations, and articles in current professional journals relating to systems concepts were thoroughly examined.

2. As the principal sources for understanding the major forces influencing the educational policy-making process in the Republic of Korea and for identifying problems or limitations in the policy-making process, government publications, educational laws and decrees, unpublished theses and dissertations, articles in professional journals, reports of UNESCO and Korean educational research institutes, and The Dong-A Ilbo (Korean daily newspaper) were closely examined. These data were
obtained from various primary and secondary sources in the Republic of Korea. These valuable data are not otherwise available in the United States.

3. The writer of this study spent one week in Washington, D. C., making a thorough review of Korean Education Index volumes published from 1960 to 1971, and available in the Korean Section, Library of Congress. Current articles in Korean professional journals relating to the dissertation topic were closely examined.

4. To secure the consensus concerning the educational policy-making process in the Republic of Korea, informal discussions with Korean scholars in the United States were held.

Procedures for Treatment of Data

To accomplish the purposes of the study, analytic and descriptive methods were used as a research technique. The procedures were as follows:

1. The relationship between politics and education was examined by focusing on political behavior in educational policy-making. To understand the political processes in educational policy-making, Easton's model of the Flow Characteristics of Policy-Making (3, p. 30) was applied. Easton has developed a model which provides a conceptual framework for understanding political processes. The political system, as part of the broader social system, receives input from the environment in the form of demands and supports which are converted through a
series of conversion processes into outputs such as decisions or policies. In turn, the outputs of the system affect the environment and as feedback may result in another demand or input on the system. The important benefit to be gained through the application of the Easton model of the political system is that it can be used in analyzing the political relationships which exist between the educational system and its environment. In addition, Easton's model serves in the elaboration of political relationships which enable policy-makers to develop political rationality in educational policy-making.

2. In order to identify major forces involved in the educational policy-making processes in the Republic of Korea, and to examine their interactions in the national educational system, Sharkansky's systems model was applied.

Ira Sharkansky developed a systems model which shows the important features of the policy-making process and the relationships that make each feature important for the others. According to his model, the important features of the policy processes are considered as part of an input-conversion-output process. The systems framework includes: (1) the inputs from the environment that stimulate participants in the educational system and receive the product of the system; (2) the outputs of the system that effect the environment; (3) the conversion processes that transform inputs into outputs; and (4) feedback that transmits the output of one period back to the conversion process as the inputs of a later time (17, p. 4).
The Sharkansky systems model was applied for two reasons. His systems model has been frequently used as a framework for examining policy-making in government agencies in recent years. Secondly, the model is relevant to the concern of this study. The systems model provides what the writer considers to be a useful framework in which to analyze the numerous factors influencing educational policy-making and their interactions in the Korean national educational system.

3. In order to seek solutions of those problems in the educational policy-making process in the Republic of Korea, recommendations were made as to how and to what extent the weakness in educational policy-making can be eliminated.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Recently several research studies have been done on educational policy-making in the Republic of Korea. However, the writer can locate none which have attempted to examine the overall processes of educational policy-making in the Republic of Korea through an application of a systems analysis.

The first section of this chapter is a review of literature on politics and education which can conveniently be divided into two areas: (1) the relationship between politics and education, and (2) the systems theory of politics. To examine the relationship existing between politics and education provides a useful approach for understanding how political behavior influences the process of educational policy-making.

The last section of this chapter, a review of literature on the educational policy-making theory, can be divided into the following three areas: (1) the basic concepts of educational policy-making, (2) the educational policy-making process, and (3) the systems analysis approach to educational policy-making.

Education and Politics

During the two and a half decades since the establishment of the new Republic in 1948, many Korean professional educators and lay people have advocated that education must be
separated from politics. The reasons for this fear of politics were varied, but they reflect in part the revulsion against spoils or patronage politics. Many educators fear politics because of their common belief that the administration of public education is naturally subject to the influence of organized partisan politics. As a result, educators have tried to keep partisan politics out of education. This desire is apparently reflected in the basic principle of educational administration in Korea. "Educational administration in Korea holds that its ultimate objective is to evolve itself organizationally into a system which ensures neutrality and independence from politics" (21, p. 370). Independence and political neutrality of education are guaranteed in Section 4, Article 27 of the Constitution as follows: "Independence and political impartiality of education shall be guaranteed" (27, p. 199).

Despite the educators' credo that "schools must be kept out of politics" and the Constitutional guarantee, it is an inescapable fact that education always has been intimately interrelated with politics in society. In Korea, with a unitary form of government, the central government exercises direct control over the school system. Establishment and organization are under the authority of the Ministry of Education; all other aspects of education, such as curriculum, school finance and
school personnel policy, are determined by laws made in the political arena.

Korean educational policies have resulted in a highly centralized system in school organization and administration. The policies provide that education be controlled to a large degree by civil officials, with no provision for keeping education from the exploitation of pressure groups and political parties (49, p. 5). As a result, every aspect of the operation of the educational system is affected by politics.

In spite of the fact that school administrators are frequently caught between conflicting pressures and demands, little research has been done on the political aspects of education and of its administration. Few scholars have yet sought to apply to education the insights gained from the study of politics; however, education needs these insights. As a result, it has become an important issue for the educational profession to examine its role in the political process for the purpose of better understanding the political aspects of education and of its administration.

**Relationship between Politics and Education**

Because of the elusive nature of politics, it is difficult to understand the relationships of politics to education. There is no doubt that politics mean different things to different people. The average citizen's concept of politics is restricted largely to the activities of partisan politics. However, the
politics in a democracy is importantly related to power and influence, both formal and informal, and not restricted to political party activities.

Bone says that "... politics is a struggle for power, the attempt to influence the course of public policy and public decisions" (2). According to his view, politics is equivalent to the broadest conception of public decision-making. Its aim is the influencing of decisions relating to public issues within a political system. Gregg states that "the important aspect of the political system is the activity of influential individuals and groups of people as they strive to influence the nature of public policies" (18, p. 215). According to his concept of the political system, politics can be clarified as the relationship among individuals and groups as they seek to exercise power, in such a way as to influence the thinking and acting of other persons and groups concerning public problems and issues.

El-Ghannam's study on "Politics in Educational Planning" shows the historical roots of the relationship between education and politics in the speculation of Plato and Aristotle. He explains that the relationship between education and politics has been a concern of scholars since ancient times. It was Plato and Aristotle who first clarified the relationship and affirmed some principles embodied in phrases such as; "education is a creature of polity," "the school is a powerful instrument in building or rebuilding a state," "the school usually
patterns citizens after the image of the state," and "as is the state so is the school" (16, p. 13). Two thousand years ago education and politics occupied a prominent position in thoughtful debate. But since then thoughtful debate on the way politics and education seek to influence each other has all but disappeared.

From the very beginning of political speculations, as in Plato and Aristotle, political philosophers were sensitive to the role of education in the political system, and they have continued their concern to the present day. But their awareness of and their interest in the mutual relations between education and politics has not been sufficient to induce them to search out the way in which each seek to influence the other (13, pp. 304-305). However, a regeneration of this interest has only recently occurred in the wake of growing awareness of political decision-making concerning education at various levels of government. Ralph B. Kimbrough justifies the fact that "education is a creature of polity" as follows:

"It is an accepted fact that education is a creature of polity, and, in a sense, a political phenomenon. If education is denied its political character, it will not be the education of its time. That is why educators, and educational planners in particular, should be concerned with politics" (29, p. 116).

Perhaps the closest statement of the mutual relationship of the two disciplines is that of Nathan Rotenstreich (44). He finds that one distinctive feature of the similarity between education and politics lies in the fact that both exist in a
sphere of activity which might be called the "sphere of means." Education is not contained in itself; its motives lie in the objective toward which it is directed. The reason for politics is not contained in itself, but in the goal it envisages. These two branches of activity are functions of human society for the sake of society.

Another similarity between education and politics is their dependence upon society. This dependence leads to activities which bring about a third similarity between them—the tendency to establish a social sphere of their own. Not only are they dependent upon social factors, but they create social factors as well. Both are concerned with the function of shaping and managing society. In his analysis, Rostenstreich states:

Thus the nature of the relationship . . . between education and politics is not exhausted through the assumption of their common source. Education needs politics in so far as it needs society to be managed in such a manner as to make education shaping possible. It needs such politics as does not overstep its legitimate borders, that is to say, politics which does not pretend to serve as the content of intellectual life but is bent on establishing the framework in which intellectual life is produced. Education needs politics which respects the domain and preserves the autonomy of education. This education needs politics which is aware of its limits and the field beyond its limits, while politics needs men whose shaping will inter alia contain the elements of political interest such shaping as will make them capable of political activity and will not commit them to indifferent contemplation. Politics which clears the way for education does so not only for the sake of education but even for its own sake: the educated man who possesses the combination of knowledge, ability and interest is due to be the bearer of politics (44, p. 98).
In a discussion of the function of education in a political system, John Thompson remarks as follows:

Education makes a significant contribution to the stabilization and transformation of political systems. Schools are the agencies that propagate the historical lore of the people of political indoctrination or socialization, an essential function in every political system (47, p. 1).

As a result of these vital functions, education is one of the most potent political institutions. As an institution it is instrumental in developing and preserving the political and social orders. It is, therefore, important that educational administrators recognize the political nature of their jobs and continuously strive to develop the knowledge and skills to be effective in the political process.

In the past, research on the relationships of politics to education was neglected by practicing educators who pointed out that public education should be a unique nonpolitical function with a separate and independent governmental structure. This isolationist stance led researchers studying school operations to ignore their political environments (31, p. 637). However, in the past decade social forces affecting the development of education have changed this traditional view and created a more open system of educational politics. Educators are now turning their attention more to the politics of education, and researchers now examine both the interchanges between education and its political environment. Most of the research has concentrated on the consequences of political interaction. Each research
has contributed to an understanding of how the political system works, but no single one fully explains the political process in which schools operate.

The remainder of the first section of this chapter attempts to elaborate on the systems theory of politics found useful for understanding how the political system works.

**Systems Theory of Politics**

A systems analysis approach to the study of politics provides a conceptual overview of how the political system operates. Gerald E. Sroufe says that "the most promising type of systems theory applicable to educational policy-making is political systems analysis" (46, p. 1).

David Easton, in *A Systems Analysis of Political Life* (14), and in other publications, developed a useful analytical tool of political systems which provides a means of examining the interrelationships among political actors and institutions, and of understanding the complex processes by which public policy is made. Easton's model of the "Flow Characteristics of Policy-Making" shown in Figure 1 provides a conceptual framework for understanding political processes. The political system as part of the broader social system receives input from the environment in the form of demands and supports which are converted through a series of conversion processes into outputs such as decisions or policies. In turn, the outputs of the system affect the environment and, as feedback, may result in another demand or input on the system.
Fig. 1--Flow Characteristics of Policy-making: A Political System


The usefulness of systems analysis in describing the relationships between the environment and political processes can easily be seen when applied to educational policy-making. For example, the Russian success with Sputnik in 1957 drastically disturbed American society. This blow to the American national pride was traumatic, and immediately there was a hue and cry that something had to be done. The question of curriculum was pushed into the center of public debate. Numerous groups were created to alter and improve educational programs. New demands were put on schools for a more rigorous scientific and mathematical curriculum. The demands were in turn converted into public policy; the National Defense Education Act was enacted in 1958. As a result, new curriculums were developed, new courses were designed, and new textbooks were written and adopted.
Consequently, greater emphasis was placed on scientific and mathematical programs. In turn, these programs affected the environment, and the feedback from these actions has led to still other demands on the system such as demands for additional vocational-technical education (5, pp. 258-259; 47, p. 5).

The remaining part of this chapter attempts to explain the educational policy-making theory which provides a means of understanding the complex processes by which the educational policy is made.

Educational Policy-Making Theory

Recent literature which deals with educational policy-making reflects a growing awareness that at the policy level, education becomes very much involved in politics. Since the political behavior in educational policy-making has been explored only recently, no general theories have emerged as yet (30, p. v). In 1959 Thomas H. Eliot (17), a professor of political science, presented the need for the study of educational politics and policy-making. Since then a significant number of research studies pertaining to public policy-making on education in the United States have been published (31, p. 623).

In the Republic of Korea, many educators believe that the traditional approaches to education have become inadequate to the challenge and needs of the present. There is a general agreement among the professional educators that public policy must support new approaches to education that depart from the traditional. Despite the growing need for a study of educational
policy in the new age, there has been little research on the educational policy-making process in Korea. The need for such research was well stated recently by Hyun-ki Paik in expressing the view that "despite the critical need for a study of educational policy-making in Korea, only a few scholars have been interested in this area" (39, p. 110). There may be a no more urgent need in Korean education today than the need for a critical analysis of the problems in educational policy-making.

Recently, a few research studies which deal with educational decision-making in the Republic of Korea have been published. Although these studies have attempted to analyze the educational policy-making process in the Republic of Korea, none have examined the overall processes involved in educational policy-making through an application of systems analysis. Because of the recent development of educational policy-making in the Republic of Korea, the published literature dealing with this field is still very limited.

A most important work is Hyun-ki Paik's book, An Approach to the Problems of National Development in Educational Policy-Making in Korea (40). This is the only book which deals with educational policy-making in Korea. In his work, the writer attempted to identify various problems in educational policy-making, and discussed an approach to innovating educational policy-making for the purpose of modernizing the nation.

Suk-choon Cho in his research report, "Decision-Making Process for Educational Policies in the Korean Government" (8),
discussed current practices of educational policy-making in Korea. His study focused on examining processes of educational policy-making by the Ministry of Education in Korea since 1961 when the Military Revolution Government was established. In his research report, Cho attempted to describe various decision units which were involved in educational policy-making and their interaction. His study seems to be helpful in understanding the relationship between the Ministry of Education and various decision units in the policy-making process.

Hyun-ki Paik in his research, "Problems in Educational Policy-Making for Educational Autonomy" (41), pointed out several problems in policy-making for the purpose of preserving educational autonomy and political neutrality of education. In his study, focus was placed upon the problems and limitations with which the Minister of Education has been confronted in the process of educational policy-making.

There are several articles written on educational policy in the Republic of Korea. "Changing Korean Society and Direction of Educational Policy" by Bom-mo Chung (10), "New Approach to Educational Policy" by Jong-chul Kim (26), "Educational Policy for the 70's" by Tae-sun Park (42), "Re-examining Educational Policy" by In-jong Yoo (48), "Practice of Korean Educational Policy and Direction for Its Improvement" by Du-bom Jin (23), and others.

This published work can neither be considered extensive nor satisfactory. Apart from published literature there are
a few unpublished doctoral dissertations and master’s theses related to the study of the educational policy-making process in the Republic of Korea.

Young-dae Yoo in his unpublished doctoral dissertation, "Suggestions for the Improvement of Korean Education Laws in Terms of Democratic Principles" (49), pointed out the provisions in Korean educational laws which contradict the democratic principles, and made suggestions for improving the laws.


Jin-eun Kim wrote his unpublished master’s thesis on "An Analytical Study of the Process of Policy-Making for Education in the Central Government" (25). His study focused on the identification of the main factors hindering rational decision-making by the Minister of Education.

Young-soo Lee in his unpublished master’s thesis, "An Analysis of the Korean Pattern of the Educational Policy-Making Process; the Case of the Middle School Non-examination Admission Policy" (34), attempted to analyze the decision-making process in formulating the middle school non-examination admission policy. His study focused on the analysis of the reality and
interaction of the main policy-making units involved in the process of policy-making in the case.

Since literature relating to the study of educational policy-making in the Republic of Korea is very limited, the writer attempted to present various approaches through reviewing literature published in the United States of America.

Basic Concepts of Educational Policy-Making

Educational policy may be conceived as a set of guidelines which give direction to the development of an educational program. It is also a key concept in any discussion of educational administration. As one approach to understanding the basic concept, it might be helpful to examine the relationship between policy-making and administration. Campbell and Layton in their research work, "Policy-Making for American Education," explained the relationship between administration and policy-making as follows:

In a like manner the boundary between administration and policy-making, or purpose setting for that matter, is not always clear. It is within the domain of administration to devise means by which policy may be effectively implemented for the achievement of goals. . .policies are so often very broad and general they need to be interpreted and this interpretation involves administrators. Administrators are involved because of their expertise in advising on the formation of policy and statement of purposes, nonetheless, the unique function of administration is the implementation of policy (7, p. 83).

According to the Campbell and Layton statement, educational policy is being implemented within the domain of administration.
for the achievement of goals. Therefore, the unique function of administration is the implementation of educational policy.

In discussing educational policy-making, many writers have given considerable attention to the political nature of educational policy. Phillip Monypenny, in discussing the problem of educational policy-making, made the following statement:

For the political scientist, any policy-making structure may be viewed as having three related elements. One is the formal structure itself as one finds it set out in law and practice. Another element is constituted by the groups in the population which have an interest in the policies which are determined through that structure. A third element is the goals which are sought by groups in the population and by their representatives in the policy-making structure (38, p. 1).

The process of educational policy-making, according to Monypenny, appears to come about as an interplay between those holding the official power and those representing the plurality of organized educational goal-seeking groups. Roald F. Campbell, et al., in their research report on "Policy-Making for American Public Schools," conform to Monypenny's statement as follows:

... policy-making: almost by definition, is the conscious attempt of officials, legislators, and interest publics, to find constructive responses to the needs and pathologies which they observe in their surrounding culture (6).

In these terms, educational policy-making seems to have a rich and reassuring history.

Milstein and Jennings, in their research report on "Perceptions of the Educational Policy-Making Process in New York State: Educational Interest Group Leaders and State Legislators" (37), discussed the policy-making process in terms of a
system in which interest groups compete for fiscal support.

The policy-making process can be conceived of as a system in which individuals, groups, and organizations compete for the allocation of scarce resources. For the purpose of the study, individuals, groups and organizations can be thought of as involved in the policy-making system when their actions are directly related to the process of educational decision-making at the state level (37, p. 3).

In their statement, the writers emphasized the financial input which has propelled education into a central and continuing issue area in the policy-making process.

In a text on governing American schools, Roald F. Campbell, et al., stated: "educational policy-making at all government levels is immersed in politics and by definition educational policy-making is political action" (3, p. 404). Ralph Kimbrough has taken a similar position that "if the educational leader and his staff have any opinions about educational policies and take action accordingly, public education in that school district is involved in politics" (28, p. 275).

In view of the above authors' statements, educational policy-making can be construed as a political act of those responsible for achieving educational goals. Furthermore, it is an overall process including the formation, adoption, and application of a legal course of action in relation to the guidelines established in the political arena for achieving governmental goals on educational programs.
Educational Policy-Making Process

The educational policy-making process is still such a new and uncharted area of research that no distinctive empirical base has yet been developed.

According to Daniel Griffiths (19, p. 140), the concept of the policy-making process is construed to mean not only the making of decisions, but also the acts necessary to put the decisions into operation, thereby affecting the course of action of a system. Based on Griffiths' definition, the policy-making process is conceived as decision-making acts. Luvern L. Cunningham, in his article on "The Process of Educational Policy Development," stated that "the policy-making process was conceptualized as a continuum, characterized by movement through time within an organizational and community setting" (12). According to his view, the term "process" connotes a continuum, developmental evolution of an organization through time. In analyzing the process of educational policy-making, Cunningham proposed five stages: (1) initiation, (2) definition, (3) deliberation, (4) enactment, and (5) consequences. These stages are not unlike the steps commonly included in the description of scientific method or problem solving. This article emphasizes the third stage of the process—deliberation, bargaining, and the raising of alternatives. The other four steps are only briefly reviewed.

A most valuable work for the study of the educational policy-making process is Campbell's conceptual framework.
Roald F. Campbell, et al., have proposed a conceptual framework which they believe helps to explain the process by which educational policy is formed. The model was first proposed and described briefly by Campbell in one of his earlier writings (5, pp. 72-74). According to the model, educational policy is formulated through a four-phase process.

The first phase of Campbell's model is called "basic forces," by which is meant major political, economic, or social movements that are national and sometimes world-wide in scope. Schools, like other institutions in a social system, are affected by basic social, political, economic, and technological developments. For instance, the amount of schooling of the people of a country is significantly related to the aspirations which that country holds for schools. The Korean national defense policy is directly related to the creation of the student defense corps. For another example, recent Korean government economic policy gave top priority to the development of industry. In order to meet the demand adequately, greater emphasis was placed on the development of vocational and science education.

Campbell illustrates the basic forces which affect schools as follows:

At the moment, these forces include international tensions, economic independence of all people, population mobility, widespread communication, technological advancement generally, the growth of knowledge, and the push for self-determination on the part of people everywhere (4, p. 309).
The second phase of Campbell's model is called "antecedent movements" and may be thought of as some kind of visible, articulate reaction to basic forces which attract considerable attention, such as a recommendation for certain educational reforms made by a respected individual or group. In discussing "antecedent movements," Campbell illustrated several cases pertaining to these movements.

...the National Merit Scholarship Program, the Conant studies of American high schools and teacher education, the Rockefeller Report on Education, the White House Conference on Education, the President's Committee on Education, and the National Assessment Program (4, pp. 310-311).

All of these activities seem to be antecedents to the American educational policy. It should be noted that these movements tend to be nation-wide in scope. These two phases, "basic social forces" and "antecedent movement," generate a sense of need and interest in bringing about change in education.

The third phase, "political action," reveals the public discussion or debate which precedes policy-making. The antecedent and the resulting proposals provoke political activity in and out of government (4, p. 311).

The fourth phase is "formal enactment" which represents the final step of policy formation. In discussing "formal enactment," Campbell and others stated that "the process--change in basic social conditions, the organization of nation-wide antecedent movements, and political activity in and out of government--often culminates in policy" (4, p. 313). Usually
policy requires some kind of legal formulation—an action that may be taken by local or central governments.

The four-phase process by which the educational policy is formulated is shown in Campbell's policy-making flow chart. (See Figure 2.) Campbell's flow chart enlarges the concept of the policy-making process. Also, it seems to be a useful framework in which to understand the process of educational policy-making in the Republic of Korea. Campbell's approach to the study of policy-formation is an example of the rational and heuristic methods being used in the study of the educational policy-making process.

**Systems Analysis Approach to Educational Policy-Making**

Systems analysis is a relatively new methodological approach to the study of the educational policy-making process. The 1960's may be remembered as the time in history when the systems concept began to be talked about with increasing frequency in educational decision-making (32, p. 539).

The concept of systems.—In education today there is a prevalence of confusion concerning the meaning of "systems analysis" and its potential applications to educational decision-making. This confusion mandates that any discussion of systems analysis considers the clarification and definition of a number of areas (1, p. 93).
I
Basic Forces

II
Antecedent Movement

III
Political Action

IV
Formal Enactment

Social, economic, political and technological forces, usually national and world-wide in scope.

Usually national in scope, such as reports by educational research groups and others.

By organizations usually inter-related at local and national levels, such as professional education groups, mass-media, etc.

May be at local and national levels, and through legislative and executive agencies.

Fig. 2--A flow chart for the educational policy-making process

One of the areas in need of clarification revolves around the definition of the work "system." Its meaning depends a great deal upon who uses it. Some speak of political systems, while others are concerned with educational systems, and still others with social systems or control systems. Many use the term to indicate their concern for complicated organizations comprising many interrelated parts. This places an imperative on the uses for a precise definition.

R. A. Johnson, et al., defined the systems concept and a system as follows:

A system is defined as an array of components designed to accomplish a particular objective according to plan. There are three significant points in this definition: (1) there is a design or an established arrangement of materials, energy, and information; (2) there is a purpose or objective which the system is designed to accomplish; and (3) inputs of materials, energy, and information are allocated according to plan (24, pp. 403-404).

Others view a system as a collection of interactive and interdependent components which focus on a cluster of objectives for all organized entities.

General systems theorists have established a distinction between open and closed systems. An open system is open to its environment. In other words, exchanges take place between an open system and its environment consisting of inputs and outputs as viewed from the system's frame of reference. However, this is not the case with closed systems which are not related to, or do not exchange matter with their environment. Further, a closed system is unstable in the long run, for it lacks the mechanism
to sense changes in the surrounding environment which have implications for the effectiveness of internal operations.

The general systems theory has been applied to educational administration. Daniel Griffiths, one of the leading theorists in educational administration, says that "systems theory deals only with open systems having the properties of systems in general" (20, p. 102). The following is Daniel Griffiths' summary of the open systems theory applied to educational administration:

1. Open systems exchange energy and information with their environment; that is, they have inputs and outputs.

2. Open systems tend to maintain themselves in steady states. A steady state is characterized by a constant ratio being maintained among the components of the system.

3. Open systems are self-regulating.

4. Open systems maintain their steady states, in part, through the dynamic interplay of subsystems operating as functional processes.

5. Open systems maintain their steady states, in part, through feedback processes.

6. Open systems display progressive segregation.

**Systems analysis approach to the study of policy-making.**—Donald R. Miller explains systems analysis as follows:

Systems analysis is a generalized and logical process for identifying and breaking down, into as many carefully distinguishable parts as possible, the structure, parts and interactions of a system (36, p. 14).
According to Miller's view, systems analysis can be construed as a logical process for analyzing the structure, parts and interactions of a system.

E. S. Quade justifies systems analysis as follows:

Systems analysis and operations research are successful aids to policy determination in areas where there is no accepted theoretical foundation precisely because they are designed to make systematic and efficient rather than haphazard and unguided use of judgement by specialists or experts in the fields of interest. The essence of their method is to construct a "model" appropriate to the problem; such a model introduces a precise structure and terminology that serve primarily as an effective means of communication, and, through feedback, helps the expert to arrive at a clear understanding of the subject matter and the problem (43, p. 153).

Some writers speak of systems analysis in terms of political systems. In a paper entitled "Political Systems Analysis in Educational Administration: Can the Emperor be Clothed?" (46), Gerald E. Sroufe asserted that systems analysis had introduced several studies, but it has yet to prove rewarding as a method of study. He did concede that the systems model could be used to suggest the larger canvas, the total picture of which one's study is but a piece. Also, it provides a way of ordering complex situations to make them manageable for analysis, and it generates questions about the actors in the system.

Laurence Iannaccone, in his book, Politics in Education (22), stated that the government of education is characterized by long periods of stability interspersed with shorter periods of abrupt change. He attributed this phasing to the closed-system form
of politics that does not generate alternatives to the policies advanced by educators.

In view of the preceding statements, the term "systems analysis" can be construed, and is defined in this study, as a logical and scientific process for analyzing the structure and interactions of a system.

**Systems framework for analysis.**—The potential value of systems analysis for the study of policy-making in education has been discussed in the previous subsection. It is important to recall that systems analysis offers a useful framework for examining the processes and dynamic behavior of educational policy-making.

One coherent and distinctive influence on research activity regarding policy-making today is the application of systems analysis models. If we are to provide the intellectual framework for studying and analyzing educational policies, we need to develop a model to represent the organizational structure and social interactions of the educational system. A systems model is a theory describing the structure and interrelationships of a system.

John Thompson (47), in discussing educational policy-making, pointed out the major factors influencing educational policies as follows:

**Major educational policies must be made regarding who will attend schools, what will be taught and who will teach, and how will education be financed. How these questions are answered depends upon the interaction of a host of economic, cultural, social, psychological, and political variables (47, p. 26).**
Further, he mentioned that "by use of a system model the dynamic processes of educational policy-making can be studied for the purpose of analyzing the numerous factors influencing activities of the educational system" (47, p. 42).

Ira Sharkansky (45), developed a systems model which shows the important features of the policy-making process and the relationships that make each feature important for the others. According to Sharkansky, the important features of the policy processes are considered as part of an input-conversion-output process. The systems framework includes: (1) the environment that both stimulates participants in the educational system and receives the product of the system; (2) the inputs that carry stimuli from the environment to the participants; (3) the outputs of the system that affect the environment; (4) the conversion processes that transform (convert) inputs into outputs; and (5) feedback that transmits the output of one period back to the conversion process as the inputs of a later time (45, p.4). All of these features interact with one another as outlined in Figure 3.

In order to examine the educational policy-making process in a systematic manner, we should be able to identify the individual components of the system and their interactions in the policy-making process. For the purpose of this type of study, information was collected about items that seem to function as conversion components, inputs, outputs, and feedback mechanisms. Sharkansky's model was applied to determine how these factors interact to produce the policy outputs of the Korean system.
INPUTS
ENVIRONMENT
INCLUDE:
(a) demands, (b) resources, and (c) support or opposition from citizens and officials of other branches of government

CONVERSION PROCESS

Withinputs include:
(a) structure, (b) procedures, and (c) participants, personal and professional experiences and predispositions

OUTPUTS
TO ENVIRONMENT
INCLUDE:
Goods and services which influence students, educational personnel and the public

Feedback: represents influence that outputs have upon the environment in a way that shapes subsequent inputs.

Environment includes: (a) clients (students and parents), (b) costs of goods and services, (c) members of the public and other governmental officials who support or oppose schools, administrators, or programs, (d) socio-economic conditions of the society, and (e) political organization and political culture of the society.

Fig. 3—The systems framework
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CHAPTER III
CURRENT EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION
IN THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Since her political liberation from Japanese colonial rule in 1945, the Republic of Korea has realized that education is the key that unlocks the door to modernization. In consequence, national enthusiasm for education has gained ever greater momentum.

Even though education in Korea has expanded phenomenally since she regained her independence, a sharp criticism among Korean educators is that the accelerated quantitative growth of Korean education has been achieved by a deterioration in the qualitative aspects of education (22, p. 1). The quality of education, therefore, has become a matter of great national concern at present. In order to resolve many problems facing education, continued efforts have been made by the Korean people themselves, but there are still a number of improvements yet to be made before a reasonable standard of education is attained.

Korean education is founded upon the democratic principle of granting every citizen equal educational opportunities regardless of differences in creed, sex, and socio-economic status. The current school system in Korea is organized in
accordance with the 6-3-3-4 pattern. It has been strongly influenced by many of the fundamental principles of democracy and the American educational system. Therefore, most patterns of educational administration are theoretically quite similar to those of the United States of America. However, in actual practice, there are many contradictions of the democratic process in school administration as a result of the social, cultural and political impact on the major educational policies.

This is perhaps understandable when we consider that democracy was transplanted to Korea by the United States Military Government in 1945 for the first time in her long history. The brief examination of Korean history has revealed that Korea had been under autocratic kingdoms and authoritarian aristocracy for thousands of years. In other words, traditionally, Korea had been indoctrinated with and accustomed to non-democratic ideology and systems for thousands of years until regaining her political independence from Japanese colonial rule in 1945. Consequently, it is understandable that there may occur confusion or contradiction between the new and the old system in educational administration in Korea.

The distinctive feature of the educational system in Korea is the extent of administrative control by the central government. In Korea, with a unitary form of government, the central government exercises direct control over the school system. By means of such a unitary form of governmental structure, it is possible to achieve a high degree of
standardization in schools. However, there is little or no room for independent decisions at the local level in order to meet the local needs.

The first section of this chapter examines the legal basis of current educational policies and attempts to develop an understanding of how those policies are being implemented within the domain of educational administration for the achievement of the educational goals in the Republic of Korea. The first section is conveniently divided into two areas: (1) the Constitution and its provisions for education, and (2) the fundamental aims and policies of education.

The last section of this chapter, educational administrative and finance systems, is divided into the following three areas: (1) the administrative system, (2) the school system, and (3) the educational finance system.

Legal Basis of Education

The Constitution and Its Provisions for Education

The Constitution of the Republic of Korea was adopted by the National Assembly on July 12, and was promulgated five days later on July 17, 1948. It was a lengthy document containing 10 chapters and 102 articles (21, p. 15). The Constitution that came into force on July 17, 1948, was a mixed one that attempted to combine both the presidential and cabinet systems. George M. McCune, in discussing the Constitution of the new Republic, states that "the Constitution of the new government
showed traces of both the principles of responsible parliamentary democracy and of the American concept of an independent executive" (15, p. 236).

Since its promulgation in 1948, the Constitution has been frequently revised in a direction which has led to the supremacy of the executive branch of government over the legislative and judicial branches (9, p. 19). As a result, the power of the President has been further strengthened.

The current Constitution, amended as of October 21, 1969, contains 5 chapters, 118 articles, and a rather long preamble. The preamble, in part, declared that:

We, the people of Korea, . . . now being engaged in the establishment of a new democratic Republic on the basis of ideals as manifested in the April 19th Righteous Uprising and the May 16th Revolution, determine:

To consolidate national unity through justice, humanity and fraternity,
To establish a democratic system of government eliminating outmoded social customs of all kinds,
To afford equal opportunities to every person, and to provide for the fullest development of the capacity of each individual in all fields of political, social and cultural life (10, p. 194).

As manifested in its preamble, the Constitution of the Republic of Korea was founded upon the basis of a democratic system of government. The general provisions in Chapter I make it clear that the Republic of Korea is a democratic and republican state. Article I states that:

1. The Republic of Korea shall be a democratic Republic.
2. The sovereignty of the Republic of Korea shall reside in the people from whom all state authority emanates (10, p. 195).
Based on this democratic principle, Korean education is founded in such a way as to grant every citizen equal educational opportunities according to ability, regardless of differences in religion, sex, social and economic status. This is clearly stated in Article 27 of the Constitution as follows:

1. All citizens shall have the right to receive an equal education correspondent to their abilities.
2. All citizens who have children under their protection shall be responsible for their elementary education.
3. Such compulsory education shall be free.
4. Independence and political neutrality of education shall be guaranteed.
5. Fundamental matter pertaining to the educational system and its operation shall be determined by law (10, p. 199).

As expressed in Article 27 of the Constitution, Korean education is founded upon the democratic principle which guarantees equal educational opportunity, respect of individual ability, and the autonomy of education.

**Educational Aims and Policies**

The major educational policies of the Republic of Korea are prescribed in her Constitution and Education Law. The fundamental policies of education in Korea are clearly spelled out in Article 27 of the Constitution presented in the previous subsection. Based on the spirit of the Constitution, the Education Law was promulgated by Law 86 on December 31, 1949 (2, p. 34). Since its promulgation in 1949, the Education Law has been revised fifteen times; however, its fundamental features have been sustained. There is no doubt that the Education Law has
been a guideline which has given direction to the development of Korean education for the past quarter century.

The current Education Law consists of 11 chapters and 167 articles, which primarily set forth the general character of the educational system in the Republic of Korea. The most significant provisions of this Law define the fundamental aims of Korean education and major policies to achieve those aims. These aims and major policies of Korean education are spelled out in the first chapter, which contains the chief part of the Education Law. The legal basis of the fundamental aims of Korean education is prescribed in Article 1 of the Education Law and stated as follows:

Education shall aim at, under the great ideal of hong-ig-in-gan (benefits for all mankind), assisting all people in perfecting individual capability, developing the ability for independent life, and acquiring citizenship qualifications needed to serve for the democratic development of the nation and for the realization of human co-prosperity (2, p. 34).

The ideal of hong-ig-in-gan (benefits for all mankind) was inherited from the time of the founding of Korea by Dan-gun. This ideal has been the guiding philosophy of the Korean nation through many centuries of the nation's history. The aim of education under this ideal is the improvement of character and citizenship necessary for the development of a democratic nation. As expressed in Article 1, the major aims of Korean education were established under the ideal of hong-ig-in-gan. However, according to many educators' views, this permitted a vagueness
in its practical application to the major goals of Korean education.

In order to achieve these aims, it was further decided to adopt the following seven specific educational objectives as the more concrete aims of education. These specific educational objectives are stated in Article 2 of the Education Law as follows:

1. Cultivation of knowledge and habits needed for the sound development and sustenance of body and of indomitable spirit.
2. Development of patriotic spirit for the preservation and enhancement of national independence and values for the cause of world peace.
3. Succession and development of national culture and contribution to the creation and growth of world culture.
4. Cultivation of truth-seeking spirit and of the abilities to think scientifically, act creatively, and live rationally.
5. Development of the love for freedom and of high respect for responsibilities necessary to lead well-harmonized community life with the spirit of faithfulness, cooperation, love and respect.
6. Development of aesthetic sensitivity to appreciate and create sublime arts, to enjoy the beauty of nature, and to utilize the leisure effectively for cheerful and harmonious life.
7. Cultivation of the spirits of thriftiness and diligence required to become an able producer and a wise consumer for sound economic life (2, p. 34).

It is noteworthy that the seven objectives of Korean education specified above comprehend seven phases of human life, namely health, politics, culture, intellectual life, social life, aesthetics and economic life.

Another noteworthy provision was the placing of emphasis on the development of individual potentiality. This provision is stated in Article 4 as follows:
The systems, facilities, curricula and methods of education shall always be developed on the basis of the principle which gives the respect for personality and high regard for the individuality of those who receive education so that each of them may develop his or her potentiality to the fullest extent (2, p. 34).

This provision set forth the principle which is directed toward bringing about the fullest possible development of each individual's potentiality according to his ability, interest and needs.

The Education Law provided that all educational institutions be supervised to a large degree by the national and local authorities. This provision was described in Article 6 as follows:

> The national and local authorities shall establish and maintain schools and other educational facilities and guide and supervise all educational institutions in accordance with the regulations provided in this and other laws (2, p. 34).

It is an evident fact that the national and local administrative authorities, based on this provision, have exercised their powers to a great extent by controlling and supervising their subordinate institutions rather than giving advice to them. As a result, autonomic activities of each local school have been greatly restricted. The problem caused by implementing this provision has become one of the controversial issues among professional educators at the present time.

The salient feature stated in the Education Law was the provision of compulsory and free education for all, at least for six years of elementary education. This provision is summed
up specifically in Articles 8 and 9 of the Education Law as follows:

Every person shall be entitled to receive an elementary school education of six years. The appropriate national and local government agencies shall establish and maintain schools necessary to provide the above mentioned elementary education, and the parents and guardians of children shall be responsible for their education.

In order to guarantee equal opportunity for education to all, each according to his ability, the national and local government agencies shall carry out the following measures:

1. School shall be distributed equitably in terms of locality and kind.
2. A system of scholarships and grants for school expenses shall be provided for talented but needy students.
3. Provision of evening classes, seasonal courses, part-time classes and other special measures shall be devised for education of employed people (2, pp. 34-35).

A further significant feature prescribed in the Education Law is the provision that assures the autonomy of education. This provision, specified in Article 14 of the Education Law, is summed up as follows:

The national and local government agencies shall set up organizations and carry out measures necessary and appropriate to secure the autonomy of education and to perform an educational administration with due respect to the prevailing public opinion (2, p. 35).

Despite the assurance of the autonomy of education specified in the Education Law, it is actually far from being realized. Since the present educational policy provides that all educational institutions be controlled and supervised to a great extent by the central government, the autonomy of education
can hardly be preserved under the current centralized educational system.

There is no question that the Education Law has played its significant role in developing Korean education for the past quarter century. However, there have been many problems in its operation. As many critics commented, the frequent revision of the educational policies described in the main educational law apparently reflects the lack of consistency and stability of the national educational policy. For instance, major policies such as the policy on the entrance-examination system, educational autonomy, teacher's education and curricula are those which have been revised frequently for the past two and a half decades (3, p. 211). It is evident that the frequent revisions of certain policies have brought a disturbance of educational administrative order.

Jong-chul Kim, in discussing the Korean Education Law, stated that "because of the lack of public consensus on the several policies such as the policy on educational autonomy, preliminary examination system for college entrance and teacher's education, there has been constant criticism" (6, p. 36). Based on his view, it is a quite necessary step of action to get the public consensus before any formal enactment. The brief examination of the development of educational policies in Korea has revealed that certain controversial policies have been formulated on the basis of policy-makers' bias or a few people's views (6, p. 36). It is, therefore, important to recall that
professionalism and the democratic process must be guaranteed in the process of policy-making for rational and effective policies.

Another problem is the gap between educational policy and its actual practice. Contrary to the policies stated in Chapter 1 of the Education Law, which are derived from democratic principles, the actual provision for the school administration provides that educational systems be controlled to a great extent by the central government officers. As a result, independent decisions or activities at the local level have been greatly restricted.

Another significant problem is the exploitation of the activities of pressure groups and partisan politics on education. Young-dae Yoo in discussing the weakness of Korean education laws, stated that "Korean education laws have no provisions for preventing pressure groups or political parties from dominating the Board of Education and from monopolizing the top-ranking administrative posts" (24, p. 5).

In order to keep political neutrality of education, first of all, political neutrality of the educational administrative system must be guaranteed. However, it is actually far from being realized under the current political system in the Republic of Korea. For instance, the Minister of Education, like other cabinet members, is appointed by the President upon the proposal of the Prime Minister without legislative confirmation. He is a political appointee, and his term in the office is therefore
at the discretion of the President (21, p. 158). On the other hand, the President himself is usually the head of a ruling political party under the current political system in the Republic of Korea. In view of the current political system, it is quite doubtful whether the Minister of Education can play his proper role in educational administration without being influenced by the activities of partisan politics. It is, therefore, an evident fact that assurance of the political neutrality of education largely depends upon the decisions made by the President.

The brief examination of the fundamental aims and policies of education in the Republic of Korea has revealed that some current educational aims and policies suffer from internal ambiguity and mutual contradiction.

In order to resolve various problems which have occurred in the process of implementing the major educational policies and various provisions thereof, it is required that every effort be made on the part of the educational policy-makers in testing and verifying the feasibility and practicality of strategies for solving problems.

Educational Administrative and Finance Systems

Administrative System

The administrative control over education in the Republic of Korea is very different from that found in the United States of America. In Korea, with a unitary form of government, the
central government exercises direct control over the school system. Establishment and organization are under the authority of the Ministry of Education; all other aspects of education, such as curricula, school finance and school personnel policy, are determined by laws in the political arena.

The educational administration in Korea holds that "its ultimate objective is to evolve itself into a system which ensures neutrality and independence from political and other prejudices" (16, p. 41). The provision of the independence and political neutrality of education is clearly spelled out in Section 4, Article 27, of the Constitution (2, p. 25). Despite the Constitutional provision on the political neutrality of education, it is actually far from being realized under the current political system in the Republic of Korea.

The state authorities in educational administration are the President, the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Education. At the local level, subordinate to the central authority, provincial superintendents are directly responsible for the administration of local schools. Figure 4 illustrates the organization of educational administration.

The Ministry of Education.--The Ministry of Education is the chief agency of the central educational administration. The provision of the Government Organizing Law (Article 29) provided that the Ministry of Education is responsible for the matters on education, science, physical education, social education, and publication and copyrights (2, p. 82).
FIG. 4--Organization of educational administration

The Ministry consists of two offices (Planning and Management Office and Supervisor's Office), six bureaus (General Education, Higher Education, Science Education, Textbook Compilation, Social Education and Physical Education), and General Affairs Section. The Ministry also maintains the National Library, the National History Compilation Committee, the National Academy of Science, the National Academy of Arts, Central Audio-Visual Education Institute and Central Institute for Training of Educational Administration (17, pp. 6-9). Figure 5 illustrates the organization of the Ministry of Education.

The Central Board of Education.--The Central Board of Education was created for the purpose of deliberating on important questions of national policy on education. The Central Board of Education functions merely in an advisory capacity as prescribed in the Administrative Law. However, a resolution adopted by the Central Board of Education is not subject to revision or change by the Minister of Education. Thus, the Central Education Board is greatly influential in educational administration (12, p. 118).

A provision of the Education Law provides that the Central Board of Education shall be composed of prominent scholars and educational professionals recommended by each Special City Board of Education (Seoul and Pusan) and each Provincial Board of Education--one member each--and by the Minister of Education for a total of thirty. They are appointed by the President (16, pp. 41-42).
Fig. 5—Organization of Ministry of Education

The main function of the Central Board of Education is to study major educational policies and make recommendations to the President and the Minister of Education. Article 63 of the Education Law prescribes the matters to be deliberated by the Central Board of Education as follows:

1. Enactment or repeal of educational administrative law and regulations.
2. Important educational policies and measures.
4. Deliberation of budget.
5. Important administrative measures for educational public officials.
6. International cultural relations.
7. Requests and petitions from local education boards.
8. Other matters under its jurisdiction by law.
9. Other matters considered to be important (2, p. 38).

Since the revision of the provision on the Central Board of Education on December 16, 1963, by Law Number 1582, it is not composed yet (6, p. 35). In the meantime, many professional educators have advocated that the Central Board of Education should be composed soon in accordance with the Education Law in order to reflect public opinion on the educational policy and to get professional advice necessary for the educational policy-making process (8, p. 85).

In view of the principle of public participation and the necessity of the professional advice in the educational policy-making process, the educators' demands seemed to be quite right.

The Provincial Board of Education.--The Provincial Board of Education (including Seoul Special City and Pusan City)
consists of the Province Governor (chairman), the Superintendent, and five members elected by the Provincial Assembly. The Provincial Board of Education is legislative as well as executive organization (17, p. 9). However, they are intermediary policy-making bodies because they formulate policies based on the policies and regulations of higher authorities such as decrees of the President and Minister of Education. Therefore, they find themselves working within and restricted by the framework of national policy for education.

Each Provincial Board of Education is responsible for providing elementary and secondary schools in its area. Figure 6 illustrates the organization of the local educational administration.

The functions of the Provincial Board of Education specified in Article 24 of the Education Law are summed up as follows:

1. Enactment, amendment or repeal of regulations.
2. Establishment, abolition, operation or management of schools and other educational institutions.
3. Determination of school districts.
4. Provision of suitable school environment.
5. Adult education and other cultural activities.
6. Physical education at school and in the community.
7. Conservation and management of cultural assets, Hyang-Gyo and temples.
8. Contents of instruction.
9. Educational and cultural facilities, and teaching materials.
11. Acquisition and disposition of properties needed for education and arts.
Fig. 6—Organization of local educational administration

12. Levying of special taxes, fees, rents, or allotments for education and arts.
13. Basic assets and reserve funds for education and arts.
14. Debts or loans for education and arts.
15. Extra-budgetary responsibilities for education and arts.
17. Enactment, amendment or repeal of educational regulations.
18. Other matters under its jurisdiction as stipulated by laws and ordinances (2, p. 36).

According to Article 33 of the Education Law, the superintendents of each Provincial Board of Education (including two special city boards of education) are recommended by each Provincial Board of Education, one member each. They are then appointed by the President upon the proposal of the Minister of Education (2, p. 37).

There is a chief education officer in each city and county. The chief education officer is responsible for compulsory education in its administrative district under the supervision of the Provincial Board of Education (17, p. 9). The chief education officers of each city and county are recommended by the Superintendent of their Provincial Board of Education, and are appointed by the President upon the proposal of the Minister of Education (2, p. 37).

This brief examination of the educational administrative system in Korea has revealed that the central government exercises direct control over the educational system. The practical provision for educational administration provides that the school system be controlled and governed to a great extent by the
central government officers. As a result, independent decisions or activities at the local level have been greatly restricted. This is one of the critical problems in preserving educational autonomy.

Another problem in the administrative system is mainly due to a shortcoming of the educational personnel policy itself. The Education Law provides that the top-ranking administrative posts, such as those of superintendents and chief education officers, shall be appointed by the President on the proposal of the Minister of Education. It is an inescapable fact that the appointment of these top-ranking administrative posts are usually made in the political arena. As a result, the positions of higher educational status, such as those of superintendent and chief education officer in each city and county, have been mostly occupied by political appointees rather than carefully selected professional educators. There is a general agreement among educators that Korean education is suffering from a lack of educational leadership of those who have filled these higher educational positions. It is interesting to note that these strategic positions were often occupied by persons who were not professionally trained as educational administrators.

Don Adams, in discussing the problems of reconstruction in Korean education, made his statement as follows:

The positions of higher educational status such as those of school principal and school supervisor historically have not been identified with instructional
leadership. Principals, for example, act mainly as business managers and educationally are often strong advocates of the status quo (1, p. 32).

According to his statement, the lack of educational leadership is the critical problem in reconstructing Korean education. In order to meet this challenge, it is believed that the Ministry of Education must regulate specific requirements for becoming top-level school administrators, and develop a long-term program for the improvement of educational leadership.

School System

The current school system in the Republic of Korea is organized in accordance with the 6-3-3-4 pattern; a six-year elementary school, a three-year middle school, a three-year high school, and a four-year college and a graduate school. The Korean school system has been strongly influenced by many of the fundamental principles of democracy and the American educational system.

Article 81, Chapter 5 of the Education Law of the Republic of Korea prescribes that:

. . . the following schools shall be established to enable all citizens, irrespective of creed, sex, social or economic status, to have an equal educational opportunity according to one's ability.

1. Elementary, middle and high schools, and colleges and universities
2. Junior teacher's training colleges and teacher's colleges
3. Junior technical colleges and junior colleges
4. Trade and higher trade schools
5. Civic and higher civic schools
6. Special schools
7. Kindergartens
Fig. 7—School system

Figure 7 shows the current school system in the Republic of Korea. From Figure 7 it is obvious that the current system is far from being a completely single-track school system. For example, graduates of vocational high schools—agricultural, technical, commercial, and fisheries—like the modern schools in England and the German Realschule, are placed in a very disadvantageous position in competing with regular high school graduates at college examinations. However, graduates of these schools could go to either liberal arts colleges or vocational colleges. As remarked in the UNESCO Korean Survey (12, p. 122), the educational system of Korea bears some resemblance to the dual school system. But it is not a mere imitation of the British or German model; rather it has been an inevitable outgrowth of the situation in which Korea finds itself. Han Young Lim, a prominent native scholar, stated that "these are defects born of necessary adjustments of the school system to the realities of the nation" (4, pp. 377-378).

The most striking feature of Korean education since 1945 has been a tremendous quantitative growth. Even though education in Korea has expanded phenomenally since regaining her independence, there is a general agreement among Korean educators that the accelerated quantitative growth of Korean education has been achieved by a deterioration in the qualitative aspects of education (22, p. 1). The quality of education, therefore, has become a matter of great national concern. Tables I and II show the annual increase of schools and students by level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>1945(A)</th>
<th>1960(B)</th>
<th>1970(C)</th>
<th>1971(D)</th>
<th>D/A(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>4,496</td>
<td>5,961</td>
<td>6,085</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>1,794</td>
<td>1,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Technical College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Teachers' Training College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and University</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>6,292</td>
<td>8,585</td>
<td>8,911</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE II

**ANNUAL INCREASE OF STUDENTS BY SCHOOL LEVEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>1945(A)</th>
<th>1960(B)</th>
<th>1970(C)</th>
<th>1971(D)</th>
<th>D/A(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>1,366,024</td>
<td>3,621,267</td>
<td>5,749,301</td>
<td>5,807,488</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>83,514</td>
<td>276,108</td>
<td>590,382</td>
<td>647,180</td>
<td>2,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Technical College</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>23,440</td>
<td>27,864</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Teachers' Training College</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>12,190</td>
<td>12,535</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>4,889</td>
<td>4,907</td>
<td>4,009</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and University</td>
<td>7,819</td>
<td>92,930</td>
<td>146,414</td>
<td>155,369</td>
<td>1,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,457,357</td>
<td>4,538,758</td>
<td>7,845,442</td>
<td>8,183,946</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The breakdown of the schools at various levels, their nature and enrollment is shown as follows:

**Elementary education.**—Elementary education is compulsory in Korea. The compulsory educational system was formally established in June, 1950. After the Korean war a six-year program for developing compulsory education was formulated (4, p. 379). All citizens are entitled to a free elementary education. Article 8 of the Education Law reads:

> Every person is entitled to receive a six-year elementary education. The appropriate national and local governmental agencies shall establish and maintain schools necessary to provide the above mentioned elementary education, and the parents and guardians of children shall be responsible for their elementary education (2, pp. 34-35).

As indicated in the above provision, the central and local governmental authorities are charged with the responsibility of establishing and maintaining a sufficient number of schools to provide an elementary education for all children.

The objective of elementary education is to provide every child with the basic primary education essential to the national life. This provision is stated in Article 93 of the Education Law (2, p. 41). In order to achieve this aim, the following seven specific objectives were adopted as follows:

1. To build up ability to use and understand the mother tongue in everyday use.
2. To cultivate an understanding of the relations among the individual, the community and the state, and an understanding of past and present life of the local community and nation.
3. To train scientific observation of natural phenomena.
4. To develop sufficient mathematical ability for economic problems in everyday life.
5. To cultivate a proper concept of labor and good tastes in food, clothing, and housing.
6. To cultivate basic understandings and skills in music, art, and literature.
7. To teach the importance of health and hygiene and help develop sanitary habits (4, p. 379).

Despite various difficulties, substantial progress has been made in developing a compulsory educational system in the past two decades. According to the statistics compiled by the Ministry of Education, the number of pupils has increased four times over that of 1945. (See Table I.) At the same time, the attendance rate has steadily increased. In 1953 the ratio of enrolled pupils to the total school age population was 57.6 per cent while it was 97.5 per cent in 1972 (25, p. 80). As of 1972 the elementary schools numbered 6197 with a total enrollment of more than 5.8 million pupils, consisting of 97.5 per cent of the total school population in the country (20, pp. 66-67). In 1945, Korea had only 2834 elementary schools with a total enrollment of less than 1.4 million in both the north and south. (See Tables I and II.)

This increase in number is mainly due to the continued growth of the total school-age population, the application of the principle of equal educational opportunities and the normalization of compulsory education. Even though the numerical size has significantly increased, elementary education is still suffering from the shortage of teachers. Statistics show that the student-teacher ratio was about fifty-five to one in 1972 (20, pp. 40-41).
Secondary education.--Secondary education in Korea consists of three-year middle schools followed by three-year high schools. The high school (the second three-year course) program covers academic and vocational schools. The demand for secondary education increased tremendously and suddenly following the end of World War II, and the trend has continued. The demand was so great that providing sufficient facilities, supplying the appropriate number of teachers and maintaining a reasonably high standard in the rapidly expanding field was a constant challenge and a major problem. This problem still remains to a great extent at the present time.

Middle school.--The aim of education in the middle school is to continue the liberal and general education of the pupil upon the foundation laid by elementary education. The aim of the middle school, specified in Article 101 of the Education Law, is summed up as follows:

1. Extension of the objectives of the elementary school, including the knowledge and habits needed by a responsible member of society.
2. Teaching basic knowledges and skills common to all occupations and improving the ability of the student to choose a vocation suited to his individuality.
3. Improvement of the student's self-discipline, both in and out of school, and development of an even-handed critical ability.
4. Improvement of the student's physical well-being (2, p. 42).

The rapid expansion of institutions was even more pronounced in secondary education, whereas there were 165 middle and high schools with a combined enrollment of 83,514 students in 1945.
(See Tables I and II.) The Republic of Korea had 1,866 middle schools, with 1,686,363 students and 39,888 teachers in 1972. Of the total middle school graduates for the 1971 school year, 69.4 per cent advanced to high school (19, pp. 35 and 66).

The significant increase in the middle school population is mainly due to the factors that elementary education is free in principle, and that the competitive entrance examination for the middle schools was abolished. It is evident that these factors have greatly stimulated the people's desire for education. Until the abolishment of the middle school entrance examination system, various problems had occurred due to the highly competitive entrance examination. In order to resolve these problems the Ministry of Education, in July, 1968, took a revolutionary measure to replace the entrance examination by an allocation system beginning in the 1969 school year in Seoul, and the measure was put into effect throughout the country in 1971. The new system calls for middle schools to admit, without entrance examination, whatever applicants are selected and assigned to each school by the Middle School Entrance Management Council (17, pp. 17-19). The main purpose of the new allocation system was to equalize the educational standard of all middle schools.

High school.--The aim of education in the high school is to give advanced general and technical education on the basis of what was achieved in the middle school. This aim is specified in Article 105 of the Education Law as follows:
1. To improve and extend the results of middle school education in order to develop the character and technique needed by a responsible member of society.
2. To improve the student's capability to understand and to form judgements about the nation and society.
3. To improve the student's physical well-being and ability to plan and manage his own life (2, pp. 42-43).

The present status of high schools regarding students and teachers is shown in Table III.

**TABLE III**

**STATISTICS OF HIGH SCHOOLS AS OF NOVEMBER, 1972**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Students (A)</th>
<th>Teachers (B)</th>
<th>A/B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>369,508</td>
<td>11,536</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>360,275</td>
<td>12,970</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>729,783</td>
<td>24,506</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


According to the statistics reported by the Ministry of Education, there were 942 high schools with 729,783 students and 24,506 teachers in 1972. Out of 942 high schools, 403 were academic and 539 vocational. Vocational high schools have a total enrollment of 360,275 or 49.3 per cent of the total high school enrollment. The student ratio between the two types of high schools is almost one to one.
Vocational high schools are composed of agricultural, technical, commercial, home Economics, and fishery and marine

Higher education.--As in western nations, colleges and universities form the backbone of Korea's higher education. Higher educational institutions in the Republic of Korea consist of two-year junior colleges, four-year colleges or universities, and graduate schools.

The nature of education in junior colleges can be defined as an extension of the vocational education of high schools aimed at teaching semi-professional knowledge and skills for an occupation rather than academic knowledge in a specialized subject (25, pp. 82-83).

The four-year college or university is the final stage in the educational system, with an educational purpose of imparting deeper theories of the science and methods for application, and of cultivating the virtues of leadership. The aim of education in the college and university, specified in Article 108 of the Education Law, is summed up as follows:

The aim of education in the college or university is to teach and help to investigate deeper theories of learning and the vast and precise methods for their application which are necessary to national and world welfare, and to cultivate the virtue of leadership (2, p. 43).

According to Article 109 of the Education Law, a university comprises more than three colleges with a graduate school, and a college may set up a graduate school (2, p. 43).
Graduate schools are attached to most four-year colleges or universities, conferring master's and doctor's degrees. One of the salient features of higher education in Korea is the special graduate school system. Recently, special graduate schools such as a graduate school of business administration and a graduate school of education, have been established for the purpose of training experts in respective fields.

A college is free in the formation of its curriculum, which will be as flexible as the characteristics and circumstances of the college allow, but this curriculum must be approved by the Minister of Education. The present status of higher educational institutions in Korea is shown in Table IV.

TABLE IV

STATUS OF HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS
AS OF NOVEMBER, 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior Technical College</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25,066</td>
<td>1,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Vocational College</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7,938</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3,894</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Teacher's Training College</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12,713</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and University</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>163,932</td>
<td>8,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8,681</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>222,224</td>
<td>11,722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1945 there were altogether nineteen institutions of higher education with 7,819 students and 1,490 professors. (See Tables I and II.) Since then higher education in Korea has mushroomed. As shown in Table IV, there were a total of 215 higher educational institutions with 222,224 students and 11,722 professors in 1972. The Ministry of Education pointed out the main factors which have brought such a remarkable increase in enrollment in higher education as follows:

The reason why higher education population increased can be traced to the fact that before the liberation college education was extremely suppressed by the Japanese, while after the liberation the democratic educational system was adopted and the people's educational desire came to enjoy unrestricted opportunities (19, p. 101).

According to the interpretation made by the Ministry of Education, the remarkable increase in enrollment in higher education is mainly due to the fact that people can enjoy unrestricted educational opportunities under the democratic educational system since Korea regained her political liberation from Japan in 1945. Besides the above mentioned factor, it is evident that the growing desire of the people for more education and the continued growth of total population are also important factors which have affected the increasing numbers enrolled in higher education.

During an eight-year period, higher education population so rapidly increased that it showed serious problems such as disparately slow progress of quality education and over-manpower to the Korean nation. As an approach to resolving such a
serious problem, the Ministry of Education introduced the registration system for B. A. holders and the full number ordinance for colleges and universities in 1965; then followed the state qualifying examination for college and university entrance in 1969 for the double purpose of preventing unqualified high school graduates from entering colleges and of restraining reckless quantitative expansion of higher educational institutions (17, pp. 24-25).

Since the adoption of the state qualifying examination system, some progress has been made in decreasing higher education population. However, most problems still remain.

Teacher education.—There are two types of teacher training institutions in Korea—the two-year junior teacher's college for training elementary school teachers and the four-year college of education for prospective secondary school teachers.

The specific objectives of education for a junior teacher's college and a college of education specified in Article 119 of the Education Law are summed up as follows:

1. Improvement of the national character and competence with special emphasis on diligence, cooperation, and sound critical judgement.
2. Instruction in the theory and practical methods of national education.
3. Instruction in the professional devotion and philosophy of the teacher (2, p. 44).

Table V shows the increase of teachers by each foundation level. Using the year 1945 as the baseline (1945=100), the index of teacher increase (excluding North Korea) in 1971 was almost
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>1945(A)</th>
<th>1960(B)</th>
<th>1970(C)</th>
<th>1971(D)</th>
<th>D/A(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>19,729</td>
<td>62,207</td>
<td>101,095</td>
<td>103,756</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td>13,312</td>
<td>31,207</td>
<td>35,938</td>
<td>1,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Technical College</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,436</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Teachers' Training College</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and University</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>3,439</td>
<td>7,779</td>
<td>8,071</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24,438</td>
<td>89,286</td>
<td>161,993</td>
<td>172,456</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

seven times. By levels of schools, the secondary schools show
the largest increase--about eighteen times--followed by colleges
and elementary schools in descending order.

According to the survey conducted by the Ministry of Edu-
cation in 1972, there were 16 junior teacher's colleges with
797 faculty members and 12,713 students throughout the country
(20, pp. 66-67). Even if the number of elementary school
teachers has considerably increased in the past two and a half
decades, elementary education is still suffering from a chronic
shortage of teachers. Statistics show that the graduates of
junior teacher's colleges could meet 65.7 per cent of the total
annual demand of elementary school teachers in 1971 (19, p. 103).
To make up the shortage, the temporary teacher training insti-
tutes attached to all junior teacher's colleges are offering a
four-month course to the graduates of vocational high schools,
junior technical colleges and other higher educational institu-
tions. Upon completing the short-term training course, they
are appointed as semi-qualified elementary school teachers.

For the preparation of secondary school teachers there
exist three national colleges of education and nine private
colleges of education in Korea. Four of the twelve colleges of
education are independent, not belonging to any university
(17, p. 33). Elementary and/or secondary schools are attached
to colleges of education for the purposes of providing oppor-
tunities for practice teaching and for conducting experimental
research.
Secondary education is also suffering from a critical shortage of teachers. Even if the number of secondary school teachers has significantly increased during the past quarter century, the graduates of colleges of education could meet only 19.0 per cent of the total annual demand of the secondary school teachers in 1971 (19, p. 103). Since the secondary school teacher's certificate is awarded to even those graduates of regular colleges and universities who have successfully completed, in addition to their specification, the prescribed education courses, a considerable portion of the total demand of the secondary school teachers could be met by those graduates.

Apart from the critical shortage of both elementary and secondary school teachers, there is yet another problem posed by a considerable number of unqualified teachers. To help these teachers obtain the required qualifications, "the institutes for training teachers" at each level were established. The institutes for training elementary teachers are attached to the junior teacher's colleges, while the institutes for training secondary teachers are attached to the colleges of education respectively. These institutes offer unqualified teachers the full course of a junior teacher's college or college of education through summer and winter vacations and night sessions.

For the purpose of re-training school administrators and supervisors, there is an "Institute for Training of Educational Administration" attached to the College of Education, Seoul National University. The Institute offers a six-month in-service
education for the participants of the program. The main purpose of the Institute is to improve the professional quality of an educational leader in the field of educational administration. The Institute offers eighteen semester hours as required courses and two hours for an elective course. A diploma is awarded to those who have successfully completed the prescribed course work (13, pp. 223-225).

Despite this kind of recent effort for the professional growth of administrative and supervisory personnel, Korean education is still suffering from the lack of administrative leadership. This problem is mainly due to the weakness of the system of "promotion" in the educational administration area. For instance, the positions of higher educational status, such as those of superintendent, chief education officer, and principal, have frequently been filled by those who were not professionally trained in the educational administrative area. In other words, teachers who had only long teaching experience could become principals or chief education officers. They were trained in earlier periods and promoted through length of teaching service. It is an obvious fact that those who are not professionally trained can hardly perform an effective leadership role in determining the direction of the institution through selecting goals and establishing standards, organizing the institution, and assembling and allocating resources in the rapidly changing society. These are highly professional jobs to be performed by professionally trained school administrators.
It is, therefore, believed that there may be no need more urgent in the educational administration field today than the need for establishing specific programs for training the prospective school administrators in the Republic of Korea.

Educational Finance System

General structure.—The general structure of the educational finance system in Korea consists of three ingredients—budget formulation, review, and audit. At the central level, the principal agency for educational finance is the Ministry of Education which constructs the budget draft. The budget draft prepared by the Ministry of Education is reviewed and adjusted by the Economic Planning Board and the Ministry of Finance. Then the proposed budget must be submitted to the State Council for deliberation. Section 4, Article 84 of the Constitution provides that "proposed budgets shall be referred to the State Council for deliberation" (10, p. 209). This provision tells the important function of the State Council on educational finance. However, the final appropriation depends on the deliberation and decision of the National Assembly. Figure 8 illustrates the educational finance structure at the central government level.
At the provincial level, Special City or Provincial Boards of Education are mainly responsible for educational finance, and at the city and county levels financial responsibilities are borne by Education Offices. Special City or Provincial Boards of Education and Education Offices formulate budget drafts which are reviewed and approved by the Provincial Assemblies and the Municipal or County Councils, respectively (16, pp. 46-47). Figure 9 illustrates the local educational finance structure.
Fig. 9--Local educational finance structure


The auditing is carried out by the Board of Inspection, irrespective of administrative levels.

Chief sources of school finance.--The allocation of financial sources for the support of public education is a joint responsibility of the central, provincial, and municipal governments. Article 69 of the Education Law prescribed that the national treasury provides the sources for salaries paid to the elementary school teachers and for subsidies granted to school
districts whose revenues are insufficient to meet expenditures in accordance with the Financial Grant for Compulsory Education Law (2, p. 39). The Financial Grant for Compulsory Education Law was enacted on April 24, 1962, for the purpose of equalizing expenditures among school districts of nearly every city and county (7, p. 302). In this approach to the central government's support for public schools each city and county school district would receive the central government's financial support based upon its needs. When the Financial Grant for Compulsory Education Law is suggested, it is assumed that objective formulas can be developed to determine (1) the amount of money each city or county needs annually to provide suitable schooling for all public elementary school students, and (2) the amount of money each city or county should be expected to provide annually from its own sources for this purpose. The difference between these two sums for each city or county determines the amount of central governmental aid needed.

In the case of public secondary schools, according to Article 69 of the Education Law, one-half of the teachers' salaries is provided by the national treasury and the other half by the provincial government. However, all other expenses are met largely by tuition fees and other levies from the students. This means that such a heavy financial burden is placed on the parents that secondary education is not available to every student.
At the college level the financing of national and other public universities and colleges is primarily the burden of the national treasury. School tuition and entrance fees are collected from students, but they meet only 5 per cent of overall expenditures (4, p. 389). On the contrary, private colleges depend heavily on levies from students since average revenues of the foundations are very limited. It was reported that "90 per cent of the private college budget was secured by tuition, and only 10 per cent of it was provided by its foundation" (14, p. 62).

Recently, the Ministry of Education encouraged every foundation to take charge of 50 per cent of the total budget for its college operation so that the other half of it can be secured by student tuition (11, p. 53). However, it is still far from being realized at present.

Under these circumstances colleges and universities in the Republic of Korea have been depending on supporter associations. Consequently, this imposed a heavy financial burden on the part of students' parents. The revenue obtained through these supporter associations are used to raise salaries of professors and to expand facilities. Despite these efforts to provide the faculties with a minimum livelihood, salaries of most faculties were so low that most teachers had to have other sources of income. As a result, this unsatisfactory state has adversely affected the efficiency of teaching in higher education.
Chief revenue sources for local education. -- The total revenue for local education in 1971 was approximately $227,500,000. The major revenue sources for local educational expenditures are grants from the national treasury for compulsory education (72.8 per cent), rents and fees (12.3 per cent), and subsidies (6.3 per cent). A new legal provision was made in 1968 to set aside 11.55 per cent of the total domestic income taxes and admission fees for compulsory education (19, p. 107).

### TABLE VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Unit: Thousand won*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue from National Treasury</td>
<td>75,919,023.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Education Grants</td>
<td>3,788,395.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Grants for Compulsory Education</td>
<td>66,330,532.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies</td>
<td>5,800,096.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue from Local Finance</td>
<td>15,177,718.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Income</td>
<td>358,542.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents and Fees</td>
<td>11,201,562.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred In</td>
<td>3,051,173.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>566,441.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>91,096,741.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The official money exchange rate between U. S. dollars and Korean won was one to four hundred in 1971.

Source: Adapted from "Fy 71 Revenue and Expenditure of Local Education Budget," Statistic Year Book of Education, Ministry of Education, Republic of Korea, 1971, pp. 74-75.
Table VI illustrates the major revenue sources for local education in 1971. As shown in Table VI, the largest revenue source for local education is the financial grants for compulsory education, which came to occupy 72.8 per cent of the total revenue for local education.

**Total public expenditure for education.**—According to the statistics conducted by the Ministry of Education, the total national budget for the fiscal year 1971 amounted to 524.2 billion won, of which the Ministry of Education received 99.5 billion won, or 18.9 per cent of the total government budget, an increase of 21.0 billion over the previous year. Statistics show that 75.6 billion won, or 75.5 per cent of the total Ministry of Education budget in 1971, was spent for compulsory education (19, p. 107).

As shown in Figure 10, the share of education in the total national budget shows a tendency of continued increase except during the period of 1950 to 1954 due to the Korean War. In 1971 the Ministry of Education budget came to occupy 18.9 per cent of the total government budget, which is almost twice as large as it was in 1945.

In spite of the continued increase of educational finance, Korean education is still suffering from the shortage of financial resources to meet the financial demand for the rapidly increasing school population. It is true that many problems have occurred in securing financial resources for secondary and higher education, except the resources for compulsory
Fig. 10--Yearly ratios of MOE budgets to total government budgets

education. Since the financial demand of schools at various levels is anticipated to increase continuously, securing financial resources for future education will be one of the important issues of the educational policy of the Republic of Korea.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY-MAKING
IN THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Since the Republic of Korea is a highly centralized governmental system, most of the major educational policies are formulated by the central government structure and, in particular, by the Ministry of Education. During the two and a half decades since the establishment of the Republic of Korea in 1948, educational policies have been frequently revised by authoritarian means, disregarding public consensus. Major policies such as the entrance examination, organization of higher institutions, compulsory education, curricula and private schools are those which have been revised frequently in the past quarter century (4, p. 211).

Of the many educational policies, some have contributed to the development of Korean education. However, in certain cases policies have had to be revised or changed without having been implemented due to severe criticism from educators and lay people (9, p. 2). Some of the former policies did not coincide with the later decisions. As a consequence, the discrepancies brought disturbance of educational administrative order. The inconsistency and instability of educational policies apparently reflect one aspect of the weakness of educational policy-making.
in the Republic of Korea. It is, therefore, very important to examine what the major problems are in the educational policy-making process. Have the problems occurred as a result of mistakes made by educational policy-makers, or have they been due to the deficiencies of the educational policy-making processes? One approach to finding answers to this question is through a "systems analysis." "Systems analysis" is a relatively new methodological approach to examining the educational policy-making process. The 1960's may be remembered as the time in history when the systems concept began to be talked about with increasing frequency in educational decision-making (15, p. 539). Donald R. Miller explains systems analysis as follows:

"Systems analysis is a generalized and logical process for identifying and breaking down, into as many carefully distinguishable parts as possible, the structure, parts and interactions of a system (36, p. 14)."

According to Miller's view, systems analysis can be construed as a logical process for analyzing the structure, parts, and interactions of a system.

E. S. Quade justifies systems analysis as follows:

"Systems analysis and operations research are successful aids to policy determination in areas... where there is no accepted theoretical foundation precisely because they are designed to make systematic and efficient rather than haphazard and unguided use of judgement by specialists or experts in the fields of interest. The essence of their method is to construct a "model" appropriate to the problem; such a model...introduces a precise structure and terminology that serve primarily as an effective means of
communication, and, through feedback, helps the expert to arrive at a clear understanding of the subject matter and the problem (24, p. 153).

According to Frank W. Banghart, "the term systems analysis denotes a set of quantitative scientific tools available for analytic purposes" (1, p. 92).

In view of the above several writers' statements, the term "systems analysis" can be construed as a logical and scientific process for analyzing the structure and interactions of a system.

It is the major purpose of this chapter to analyze major forces which seem to play an important role in the educational policy-making process, and their interactions in the decision-making process through an application of systems analysis.

This chapter can conveniently be divided into the following three areas: (1) a systems framework for analysis of educational policy-making, (2) societal inputs on national educational policy, and (3) governmental with inputs on national educational policy.

Systems Framework for Analysis of Educational Policy-Making

The potential value of systems analysis for examining educational policy-making was discussed in Chapter II. It is important to recall that systems analysis offers a useful framework for examining the processes and dynamic behavior of educational policy-making.

One coherent and distinctive influence on research activity regarding policy-making today is the application of systems
analysis models. If we are to provide the intellectual framework for studying and analyzing educational policies, we next need to develop a model to represent the organizational structure and social interactions of the educational system. A systems model is a theory describing the structure and inter-relationships of a system. John Thompson, in discussing educational policy-making, stated that "by use of a systems model the dynamic processes of educational policy-making can be studied for the purpose of analyzing the numerous factors influencing activities of the educational system" (27, p. 42).

Ira Sharkansky (26) developed a systems model which shows the important features of the policy-making process and the relationship that make each feature important for the others. According to Sharkansky, the important features of the policy processes are considered as part of an input-conversion-output process. The systems framework (see Figure 3) include: (1) inputs from the environment, (2) conversion process, (3) outputs, and (4) feedback.

Inputs from the Environment

Inputs from the environment stimulate participants in the educational system and receive the product of the system. Environment includes: (1) clients (students and parents), (2) costs of goods and services, (3) members of the public and other governmental officials who support or oppose schools, and (4) socio-economic conditions and the political system of the society (26, p. 4).
Conversion Process

The conversion process transforms inputs into outputs. It is not only inputs that influence the actions of policymakers. Features of the conversion process itself affect their actions. These features are given a separate label in order to distinguish them from the inputs of the environment. Since they originate within the conversion process, they are called withinputs. Withinputs include: formal structures that are found within policy-making agencies; the procedures used by officials to make their decisions; and the participants' personal and professional experiences and predispositions (26, p. 7).

Outputs

The outputs include goods and services which influence students, educational personnel, and the public. The outputs carry the results of administrative action to the environment. As a result, the environment is affected by those outputs.

Feedback

Feedback transmits the outputs of one period back to the conversion process as the inputs of a later time. In other words, feedback represents the influence of earlier outputs upon the demands, resources, and support or opposition (i.e., inputs) which an educational system receives (26, pp. 4, 8). For instance, educational policies such as the policy on the middle school entrance examination system, the registration system for B. A. holders, and the state qualifying examination
for college entrance, directly affect citizens' satisfactions or dissatisfactions and thus shape the demands they make. Feedback mechanisms are evident in the continuity of interactions among participants in the policy-making process and the many sources of their inputs and the recipients of their outputs. For example, students, parents and educational personnel are seldom satisfied. Some always ask for more. They may demand improvement of existing educational services, expansion of the magnitude of services to provide for an increased school population, and the expansion of the scope of the educational program to provide for certain needs which are left unmet by present activities.

A system such as this is a useful framework for identifying individual items; it focuses attention not only on a simple description of discrete parts, but on the importance and relationship of these parts to one another.

The systems framework developed by Sharkansky can be a useful systems model for understanding the important overall features of the educational policy-making process and their interactions in the decision-making process in the Republic of Korea. This type of conceptual framework is, of course, not a fixed set of actors and activities. However, we can use Sharkansky's framework as a guide for devising a systems model to include the actions of public policy-makers, as well as all the principal interest groups that involve themselves in the processes of educational policy-making in Korea.
In order to identify the main actors involved in the educational policy-making processes in the Republic of Korea, and to examine their interactions in the national educational system, a systems model was developed by the writer of this study. As illustrated in Figure 11, the systems model shows various parties interacting in the social system. For the purpose of understanding the relationship between the Ministry of Education and major actors participating in the educational policy-making process, the actions of the actors in the processes of policy-making are described as follows:

1. Direct: Higher authority's commands to its subordinate for the purpose of restricting the latter's decision.
2. Demand: Requests from other administrative agencies and civil organizations to restrict the other party's decision.
3. Report: Giving information on his party's decision to the other party.
4. Advise: Opinion given to the other party regarding what to do.
5. Providing Materials: Providing research results obtained by means of professional knowledge and empirical studies on the specific case.
6. Arousing Public Opinion: Arousing the opinion of the people on the specific case, as a force in determining social conduct.
Fig. 11—Systems model: inputs and withinputs on the National educational system.
It is obvious that a number of groups and individuals with varying responsibility and influence shape the policies that determine the course of national education in the Republic of Korea. Some are legal entities clothed with either implied or specific powers, and others are extralegal or informal in nature, deriving their status from the values and customs of self-government.

William L. Pharis, et al., in discussing "the decision-making structure for education," clarified the meaning of the terms--"legal and "extralegal" structures. According to Pharis, "the legal organization consists of formal government bodies and officials at central and local levels who exercise constitutional, statutory and judicial authority in regard to education" (23, p. 11). The structure of the formal governmental bodies, and officials who exercise their authorities in policy-making for education, are regarded as governmental withinputs.

The extralegal or informal structure is composed of those persons, groups, and organizations which are not part of the formal, legal organization, but which do have sufficient impact on the legal framework to influence its decision-making process (23, p. 11). Those components of the extralegal structure are regarded as societal inputs on national educational policy-making.

These classes group the various parties conveniently for analysis. The formal (legal) and the informal (extralegal) are suitable concepts for dividing all parties into two broad categories. As illustrated in Figure 11, major parties participating
in national educational policy-making, can be classified as follows:

**Legal Structure**

A. Educational Agents
   1. Ministry of Education
   2. Two Special City Boards of Education, and nine Provincial Boards of Education
   3. 169 Education Offices

B. General Governmental Agents
   1. President
   2. Prime Minister
   3. State Council and Vice Minister's Council
   4. Education and Public Information Committee, National Assembly
   5. Other Administrative Agencies
   6. Presidential Secretariat
   7. Economic and Scientific Council

**Extralegal Structure**

A. Professional Groups
   1. Korean Federation of Education Associations
   2. Private School Foundation Association

B. Teaching Profession's Meetings
   1. College and University Presidents' Meeting
   2. Seoul Secondary School Principals' Meeting
   3. Seoul Elementary School Principals' Meeting

C. Educational Research Groups
   1. Central Education Research Institute (CERI)
   2. Korean Educational Development Institute
   3. Korean Institute for Research in Behavioral Sciences (KIRBS)

D. Political Parties
   1. Democratic Republican Party
   2. New Democratic Party

E. Social Groups
   1. Korean Mothers' Association
   2. College Students
   3. Social Purification Committee
   4. Sae Sark Whai
The parties listed above are generally regarded as major forces affecting educational policy-making in Korea. As illustrated in the above list, the central government has several agencies with some kind of responsibility for educational policy-making. In addition, numerous extralegal parties exercise their influences on educational decision-making. No effort was made to examine the roles of all those parties. However, the remaining part of this chapter attempts to examine the major societal inputs and governmental withinputs placed upon the national educational policy-making system in Korea.

Societal Inputs on the National Educational Policy

The inputs from an environment include such items as the demands from the clients to receive the services (students and parents), costs of goods and services, members of the public who support or oppose schools, administrators or educational programs, socio-economic conditions of the society, and political organization and political culture of the society (26, p. 4). These environmental factors influence the kind of policy decisions which officials make. It is the purpose of this section to examine selected aspects of societal inputs on the national educational system.

Environmental Factors Affecting Educational Policy

Dramatic societal changes in recent years have caused increasing concern over education. Environmental changes, such
as the technological revolution, energy crisis, population
growth, poverty, sky-rocketing prices of commodities, a large
number of unemployed and urbanization have made educational
policies more important in the solution of national problems.
Educational policies today, as never before, vitally affect the
nation's goal of socio-economic progress toward modernization.
As a result, education has become a major public issue. Deci-
sions about schools are debated more and more in the national
political arena. Accordingly, the political system of the edu-
cational government is required to make choices concerning edu-
cational policy from among the different courses of action that
are available. The national educational policy is greatly
affected by political, social, cultural, and economic factors
in the country.

Thompson, in discussing educational policy-making, stated
that decisions on major educational policy questions, such as
who will attend school, what will be taught, who will teach, and
how education will be financed, depend upon a host of economic,
cultural, social, and political factors (27, p. 26). These are
the major factors which influence educational policies in any
society. Differences in societal conditions or changes in one
or more of the variables will result in different educational
policies. Educational policy in Korea is no exception. It
has constantly been affected by such variables as social,
political, cultural, and economic factors. For instance, the
amount of schooling of the people of a country is significantly
related to the aspirations which that country holds for schools. Another instance is the relationship of the Korean national defense policy to the creation of the student defense corps. For another example, recent Korean government economic policy gave top priority to the development of industry. In order to meet the demand adequately, a greater emphasis was placed on the development of vocational and science education. These specific cases will justify that the basic social forces are the basis upon which public policy is made in the Republic of Korea.

**Inputs into the National Educational System**

Out of the pluralistic national environment arises numerous groups attempting to influence policies on education. The governmental policies on education affect many aspects of peoples' lives, including such matters as their economic and social position, the state of societal change, and public fiscal policies. Therefore, many groups attempt to influence the educational policies to advance their primary objectives, which may not be educational. As illustrated in Figure 11, there are numerous parties influencing the Korean educational policy. These groups can generally be classified into five categories as: (1) professional groups, (2) teaching profession's meetings, (3) educational research groups, (4) political parties, and (5) social groups. In this section, focus will be placed on the inputs of selected major groups.
Professional education groups.--Since the educational professionals are most vitally affected by educational policies, they organize on a nation-wide basis in an attempt to influence the governmental policies. There are several professional education groups, such as the Korean Federation of Education Associations (hereafter referred to as the KFEA), Private School Foundation Association, Korean Private Secondary School Principals' Association, Korean Private School Teachers' Association, and the National Private Elementary School Principals' Association. (17, pp. 502-509). Out of those professional education groups, the most representative one is the KFEA.

The KFEA is the largest professional organization to exercise its powerful nation-wide influence on educational policies through its meetings and publications. Through their Federation, the Korean teachers work for a two-fold purpose: to improve the quality of education and welfare of children through raising the professional standards of teaching, and to promote the social, economic, and professional status of teachers through consolidating their professional unity (20, p. 127).

The Federation is composed of eleven regional education associations and a number of local associations at the city and county levels. The KFEA represents the entire teaching profession in Korea, and its memberships are open to all levels of school teachers and administrators from kindergartens to colleges and universities. According to the survey conducted by the KFEA
in 1971, its membership was 127,756. This was 74 per cent of all Korean teachers. The membership of elementary school teachers accounted for 73 per cent of the total membership, secondary teachers had 23 per cent, and college professors had only 5 per cent (17, p. 231).

The highest governing body of the Federation is the Assembly of Delegates, which meets once a year. The Assembly determines policies outlining the general program, establishes the budget, amends the KFEA Constitution and elects the board of directors. The delegates are elected in the proportion of one for each 300 members and an additional one for each 500 members. The Assembly is a means for Korean teachers to decide, through democratic processes, what they think about the issues and problems that affect their teaching and their jobs.

Between meetings of the Assembly of Delegates, the Board of Directors is charged with the general policies and major interests of the KFEA. The Executive Committee implements the matters entrusted to the Board of Directors (20, p. 129).

A number of KFEA proposals and suggestions with regard to the teachers' living standards have been successfully incorporated into government educational policies. The KFEA has also been successful in implementing a single salary schedule in elementary and secondary schools. In spite of its past achievements, the KFEA suffers from its internal weakness.

Jong-kwon Whang, in discussing "The Korean Teaching Profession and Its Organization," stated that despite its huge
membership, the KFEA suffers from an internal conflict between elementary and secondary groups, and pressures exerted by the high-ranking government officials. (28, p. 12).

There is no doubt that if the KFEA consolidates its internal unity, it will become the most powerful pressure group which can exercise its nation-wide influence on government educational policies.

Educational research groups.--The public policies for education are influenced not only by the inputs from professional groups, but also by the results of research related to educational policies conducted by educational research groups. There are three types of educational research institutes in Korea: autonomous institutes like the Central Education Research Institute, public institutes established by the provincial education authorities, and the educational research institutes attached to colleges and universities. There are several non-governmental independent institutes, forty local educational institutes, and six college and university educational research institutes (21, p. 38-41). For the purpose of identifying inputs on public policy-making for education in Korea, the activities of selected research groups will be considered here.

The Central Education Research Institute (CERI) is a non-governmental, independent institute. Since it was established in 1953, the CERI has carried out 190 research projects as of 1969. Out of them seventy-one were concerned with the improvement of educational administration and finance, eighty-four
with various aspects of formal education including faculty
development curriculum, and student guidance in higher ed-ucation. In addition to such research work, the CERI has also
been active for in-service training and educational publica-
tion (21, p. 38). Out of numerous research projects carried
out by the CERI, a substantial amount of research was con-
cerned with suggestions for the improvement of educational
policies. Important research projects by the Institute are:
(1) "A Study for the Improvement of Secondary Education" in
1962, (2) "A Study for the Improvement of Korean Vocational
Education" in 1966, (3) "A Comprehensive Study on the Curricula
of Higher Education" in 1967, and (4) "A Study for the Improve-
ment of Compulsory Education" in 1967 (17, p. 53).

The Korean Educational Development Institute (KEBI) was
established in 1972 for the purpose of studying the vital edu-
cational issues--such as "how to modernize Korean education,"
and "what type of educational system should be developed for
the accomplishment of this ultimate goal." These are the most
important educational issues with which Korean society is con-
fronted today.

According to the Don-A daily newspaper dated April 16,
1973, the KEBI is composed of sixty educational professionalists,
including college professors, prominent scholars, and school
administrators. The primary functions of the Institute are:
(1) to establish new goals or objectives of Korean education,
and (2) to reflect these objectives into the curriculum of each
school at various levels. Under the cooperation of the Ministry of Education, the KEDI has been conducting research through reviewing and analyzing the contents of current school curricula. The long-term comprehensive educational program is also under study. It was reported that some research results carried out by the Institute have already been reflected in the major educational policies in Korea. It is hoped that the research results by the KEDI will contribute to the innovation of Korean education.

Political parties.—Political parties also exercise significant influences on the educational policies.

Korea has yet to develop a stable and meaningful political party system. In 1947, the American Military Government in Korea reported that there were 344 political parties and groups registered with it (16, p. 18). But none of them has been able to maintain its existence consistently. The present ruling Democratic Republican Party which came into existence in 1963, is, in fact, the oldest surviving party. This phenomenon indicates the extreme instability of Korean parties, as well as the extreme fragmentation of its political elites. In an effort to end this instability and fragmentation of parties, the Constitution, the political party law, and the election laws of the Third Republic contain a list of extreme provisions to foster the stability of party politics. But the chaos of party politics is still evident (11, p. 24).
The party system in Korea is aptly called the "one and a half party system." There has been a perpetual imbalance of power between the ruling party and the opposition. This imbalance has been sometimes artificially created and maintained by the ruling party through procedures and means that the opposition regards as illegitimate and unlawful (11, p. 294). As a result, the outcome of political contests has always been in favor of the ruling party.

The ruling party exercises its significant influence on the educational policies. In his report on the "General Characteristics of the Formal Educational System in South Korea," S. R. Grank pointed out that the Democratic Republican Party (the ruling party at present), is one of the important parties affecting educational policy-making in Korea (3, p. 10). When the educational policy does not coincide with its party policy, it tries to enforce its policy in the field of education. In some cases, the Minister of Education is forced to change his policy due to the heavy pressure exerted by the ruling party. Furthermore, the Education Minister has sometimes been replaced as a last resort to change educational policies.

In light of the ruling party's power and its influence on the educational policies, it might be necessary for the educational policy-maker to enlist the support and confidence of the ruling political elites before making his decision on the important educational matters.
Students.--Out of various parties involved in educational politics at the central governmental level, college students are at times influential in shaping government policies on education. Since they are vitally affected by educational policies, they have expressed their sensitivities to the policy issues over the past decade.

Korean college students today are one of the most potent political forces in the Republic of Korea, for they have repeatedly proved their ability to act as a notable pressure group attempting to exert their influences on the government policies, although their involvement with political activities has been motivated by varying factors at different times (11, p. 278). They have neither a national organization to coordinate and sustain their actions nor a coherent program to challenge the government. However, they have repeatedly proved their potential to act spontaneously as a cohesive force.

Despite the restrictions and penalties set by the government and school authorities, college students have exercised their collective powers whenever they were deeply discontent with government policies as well as educational policies. They assert that legal authorities have been unresponsive to their demands. Therefore, as a last resort to accomplish their demands, they attempt to force their way into the policy-making structure through the use of militant action. However, instead of trying to solve the basic causes of their unrest with sincerity, the legal authorities have taken the severest measures
to suppress students whenever a student demonstration has taken place (3, p. 22). This is the critical problem with which both legal authorities and college students are faced today.

Other groups affecting educational policies.--Besides the groups listed in the previous section, there are several other groups attempting to influence educational policies. Those parties include parents' groups, interest groups, higher educational institutions, and mass media. These groups seek to advance their own primary goals through governmental policies on education.

Parent groups are at times influential in shaping educational policies. But normally it is only when an educational crisis breaks out that parents play the game of politics for real. In these instances, parents often form ad hoc groups to apply pressure at key points in the central government.

Interest groups such as book companies and consultant firms, also attempt to exercise their influence on the government policies in education. Economic gain motivates those groups which have an obvious stake in the central government policies.

Higher educational institutions are influential in shaping educational policies regarding such issues as organization of higher institutions and establishment of requirements for accreditations.
The mass media—including newspapers, popular journals, radio, and television—have their own influence on educational policies. First, they provide information about educational policy issues. Secondly, they help shape the agenda of public debate by emphasizing some issues and making them more important than others.

For whatever reason, it is evident that many groups are involved in educational politics at the central government level. These extralegal influences may be of little consequence particularly under the authoritarian policy-making governmental system. However, it is very important to recall that the formal policy-making process would be severely handicapped if some means were not available for policy-makers to determine what their public believes about any policy issue.

Informal influences in the policy-making structure. The previously discussed groups are formally organized so that the observer can identify their influences on educational policy without much difficulty. However, it is very difficult to identify informal influences in the policy-making structure that are not formally organized and that exert their influence through an informal network. Commonly, such influence is called the "power structure." More accurately, the power structure includes all those elements that have the power to influence decisions (23, p. 25).
Many formal decisions by the President, the State Council, and the Ministry of Education are based on informal agreements with influential persons whom the general public may or may not know. Even if the persons are known, their actions and agreements—the processes by which their influence is exerted—are virtually invisible to outsiders. Today many people have come to believe that all governmental decisions are controlled by a few power-holders, and that the people exert little influence in the policy-making structure.

The influence of informal power figures in the Korean society should neither be over-emphasized or under-emphasized. Instead, such influence should be appraised realistically in a specific situation.

Governmental Inputs on the National Educational Policy

National educational policies are not influenced only by the inputs from individuals and groups. Inputs, that is the structure, procedures, and personalities of the central governmental office holders are major factors affecting public policy-making for education in the Republic of Korea.

Educational policy-making at the central level in Korea necessarily utilizes the existing structure of the government. The President, chief executive branch, the State Council, the National Assembly, and the Ministry of Education have important roles to play in the decisions affecting educational policies. In Figure 12 various institutional parties involved in educational
Fig. 12—Interaction between formal decision-makers in educational policy-making at the central government level.
policy-making are represented by smaller circles within a larger central government circle. Interactions between these institutional parties (i.e., the President, the State Council, the National Assembly, the Ministry of Education, and other central administrative agencies) are shown by arrows connecting the various circles. The structural organization of the central government, the influences of the institutional parties, the formal rules of the system, the interaction between various parts of the central governmental organization, and personalities of the governmental officials will be considered here.

Let us look at the structural organization of the central government first. The central government is composed of a number of boards, ministries, and offices, each comprising a prescribed number of bureaus and sections as well as secretariats. Thus there are, in the central government, fourteen ministries including the Ministry of Education and various agencies responsible directly to the President (Central Intelligence Agency, Board of Inspection, etc.) (20, pp. 30-32). The hierarchical component in the central government is evident in the organizational chart that is shown in Figure 13.

**The Presidency**

One of the most important determinants in the development of the central government level policy, whether related to education or any other area, is the President.

The President of the Republic of Korea has traditionally been regarded as strong. In his Constitutional grants of
Fig. 13—Organization of the Republic of Korea Government

Source: Adapted from "Organization of the Republic of Korea Government," Education in Korea, Seoul, Korea, Ministry of Education, 1966, p. 31
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authority, the President is the center of power around which all important governmental and political functions and activities revolve.

The President is the chief executive of the state and the chairman of the State Council--the highest executive policymaking body. He is also the supreme commander of the National Armed Forces. The President exercises a wide range of appointive and dismissal powers. He appoints the Prime Minister without the National Assembly's concurrence. Members of the State Council, including the Minister of Education, are similarly appointed by the President upon the proposal of the Prime Minister, who may also recommend their removal to the President (22, p. 158). The President also appoints ambassadors, heads of government agencies, judges of the Supreme Court, provincial governors, and other senior public officials in accordance with provisions of the Constitution and the National Public Officials Law.

The current Constitution permits the executive branch the power not only to submit a bill, but also to veto it. Article 48 of the Constitution provides that "bills may be introduced by members of the National Assembly or by the executive branch" (13, p. 202). However, the executive branch usually drafts the bill to be introduced in the legislature. Any bill sponsored by the Administration must be forwarded to the Office of Legislation, a subcabinet office, for legal review. It is then subjected to a process of coordination among various ministries
and agencies, whose views and interests may not be compatible. Once a decision is made at the State Council meeting, the bill is submitted to the National Assembly as the Administration's policy for action (14, p. 100).

Gregory Henderson has pointed out that Koreans consider the government to be the administration, not the legislature or judiciary (8, p. 159). It is obvious that the tradition of strong leadership influenced the adoption of a Constitution which strengthens the Executive at the expense of the Legislature.

As the chief executive, the President is authorized by law to issue presidential decrees on education, and to appoint senior educational public officers such as those of presidents of national universities, superintendents of provincial boards of education, and chief education officers. Furthermore, as a chairman of the State Council, the President exercises his tremendous influence on public policy-making for education (10, p. 81). Under the strong presidential leadership, needless to say, it is the bureaucrats who draft and enforce the Presidential decree (executive order), not the members of the National Assembly. Consequently, they exercise a far greater influence in shaping governmental policy on education than the legislators.

Despite such a supreme power and authority given to the President by the Constitution, his decision-making is somewhat restricted by such factors as the limits of available time, limits of available resources, and limits of available information. Therefore, Presidential decision-making is influenced
to a certain extent by those individuals and groups who assist him. According to Dong-suh Bark's study on "the Policy-Making in the Korean Executive Branch," among those rendering assistance to the President in his decision-making are the "Blue House Office" (the chong wa dae--the presidential mansion in Korea where the president's secretarial and administrative staff is housed), the Executive Branch or the Cabinet, the Presidential Advisory Councils, political parties or the National Assembly, journalists, businessmen, and veteran politicians (2, pp. 33-34). Out of the advisory councils, the Economic and Scientific Council is the one providing assistance to the President in his decision-making, particularly on educational issues.

The State Council

Article 83 of the Constitution declares:

1. The State Council shall deliberate on important policies that fall within the power of the Executive.

2. The State Council shall be composed of the President, the Prime Minister, and the members of the State Council whose number shall be no more than twenty and no less than ten (13, p. 209).

As expressed in Article 83 of the Constitution, the State Council, of which the President is chairman, is composed of the Prime Minister and heads of Executive Ministries. It is the highest administrative organization of the Republic of Korea. The major function of the Council, stipulated in Article 86 of the Constitution, is to assist the chief executive in exercising
his administrative roles. The Council deliberates on important educational policies as well as other state affairs that fall within the scope of the power and responsibility of the executive (13, p. 209).

The salient feature of the State Council's function is its deliberation on the proposed budgets. Requests for appropriations from all central government agencies, including the Ministry of Education, must be submitted to the State Council for its deliberation before they are sent to the legislature for the final appropriation.

If there is any policy issue that needs coordination among various ministries and agencies, it must be referred to the Vice Minister's Council or the Economic Minister's Council before the issue is prepared for submission to the State Council. At the State Council meeting, the members use normal methods and tactics to build consensus among Council members.

In spite of such an important function of the State Council, as deliberating and coordinating various major national policies, their activities are so restricted due to limits of available time that decisions are frequently made superficially. Furthermore, each cabinet member is primarily interested in the affairs of his own ministry, and usually does not pay much attention to the affairs of other ministries (9, p. 93). In consequence, policy issues proposed by each minister could hardly be examined thoroughly at State Council meetings. It was also revealed that the educational policies which were referred to the State
Council have been generally passed without any trouble. However, when the policies regarding educational budgetary and personnel matters have been presented, there have been difficulties both in getting an advanced agreement of concerned authorities and in getting them through the State Council.

In order to enlist the support and coordination among concerned authorities, it is important that the Minister of Education himself should thoroughly prepare sound educational policy issues which relate directly to the national development, before submitting them to the State Council.

The National Assembly

The Constitution of the Republic of Korea vests in the National Assembly the "legislative power of the Government." Under the present Constitution, the unicameral National Assembly has the formal responsibility for enacting laws and appropriating the national budget. Members of the National Assembly are elected for a four-year term by direct, universal, equal, and secret vote of the people (14, p. 200).

The noteworthy function of the National Assembly is to deliberate on and enact all legislative bills regarding educational matters, as well as other state affairs proposed by the heads of all executive ministries including the Ministry of Education.

Usually the National Assembly confirms the Administration's bills, and very few amendments are offered and accepted during
legislative deliberation. Se-jin Kim, in discussing the roles of the National Assembly, explained that "this dependence is likely to increase with the complexity and technicality of the issues involved along the Legislators' remoteness from their ordinary experience" (14, p. 100). It is obvious that the Administration has its way in legislative matters, mainly because the National Assembly is under the control of the Administration's party, and partly because the members of the National Assembly lacks expertise in complex and technical matters. Consequently, the Administration can exercise its nearly unchallenged power in policy and law making.

Another important function of the National Assembly is to deliberate and decide upon the national budget. This provision is spelled out in Article 50 of the Constitution (13, p. 202). Based on this provision, the Assembly examines and approves the annual national budget including that of the Ministry of Education. However, the budget-making process is constitutionally set up so as to strengthen the power of the Administration. It is not the National Assembly, but the Administration that formulates an annual budget to be submitted for legislative scrutiny. The Constitution further weakens the power of the National Assembly by prohibiting it from increasing the sum of any expenditure or from creating a new one without the consent of the executive branch (13, p. 203). As a result, the professional civil servants play their significant roles in shaping the nation's largest appropriation.
Another salient function of the Assembly is to advise the President upon the removal of the Prime Minister or any cabinet member, including the Minister of Education (13, p. 204). Although the President is required to act on the National Assembly's recommendation for removal, he may refuse it, giving his "special reasons."

The Education and Public Information Committee of the National Assembly is mainly responsible for the issues of education and public information. As to the educational issues, the Committee not only makes important decisions with regard to legislation and appropriation for educational matters, but also oversees the administration of policies by the Ministry of Education. It is in this committee that the Administration's demands for legislative decisions regarding educational matters start their legislative journey, and to a large degree the action in the committee determines how they fare in the policy process.

The Minister of Education

Roles of the Minister.--The Minister of Education is the head of the Education Ministry, a chief educational policy-making agency in Korea. The Minister, like other cabinet members, is appointed by the President upon the proposal of the Prime Minister without legislative confirmation. He is a political appointee, and his term of office is likewise at the discretion of the President (22, p. 158). The Minister, as chief of the central
educational administration, is responsible not only for formu-
lating national educational policies, but also for supervising
educational administration. Among the powers given to the
Minister of Education are: (1) to issue educational decrees
and regulations, (2) to draw a draft of law bills or presi-
dential decrees pertaining to educational matters, and (3) to
supervise all subordinate organizations in educational
administration (10, pp. 89-90).

**Educational policies set forth by the successive Ministers of Education.**—The salient function of the Minister of Education
is to establish basic educational policies. These policies are
the guidelines for planning, programming, and budgeting national
educational affairs for a year, and also for establishing educa-
tional goals of subordinate educational authorities. Those
policies are formulated by the Minister of Education on a yearly
basis in accordance with the national goal to meet political and
social demands of the nation. It is an inescapable fact that
these policies have been frequently changed whenever replace-
ment of the Minister has occurred. The outlines of the major
policies set forth by the successive Ministers of Education are
as follows.

1. An, Ho-sang, the first Minister (August, 1948-May, 1950).
   a. Emphasis on democratic education toward nationalism
   b. Prevalence of "Il-min-chu-i" (principle of one nation).
2. Pai, George Nak-chun, the second Minister (May, 1950-October, 1952).
   a. Emphasis on education for the character development of the individual
   b. Encouragement of technical education
   c. Implementation of education for national defense
   d. Accomplishment of education for intellectual development.

3. Kim, Pub-im, the third Minister (October, 1952-April, 1954).
   a. Education for the reconstruction of the nation
   b. Innovation of education for strengthening of national defense
   c. Education for independence.

4. Lee, Sung-kun, the fourth Minister (April, 1954-June, 1956).
   a. Promotion of anti-communist education
   b. Improvement of the qualities of education
   c. Simplification of living.

5. Choe, Kwi-nam, the fifth Minister (June, 1954-November, 1957).
   a. Improvement of the qualities of education
   b. Encouragement of moral education.

6. Choe, Che-yu, the sixth Minister (November, 1957-April, 1960).
   a. Training for national spirit and democracy
   b. Emphasis on practicalism in educational administration
   c. Promotion of compulsory and scientific education
   d. Development of the national culture
   e. Strengthening of morals of staff and moral education.

   a. Achievement of morals of staff and moral education
   b. Emphasis on the independence and political neutrality of education.

   a. Enforcement of educational policies based on the spirit of revolution
b. Improvement of quality of education
  c. Reformation of national culture.

  a. Review of the school system
  b. Emphasis on the improvement of vocational education
  c. Emphasis on the education for Korean residents in Japan.

  a. Encouragement of anti-communist education
  b. Human Reformation
  c. Fighting against poverty
  d. Cultural Revolution.

  a. Encouragement of anti-communist education
  b. Human reformation
  c. Fighting against poverty
  d. Cultural Revolution

  a. Emphasis on moral education
  b. Encouragement of people's morals
  c. Enhancement of vocational education
  d. Emphasis on compulsory education.

  a. Emphasis on sound educational administration.

  a. Improvement of the quality of life for a democratic people
  b. Emphasis on science and vocational education
  c. Emphasis on the development of national culture.

15. Yoon, Chun-joo, the fifteenth Minister (May, 1964-August, 1965).
  a. Renovation of education for modernizing the nation
  b. Improvement of the quality of life for a democratic people
  c. Emphasis on science and vocational education.

(10, pp. 119-124).
This brief examination of the educational policies set forth by successive Ministers of Education reveals that the policies were influenced not only by the social, political, and economic situation of the national society, but also by personal and professional experiences of Ministers of Education. This specific case illustrates that inputs from environmental and governmental withinputs, such as personal and professional experiences of the policy-makers, are the major factors affecting educational policy-making.

Problems and limitations in educational policy-making by the Minister of Education.---Despite all his power vested by law, the Minister of Education has many limitations in his decision-making for education. One of the most critical factors restricting effective educational policy-making is largely due to the Minister's short serving term. According to the survey research conducted by Jin-un Kim, eight former Ministers of Education have taken similar positions that one of the most critical factors restricting their positions in formulating effective educational policies was their short service terms. Further, his study shows that the average serving term during the period of 1948 through 1965 was one year and two months. The longest term was two years and six months, while the shortest one was two weeks (the ninth Minister's term was terminated due to the May 16 Military Revolution) (9, pp. 50-53). There was a general agreement among the ex-ministers that they needed more time to carry out
their educational policies. Some of them expressed their views that it takes at least one year for them to become familiar with various functions and operations of each division within the Ministry.

It is obvious that the frequent replacement of individuals as the Minister of Education and the lack of consistency and stability of their policies thereof, have been major factors restricting rational and effective educational policy-making in the Republic of Korea.

Another limitation in his policy-making is the pressures by various groups. The Minister's position is plagued by pressures for personal favors from the National Assemblymen and other influential politicians, as well as by inadequate funds (2, pp. 62-63). In some cases, the Minister of Education has been forced to change his policy due to heavy pressures from various pressure groups. Furthermore, some former Ministers have been replaced as a last resort to change educational policies. As far as the individual Minister is concerned, he must enlist the support and confidence of ruling political elites; if he is to effectively lead his subordinates, he must be politically adept in dealing with the National Assembly, the press, political parties, and other ministries, and set forth clear policy guidelines to his subordinates; if he is to formulate effective educational policies, he must choose a democratic decision-making process through which public participation is available.
Another limitation in educational policy-making is mainly due to the lack of professional experience of ex-ministers, particularly in the educational administration area. According to the survey research conducted by the Central Education Research Institute (CERI), out of fifteen ex-ministers who served during the period of 1948 through 1965, there were four ministers who majored in philosophy, three in political science, two in history, and the remainder majored in law, science, medical science, education, English and military science respectively (9, p. 54). Since most former ministers were not professionally trained in the educational administration area, they were typically not too capable in playing their roles as chief decision-makers of the Ministry of Education. As a result, they had to rely heavily on their subordinates, and this placed a premium on the people whom they could trust.

Since their major fields were all different, we can see some differences among educational policies set forth by them. The policies most emphasized by five selected ex-ministers, and their educational backgrounds are as follows:

1. "Democratic education toward nationalism" and "il-min-chu-i" (principle of one nation) by An, Ho-sam, Ph.D., who was educated in Germany.
2. "Education for the character development of the individual" by Paik George, Ph.D., who was educated in the United States.
3. "Education for moral and material reconstruction" by Kim, Pub-in, who was educated in France and who was a buddhist monk.
4. "Anti-communist education" and "improvement of the quality of education" by Lee, Sung-kun, LL.D., who was educated in Japan.
Those educational policies, interestingly, seem to be correlated with their educational backgrounds and the national situation.

Finally, the limits of available time for the Minister's ministerial work is another factor restricting his educational decision-making. The Minister of Education should devote more time and energy to the affairs of his own Ministry and less to extra-ministerial affairs. According to a survey on the Minister's daily work schedule conducted by the Graduate School of Administration, Seoul National University (7, p. 5), the Minister spends an average of six hours a day in his office, of which about one-half is spent with guests, and less than two hours is spent examining and signing ministerial papers. The latter, moreover, is often postponed until after office hours. There is a clear need for a more equiptable distribution of his time.

Out of many limitations, the four factors listed above are considered to be the most critical limitations restricting rational and effective policy-making for education on the part of the Minister of Education.

The primary responsibility for improving educational policy-making clearly lies with the Minister of Education, who is the head of the educational policy-making agency in Korea. In order to achieve the goal for improvement of educational policy-making, the Minister himself should be adept in identifying the nature and dimensions of the problems in rational educational
policy-making, and should make every effort to test and verify the feasibility and practicality of solution methods and strategies through a cooperative process capitalizing upon professional advice from various groups.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


CHAPTER V

A CASE STUDY IN THE PROCESS OF POLICY-MAKING
AT THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENTAL LEVEL

Policy-makers in legal structure at the central level cope with the inputs from their environment and the withinputs existing in agencies by making decisions. As noted in the previous chapter, inputs are the stimuli from the environment of the national educational system which affect the decisions of educational policy-makers, and withinputs are stimuli that originate in the legal structures. Formal policy-maker's decisions are choices from among alternative courses of action, and they help to shape the outputs that the decision units produce (10, p. 35).

The conversion process whereby the inputs and withinputs are enacted into outputs of public policies might be conceived as a series of interactions between the actors in the policy-making process (9, pp. 40-42). First, groups articulating demands for change contact and interact with formal decision-makers. In these interactions, groups present their demands, inform and attempt to persuade the decision-makers of the rightness of their case, argue and apply influence, make compromises in an effort to shape public policy. Secondly, formal decision-makers interact with one another. Persuasion, pressures, and bargaining are aspects of these interactions.
This chapter attempts to examine the process whereby the inputs and withinputs are converted into public policy outputs. Particularly, focus will be placed on the interactions among formal decision-makers in the conversion process.

The dynamic behavior of educational policy-making at the central governmental level is studied by examining the process of policy-making regarding the issue of the revival of educational autonomy in Korea. Since the official records regarding the process of decision-making on the issue are not available, the writer used various sources from Kyu-taik Kim's research report on "Decision-Making in an Inter-Departmental Conflict: The Case of the Revival of an Educational Autonomy in Korea" (6). For the purpose of his case study, Kyu-taik Kim had interviews with twelve key persons who actually participated in the process of decision-making regarding the issue of the revival of an educational autonomy during the period of 1962 through 1963.

Background

The case of revival of an educational autonomy is the output of the Military Revolutionary Government's decision to revive an educational autonomy which was abrogated by the same government at the time of the 1961 military coup.

In May, 1961, when the Military Revolutionary Government came into power, the autonomous educational system that had been in operation for nearly ten years, since its first enactment in 1952, was disbanded along with other institutions
Mainly because of the relatively brief experiences in local autonomy, and partly because of the highly centralized Korean governmental system, the autonomous educational system was often made the target of political exploitation. As a result, many people regarded the autonomous educational system as a hotbed of political corruption and patronage.

Despite these critical views of educational autonomy, no one could deny the fact that the realization of educational autonomy was a necessary step toward the democratization of Korean society. In this respect, the Military Government's decision to revive an educational autonomy was one of major political significance. However, the necessity for such a system does not explain within itself why the Military Government made its decision to revive the system prior to the revival of the local autonomy. It is obvious that the primary motivation of the revival of an educational autonomy in 1963 was largely politically motivated.

The political elites of the Military Government realized that the restoration of local educational autonomy was imperative in order for the government to befriend the local school teachers in connection with the National Election in 1963. In his case study on the revival of educational autonomy, Kyu-taik Kim pointed out two major reasons why political motivations played such a significant role in the local educational system:
First is the vastness of educational administrative structure in terms of both the number of personnel involved and the influence wielded by them. This fact makes it one of the most potent organized forces, politically, in the nation. Second is that the question arouses emotions that have far-reaching effects on the nation's politics (6, p. 11).

In a traditional society like Korea, teachers hold relatively high positions in the social stratum. Confucian doctrine taught that teachers are to be respected as much as the monarch or the father. In terms of education and general level of intelligence, the teachers, especially in rural areas, occupy the position of opinion-makers. It is only natural for the politicians to try their best to bring these teachers on their side.

There is another political purpose that the Military Government intended to accomplish. It was the way in which the government could make the nation think well of it by making itself out as a champion of local educational autonomy. The government can tell the people that it vigorously supports local educational autonomy, which is the foundation of democracy, and that it cares about the integrity of the teaching position. It wants the people to think that it is working hard for the benefits of teachers and the people through a democratic process. In other words, the government wants to buy favorable public opinion in return for its support of local educational autonomy.

It is obvious that this approach had double merits. The government could induce the teachers to vote favorably in the coming National Election, as well as sell the public a very
democratic image of itself. This kind of appeasement approach was in fact adopted by the Military Government in restoring the educational autonomous system shortly before the National Election in the latter part of 1963.

Societal Inputs

Since the educational professionals were most vitally affected by the issue of educational autonomy, the Korean Federation of Education Associations (hereafter referred to as KFEA), the largest professional group in Korea, strongly supported the revival of educational autonomy and exercised their nation-wide influences through various activities such as holding public meetings, publishing pamphlets, and submitting recommendations or proposals to the legal authorities concerned. It is evident that KFEA played a significant role for the revival of educational autonomy.

It is interesting to note that the press, in particular, is very outspoken on this issue in favor of local educational autonomy (6, p. 14).

The policy issue on the revival of educational autonomy was supported, not only by the professional groups and the mass media, but also by the public. It was rather rare to see such a forceful public opinion backing up an administrative issue.

Considering such powerful societal inputs which might reflect their nation-wide influences on the National Election in the latter part of 1963, the Military Government took its
The Cause of Conflict

Despite such a forceful societal movement in favor of local educational autonomy, there was a conflict between two competing groups—the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Home Affairs—in the Executive Branch, which delayed the immediate restoration of the autonomous educational system.

As far as the formal aspect of educational autonomy goes, one might simply conclude that local educational autonomy is a matter solely within the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education. However, the local autonomous educational system is in reality a matter directly related to the issue of local self-government which is under the close supervision and control of the Ministry of Home Affairs.

This problem, in its concrete manifestation, forms the basis of a conflict between the two ministries in the central government. The factors contributing to the conflict are two-fold: first, Korea lacks a tradition of local self-government, of which educational autonomy is only a part; second, as a consequence, educational autonomy becomes a prize in the jurisdictional disputes between the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Home Affairs (6, p. 15).

As for the first cause of the conflict, the position of the Ministry of Home Affairs is that educational autonomy should be a part of local self-government in general. But
those who disagreed with this view criticized it on the grounds that the position of the Ministry of Home Affairs can be tenable only when there is a genuinely functioning and mature self-government in the local area. As long as the local self-government remains in the hands of the bureaucrats of the Home Ministry, the argument is only a subterfuge to perpetuate their control over local educational autonomy. Further, they asserted that if educational autonomy is left as a part of local self-government, it will forever remain subject to control and interference by the bureaucrats of the Home Ministry.

But the realistic cause of conflict was the inability of the local self-governments to maintain their independence from the central control mainly due to the lack of local financial resources. Since the local self-governments had to rely heavily on the subsidies of the central government, it was impossible to postulate the autonomy of local governments.

On the other hand, the Ministry of Education took its position that an educational autonomous system should be operated within its jurisdiction. However, it was by no means an improvement on the situation as far as the principle of local authority is concerned. Certainly, it meant the centralized control by the Ministry of Education's hierarchy (12, p. 20).

Nevertheless, the educators considered this to be the lesser of the two evils. Under the circumstances, they knew that genuine local self-government in education was not possible. Since national control and intervention were inevitable, they preferred
for it to come from the Ministry of Education rather from the Home Ministry. They believed that the Ministry of Education would understand the problems of local educators (6, p. 18).

As a result, a power conflict developed between the two hierarchies of the Home and Education Ministries. If it were possible for the Korean people to have a genuine local self-government, this kind of jurisdictional dispute between the two ministries of the Executive branch would not have arisen.

According to Kyu-taik Kim's study, the direct sources of conflict between the two competing ministries were caused by their interests in controlling fiscal affairs and appointing the educational personnel involved in the educational autonomous system (6, pp. 18-19). Certainly the amount of money appropriated for educational purposes takes up more than 50 per cent of the total budget of local governments, and if the local governments were to lose their revenue for educational purposes, nothing would be left for them to function on.

It may be necessary here to make clear the position of the KFEA in this interdepartmental conflict. For the revival of the educational autonomy, it worked cooperatively with the Ministry of Education. However, the objectives of the Federation were not identical with those of the Ministry of Education. The Federation rejected centralized control by the Home Ministry (1, pp. 31 and 33). At the same time, it also wanted to be free from centralized control by the Ministry of Education hierarchy. Despite the differences of their views on an educational autonomous
system, the Federation and the Ministry of Education worked cooperatively for the revival of the system by exchanging information and materials. As a consequence, the Federation and the Ministry of Education became a common foe of the Home Ministry.

Decision-Making Process: Conversion Process

Until its adoption in October, 1963, the Military Government's decision to revive educational autonomy in Korea had gone through a series of decisional phases which can be broken down into the following three stages: (1) initial stage, (2) negotiation stage, and (3) decision stage.

Initial Stage

Chung-hee Park, Chairman of the Supreme Council for the National Reconstruction (hereafter referred to as SCNR), delivered his public speech on educational autonomy before the KFEA Conference held at Citizen's Hall in Seoul on November 12, 1962. In his speech, Chairman Park make the following statement:

I am of the opinion that educational neutrality and independence must be established at the earliest date possible. Unlike the past regimes which paid only lip service to the principle of educational autonomy and neutrality, the Revolutionary Government, under my instruction, is working out a concrete plan for its realization in the near future. . . . After the military revolution, the educational autonomous system temporarily stopped functioning, largely due to the government policy to integrate all local administrative structures. But this was inevitable in order to establish a genuine educational independence and neutrality based on a new ideology by eliminating all the evil elements which had impaired the satisfactory implementation of educational autonomy in Korea (6, p. 24).
In his statement Chairman Park pointed out that the temporary suspension of educational autonomy right after the Military Revolution was largely due to the governmental policy to integrate all local administrative structures. He promised the early revival of a sound educational autonomous system.

Chairman Park's statement was significant in view of the fact that it was the first official pronouncement on the issue of the revival of educational autonomy by the highest-ranking leader of the Military Government, which had previously abolished it by a decree in May, 1961.

This issue was one of the major concerns of the KFEA. The Federation announced a plan to set up educational autonomous organizations at special cities (Seoul and Pusan), counties, and rural city levels, and submitted the plan to the Ministry of Education and the SCNR Committee on Education and Social Affairs (6, p. 25). The degree of influence exerted by KFEA over the government was well reflected in Chairman Park's public address in which "an early revival of educational autonomy" was promised.

Apart from Chairman Park's personal involvement in the issue of the revival of educational autonomy, the members of the SCNR admitted the fact that the large number of educators scattered throughout the country was too powerful a political asset to be ignored, particularly in connection with the National referendum scheduled for December 7, 1962 (6, pp. 27-28). Thus, the fact that educational autonomy drew serious attention
from SCNR members during their deliberation on the proposed revised Constitution substantiates this point.

Meanwhile, the KFEA submitted a recommendation to the Drafting Committee of the Constitutional Revision proposing that the "guarantees for educational independence and neutrality" be inserted in the newly revised Constitution (7, p. 150). Later, the phrase "guarantee for educational independence and neutrality" became a powerful symbol for those who were actively engaged in the movement for the revival of educational autonomy. They also received the full support of local newspapers in their movement.

Mindful of the aspirations of the educators and public opinion which supported them, the SCNR decided on November 28, 1962, to set up a Committee for Review on Educational Policy. The primary purpose of the Committee was to make an overall review of educational policies adopted and implemented during the Military Government rule, and, if necessary, to propose recommendations concerning educational policies to Chairman Park. The Committee dealt specifically with the issue of the revival of educational autonomy (6, p. 29).

For the revival of educational autonomy, KFEA made frequent contacts with the Committee members in order to persuade them to adopt their proposal.

Within the Committee, the majority of the members were in favor of the revival of educational autonomy. Furthermore, the Committee was chaired by Col. Chung, se-ung, who was
generally in favor of the revival of educational autonomy. However, a strong opposition came from Mr. Shin Ki-suk, consultant to the SCNR Committee on Home Affairs. He opposed the proposal on the grounds that: (1) educational independence can be maintained under the existing framework of the educational system; (2) in principle, educational self-government must be incorporated into local self-government; (3) to enforce educational autonomy before reviving local autonomy is inconceivable. His view represented that of the Committee on Home Affairs (6, pp. 30-31).

Nevertheless, the Committee reached a consensus that in principle educational autonomy must be revived; further, at the final meeting of the Committee on December 21, it adopted the KFEA sponsored proposal and referred it to the Cabinet and Chairman Park for deliberation.

It is obvious that at the initial stage the KFEA and public opinion played a vital role in arousing the interest of Chairman Park and the high-ranking officials of the government, who, in turn, instructed the staff members of the two ministries concerned to hold a joint staff meeting in order to release conflicts between the interests of the two ministries.

**Negotiation Stage**

The negotiation stage covers the period between March 3 and August 31, 1963, during which time a series of meetings of officials of the two ministries were held to iron out their
different views on the issue of the revival of educational autonomy (6, pp. 34-35). While the negotiation was going on between the officials of the two ministries concerned, an informal group composed of six officials of the Ministry of Education was engaged in a series of discussions on the plan for the autonomous educational system. This group was formed under the instruction of the Minister of Education, who predicted that the issue of the revival of educational autonomy would come up soon in connection with the transfer of power over to the civilian government, which was widely talked about at that time. The major assignment of this informal group was to draw up the plans submitted by the Ministry of Education to the SCNR. After having several meetings, the group adopted two plans—plan A and plan B.

Plan A proposed the establishment of a board of education as a policy-making body at the provincial level. According to this plan, a complete separation between local government and educational administration was suggested.

Plan B provided for a provincial local assembly as an overall decision-making body and the board of education as a special executive organization in charge of educational matters. The meetings between representatives of the two competing ministries were held over eight times without reaching a solution.

At the briefing for Prime Minister Kim, the Ministry of Education proposed Plan A. However, the plan was strongly opposed by the Ministry of Home Affairs on the ground that
educational autonomy can be maintained within the existing framework of the local autonomous system. They asserted the principle of one self-government in one district. The Ministry of Education also challenged the Ministry of Home Affairs' position on the grounds that self-government is possible only in theory and, in the light of the realities of self-govern mental practices in local affairs, educational autonomy could hardly be preserved when it is integrated into the general local self-governemental framework (6, pp. 36-43).

Once Plan A was rejected by the Home Ministry, the Ministry of Education made a concession and reversed from the support of Plan A to the support of plan B at the successive staff members' meetings between the two competing groups.

Despite the concession of the Ministry of Education, they could not reach a solution through a series of negotiations. This indicates roughly an equal power equation of the two groups. Thus, the issue was finally referred to the two counterpart program committees within the SCNR in September, 1963.

During the period of negotiation stage, the KFEA continued to press the government to take action for the revival of educational autonomy. It was evident that the Federation acted as a strong external limitation on the conflict.

**Decision Stage**

An impetus to make the decision for the revival of educational autonomy was provided by Chairman Park when he instructed
Mr. Jong-chul Hong, then a member of the SCNR Committee on Education and Social Affairs, to take up the pending issue of educational autonomy with the SCNR (7, p. 161). Thus, the SCNR played a crucial role from September 10, 1963, until the issue's adoption on October 5, 1963.

Following Chairman Park's instruction, on September 15 the chairmen of the Committees on Education and Social Affairs and Home Affairs met and agreed to work out a solution of the issue on the revival of educational autonomy (6, p. 49). At this meeting of the chairmen of the two program committees the blueprint for educational autonomy began to take a definite step. From then on, until the 105th SCNR Standing Committee meeting on September 30, 1963, the Ministry of Education devoted its time to persuading members of the SCNR to accept Plan A. On the other hand, the Ministry of Home Affairs made every effort to block passage of the plan. In the meantime, the KFEA contacted and persuaded the Ministry of Education and the members of the SCNR Standing Committee (7, p. 162). The SCNR Committee on Social and Educational Affairs took up Plan A as proposed by the Ministry of Education first. Since the interdepartmental conflict was so complicated, there was no room for the Committee to draw up its own plan; therefore, it accepted the proposal made by the Ministry of Education. Meanwhile, the Committee on Home Affairs accepted the proposal made by the Ministry of Home Affairs.
At the 105th SCNR Standing Committee meeting Plan A, which had been initiated by the Ministry of Education, was presented by the Committee on Education and Social Affairs under the title of "An Amendment Bill on Education Law." However, Plan A was strongly opposed by Yong-suk Park, a member of the SCNR Committee on Home Affairs. Park's criticism was based on the principle of a single-local autonomous structure, whereas members of the Education and Social Affairs Committee asserted the necessity of educational independence and neutrality (6, pp. 51-52).

Due to differing views between the two Committees concerned, the Standing Committee engaged in a lengthy debate on the issue without reaching an agreement. In view of the long standing conflict between the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Home Affairs, it was not easy to arrive at a satisfactory compromise on the issue. However, the Standing Committee seemed to have the general feeling that the bill had to be passed before the National Election scheduled for October 17, 1963.

For the purpose of deliberating on the bill, a sub-committee within the SCNR was established. It consisted of members from the Committees on Home Affairs, Education and Social Affairs, Judicial Affairs, Finance-Economy, a representative of KFEA, and the advisor to the SCNR (6, pp. 52-53). The total number of members on the sub-committee was fifteen, of which only two persons supported the position of the Home Affairs Committee. In consequence, most of the sub-committee members were in favor
of the proposed bill. On October 1, when the first meeting of the sub-committee was held, the Ministry of Education shifted its stand from the support of Plan A to that of Plan B, which provided much more room for a compromise with the Ministry of Home Affairs (6, p. 54). Plan B recognized the overall authority of the local administrative system and placed the board of education as a special type of organization at the province level under the supervision of the provincial assembly. However, Plan B met strong opposition from the representatives of the Ministry of Home Affairs, who maintained their previous position that educational autonomy should be restricted to the rural city and county level. In short, the issue regarding the level of organization for the "basic unit" was the main subject of the debate in the first conference. In this respect, the first meeting was significant in providing a stepping stone for further consideration on other points of dispute.

The second meeting of the sub-committee was held on October 4, 1963. At the meeting Major Sang-chul Kim, a member of the Ministry of Home Affairs, presented a compromise bill. The conflicting viewpoints of the two competing ministries at this stage is presented in Figure 14.

Plan B of the Ministry of Education requires that the board of education, free from supervision of the Ministry of Home Affairs or the governor, be established at the provincial level and in rural cities and counties; education offices, free from the control of municipal assemblies, should also be
Compromised Plan

installed. In contrast to this plan, the Ministry of Home Affairs provided that a Bureau of Education be installed under the supervision of the governor at the province level. Likewise, the offices of the superintendents, who are independent from the control of the municipal city and county assembly, should be installed.

The compromise bill recognizes the establishment of the board of education at the province level. However, the chief education officers in each city and county are under the supervision of the municipal city or the county assembly. Although the compromise bill seemed reasonable, it hardly satisfied either party. However, at the third sub-committee meeting on October 5, the compromise bill was finally adopted without much objection. The issue was then placed on the agenda for the 106th Standing Committee meeting of the SCNR.

When the 106th Standing Committee of the SCNR met on October 5, 1963, they dealt with the issues concerning the veto power of the governor over educational finances and the responsibilities of the superintendent.

The representatives of the Home Ministry proposed the veto power for governor over educational finances. They insisted on the governor's control over educational finances, but opposed the proposal of the Ministry of Education which allowed the inclusion of a superintendent in the membership of the board of education. However, both parties made concessions by accepting
the veto power of governors and the participation of superintendents in the boards of education (6, pp. 60-61).

Thus, the controversial policy issue on educational autonomy, which had been pending for nearly a year, was finally resolved and the revised bill on the Education Law was adopted by the 106th SCNR Standing Committee on October 5, 1963. It went into effect as of November 1, 1963 by Public Law No. 14351 (5, p. 104).

So far the overall processes of policy-making over the issue of the revival of educational autonomy in the Republic of Korea has been examined. As has been discussed, the important inputs that contributed to the resolution of the conflict can be categorized into two key factors. The first contributing factor was the time limit. Mr. Jong-chul Hong and Major Sang-chul Kim, who played main roles in compromising the conflict, were aware of the significance of the time limit set by the proposed election for the Presidency in October, 1963. Mr. Hong was the one instructed by Chairman Park of the SCNR to work out an early solution to the issue. He realized the implication of that instruction from the top leader of the Military Revolutionary regime. The second factor was a number of inputs from the Korean Federation of Education Associations. The Federation acted as a strong external limitation on the conflict through its various activities. There is no doubt that these external limitations worked as strong elements in compromising
the conflict and in making it possible for the two groups to reach a solution.

A brief examination of the interaction between decision-makers (the officials of the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Home Affairs) who formed the administrative subsystem in the decision over the issue of educational autonomy, reveals that they maintained a considerable degree of "semi-autonomy" despite the external limitations from the top leader of the SCNR. This was mainly due to the highly technical nature of the policy issue. As a result of this, the negotiations between the staffs of the two ministries were carried on over a period of five months without reaching a solution. However, a detailed examination of the issue was made possible by the members of the administrative subsystem.

Finally, the salient characteristic observed in decision-making behavior is the tendency for decision-makers to be strongly oriented toward the issue of personal loyalties to the leader. As emphasized by many Western observers of Oriental group behavior, it is an evident fact that a sense of personal obligation plays an important role in group relations. Particularly in an induced kind of inter-group conflict, loyalty and a sense of personal obligation function as group norms governing the behavior of the members, which in turn demands a strong commitment from its members.
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CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, SUGGESTIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary of the Study

This study was concerned with examining the process of educational policy-making at the central government level in the Republic of Korea through an application of systems analysis.

The purposes of this study were (1) to examine the relationship existing between politics and education; (2) to construct a systems analysis for examining the process of educational policy-making; and (3) to identify problems and limitations in the educational policy-making process in the Republic of Korea. To accomplish these purposes analytic and descriptive methods were used as a research technique.

The purpose of this section is to briefly summarize the findings of the study which the writer believes to be the most significant.

In spite of the fact that the operation of the educational system in Korea has been affected by politics, research on the relationship between politics and education has been neglected by most practicing Korean educators who posited that public education should be a unique non-political function with a
separate and independent governmental structure. The examination of the mutual relationship between politics and education has revealed that these two disciplines are closely interrelated to each other. Education is a creature of polity, and also it is one of the most potent political institutions. In light of this mutual relationship, the desire of Korean educators to keep education out of politics is unrealistic.

A distinctive feature of the educational system in Korea is the extent of administrative control by the central government. In Korea, the central government exercises direct control over the school system. Establishment and organization are under the authority of the Ministry of Education; all other aspects of education, such as curriculum, school finances, and school personnel policy are determined by laws made in the political arena.

The types of educational policies formulated by the central administrative organizations in Korea can be classified into three categories: (1) decrees of the President on education, (2) ordinances of the State Council on education, and (3) decrees of the Ministry of Education. These are superior policies which influence and restrict policy-making by the local educational governments. The Ministry of Education formulates policies within and is restricted by the frameworks of the decrees of the President and the ordinances of the State Council, while the local boards of education are working within
and are restricted by the decrees and policies of the Ministry of Education.

Major educational policies such as the policy on the entrance examination, educational autonomy, teachers' education, and curricula, have been frequently revised by authoritarian means without regard to public consensus. As a result, the educational system has suffered from the inconsistency and instability of those policies.

For the purpose of examining the educational policy-making process in Korea, systems analysis was applied. It is a logical and scientific process for analyzing the structure and interactions of a system. In light of its potential value, the writer considers systems analysis to be a very useful aid for analyzing the educational policy-making process in Korea.

In order to identify major forces involved in the educational policy-making process in Korea and to examine their interactions in the decision-making process, Ira Sharkansky's systems model was applied. According to his model, the important features of the policy-making process are considered as part of an input-conversion-output process. Through an application of his systems model, the major forces affecting policy-making in Korea were divided into two broad categories--(1) societal inputs and (2) governmental withinputs.

Since the governmental policies on education affect many aspects of peoples' lives, numerous groups attempt to influence policies on education. Out of those groups, professional groups,
such as the Korean Federation of Education Associations; educational research groups, such as the Central Education Research Institute and the Korean Educational Development Institute; the Teaching Profession's Meetings, such as college and university presidents' meetings, and political parties were identified as the major societal inputs on the Korean national educational system.

Educational policy-making at the central level in the Republic of Korea necessarily utilizes the existing structure of the government. The President, chief of the executive branch, the State Council, the highest administrative organization, the National Assembly, the law-making and fund appropriating body, and the Ministry of Education have important roles to play in decisions affecting educational policies. These are major governmental withinputs on the Korean national educational policy. Particularly, the structure of the central government, procedures of decision-making, and personal and professional experiences of the policy-makers are major factors affecting policy-making for education in Korea.

As the chief executive, the President is authorized by law to issue presidential decrees on education, and to appoint senior educational public officers as well as the Minister of Education. Furthermore, as chairman of the State Council, the President exercises tremendous influence on public policy-making for education. Under strong presidential leadership, it is the bureaucrats who draft and enforce presidential decrees. As a
consequence, they exercise a far greater influence in shaping governmental policy on education than the legislators.

One of the salient functions of the State Council is to deliberate on important educational policies, as well as other state affairs that fall within the scope of the power and responsibility of the Executive. In spite of its important function, the activities of the State Council are so restricted, due to the limits of available time, that decisions are frequently made superficially. The educational policies referred to the Council have been generally passed without any trouble. However, when the policies regarding educational budgetary and personnel matters were presented, there have been difficulties in getting an advanced agreement of the concerned authorities and in getting them through the Council.

As head of the Ministry of Education, the Minister is authorized by law to issue educational decrees and regulations, and to supervise all subordinate organizations in educational administration. Despite his power vested by law, the Minister has many limitations in his decision-making for education. One of the critical limitations in policy-making is largely due to the Minister's short term. The frequent replacement of the Minister of Education, and the lack of consistency and stability of their policies are regarded as the main factors restricting rational and effective policy-making for education in Korea.
Another limitation is the pressures from various groups. The Minister's position is plagued by pressures for personal favors from the National Assemblymen and other influential politicians. In some cases, the Minister was forced to change his policy due to heavy pressures from powerful groups. Furthermore, some former ministers have been replaced as a last resort to change educational policies.

Another limitation in his decision-making is largely due to the lack of professional experiences of ex-ministers, particularly in the educational administrative area. Since most of the ex-ministers were not professionally trained in the educational administration area, they were typically not too capable in playing their roles as chief decision-makers of the Ministry of Education. As a result, they had to rely heavily on their subordinates.

Finally, the salient characteristic observed in the policy-making process in Korea is the tendency among decision-makers to be strongly oriented to the issue of personal loyalties to the leader.

Suggestions for the Improvement of Educational Policy-Making

A systems analysis of the educational policy-making process in Korea shows that there are many problems and limitations restricting sound policy-making. For the improvement of educational policy-making, suggestions were made for the solution of
five selected problems without attempting to place them in order of priority.

Limited Public Participation in Policy-Making

Educational policies have been frequently determined by authoritarian means without regard to public consensus. The brief examination of the development of educational policies in Korea has revealed that certain controversial policies have been formulated on the basis of policy-makers' bias or a few influential individuals' views. Thus, the formal policy-making system has been severely handicapped due to the lack of mechanisms to sense changes in the surrounding environment which have implications for the effectiveness of internal operations.

Suggestions for the Solution.--The formal policy-making process would be severely hindered if some means were not available for policy-makers to determine what their public believes about any policy issue. In formulating rational and effective educational policies, the importance of public participation in the process of policy-making cannot be overemphasized. To accomplish this goal, the following strategies are suggested. First, the current political decision-making system, identified as a relatively closed system, must become an open one to meet the challenges and needs of the present and the future. As discussed in Chapter II, a closed system has many weaknesses. First of all, it suffers from the lack of professional advice and the lack of public support. For the
effectiveness of internal operations, the system must be an open one where exchanges of energy and information can take place between the system and its environment. To make the decision-making structure become an open system, the central government should allow various social groups to participate in educational policy-making through democratic processes. Through public participation in the policy-making process, dissent can be incorporated effectively and constructively into the fabric of educational policy-making.

One of the possible means for capitalizing upon professional advice for decision-making is to compose the Central Board of Education. A provision of the Education Law provides that the Central Board, the highest advisory organization to the Ministry of Education, shall be composed of thirty prominent scholars and educational professionalists recommended by each special city and provincial board of education throughout the country. In spite of this provision of the Education Law, it is not composed yet. For whatever reason, it is an urgent task for the central governmental authority to compose it for the purpose of reflecting public opinion on national educational policies and to get the professional advice necessary for educational policy-making.

If we are to achieve the goal of public participation in the process of policy-making for education, we must enable the policy-makers and ruling politicians to realize the importance of professionalism and the democratic process for rational and
effective policy-making. More realistic, however, is the creation of external pressures. That is, not only must the general public, the mass-media, professional educators, parents, and students be awakened to the need for reform, but also, they should be able to exert collective pressures for reform. The latter step would go a long way toward making educational policy-making in Korea more rational.

Problems in Preserving Educational Autonomy and Suggestions for a Solution

Since present educational policy provides that all educational institutions be guided and supervised to a great extent by the central government, the autonomy of education can hardly be preserved under the current centralized governmental system. The theory that boards of education should be policy-making bodies while their superintendents should be executives has not been put into practice due to the central government's excessive control. Accordingly, educational autonomy, in the true sense, has never actually been realized.

One possible means for preserving educational autonomy in Korea is the separation of educational administration from the control of the civil government. To accomplish this goal, the following suggestions are made.

The creation of educational taxation as a local tax.--The inability of the local self-governments to maintain their independence from the central government's control is largely due
to the lack of local financial resources. Since the local government has to rely heavily on grants and subsidies from the national treasury for its education, it is impossible to postulate the autonomy of local governments.

As a means of securing local educational finances for local self-government itself, it is necessary to create educational taxation as a local tax as long as the amount of the tax for education is not too burdensome for the people. The creation of educational taxation as a local tax contains several merits. First, the initial financial support of education by the local people will arouse their concern over education and stimulate their enthusiasm for the establishment of better schools. Secondly, the people shall be provided with the opportunity to operate their own schools with their own money. Thirdly, by paying for the education of their children, a spirit of independence will be strengthened on the part of parents.

Upgrading the status of the provincial board of education.-- Due to the excessive control of the central government over the educational system, there is little or no room for independent decisions of each provincial board of education. In order to eliminate control from the central authority, and to help the local boards of education make their independent and autonomous decisions to meet their own needs, the current Education Law should be revised in such a way that the Ministry of Education shall limit itself to determining educational board policies
and shall grant broad powers to the provincial board to implement those policies. The local board of education should also be entitled to appoint its superintendents and the chief education officers within its jurisdiction.

The reorganization of the present system of composing the local board of education.—The current Education Law provides that members of the special city and provincial boards of education are not elected directly by the people, but by the local legislative councils. What is worse still, the board members are actually appointed by the Minister of Education at present, since the local councils are not yet composed. Therefore, most people have come to believe that education is a matter to be handled by the governmental officers, and that they are unable to participate in its operation. Under the current system, true educational autonomy can hardly be expected. In light of democratic principles, the present system of composing the local board should be modified so that the boards may be formed only by lay leaders elected directly by the people.

Another weakness in the present system is that chairmen of the local boards are special city mayors and provincial governors likely to be dominant in making decisions over educational issues. As long as education remains in the hands of civil government officials, there is no way to prevent their control over educational administration. In order to eliminate the control of provincial governors and special city mayors over educational
issues, the chairman of each local board of education should be elected by board members.

The Need for Long-Range Comprehensive Educational Planning

This brief examination of the development of Korean educational policies has revealed that policies have been frequently revised in the direction of authoritarian principles. Major policies such as the policy on the entrance examination, organization of higher institutions, curricula, and private schools are those which have been revised frequently in the past quarter century. As a result, Korean education has suffered from the inconsistency and instability of these policies. There is a general agreement among Korean educators that frequent revisions of policies have been made due to the lack of long-range educational planning on the part of formal governmental authorities.

Suggestions for a solution.--In order to modernize education and to solve the critical problems caused by frequent revisions of educational policies, many educators have proclaimed the importance of establishing long-range educational planning. As a consequence, the Ministry of Education responded to their demands, and organized a task force to draft a plan for the development of long-range educational policies in 1968. Through participation of experts in various academic areas, the Ministry of Education produced a long-range comprehensive educational plan in 1970.
The purposes of this plan are (1) to improve the efficiency of education by modernizing teaching methods, (2) to increase the productivity of education to meet growing demands for manpower and learning, (3) to improve educational administration, and (4) to insure the planned development of educational systems (4, p. 78). The plan covers a fifteen-year period from 1972 to 1986 and will be instituted in three five-year stages. The plans for the first five-year stage are presently underway. It is expected that these plans for development of long-range educational policies will contribute to the innovation of Korean education.

In the planning system for any educational program, attention should be given to the following guidelines: (1) needs assessment, (2) establishment of goals or objectives, (3) implementation of the program, and (4) assessment of the effectiveness.

The most workable model for developing long-range educational programs is probably the PPBS. This is the Planning, Programming, Budgeting, System (PPBS). The PPBS is concerned not only with costs, but also with objectives, alternatives, and effectiveness. It is concerned with questions such as:
What are the goals of the organization? What is it trying to achieve? What are the different ways of achieving the objectives? What are the full costs of each alternative (both monetary and non-monetary)? Which of the alternatives will be most effective, at a given cost, for achieving the desired objectives? How do the costs compare with the benefits? (1, p. 295).
In order to accomplish these activities intelligently, educational policy-makers must know precisely what they are trying to achieve. They must be able to express these objectives in performance terms. No longer can objectives, activities, and evaluation be considered in isolation one from another. Therefore, they must become part of a system.

It is true that most educational policies in Korea have been made through short-term planning in the meantime. It is very important that any educational policy must be developed on the basis of long-range planning.

Since the plans for the first five-year stage are presently under way, the Ministry of Education should continue to make every effort in testing and evaluating the effectiveness of the programs through a cooperative process capitalizing upon professional advice from experts in various academic fields.

The Problem of Educational Administrative Leadership

One of the critical problems facing Korean education today is the lack of administrative leadership. The positions of higher status, such as those of superintendent, chief education officer, and principal, have frequently been filled by those who were not professionally trained. Most of the school administrators who occupied higher educational status, were trained in an earlier period and promoted through length of teaching service. It is obvious that those who were not professionally trained, can hardly perform an effective leadership role in
determining the direction of the institution through selecting goals and establishing standards, organizing the institution, and assembling and allocating resources in the rapidly changing society.

Suggestions for a solution.--For the purpose of retraining elementary and secondary school administrators, there are several training institutes in Korea. The Institute for the Training of Educational Administration attached to the College of Education, Seoul National University, offers six months of in-service education particularly for the chief education officers, principals, and supervisors (2, pp. 223-225). However, this type of training program cannot be a sufficient measure for improving educational administrative leadership. One of the main problems in administering the school personnel program results from the weakness of the Education Law. The qualifications for superintendents and chief education officers specified in the Law, lack emphasis on the importance of professional preparation. As a result, those top-ranking administrators are usually appointed on the basis of their experiences rather than on the basis of their professional preparation. This may be a noticeable shortcoming in Korean educational policy. To meet this challenge, the Ministry of Education should regulate specific requirements for prospective school administrators. The most workable way for developing criteria regarding the qualifications of those administrators, is probably the establishment of a strict administrator's certification program.
In the United States, in most cases, the administrator's certification program requires sixty-semester hours beyond the bachelor's degree. However, the amount of course work required for the certification program should be regulated specifically by the Ministry of Education under the cooperation of higher educational institutions.

Problems in Improving Quality of Education

The most striking feature of Korean education since 1945 is a tremendous quantitative growth. According to a survey conducted by the Ministry of Education, elementary school children in 1972 totaled 5.8 million as opposed to 1.3 million in 1945; and secondary school students totaled 2.2 million as opposed to 84,000 in 1945; and college students totaled 222,000 as opposed to 7,800 in 1945 (3, pp. 26-27). This accelerated quantitative growth of Korean education has been achieved at the cost of quality; physical facilities became increasingly inadequate; and many schools suffered from a limited number of competent teachers and limited financial resources. In spite of the continued increase of government expenditures for education over the past decade, they could hardly meet the financial demand of the rapidly increasing school population. Under such circumstances, the quality of education suffered markedly.
Suggestions for qualitative improvement. — In order to improve quality education, great attention and efforts should be directed toward:

1. The establishment of strict requirements for accreditation and facilities for schools of all levels

2. Increasing the central and local expenditures for education to meet the financial demand for the rapidly increasing school population

3. Promoting quality in teaching through an expansion of in-service training of teachers and school administrators to keep them abreast of recent developments in educational theories and practices

4. Applying new teaching methods, such as team teaching, programmed instruction, and audio-visual instruction for the effectiveness of teaching and learning activities

5. Increasing the research and scholarship fund for professors and students in higher institutions.

These suggestions for improving educational policy-making in the Republic of Korea are not sufficient, but the writer believes that each of them is necessary. In a modern pluralistic society, the task of improving educational policy is almost universal. The professional education groups, the educational research groups, colleges and universities, parents, students, and the mass media—all of these and more should participate actively in searching for new and more effective ways of improving Korean education. But the ultimate responsibility falls
upon those charged with the formal governmental authority of educational policy-making.

Conclusions

Even if substantial progress was made in developing the overall Korean educational system in the past quarter century, there are still a number of improvements yet to be made before a reasonable standard of education is attained.

This examination of the educational policy-making process at the central governmental level in Korea through an application of systems analysis, has revealed that there are many factors hindering rational decision-making by the policy-makers. Those factors are largely due to limited public participation in the decision-making process, limited professional advice, and insufficient compromises among decision-makers and major interest groups. These arise from the fact that the policy-making system itself is a relatively closed one.

Furthermore, the policy-making system was institutionalized under the democratic ideology, but it has revealed the characteristics of authoritarian policy-making in practice. The manipulation of educational policies for the purpose of strengthening legal authority has prevented the democratic principle from taking root as a strong force for stability and consistency in the Korean educational system.

The Korean educational system, if it is to meet the changes occurring in its society, must be open to change in the future.
These changes will in turn mean that the traditional methods of determining educational policies need drastic revision to meet the impact of educational innovations. There is much truth in Sorenson's view that "in the final analysis there can be no wisdom without dissent, no progress without variety and no greatness without responsibility" (5, pp. 88-89).

Implications for Further Research

In this study, focus has been placed on identifying major forces involved in the educational policy-making process in Korea, and examining their interactions in the decision-making process by applying systems analysis.

In order to comprehend the overall process involved educational policy-making and to seek solutions of the problems and limitations hindering rational policy-making, a substantial amount of research should be done in this area.

The following recommendations for further research are made based on the results of this study:

1. It is recommended that a case by case study on what and how educational policies have been made at each government level be conducted.

2. It is recommended that research on how social, political, and economic factors affect educational policy-making in Korea be conducted.

3. In order to test and verify the effectiveness of educational policies, evaluation research on each policy issue should be conducted.
4. It is recommended that research on the roles of the legislature in policy-making for education be conducted.

5. As a means of solving various problems hindering rational policy-making in Korea, it is recommended that a problem-solving model be developed through an application of the systems approach.
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