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ABSTRACT

In the mid-1990s, South Korea’s government provided its educational system with more support for educational reform than ever before. South Korean President, Kim Young-Sam, with a civilian background, proclaimed that he would show a resolute determination to become an “Education President.” Moreover, President Kim created national policies and constructed an educational system to meet the demands of an increasingly global society. This became a key purpose of educational reform in the 1990s. From 1995 to 1997, the Presidential Commission on Education Reform set up by President Kim’s government announced four educational reform agendas, reflecting an emphasis on globalization:

- May 31, 1995, 48 educational reforms;
- February 9, 1996, 30 new educational reforms;
- August 20, 1996, 24 reforms; and
- June 2, 1997, 18 reforms.

This study represents a historical case analysis to the initiation, development, and characteristics of the mid-1990s Korean educational reforms in terms of the government’s desire to create an educational system prepared to meet the worldwide trend toward globalization. The research questions are (a) “What were the major factors leading to the initiation of the mid-1990s educational reforms?”; (b) “By what process was the educational reform blueprint of the mid-1990s developed?”; (c) “What were the goals and key components of the mid-1990s education reforms?”; (d) “How are the characteristics of the mid-1990s educational reforms compared with the globalization phenomenon of education and the previous educational policies or reforms of Korea?”; and (e) “What are the implications of the mid-1990s educational reforms on Korea’s educational system?”

President Kim, the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, and the
political motives of President Kim and his followers to attract people’s support by satisfying the needs of people were key factors in initiating and developing the mid-1990s educational reforms.

The global trend of educational reforms and the mid-1990s educational reforms of Korea have similar characteristics in that both emphasized the decentralization of educational system and education for English and information technology, increased higher education opportunities including women, and enhanced the accountability of schools and the cooperation of education and industry. The global and Korean trends of educational reforms differed in that the global trend emphasized the efficiency and reduction of public educational funding, math and science education, and standardized testing while the mid-1990s trend of Korea emphasized an advanced democratic educational system, increased public educational funding, with little emphasis on math and science education and standardized testing.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Brief Historical Background on Korea

Korea was started as a tribal state, Ancient Chosun, in 2333 B.C. The tribal state ended around 100 B.C. with the advent of the three kingdoms: Koguryo, Paekche, and Shilla. These kingdoms were followed by Unified Shilla in the south in the 7th century and Parhae in the North. The Koryo Dynasty, which the name of Korea originated from, reigned on the Korean peninsula from the 10th century after the two kingdoms had fallen. Then, the Chosun Dynasty succeeded the Koryo Dynasty in the 14th century and continued for around 600 years up to the establishment of the Republic of Korea in 1948 after the Japanese colonial rule from 1910 to 1945 and the U.S. Military Government control from 1945 to 1948 (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997; Lee, 1999).

Korea was liberated from the Japanese colonial rule in August 1945 as a result of the defeat of Japan in World War II. But the liberation did not bring the independence for which the Koreans had fought so hard, owing to the occupation of South and North respectively by the U.S. and the Soviet Union. The United Nations (UN) General Assembly adopted a resolution calling for a general election under the supervision of a UN Commission. When the Soviet Union refused to comply with the UN resolution, the UN General Assembly adopted a new resolution calling for an election in areas accessible to the UN Commission, namely, South Korea. The first election in South Korea took place on May 10, 1948, and the Government of Republic of Korea with a democratic national system was inaugurated on August 15, 1948 (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997; 2000). The North Korean troops that had been supported by the Soviet Union invaded
South Korea without any warning or declaration of war on June 25, 1950, ushering in the Korean War, which lasted until the armistice of July 1953. The hostile forces of South and North Korea are still deployed along the 155-mile demilitarized zone under heavy arms (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997; Lee, 1999).

Korea had maintained a predominantly agricultural society until the first half of the 20th century. In 1962, South Korea launched a five-year economic development project series, which were national comprehensive development plans. The successful implementation of the economic development project series brought South Korea to the threshold of modern advanced industrialization (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997). Per capita GNP was changed from $87 in 1962 into $10,600 in 1996, and South Korea with a population of 47.9 million became the 13th largest trading country in the world with $314.6 billion in trade in 2002 (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997; the Korean Ministry of Education & Human Resources Development, 2003).

The South Korean government has encouraged the expansion of exports since 1960s, the development of heavy and chemical industries since 1970s, and, recently, the growth of high technologies like information, bio-, nano-, environment, aeronautics-space, and culture technologies (Science & Technology Policy Institute, 2002). Its growing economic power enabled South Korea to successfully host international events like the Asian Games in 1986, the Olympics in 1988, “Taegon EXPO 93”, the world industry festival, in 1993, and the Fifa World Cup co-hosted with Japan in 2002 (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997; the Korean Ministry of Education & Human Resources Development, 2003).

The rapid economic growth brought about new social problems, however. The population of rural areas rapidly moved into urban centers, producing housing shortages, traffic jams, and tough competition for survival due to the sudden increase of population. The family system and bonds that many generations had lived under for so long began to break down, and the nuclear family system is becoming generalized. The enlargement of regional and social-economic gaps has brought the increase of dissenters and unbalanced growth among regions or classes (Korea Council of Economic & Social Research...
Education and the Development of the Modern South Korea

Education has played a major role in promoting the political, economic, and social and cultural development of South Korea since the liberation from Japanese colonial rule in 1945. Education has served as a means of political socialization by instructing students in knowledge and behavior patterns and attitudes regarding democratic values and systems and by bringing up political leaders and politicians (the Korean Ministry of Education & Human Resources Development, 2003).

Education has cultivated a trained workforce in various fields and increased the levels of skills needed for economic development, especially at the secondary vocational school levels in the 1960s and 1970s and in higher education since the late-1970s and 1980s. The highly trained workforce has contributed to the promotion of productivity and the technology needed for the enhancement of industrial and economic competitiveness. The expansion of education has brought the enlargement and development of the education industry and created a great demand for teachers, school facilities and buildings, and various kinds of educational equipment and materials. All of this has played a direct role in economic growth (the Korean Ministry of Education, 2000).

Education has contributed to the socialization of South Koreans and has helped to instill values that contributed to the creation of an internationalized and democratic society. Education in South Korea has provided a means of upward mobility in social classes based on a meritocracy system, and expanded educational opportunities have made it possible for everybody to have a chance to move into a higher socio-economic status. In addition, education has played a role in the rediscovery and appreciation of traditional values as Korea encountered increasing numbers of foreign cultures through globalization (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997; 2000).

Since the 1990s, the South Korean economy has been undergoing a tremendously rapid industrial structural change into an advanced economic system that increasingly
depends on technology, and knowledge-intensive growth. The coming age of globalization and information accelerates these trends. There is no guarantee that the educational institutions that performed well during the industrialization period will continue to perform well in the age of information and knowledge based society (S. I. Park, 2000). Recently, educational institutions have been forced to satisfy the new educational needs of the global, information society.

**Introduction on the Mid-1990s Educational Reform**

In the mid-1990s, the government of South Korea provided its educational system with more support for educational reform than ever before. South Korean President, Kim Young-Sam, with a civilian background, was inaugurated on February 25, 1993, through a democratic election in December 1992. Prior to President Kim, presidents with military backgrounds had ruled Korea for 30 years, from 1961 to 1992. President Kim proclaimed that he would show a resolute determination to become, first and foremost, an “Education President” because he believed that education was the means by which Korea could be turned into a first-class nation (S. I. Park, 2000).

In February 1994, President Kim announced his pursuit of more practical and comprehensive educational reforms than had ever before been attempted in South Korea. Kim created the “Presidential Commission on Education Reform,” and appointed persons of diverse backgrounds, such as professors, industrial personnel, reporters, teachers, parents, and educational researchers, to serve on it. He then charged the Commission with the task of developing an educational reform blueprint, and let the Ministry of Education implement the reform blueprint developed by the Commission (Education Reform Evaluation and Research Task Force, 1997, December).

In November 1994, President Kim participated in the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) supreme conference in Sydney, Australia. Afterwards, he announced five directions for national development in Korea:

---

1 Hereafter, “South Korea” and “Korea” are used interchangeably.
1. The construction of a development strategy to enable South Korea to evolve into an advanced nation;
2. The construction of a development strategy for creating policies and harnessing manpower to enhance cooperation and competition in the international society;
3. The construction of a national management system to help Koreans engage in the global society;
4. The cultivation of people’s creativity; and,
5. The formation of a social structure that respect spiritual culture and individual character as well as material prosperity (Kim, 1994, November 17, p. A1).

President Kim judged that the development of Korea was intimately connected to the engagement of the country in the increasingly global world economy. S. O. Park (1998) observed the phenomenon of South Korea’s globalization initiated by President Kim:

‘Globalization’ has been one of the most popular words in Korean society during the 1990s. Newspapers, TV, symposiums, and conferences have dealt with globalization as a major issue. Especially, since the announcement of ‘Globalization Era’ and the organization of the ‘Committee for Globalization’ by President Young Sam Kim after he came back from ESCAPE in 1994, the term globalization has explosively diffused throughout the whole country, even to people in rural areas and to pupils in primary schools. (p. 123)

During the 1990s, the notions of an “era of globalization” and “educational reform” prevailed in Korean society and were important stimuli for Korean social change. According to President Kim’s national policy for globalization, the construction of an educational system that would meet the requirements of the global society became a key purpose of educational reform. In fact, the Presidential Commission on Education Reform identified globalization and the use of information technology for education as two major priorities for educational reform (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1995, May 31).
From 1995 to 1997, the Presidential Commission on Education Reform announced four educational reform blueprints, reflecting an emphasis on globalization. First, on May 31, 1995, the Commission announced 48 educational reforms encompassing all levels of schooling, from elementary and secondary education to higher and life-long education. The Commission suggested that the central government increase public funding for education from 4.11 percent of the GNP in 1995 to 5 percent of the GNP in 1998 in order to achieve its desired educational reforms (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1995, May 31). The core goals of the educational reforms were as follows.

- Construct the fundamental basis to develop into an open and life-long learning society;
- Construct a school-based management system that includes parents and communities in decision-making at school sites;
- Promote the development of diversified and differentiated higher education;
- Attain competent teachers; and,
- Invest public funding of five percent of GNP in education.

On February 9, 1996, the Commission announced 30 new educational reforms. The primary goals of the second set of reforms were: (a) to construct a new vocational education system of adapting to the change of social circumstances, (b) to introduce a new elementary and secondary educational curriculum that meets the requirements, for example, the cultivation of creativity and diversity, of the 21st century, knowledge-based society, and (c) to revise or create educational laws to achieve educational reforms (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996, February 9).

A little more than six months later, on August 20, 1996, the Commission announced 24 more education reforms. The third set of reforms included: (a) the enhancement of autonomy in local education; (b) the reform of the current teachers’ professional development training system: and, (c) projects for the use of information technology in education (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996, August 20).
Eighteen more educational reforms were enacted on June 2, 1997. The fourth set of reforms suggested: (a) the inclusion of kindergarten education within the public education system; (b) the promotion of citizenship education; and, (c) the improvement of public adaptability to an information society (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1997, June 2).

Once the Commission had suggested a blueprint for educational reform, it was left to the Ministry of Education to carry out the creation and implementation of specific practice plans for the 120 reforms. President Kim supported the educational reforms with an unprecedented pledge by increasing national funding for education from 4.11 percent of the GNP in 1995 to 5 percent in 1998 (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998a). In February 1998, President Kim completed his 5-year Presidential term, and the era of the “Education President” ended.

**Statement of the Problem and Research Questions**

Understanding Korea’s educational reforms of the mid-1990s is a short cut to understanding the thrust of modern educational policies in Korea. The worldwide trend toward globalization of economic systems results in the power of core countries to bring all countries into conforming to a capitalistic system (Stromquist, 2002). The globalization trend has forced most nations in the world to accept homogeneous social systems, including educational systems, to meet the standards of globalizing economic systems and values. Accordingly, globalization has influenced Korean educational policymaking since the 1990s.

By comparing the goals and key components of the mid-1990s educational reforms in Korea with previous Korean educational policies and the homogenizing phenomena of educational systems of nations across the world in terms of this trend toward globalization, this research will help to identify the characteristics of the mid-1990s Korean educational reforms. This study represents a historical analysis to the initiation, development, and characteristics of the mid-1990s Korean educational reforms in terms of the government’s
desire to create an educational system prepared to meet the worldwide trend toward globalization. In the course of the study, the researcher will address the following research questions:

1. What were the major factors leading to the initiation of the mid-1990s South Korean educational reforms?
2. By what process was the educational reform blueprint of the mid-1990s South Korea developed?
3. What were the goals and key components of the mid-1990s Korean education reforms?
4. How are the characteristics of the mid-1990s educational reforms in Korea compared with the globalization phenomenon of education and the previous educational policies or reforms of Korea?
5. What are the implications of the mid-1990s educational reforms on Korea’s education system?
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The purpose of this literature review is to provide a context for the discussion of the mid-1990s South Korean educational reforms in light of the government’s pursuit of an educational system that would support goals of globalization.

Educational reform occurs in order to remedy frequently debated and sometimes chronic educational or social problems rather than to solve sudden, new educational problems (Tyack and Cuban, 1995). The authors defined educational reforms as planned efforts to change schools in order to correct perceived social and educational problems. They argued that reforms have rarely replaced what is there, but have more commonly added complexity. The authors stated that the history of public school reform shows an interaction of long-term institutional trends, transitions in society, and policy talk. Moreover, they mentioned that reform proposals to change schools and society appear in cycles, sometimes with new labels but basically with recurrent messages, and that the reforms have reflected the tensions between democratic politics, with its insistence on access and equality, and the enhancement of excellence in competitive market economy.

This section contains a review of much discussed and highly controversial issues in Korean education that ultimately led to the agenda for the educational reforms of the mid-1990s. In addition, this section contains a review of recent studies related to the educational reforms.

In order to identify such studies, the researcher searched the following sources: (a)

The search results identified a large number of comparative education studies examining the educational systems, practices, and reforms of various countries, including South Korea. Such studies also explored differences in the academic curricula and the technical-vocational programs of countries faced with a critical need for education that keeps pace with recent changes in technology. Few studies, however, explored the relationship between recent Korean educational reforms and the Korean government’s policy of embracing globalization.

Among the topics represented in the studies identified by the search were:

- The decentralization of educational administration in K-12 education;
- The assessment of educational achievement;
- The use of information technology;
- The comparison of math and science achievement among nations;
- Teacher training;
- The process and problems of the development of Korean higher education;
- The vocational and technical education of meeting recent changes in technology and the requirements of a knowledge-based society;
- The impact of globalization on adult or life-long education;
- The relationship between economic or national development and education; and,
- Special education.

The researcher then searched for Korean studies examining Korean educational reforms and policies since the 1990s from the documents published by the Korean Ministry of Education and Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI). Most of these

---

2 KEDI is an educational research institute that specially researches Korean education and educational policies. The Korean Ministry of Education funds and supports the operation of KEDI.
studies and documents were written in the Korean language and described specific educational reform projects and their evaluations. There were few studies, however, regarding the process by which such reforms were initiated or the impact of globalization on the perceived need for such reforms. Further, no studies provided a comparative analysis of the globalization phenomenon and the Korean educational reforms in the mid-1990s.

**Korean Educational Issues in the 1990s**

After Korea was liberated from Japanese colonial rule in 1945, the South Korean educational system experienced rapid growth in the number of students, schools, and educational organizations working to improve educational quality. The sudden growth in Korea’s educational system brought about chronic problems in educational quality. Over the years, many Korean educational researchers have studied Korea’s educational systems and, with the Korean government (the Ministry of Education), have sought solutions to these problems. In this section, studies of the most discussed issues in Korean education are divided into the following three categories: (a) K-12 educational issues; (b) the college admission system; and, (c) higher educational problems.

**K-12 Educational Issues**

Since the 1990s, the inclusion of kindergarten within the public school system has been a hot issue in Korean educational policy circles and an important item of the mid-1990s educational reform agenda. Preschool education has been considered important to the modern educational system of Korea since 1945, and, regardless of their socioeconomic status, parents have paid for such schooling for their young children (Lee, 1997). The effort to include kindergarten in the public education system was initiated by the Presidential Commission on Education Reform in 1997. The reform agenda of this body included the construction of an educational system for children three years and older as well as free, compulsory education for five-year-olds. These initiatives have been
stymied, however, by the difficulties in obtaining additional funding for pre-school education, and in coordinating and integrating the functions of the Education and Heath and Welfare Ministries\(^3\) (KEDI, 1999, December).

In Korea, a nation that has had a highly centralized government structure for most of its history, the decentralization of educational administration, or the democratization of schools, has been a controversial issue. In order for such decentralization to succeed, it is very important that the national government enhance the ability of local educational administrators to initiate educational policies important to their localities (Chung, 1990). Since the mid-1990s, School-Based Management (SBM) has been promoted through the establishment of School Operation Councils, which are groups of parents, teachers, and community members who participate in school decision-making at each school. Nevertheless, the SBM system has not attained the expected level of democratization or autonomy within Korean schools (J. P. Park, 2000). According to Park, schools must have real decision-making authority in such areas as budget, personnel, and curriculum in order to achieve the purposes of SBM.

In modern Korean educational history, issues of educational equity and excellence have been highly controversial, just as in many other countries. Since the mid-1970s, Korea has implemented a “High School Leveling Policy” that gradually abolishes the high school entrance exam in order to achieve educational equity and transform the competitive, test-driven, knowledge-centered atmospheres of elementary and middle schools into more balanced and creative educational environments (Chung 1998). The High School Leveling Policy was planned to eliminate the hotly contested high school entrance competition and to realize universal secondary education. On the other hand, opponents of the Leveling Policy contend that the Policy has brought about the deterioration of academic achievement, or the loss of educational excellence (Chung, 1998).

Researchers at KEDI (1999, December) evaluated the High School Leveling Policy and found that it created a more balanced middle school education, reduced the private

---

\(^3\) The Ministry of Education manages kindergarten education and the Ministry of Health and Welfare manages the protection and nurturance of children 0 to 5 years old.
educational expenditures of parents that paid for their children to take preparation courses for the rigorous high school entrance tests, and expanded high school educational opportunities. The researchers also found that the policy resulted in problems, such as lower academic achievement, the diminished autonomy of private high schools\textsuperscript{4}, the deprivation of students and parents’ school choice rights, and the weakening of educational competitiveness. Therefore, it was recommended that the Leveling Policy be changed in order to enhance educational competitiveness, guarantee the school choice right of students and parents, and protect the autonomy of private schools.

To match the rapid development of information technology worldwide since the late 1980s, computer education and the utilization of information technology in education and educational administration have become a major issue in elementary and secondary education policymaking circles in Korea. The use of computers in public education is now common and becoming increasingly important. Korean schools generally have a relatively large amount of hardware and software due to strong government support, although the quality of the hardware and software is often marginal. Clearly, Korean schools need to upgrade their computer hardware and be provided useful computer software. It is also imperative to promote teacher training in computer technology (Jo, 1996).

Among the issues facing Korean K-12 educators in the early 1990s, other than the previously reviewed issues, were questions about how to promote democratic citizenship in elementary school education, stimulate innovative teaching methods, construct an evaluation system for various curricula, develop programs for gifted children, develop useful teaching-learning materials, recruit competent teachers, and activate the Educational Broadcasting System (KEDI, 1993).

\textsuperscript{4} Middle school graduates were distributed by a computerized lottery to the high schools of their neighborhoods, whether public or private (Chung, 1998). Thus, private schools have no right to select their students. Furthermore, there is little difference in curriculum between private and public schools. The notable difference between public and private high schools is who establishes and manages the schools. Around 47 percent of all high schools (2,008) are private (the Korean Ministry of Education & KEDI, 1999, p. 8)
College Admission System

Among most contentious issues in Korean educational policy-making has been the college admission system. Since 1945, the rapid increase in the number of students who wish to enter college has caused widespread entrance examination “fever” and “overheated” competition for admission (Yun, 1989). In 1987, the Presidential Committee on Education Reform identified evaluating and testing as the most critical factors in the reconstruction of a national school system (Wilson, 1990). The college admission system has been so highly controlled by the Ministry of Education that only 25 percent of applicants are admitted to college (Lee & Kang, 1994).

The previous Korean Minister of Education, H. C. Lee, spoke of the importance of reforming the college admission system in a monthly meeting for all the officials of the Ministry of Education:

I will do my best to accomplish three key educational policies during my period of service as a Minister. The first is the reform of the college admission system, the second is the reform of the current system to attain competent teachers, and the third is to successfully accomplish the ‘BK (Brain Korea) 21 Project’ in order to enhance the research competitiveness of Korea…. The college admission system has the biggest influence on elementary and secondary education and is a major cause of our educational problems. Therefore, the reform of the admission system is an important key to solving our educational problems (Personal communication, cited from the researcher’s diary on April 14, 1998).

High schools in Korea are plagued by a number of problems related to the college admission system (Sung, 1992). For one thing, they overemphasized success on college entrance examinations. According to Sung, high school curriculum is remote from the requirements of actual life, and the college admission system fails to select qualified students.
Problems in Higher Education

The Korean higher education system was introduced in the late 1890s, and became fully operational during the Japanese colonial period, from 1910 to 1945. The development of the modern Korean higher education system was begun in earnest in 1945, the year of liberation from Japanese colonial rule. More recently, the higher education system in Korea has seen rapid growth in both student enrollment and new educational institutions. For example, the number of higher education institutions in Korea, including 2 or 3-year junior colleges, increased from 153 in 1970 to 350 in 1999, and the quota of freshmen students, set by the Korean Ministry of Education, rose from 54,550 in 1970 to 707,240 in 1999 (the Korean Ministry of Education & KEDI, 1999).

Both the quality and quantity of Korean higher educational institutions have been increased markedly due to various government educational policies, but colleges are still experiencing crowded campuses, comparatively small faculties, and inadequate financial support (Yun, 1989). The Korean higher education system still tends to be restricted, competitive, and elite-centered, even though it is necessary that Korean colleges cultivate a trained workforce to insure future economic competitiveness (Henkin & Helms, 1995, Fall).

Junior colleges in Korea have experienced a severe shortage of academic facilities (Lee, 1992), and have recently experienced severe faculty shortages as well. In 1999, for example, the number of students attending junior colleges was 861,356 while the number of regular professors excepting temporary lecturers was 11,332. The ratio of a professor or a teacher to students (not including part-time professors) at junior colleges in 1999 was 1 to 76; while the ratio at universities was 1 to 47.4 (43,966 to 2,082,126); at elementary schools, 1 to 28.6 (137,579 to 3,935,619); at middle schools, 1 to 20.4 (93,444 to 1,901,783); and at high schools, 1 to 21.5 (105,829 to 2,275,764) (the Korean Ministry of Education & KEDI, 1999). The shortages of faculty and facilities are considered to be key factors in the deterioration of educational quality in junior colleges.

Researchers at KEDI (1999, December) stated that Korea in the 1990s had carried
out higher education policies of enhancing the self-controlled, diversified, and specialized development of universities. They suggested that the success or failure of a university depend upon its capacity and the government focus on building an institutional basis for the enhancement of autonomy for each university.

For the sake of strengthening the autonomy of higher education, the government initiated university reform in the 1980s and actually implemented them in the 1990s. The current approach to university reform needs to be reviewed, however, to keep pace with the ongoing, rapid changes in Korean society (Chung, 2001). Chung mentioned the Korean Ministry of Education has recently made changes that allow universities and colleges to be more autonomous, but the decision-making capacities of these institutions are still somewhat restricted.

Since the 1990s, the Korean Ministry of Education has evaluated universities and colleges to improve their capacity in education and research, and has emphasized diversified and differentiated development (KEDI, 1999, December). The Ministry of Education funded them according to the evaluation results.

Now, higher education institutions in Korea are faced with a new, serious problem: the number of potential students, high school graduates, is rapidly decreasing. The Korean Ministry of Education has anticipated that the college freshmen quota (726,181, including junior colleges) is greater than the number of high school graduates (645,713) in 2003 (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1999).

**Studies for the Mid-1990s Korean Educational Reform**

Pak (1997) explored the practice and effect of the Credit Banking System\(^5\) that intended to promote life-long education, which is one of the mid-1990s educational reforms. Pak argued that the Credit Banking System, along with developing multimedia technology, could provide new avenues for higher education, beyond the current restricted

---

\(^5\) The Credit Banking System is a system that gives individuals college credit for individual training and work experiences, thus enabling them to obtain junior college or university diplomas without having actually attended classes.
university and junior college opportunities available in Korea. Prior to the establishment of the System, the Korean educational system offered only limited opportunity for participation in higher education, the primary method of gaining membership in the social elite.

Most of the studies examining the developmental process or evaluation of the mid-1990s educational reforms in Korea have been conducted or supported by the Korean Ministry of Education. The Korean Ministry of Education (1998a) reported that 87 (73%) of the 120 educational reforms were implemented, and that plans for the implementation of the remaining 33 reforms were set up. The Ministry judged the educational reforms of the mid-1990s were successfully accomplished under the strong leadership of President Kim and would achieve successful improvements in elementary and secondary education. It is possible, however, that the evaluation results were somewhat biased in favor of the government.

The Education Reform Evaluation and Research Task Force of Korea noted that the educational reforms in the mid-1990s were an important issue for government officials, political parties, educators, parents, and educational administrators. The Task Force commented that President Kim had earnestly and comprehensively carried out the educational reforms. The report of the Task Force concluded that the reforms had indeed brought practical improvements in elementary and secondary education. The Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), an independent international organization, also evaluated the educational reforms of the mid-1990s, but found that despite the bold and broad vision of the reform program, practical improvements were still needed in the areas of teacher-student ratios, comfortable schools

---

6 The evaluation of the implementation and impact of the education reforms was conducted by those Ministry of Education administrators who led the implementation of the education reform agenda.
7 The task force was composed of persons with diverse backgrounds, such as professors, educational researchers, principals, teachers, parents, journalists, and educational administrators from the Ministry of Education, and was empanelled to evaluate the process and impact of the education reforms of 1995 through 1997.
8 The Task Force evaluated the implementation and effects of the education reforms with data from documents, existing statistics, interview surveys, and observations.

Since February 25, 1998, when President Kim, Dae-Joong’s government took office, the Korean Ministry of Education (2000) has endorsed the mid-1990s educational reforms by appraising that the reforms under the leadership of the previous President Kim were comprehensive and connected directly with practice to eradicate chronic educational problems unlike the partial and provisional attempts that were made earlier.

Thus, the studies and evaluations with regard to the educational reforms of the mid-1990s have deemed the implementation and impact of the reforms to be effective and successful. Yet the results of these studies and evaluations may be biased by a certain amount of vested interest, because they were conducted by the same government organizations that initiated and implemented the reforms.

In the study, “Managing Education Reform: Lessons from the Korean Experience 1995-97”, S. I. Park\(^10\) (2000), who was a major player in the development of the educational reforms, analyzed the management aspects of the educational reforms implemented from 1995 to 1997, relying upon his direct experience and relevant data. Park examined the goals and objectives, initiation and implementation, and major difficulties and hurdles associated with the educational reforms. As a whole, he rated the mid-1990s reforms as positive and successful, and suggested the creation of a reform body that would outlive the current government in order to ensure the successful completion of the educational reform agenda. He drew the following conclusions from the Korean experience with educational reforms:

- The organization of an independent Presidential Commission on Education Reform is a good start for successful reform management;
- For reform success, the careful appointment of the heads of the following three organizations is extremely important: (a) the Commission - designing body, (b) the

\(^9\) OEDC evaluated the phenomena of Korean education with data such as documents, interview, and observation.
\(^10\) As the 1995-98 Senior Secretary for Policy Development (and later for Social Development) to the President (a status similar to a minister of the government), S. I. Park is one of the key players in the educational reform movement.
Ministry of Education - implementing body, and (c) the Executive Office of the Blue House (the Presidential Office of South Korea) – mediator;

- The procurement of a sufficient budget for educational reform is a must;
- In dealing with vested interest groups, more refined and sophisticated strategies must be prepared;
- The democratic national assembly tends to be susceptible to the influence of vested interest groups;
- The government should provide an appropriate incentive system to encourage bureaucrats in order to successfully implement the educational reforms;
- Close cooperation with the mass media is indispensable for reform success;
- The government must take the lead in initiating educational reform;
- Educational reform usually takes a long time to consolidate; and,
- For an effective deregulation, the establishment of a “Committee for Deregulation” composed of only non-bureaucrats is recommended.

In summary, Park investigated the administrative aspects of the mid-1990s educational reforms and identified some of the obstacles, interest groups, and managerial lessons associated with them. Other researchers evaluated or explored the implementation and accomplishments of the reforms. There were few studies regarding the characteristics or process of the educational reforms themselves, however.

**Rationale for the Study**

The Korean educational reforms of the mid-1990s may be the most powerful and comprehensive reforms in the history of the modern Korean education system. A key factor in the development of the reforms was the ideology of globalization, which compels all countries in the world to conform to capitalist economic systems, and now forces countries to adopt common social systems in order to meet the standards of global economic systems and values.

There are many studies and evaluations concerning specific education reforms and
their implementation; however, there are few studies examining the process by which educational reforms were created and developed, or the factors leading to the initiation of the education reforms. Similarly, there is no study exploring the characteristics of Korean educational reforms by comparing them to past policies or to the homogenized phenomenon of educational systems in the world.

Thus, this study was designed to provide educational administrators and comparative educational researchers with an analysis of the mid-1990s educational reforms, a major event in the history of education in Korea. The researcher will explore the initiation, development, and characteristics of the Korean educational reforms.

**Significance of the Study**

This study will provide useful information for comparative education researchers and individuals who wish to understand the recent educational policies or reforms of South Korea, a nation that has experienced rapid social change and economic development since the 1960s. Furthermore, this study will help readers understand the impact of globalization on education reform in the Korea of the 1990s, and on other educational systems throughout the world.

In addition, this study will provide Korean educational administrators with a more in-depth understanding of Korean educational policies and reforms. The researcher expects that this study will also contribute to Korean educational policymaking by offering policymakers and administrators useful background knowledge for developing future educational policies.

**Delimitations of the Study**

This study will focus on the educational policies and activities of the Korean central government, especially those of the President and the Ministry of Education. Korea still has a centralized governance style, so the central government plays a major role in the
development and implementation of educational policies. Because understanding the educational policy of the central government is tantamount to understanding Korean educational policies, this study is designed to explore national, rather than local, educational policies and reforms.

Furthermore, this study will focus on analyzing the process of creating the educational reform blueprint and the contents of the educational reforms in the mid-1990s, a landmark on the history of education in Korea. For this analysis, the researcher will explore the activities of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform and organizations to support the Commission that are core players in creating the educational reform blueprint of the mid-1990s.

The next chapter deals with the concept of globalization and its influence on education in Korea and educational systems around the world, in order to provide a theoretical background for the discussion of the proposed study.
CHAPTER 3
GLOBALIZATION AND ITS INFLUENCE ON EDUCATION

S. O. Park (1998), a university professor in Korea, once observed how Koreans perceive the notion of globalization:

Many people had a dream of globalization. There had been, however, confusions and conflicts about the meaning of globalization among scholars, generations, and professions in Korean society. For some people, globalization meant just trips to foreign countries and experiences of different cultures, while some others regarded global economic integration as globalization, and for others, globalization is the expansion of economic activities to foreign countries beyond the national boundaries. (p. 123)

In the last two decades, the force of globalization has affected more than just the economies of countries throughout the world. The influence of dominant countries like the United States, Australia, Canada, Japan, and those in Western Europe, has manifested itself in the social, political, cultural, and economic spheres of many nations, especially those in Southeast Asia. Increasingly, countries seeking to adapt to the demands of the global economy are adopting similar standards in trade, commerce, education, human rights, and manufacturing (Hallinger, 1998).

Japan, China, and South Korea are the main players in Northeast Asia, one of the most dynamic economic regions in the world, and ranked respectively, second, sixth, and thirteenth in the world in terms of GDP as of the year 2000. Furthermore, in the 21st first century, communication and information exchange among the three countries are a necessary ingredient for closer economic relations and common prosperity (Korea Development Institute, 2003).
In 1994, President Kim proclaimed *se-gye-wha* (globalization) for Korea, and underscored the connection between education and *se-gye-wha* by raising the amount of government funding used to support educational reform. The President’s proclamation had a great impact on Korean educational policies. This chapter explores the complicated concepts of globalization and the relationship between globalization and education.

**The Concept of Globalization**

The use of the term globalization has become prevalent in Korea and throughout the world since the late 1980s. Currie and Subotzky (2000) described that the term globalization had gained favor as a topic of study over the last 20 years. The authors stated that the sociologists first used globalization in the title of an article in 1985. According to them, a recent search for titles using “globali” on the Internet revealed a dramatic rise in hits, from two in 1986 to 196 in 1997.

Globalization is difficult to define clearly and concisely because it is a very complex term, the meaning of which appears to vary (Dale & Robertson, 2002). Though globalization first referred to the economic sphere, its powerful influence has been felt in all areas of societies throughout the world. This section concerns the meaning of globalization in economic terms as well as the more complex implications of the term. In addition, the differences between the concepts of globalization and internationalization, which are often used interchangeably, are discussed.

**The Economic Implications of Globalization**

The term globalization was first used in reference to business as a means of conducting business more efficiently, profitably, and discreetly. Furthermore, globalization intended to open up the world’s markets and minimize the supervisory role of public authorities (Jones, 2000). Gibson-Graham (1996, cited in Stromquist and Monkman, 2000) offered a more formal definition of globalization as the processes by
which the world is merged into one economic space via increased international trade, the internationalization of production and financial markets, and the internationalization of a commodity culture, with increasingly networked telecommunications systems.

In economic terms, globalization represents the intensification of a global market based on international economic competition, market competition, and technological change, with multinational corporations as the sources of the global economy (Welch, 2002). Economic globalization allows trade and investments to shift freely among nations, forcing each nation’s economic institutions to become convergent, and reducing obstacles that might impede transnational economic flows. These trends cause the economic systems of nations around the world to eventually become more and more homogeneous, capitalistic systems.

Globalization requires each nation to make various efforts to cultivate its competitiveness, making adjustments to help it enter the globalizing world market system, or adjust manpower to meet the changing economic circumstances of a globalizing world (Castells, 1996). Castells identified four distinct sources of competitiveness in the global economy: (a) the technological capacity of a country or the articulation of science, technology, management, and production; (b) the access of a country to affluent markets such as the areas of the North American Free Trade Agreement, the European Union, and Japan; (c) a profitable differential between production costs at the production site and prices at the market of destination; and, (d) the political capacity of national and supranational institutions to guide the growth strategies of countries under their jurisdiction.

It is a characteristic of globalization trends that financial investment among nations have rapidly increased to gain more profit than investment within a nation. For example, foreign exchange transactions (around $1.5 trillion a day) in 1999 were more than 100 times that of 1973. Moreover, the amount of foreign direct investment (FDI) much influences the economic development of a nation. Sixty percent of the FDI investments of the European Union, Japan, and the United States—who are in charge of most FDI in the world—go into five countries that have rapidly developed in recent years: China, Brazil,
Singapore, Mexico, and Indonesia (Stromqiuist, 2002).

To summarize, globalization has evolved from a long history of trade and transaction among nations seeking to gain economic profit. Such trade and transactions require the standardization and publicity of goods as well as a method for exchange among nations. Many countries have tried to cultivate their manpower through various educational systems to enhance their competitiveness. In this way, globalization represents the extension of a basic predisposition of nations that strive to enhance their economic competitiveness in order to gain more wealth and prosperity.

**Globalization and Internationalization**

Before President Kim proclaimed the start of the era of globalization in 1994, Korean society typically used the term internationalization in place of globalization. Prior to that time, the term globalization had been used mainly as an economic concept. For example, in 1995, the term *se-gye-wha* (globalization) appeared first in the annual educational policy plan of the Korean Ministry of Education (from the analysis of the annual major educational policy plans of the Korean Ministry of Education from 1969 to 1995, Chung, 1995). The Ministry of Education, under the influence of President Kim, played a major role in using the terms globalization and internationalization in education.

For comparison between globalization and internationalization, Parmenter (2000) summarized three approaches used by researchers to define the relationship between globalization and internationalization: (a) clearly distinguishing between globalization and internationalization in terms of territorial or action spheres (internationalization has a narrow, limited domain); (b) conceptualizing internationalization (inter-stateness) as a progression from nationalism, and globalization (trans-stateness) as a progression from internationalization; and (c) viewing internationalization (looking out at the world from one’s own native country and culture) and globalization (the world provides the standpoint from which to look in at individual nations and cultures) not as distinct phenomena, but as different perspectives. With regard to the use of the terms globalization and
internationalization, Parmenter stated that globalization and internationalization are not fixed concepts but are constantly self-renewing, and the use of the terms is much dependent on national interpretation.

Bok Song (cited in Kim, 1994, November 23), an eminent Korean scholar, distinguished between the concepts of internationalization and globalization as used by the Korean society in the 1990s in the following way:

Internationalization has the national boundary to be able to limit transaction and movement among nations and the characteristics of limited competition, and it focuses on economic activities. On the other hand, globalization means the national borderless society of unlimited movement among nations, and the society becomes an unlimited competitive one. In the globalizing society, national competitiveness moves from economy-centered into non-economy-centered, so a nation should become an advanced society in the areas of politics, social system, culture, and human right as well as economy for its prosperity.

The song’s interpretation of relationship between globalization and internationalization is similar to Parmenter’s second definition: globalization as a progression from internationalization.

A representative of the Blue House (Presidential Office) stated the term globalization, which President Kim suggested, implied to enhance overall national standards in every field into those of an advanced nation and broader meaning “a world village” than that of internationalization that focused on the competition among nations (Song, Y. U., 1994, November 23).

Globalization, as used by the Korean government of the mid-1990s, refers to unlimited transactions, movement, and competition among nations in every area, including politics, culture, information, labor, social systems, and economy, and has taken on a much broader and more progressive meaning than internationalization.
The Complex Meaning of Globalization

According to Ghai (in Stromquist & Monkman, 2000), the ever-increasing globalization of the world has the following implications for the economic, political, and cultural lives of people throughout the world: (a) in the economic area, promoting free trade, private enterprise, foreign investment, and liberalized trade, (b) at the social and cultural level, taking shape ‘new consumption patterns and lifestyles’ and ‘new identities and imaginaries’ from the increased flows of people, goods, information, and images among nations, and (c) at the political level, accepting pluralistic systems, multiparty democracy, free elections, independent judiciaries, and the call for human rights.

Jones summarized, similar to Ghai’s description, the economic, political, and cultural aspects of globalization as follow (Jones, 2000, p. 29-30):

- The economic aspects of globalization as (a) free exchange of services and symbolic commodities between localities, (b) production activity in a locality based on its physical and geographical advantages, (c) flexible responsiveness of organizations to global markets, (d) decentralized, instantaneous, and “stateless” financial markets, and (e) free movement of labor;
- The political aspects of globalization as (a) absence of state sovereignty with multiple centers of power at global, local, and intermediate levels, (b) local issues discussed and situated in relation to a global community, (c) powerful international organizations predominant over national organizations, (d) fluid and multi-centric international relations, and (e) weakening of national values and strengthening of common and global political values;
- The cultural aspects of globalization as (a) deterritorialized religious mosaic, (b) deterritorialized cosmopolitanism and diversity, (c) widespread consumption of simulations and representations, (d) global distribution of images and information, and (e) universal tourism.

Carnoy (2000) stated that two of the main bases of globalization are information and innovation, highly knowledge intensive. Carnoy mentioned global and fast-growing
information industries produce knowledge-based goods and services and that massive movements of capital depend on information, communication, and knowledge.

In summary, dramatic and continuing developments in information technology have accelerated the exchange of information among nations, overcome the limits of space and time, and extended the reach of globalization into every area of our lives. The economic aspect of globalization has provoked concerns regarding the customs, cultures, social systems, and interests of other nations. Every country has tried to emulate the strong points of other nations to keep pace with the thrust of globalization and enhance its own competitiveness and prosperity. The increasing globalization of the world means that transactions have occurred among nations, not just in economics, but also in every area, such as politics, culture, and social systems.

Globalization represents a dynamic and evolving concept with a long history, which now influences all social areas, such as economics, politics, culture, labor, and education. Globalization depends on the free shifting of capital, culture, labor, goods, and information without national boundaries, government intervention, or regulation that might limit this free shifting. These days, globalization forces people of every nation in the world to have a much more homogeneous life style and mindset than individuals in the past, because all nations must coexist in the “globalizing” world within the same influence area. Recently, globalization has proliferated partly because information technology eliminates the constraints of time and space. Globalization causes many nations of the world to strive to adopt the same lifestyles, mindsets, and social systems as those of dominant countries, while paradoxically, making the world more aware of unique local cultures and identities.

The Impact of Globalization on Education

The impact of globalization on education varies according to the conditions and traditions of a nation or a region. With regard to the variation of the impact of globalization on education, Dale and Robertson (2002) said that globalization is not a homogeneous
force, nor consistent in its effects on education. The authors described that globalization is an extremely complex process that creates various effects in many different levels.

This section explores studies examining the general impact of globalization on the education systems of nations across the world, in addition to its impact on Korea’s education system.

**The General Impact of Globalization on Education**

Globalization stemming from the economic sphere has much influenced the educational systems of every country because countries have utilized education as a means of prosperity or survival that meets the competitive demands of an increasingly globalizing society. Regarding the instrumental role of education in a globalizing economy, Stromquist (2002) said that educational systems in recent are much more attuned with business values and needs than in previous decades. According to Stromquist, market sponsors believe that the competitiveness in education can be enhanced by increasing standards, improving efficiency, and reducing costs, as would be done in the economic sphere.

For the improvement of efficiency in education, decentralization policies in educational administration have prevailed in the contemporary world. On the other hand, many nations with decentralized educational systems have adopted centralized curriculum governance as a result of a desire to enhance their national competitiveness to meet the demands of a globalizing world market with active flows of capital, labor, goods, and information among nations (Astiz, Wiseman, & Baker, 2002). Consequently, countries with centralized educational systems tend to adopt decentralization policies, while some countries with decentralized systems tend to adopt more centralized ones.

Carnoy (2000) explained that globalization influences education in that science and mathematics are emphasized, as is educational measurement of learning achievement, for the development of information technology and other science-based industries. Carnoy (2000, p. 44) suggested that globalization has a major impact on education in the following, crucial ways:
In financial terms, most governments are under pressure to reduce public funds for education and to find other sources for its extension.

In labor market terms, the payoff of the proliferation of knowledge-intensive products is raising the level of education worldwide. Globalization has also induced a trend toward higher educational expansion; an increase in secondary school graduates ready to attend postsecondary institutions; and expanded educational opportunities for women due to the need for more highly educated, low-cost labor.

In educational terms, the quality of national educational systems is increasingly being compared internationally, resulting in an increased emphasis on math and science curricula, standards, and testing, and changing the way that education is delivered.

The “Educational Sector Paper” of the World Bank\textsuperscript{11} recommended the following education-related strategies for donor countries: (a) shift public funding for education from higher to lower levels of education, (b) expand secondary and higher educational opportunities through increased privatization, (c) reduce public spending per pupil in primary and secondary education by increasing class size, and (d) increase the quality of education through relatively costless “efficiency reforms” such as decentralization (World Bank, 1995, cited in Carnoy, 2000).

In addition to the influence of globalization on reducing public support for education across the world, educational programs stressing spoken communication and communication technology are now offered in many countries. These curricula are seen as necessary to insure the ability to communicate with nations or regions expected to participate in the globalizing world. Stromquist and Monkman (2000) reported English is emerging as the global language and that social and economic transactions are being formulated within network societies dependent upon computer-mediated technologies.

Other researchers have made similar links between globalization and the spread of a common spoken, written, and technological language. Arnove (1999) stated that economic globalization is facilitated by the rapid development of telecommunications,

\textsuperscript{11} World Bank is a representative international organization that supports globalization ideology.
computerization, and scientific and technological knowledge. In addition, Arnove noted that a more integrated world society has increased the use of English as a common language of scholarly production, business and diplomacy. The author said that people throughout the world, therefore, believe that studying English and computer technology is the surest and quickest way to secure a job and enter the global economy.

Japan and Korea have traditionally had highly centralized school governance systems and homogeneous educational values while the United States and England had decentralized educational governance systems and relatively heterogeneous educational values (Lee, 2000). According to Lee, because the United States and England assessed that their educational systems lack focus and accountability, they have tried to standardize curricula, tighten assessment practices, and introduce market-like competition to improve schooling achievement and the accountability of schools.

In the case of the United States, a representative nation that gives other nations globalization influence, the federal government had driven large-scale educational programs to improve the quality or excellence of schools in the 1980s and reforms to provide parents with choice or accountability to their children’s schooling in the 1990s (Wirst & Kirst, 2001). The contemporary Bush’s government has initiated a representative educational reform program, the “No Child Left Behind (NCLB)”, of putting pressure on schools across the country to national standards. The NCLB program pursues stronger accountability by standardized tests, encouragement of proven educational methods, more freedom for state and local schools, and increased choice for parents to school attendance (Keeting, 2005).

In summary, globalization has intensely influenced education around the world. Globalization has forced educators to think about cultivating human resources to meet the global standards and enhancing the competitiveness of their nations. The influence of globalization has resulted in a certain amount of homogenization of education and educational systems throughout the world, for example:

- The reduction of public funding for education
- The increased access to higher education
• The increase in higher educational opportunities for women
• The privatization of higher education
• The decentralization of educational governance
• The emphasis on efficiency in educational funding
• The emphasis on science and mathematics for the enhancement of national economic competitiveness
• The emphasis on information technology and English education as a means of participating in the global economy
• The emphasis on standardized tests and evaluation.
• The enhancement of accountability to educational institutes
• The strengthening of the cooperation between educational institutes and industry.

Globalization and Education in Korea

Korea began to open its higher educational programs to the world after introducing the educational open-market policy in the mid-1990s. The open-market policy was implemented under World Trade Organization (WTO) influence and represented an impact of economic globalization on educational policymaking (Kim, 1997). Because of this policy, Korea’s higher educational institutes were able to directly adopt the educational programs of dominant countries, particularly the United States. Thus, in Korea, the impact of globalization on education is increasing, and globalization is causing the homogenization of education. To see the effects of the homogenization of higher education, one need only look to Korea’s attempt to introduce a medical graduate school system, emulating that of the United States, as a part of the educational reforms in the mid-1990s (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998a). Currently, Korea begins medical education at the undergraduate level.

Similarly, the homogenization in K-12 education followed upon emulation of the education systems of the United States and Great Britain. The elementary and secondary schools of Korea instituted a School Operation Council System allowing parents, teachers,
and community members to participate in decision-making at the local school level since the mid-1990s, benchmarking the PTA systems of the two countries (J. P. Park, 2000).

English has emerged as the language of the global economy, and, since 1997, English education in Korea is taught beginning in the third grade of elementary school. In the past, English education was not begun until middle school. The prominence of the English language in the emerging global economy has had a profound influence on Korean society. The widespread perception that English is the language of power has promoted the Americanization of Korean youth, who believe that English is a powerful means by which economic and educational success can be achieved (Kim, 2002). English is gaining more strength as a hegemonic language in Korea society in spite of the strong nationalistic attitudes and monolingualism to the Korean language (Park, 2004).

Historically, the Korean educational system was relatively centralized and had a nationwide standardized curriculum. In recent years, however, Korea has endeavored to make its governance style more decentralized and its curriculum and assessment methods more diverse. Like other nations, Korea has sought to reproduce the merits of the exemplary educational practices of other countries. In this age of advanced information technology, most countries can share information about the most effective practices almost instantaneously, resulting in increasing homogeneity of educational systems throughout the world.
CHAPTER 4
METODOLOGY

Research Design

This study is an analysis of the processes and characteristics of South Korean educational reforms in the mid-1990s, which were initiated and implemented in order to meet the demands of an increasingly globalizing world economic system. Majchrzak (1984) spoke that policy analysis is the study of the policymaking process. Policy analysis is typically performed by political scientists interested in the process by which policies are adopted as well as the effects of those policies. According to Majchrzak’s definition, this study represents a policy analysis study in that it analyzes the process of initiation and development of the Korean educational reform policies in the mid-1990s.

In addition, the researcher will compare the trends in the mid-1990s Korean educational reform with the homogenized trends of nations’ educational systems throughout the world. In regard to this intention, this study will utilize the method of comparative educational analysis that uses data from one or more countries or regions (a) to describe educational systems, processes, or outcomes; (b) to assist in the development of educational institutions and practices; (c) to throw light on the relationships between education and society; and, (d) to establish generalized statements about education that are valid for more than one country (Noah, 1988). Therefore, this study involves an aspect of comparative educational research in that it investigates the trends of educational reforms and policies in Korea, and compares those trends with those of educational systems of other nations.

This study will involve the collection, interpretation, analysis, and description of
relevant data concerning Korea’s mid-1990s educational reforms and the past educational policies with using a historical research method that utilizes documents, numerical records, relics, and oral statements (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000). Thus, this study has a characteristic of a historical case study that is a comprehensive exploratory research study of dealing with entangled situations between phenomenon and context with contemporary and historical events (Russo-Converso, 2001). The focused phenomenon in this study was the Korean educational reform in the mid-1990s, the reform that had been comprehensively and powerfully pursued by the Korean central government.

To conclude, this study was characterized by elements of both a comparative education research involving the educational policy analysis of a nation and a historical research method in order to understand the process and characteristics of the Korean educational reform in the mid-1990s.

**Data Sources**

Historical research uses primary and secondary sources of data to answer particular research questions. Whereas primary sources are produced by those who were directly involved in or witnessed a particular historical episode or event, secondary sources are usually written after the event by others who were neither directly involved in nor witnessed the event (McCulloch & Richardson, 2000).

Primary documentary evidence is typically used in historical educational research; common primary documentary sources include policy reports, committee papers, correspondence, autobiographies, diaries, school logbooks, school and university magazines, newspapers, and photographs (McCulloch & Richardson, 2000). The common secondary sources used by authors for historical educational research are published books, articles in academic journals, and chapters from edited collections. Charles (1998) suggested seven data sources that play prominent roles in descriptive and historical research: participants, procedures, settings, objects, records, documents, and informants. These sources may offer primary or secondary data, depending upon the situation.

Documentary sources and methods in historical research are very important, but
they have limitations. To be helpful, documents must first exist, and then must be complete and accessible. Because of the potential limitations of documentary data, other sources, like oral accounts of events, are often needed to complement it.

The primary sources of data used to answer the research questions of this study were collected from the following sources: (a) documents from the Korean central government, including the Ministry of Education; (b) interviews with informants involved with the mid-1990s educational reform; (c) popular Korean newspapers reporting significant information or communications regarding important national policies and events since the 1990s; and (d) the direct observation and experience of the researcher, who, as an educational administrator since 1989, had participated in Korean educational policymaking and implementation.

This study depended upon primary sources such as mainly governmental documents and interview data from informants with secondary sources coming from some studies regarding the educational reforms or policies of Korea.

**Document Data**

Formal and informal documents from the Korean Ministry of Education, including those found on the Ministry’s website (http://www.moe.go.kr), were used as rich sources of data. These documents included all “Annual Educational Policy Plans” since 1969, “A 50-Year History of the Ministry of Education,” and “A Draft of a 5-Year Educational Development Plan,” published in 1999.

The “Annual Educational Policy Plans” contain the core national educational policies for each year since 1969, and each describes the results of key educational policies of the year prior. The Plans were created by the Korean Ministry of Education, and were reported to the President every year.

“A 50-Year History of the Ministry of Education,” written by the Ministry, reports its activities and important policies from the late 1940s to the late 1990s, while “A Draft of a 5-Year Educational Development Plan” contains the purposes, directions, and major
contents of the educational policies initiated since the new Korean government’s inauguration on February 25, 1998. The Draft demonstrates the recent trend in Korean educational policies, as well as the impact on current Korean educational policies of the educational reforms in the mid-1990s.

The Ministry of Education’s website offers recent policies, events, educational laws, and some statistical data relevant to Korean education. The website was created and is operated by the Korean Ministry of Education, and most of its contents are written in the Korean language. The researcher used this wide range of educational statutes, studies, reports, and statistics relevant to Korean education in order to provide background and details that enriched the analyses of the mid-1990s Korean educational reforms and globalization.

In addition, documents from the Korean Ministry of Public Information and the Presidential Secretary Office were used to supplement the documents of the Ministry of Education. The documents from the Korean Ministry of Public Information included “Change and Reform: Data Collection of Five Years’ Kim, Y. S. Government (1997, December 30)” and “Reform White Paper of the Five-Year Civilian Government (1997, December 31).” The document from the Presidential Secretary Office was entitled, “President Kim, Young-Sam’s Important Addresses.” These sources contain President Kim’s and the central government’s philosophies, policies, activities, and accomplishments during the mid-1990s.

One a cautionary note: the historical sources were not written or developed specifically for use in this research project, therefore might not serve well the purposes of this study. Furthermore, the documents may be biased or exaggerated depending upon the intentions of their creators. In order to enhance the trustworthiness of the documents, the controversial parts of them were corroborated with other source data, such as interviews and other kinds of documents. The term “trustworthiness” is used to gauge the credibility of data in qualitative research, and corresponds to the validity and reliability of data in quantitative research (Sturman, 1999).

The documents of the Korean government to be used in this study may be biased or
exaggerated owing to depending upon the intention of the government. To further complement the Korean government’s documents, the researcher used data from the databases of three popular newspapers (Chosunilbo, Dongailbo, and Joongangilbo) and one liberal-leaning newspaper, Hankyoreh. The newspapers provide additional documentation of Korean national policies and government-sponsored educational activities, as well as transcriptions of the public speeches of President Kim and other important persons. The data from these newspapers reflected the professionalism that one expects from journalistic sources of information. Although professionally written, the information from the newspapers was replete with facts, opinions, critiques, and direct communications. This kind of data is often biased or incorrect, compelling the researcher to accept its veracity cautiously. The controversial data from newspapers must be compared to data from other sources, such as other kinds of documents or interviews, to ensure the trustworthiness of the data.

The newspaper records gave an account of the initiation and implementation processes associated with the educational reforms of the time, as well as the diverse opinions of readers and editors about these educational events. Most of the newspaper database records are written in the Korean language, and the records are available from the newspapers’ Internet websites, http://www.chosun.co.kr (Chosunilbo), http://www.donga.com (Dongailbo), http://www.joins.com (Joongangilbo), and http://www.hani.co.kr (Hankyoreh).

The researcher had struggled with appropriately translating and expressing data or documents written in the Korean language into English. The researcher described the data or documents written in the Korean language with English translation version to them in this study.

**Interview Data**

Well-informed interviewees can provide important shortcuts to the prior history of a situation in historical research, or help to identify other relevant sources of evidence (Yin,
1994). Carefully developed questions increase the validity of interview data, and are necessary to obtain appropriate data and to insure that the research questions are correctly answered (Russo-Converso, 2001).

To complement the document data, the researcher conducted interviews with informants who are familiar with the operations and activities of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, and with administrative personnel from the Korean Ministry of Education. In February 1994, the Presidential Commission on Education Reform was composed of 25 members of varied backgrounds, including professors, journalists, civic leaders, educators, and specialists, that provided the Commission with help on specific technical issues (S. I. Park, 2000). According to Park, the secretariat providing administrative and logistical support was formed of 21 staff members, mostly from the Ministry of Education.

The purpose of the interviews was to assist the researcher in clarifying research questions related to the process of the initiation and development of the educational reform blueprint in the 1990s. The interviews were planned in detail after the collection and analysis of the documents.

Because these interviews were expected to explore the experiences, opinions, and comments of human subjects, the researcher sought and received the prior approval of Florida State University’s Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects (attached to Appendix A). These guidelines for survey research were issued on October 5, 2003.

This study used a partially structured interview format. According to Gay & Airasian (2000), the partially structured interview has the characteristics that question areas and items are chosen but order is up to interviewer, interviewer may add questions or modify them, and questions are open-ended.

It is important to minimize leading the responses of the interviewees in order to collect the unbiased, trustworthy interview data. To minimize leading the responses of the interviewees, questions should be emotion-neutral and bias-free as possible, and, to enhance the validity of the survey, the researcher must altogether avoid the following types
of questions (Russo-Converso, 2001): (a) double-barreled questions, which include two kinds of question at once; (b) long and short questions (i.e., too wordy or too vague); (c) jargon-filled questions including unfamiliar terms; and (d) combination questions, (i.e., open questions combined with closed ones).

In addition, the researcher adhered to the following guidelines such as (a) listen more, talk less, (b) follow up on informants’ talking, (c) avoid leading questions and ask open-ended questions, and (d) don’t interrupt (wait) (etc.) in order to obtain the highest quality, sufficiently reliable, and trustworthy data during the interviews (Gay & Airasian, 2000).

Again, because interview data are open to common human errors such as bias, poor recall, and inaccuracies, it is important to corroborate the interview data with other sources of evidence to enhance its trustworthiness (Yin, 1994). Thus, interview data were compared with data from other sources.

**Preparation of the Researcher**

Data in a qualitative historical research study may be biased, more than in quantitative research, by the researcher’s intentions or perceptions. In qualitative research, the researcher may become an instrument of data collection. Further, the sources of historical data must be subjected to rigorous analysis to determine both their authenticity (external criticism) and their accuracy (internal criticism). Therefore, the researcher must determine whether each source of historical data is authentic (the authenticity of the author) and accurate (the accuracy of the source content) (Gay & Airasian, 2000).

A researcher conducting historical research acts as both a data-collecting instrument and the judge of the data’s authenticity and accuracy. The researcher for this study has worked as an educational administrator in the following Korean educational organizations: (a) a broad provincial educational office which manages K-12 education and serves as one of the 16 broad provincial educational offices in Korea, 1989-1991; (b) four Korean National universities, 1991-1994, 1996, and 2000; and (c) the Korean
In addition, the researcher studied historical and qualitative research methods for education in a graduate program at Florida State University, and, therefore, has both the professional experience and the academic qualifications to collect historical data appropriate to this study, and to judge its authenticity and accuracy.

**Procedure**

The process of initiation and development for the South Korean educational reforms in the mid-1990s, and the characteristics of the reforms, were studied according to the following steps.

**Step 1: Collecting Documentary Data**

The researcher obtained all “Korean Annual Educational Policy Plans” since 1969 and “A Draft of a 5-Year Educational Development Plan” from the Korean Ministry of Education; and “A 50-Year History of the Ministry of Education” from the website: http://www.moe.go.kr. Additionally, the researcher collected several studies and reports relevant to Korean educational policies and the mid-1990s Korean educational reforms from the Korean Ministry of Education and KEDI, prior to the Fall 2002 semester.

Next, documentary data concerning the mid-1990s Korean educational reforms from three popular Korean newspapers, 1990 to present, were collected. To facilitate these searches, appropriate Korean language key words were entered to search for data on the initiation, developing process, and contents of the educational reforms of the 1990s. To enhance the trustworthiness of the data, whenever possible the researcher collected two or more data samples per topic from different newspapers.

In addition, other necessary information, such as numerical data (i.e., educational status and budget changes) and educational statutes relevant to this study were gathered from the Ministry of Education, and from other sources in Korea. To collect data best obtained in person, the researcher returned to Korea in August 2003, and personally visited Korean educational and governmental organizations.
Step 2: Analyzing Collected Documents and Collecting Additional Data

In Korea, during the Fall, 2003 semester, the researcher classified the collected document data according to the research questions and analyzed them to tentatively answer the questions. Next, the researcher twice visited the Reference Documents Library of the Korean Ministry of Education to find additional documents. The following major documents in the Library were found and investigated:

- “The Education Reform Projects I to Construct a New Educational System Leading Globalization and Information Era” (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1995, May 31)
- “The Education Reform Projects II to Construct a New Educational System Leading Globalization and Information Era” (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996, February 9)
- “The Education Reform Projects III to Construct a New Educational System Leading Globalization and Information Era” (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996, August 20)
- “The Education Reform Projects IV to Construct a New Educational System Leading Globalization and Information Era” (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1997, June 2)

The above documents, authored by the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, contain the complete records of the background, purposes, goals, policymaking processes, and contents of the Korean educational reform blueprints in the mid-1990s.

Additional documents were gathered during the Fall, 2003 and Spring, 2004 semesters in three separate visits to the Korean government’s Comprehensive Documents Library in the Complex Government Building located in Seoul. The following documents illuminating the President Kim’s and the Korean government’s activities, policies and accomplishments in the mid-1990s were located and analyzed:
Lastly, the researcher twice visited the offices of the Presidential Committee for Educational Innovation, established in 2003 as the successor of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform in the mid-1990s. These visits were made during the Spring, 2004 semester to gain additional documents concerning past Presidential Commissions or Committees that dealt with education reforms, including those of the mid-1990s. The following documents were obtained:

- “Direction and Problem of Educational Reform to Create a New Korea” (the Presidential Committee on Education Reform, 1996)
- “Study on Evaluation for the Implementation of Educational Reforms” (the Presidential Committee on Education & Human Resources Development Policy, 2002)

Data from these additional documents were classified and analyzed in the same way as data discussed previously.

**Step 3: Writing the Interim Results and Developing Interview Questions**

Interim results answering the research questions posed were written from the analyses of the documentary data following the Spring, 2003 semester. Then, the interview plan was developed to supplement the document data.

In order to answer the research questions, the researcher used the analyses of the interim results to carefully develop open-ended questions of complementing the documentary data. During the interviews, interviewees were asked to give suggestions for additions or corrections with regard to the appropriateness of the question items in order to
improve the validity of the questions.

In accordance with the partially structured interview style, the questions were developed before the interviews. Then, questions were added or modified as necessary, depending upon the situation of each interview. The preliminary interview questionnaire was composed of two question types: basic questions and main questions to gain information concerning events. The basic questions were designed to ascertain the interviewees’ positions and roles, to enhance the trustworthiness or accuracy of interview data. These preliminary questions were designed to be adaptable according to each interviewee’s circumstances. The preliminary questionnaire contained the following items:

- What was your position in the initiation and development of the mid-1990s educational reforms?
- What do you think were the purposes of the mid-1990s educational reforms?
- What do you think were the purposes of the educational reforms in the field that you were involved?
- By what process in your commission were the reform agenda developed?
- What do you think are the differences between the mid-1990s educational reforms and the previous educational reforms?
- Please tell me about your view of successful and/or failing aspects in the implementation of the educational reforms in the mid-1990s.
- What do you think has been the impact of the educational reforms in the 1990s on Korea’s education?
- Do you think that any additional item or change is needed in these interview questions?
- Please let me know any other well-informed interviewee with information regarding the initiation and development of the mid-1990s educational reform.

The analyses and interim results for the collected documentary data showed the need for interviews to supplement both the process of developing the educational reform blueprint and explanations regarding the impact of the mid-1990s educational reforms on the Korean education system.
The educational reform blueprints were announced four times from 1995 to 1997. Each development process for the four reform blueprints was similar. The first of the four blueprints was the most comprehensive and dynamic (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998a; 1998b). Therefore, the researcher planned to explore the development process of the first educational reform, proclaimed on May 31, 1995.

The interview questions were written in the Korean language, and focused on the process of developing the first educational reform blueprint, and on determining the impact of the educational reforms on Korean education (the interview questions are attached in Appendix B.1).

**Step 4: Selecting Informants**


First, the researcher ascertained the members who participated in the process of creating the first educational reform blueprint in 1995 from the following documents: “Direction and Problem of Educational Reform to Create a New Korea” (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996), “The Education Reform Projects I to Construct a New Educational System Leading Globalization and Information Era” (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1995, May 31), and “Korean Educational Reform White Paper: 1994-1998” (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1998). These three documents contain the members’ lists of organizations involved in creating the educational reform blueprints. The most informative is the “Direction and Problem of Educational Reform to Create a New Korea,” which recorded: (1) three educational reform blueprints reported to President Kim from September 1994 to February 1996; (2) the activities and members’ lists of organizations relevant to the formation of the educational reform blueprints; (3) the process of creating the blueprints and events surrounding their creation; and, (4) the brief conference records of the Presidential Commission on
Education Reform, and so forth. Other than this document, no other conference records of the Commission could be found.

Because interviews were conducted in person, the researcher knew the identities of the interviewees, but their real names have been kept confidential in the dissertation and in other written documents from which the participants might otherwise be publicly identified. This was done pursuant to a guarantee of confidentiality offered to participants prior to their interviews.

The first interviewee selected was an educational administrator who participated in the entire process of creating the first educational reform blueprint, having occupied the office since its inception on September 7, 1993. The researcher knew the administrator, (hereafter referred to as “Administrator A”), because both had worked for the Ministry of Education at the same time in the late 1990s. The Appendix B.1 questions written in the Korean language to be used in the interview with Administrator A represent the full scope of the survey questions to be used in this study. His interview was intended to provide broad ranging information regarding the process of developing the first educational reform blueprint. In his interview, Administrator A said, “The directors of the Secretariat Office attended all the conferences of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform. Accordingly, they well know the whole process of creating the educational reform blueprint.” (Personal communication, cited in the interview with Administrator A on September 15, 2004).

Then, to supplement the shortage or vague points of the interview data from the Administrator A, another interviewee was selected from the members’ lists of the organizations relevant to the educational reform. These “snowball interviews” were continued until enough broad and reliable interview data had been collected.

**Step 5: Conducting Interviews**

The researcher returned to South Korea in August 2003, for the interviews and for additional data collection. The selected informants first were contacted by E-mail or telephone. The researcher explained the purpose of this study and explained the interview methods to the informants and then scheduled interviews with the willing informants. The
interviews were conducted in person, using the Korean language, with questions pre-developed by the researcher. For the convenience of certain interviewees, telephone or E-mail interviews were conducted instead.

A couple of informants were asked the same questions in order to broaden the information and to crosscheck for data reliability (Charles, 1998). In addition, as Charles suggested, the researcher remained alert for other important information that the informants might offer, even though the interviews were conducted using pre-structured questions.

During the interviews, key contents of the informants’ responses were concisely recorded directly on the pre-developed questionnaire in order to maintain a free-flowing exchange of information and to make interviewees comfortable. More detailed interview data were recorded within 2 days after each interview.

To insure the accuracy of interview data, interviewees were sent words of thanks for their participation, as well as review copies of the interview data collected during their interviews, with a request for corrections where necessary.

On September 14, 2004, Administrator A agreed to participate in a partly structured interview. He was interviewed, using the questions in Appendix B.1, at his office at a Korean National University on September 15, 2004. The interview lasted three hours, from 11:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., with a break for lunch.

The following is a partial account of the information gleaned from the interview with Administrator A: (a) the role of the Ministry of Education in educational reforms from the start of the President Kim’s government, in February, 2003, to the establishment of the Secretariat Office of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform; (b) the activities of the Secretariat Office from its composition on September 7, 1993, to the composition of the Commission on February 5, 1994; (c) the entire process of creating the first educational reform blueprint; (d) the characteristics of the educational reforms; and (e) the impact of the educational reforms on Korean education.

The results of the interview with Administrator A indicated the need for supplementation through an examination of the role of the Educational Secretary Office in
Blue House in creating the educational reform blueprint. This was needed to double check for the accuracy of the interview information provided by Administrator A. Then, an interviewee who had worked as a deputy director of the Secretariat Office of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform and then worked for the Educational Secretary Office of White House was selected (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1998). The interviewee (hereafter referred to as “Administrator B”) is now working as a director of the Korean Ministry of Education & Human Resources Development (KMEHRD).

The researcher called Administrator B on September 20, 2004, to schedule an interview with him. He agreed to the interview, but was too busy to schedule it at that time. A second call on September 21 yielded an interview appointment. The interview with him, lasting less than an hour, was conducted using slightly modified interview questions from Appendix B.1. It was conducted in his office at KMEHRD, on September 24. The interview with Administrator B provided information concerning the role of the Educational Secretary Office of the Blue House, to supplement data gathered from Administrator A.

The researcher analyzed the interview data and decided additional data were necessary concerning the operation processes and the specific roles of organizations involved in creating the educational reform blueprint, and to assess the impact of the educational reforms in the mid-1990s on the Korean education system. Then, for the additional interviews, the researcher selected 3 members of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 4 members of the Expert Committee (Expert Members) that provided practical support to the Commission in creating the educational reform blueprint, and 5 administrators of KMEHRD who participated in the implementation of the educational reforms (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1998).

Via e-mail, the researcher sent open-ended questions of Appendix B.2 to the 7 selected informants of the Commission and the Expert Committee, and open-ended questions of Appendix B.3 to the 5 administrators of KMEHRD. One member of the Expert Committee (hereafter referred to as “Expert A”), a University Professor, was
interviewed by telephone for two and a half hours, over the course of two calls, on October 4, 2004. Expert A said that he worked as a member of the Expert Committee and participated in the entire process of developing the educational reform blueprint, including attending conferences of the organizations involved in creating the reform blueprint. The interview with Expert A provided information concerning the background and process involved in creating the reform blueprint; the purpose of the reforms; the impact of the reforms on Korean education; the operation of organizations, including the Presidential Commission; and more (Personal communication, cited in the interview with Expert A, October 4, 2004).

Park, S. I., a member of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform from February, 1994, to December, 1995, and then a Society-Welfare Chief Secretary to the President, referred the researcher to a document he authored, entitled “Managing Education Reform: Lessons From the Korean Experience: 1995-1997.” Park wrote this document using data and experience related to education reform that he gained while a member of the Commission and as Chief Secretary (Personal Communication, cited in the e-mail with Park, S. I., October 4, 2004).

Four of the five administrators of KEMHRD answered the e-mail questions sent to them. They provided information concerning influences on Korean education and characteristics of the educational reforms.

Data coming from the interviews and e-mail surveys sufficiently filled the gaps in the documentary data and the researcher’s experience data. The data collection activities were completed.

**Step 6: Writing Interim Results and Following-up Data Collection**

The researcher wrote additional interim results, as applied to the research questions, from the analyses of the interviews and additional collected data. If an analysis of the interim results would indicate the need of additional data, the researcher collected more data until the additional data added little to older data. Necessary follow-up activities would be continued until satisfactory results were obtained.
Data Analysis

This study used a historical research method to analyze the process and characteristics of South Korea’s educational reforms in the mid-1990s. Documentary and interview data in this study were the major sources of information used to answer the research questions. This section will discuss the analysis of documentary and interview data. Other data, such as observations and numeric sources, were included within the analysis of the documentary and interview data.

Data analysis in qualitative research is an activity to induce appropriate interpretations from collected data in order to answer the questions posed by the research design. Bogdan and Biklen (1998) suggested two kinds of data analysis approaches usually employed in qualitative analysis. The first approach was that analysis is concurrent with data collection and more or less completed by the time the data are gathered, and the other was to more or less complete collecting the data before doing the analysis. The authors argued that some analysis should take place during data collection, before a full-fledged analysis. Following the advice of Bogdan and Biklen, the researcher analyzed data during the process of data collection, and completed the full-fledged analysis by the time that the data collection was done.

It is also important to check the authenticity and accuracy of the sources of historical data during the analysis process in order to guarantee the trustworthiness of historical research. One possible authenticity problem with historical data, authenticating the author of a historical document, is generally not problematic because there are few possible hoaxes (Gay and Airasian, 2000). In this study, the researcher was able to easily judge the authenticity of data relevant to Korean educational reforms and policies because of his experience as an administrator of several educational organizations, including the Korean Ministry of Education.

Nonetheless, it is not easy to guarantee the accuracy of the contents of the data sources used in a historical study. Gay and Airasian (2000) suggest considering the following four factors to determine the accuracy of documents: (a) knowledge and
competence of the author, (b) time delay between the event’s occurrence and the recording of the event, (c) bias and motives of the author, and (d) consistency between different data. All of these factors were carefully considered during the collection and analysis of data.

Data Analysis During the Data Collection

Charles (1998) proposed four steps of data analysis: (a) identification of topics, (b) clustering of those topics into categories, (c) forming the categories into patterns, and (d) making explanations from what the patterns suggest. Russo-Converso (2001) used a two-step procedure for analysis in her dissertation (a historical case study), aggregation of the data, and interpretation of the data. The researcher decided upon a more concise analysis process for this study, similar to that of Russo-Converso.

In this study, the documentary data were first collected and analyzed in order to write the interim results for the research questions. During the data collection, the documentary data were analyzed in two steps: classification and interpretation. The researcher used preliminary categories stemming from the research questions as themes to classify the data, as reflected in Table 1.

Table 1
Categories Based on Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Provider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of education reform (ER)</td>
<td>Documents, Newspaper database</td>
<td>Korean Ministry of Education, Newspapers’ Internet site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of reform development</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Korean Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Korean government archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals &amp; contents of ER</td>
<td>Documents, Newspaper database</td>
<td>Korean Ministry of Education, Newspapers’ Internet site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past policies</td>
<td>Documents, Studies</td>
<td>Korean Ministry of Education, Library and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison between ER and past policies</td>
<td>Documents, Studies</td>
<td>Korean Ministry of Education, Library and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of ER on Korea’s education</td>
<td>Documents, Studies</td>
<td>Korean Ministry of Education, Library and others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The classified data were separated into primary sources and secondary ones. To guarantee the accuracy of the data, separate sources for controversial and vague data on the same topic were consulted and compared with each other to check the consistency of the data. When the contents of data on the same topic from separate sources was not the same or controversial, other relevant data from additional sources were collected and compared. After the classification of the collected data was finished, the data were interpreted in order to answer the research questions.

Next, the interview data from informants were collected. The interview data were then combined and analyzed with documentary data and interpreted in order to answer the research questions. Again, when the content of different interviews on the same topic was dissimilar or controversial, the researcher checked the accuracy of the data with additional data from other sources, or additional follow-up interview data.

**Data Analysis After the Data Collection**

After the interview data collection was complete, the data was classified and analyzed according to the following categories derived from the research questions:

- Initiating-factor, Initiating-process
- Blueprint-creating-process
- Goal-reform, Content-reform, Accomplishment-reform
- Past-policy
- Comparison-policy
- Impact-ER

The findings of this study, through interpretation and synthesis of the classified data, provide answers to the posed research questions. Analysis in a historical study is based on the researcher’s interpretation as other qualitative methods. As previous steps, any suspicious or controversial data that discovered during the interpretation and synthesis process were crosschecked against additional data from other sources or supplemental interviews.
CHAPTER 5
ADVENT OF THE MID-1990s EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN KOREA

Introduction

According to written history, Korean formal education system dates back to 372 A.D. The first formal educational establishment was Tae-Hak of Koguryo (a kingdom nation), an institute of higher education designed to educate top public officials. The Korean language used the Chinese alphabet, “Han-Ja,” until unique Korean letters were developed in the 15th century. While relying heavily on ideas derived from Chinese Confucianism, these traditional Korean educational institutes offered education intended to cultivate public officials, representative social elites, who were selected by their test performance (Han & An, 1985).

These educational traditions continue in the current Korean educational system. Chinese letters are still used to complement the Korean language, and are taught in almost all schools in Korea. To this day, citizens seeking economic success or membership in the social elite believe it is necessary to have a socially diverse background, and to have attended a school of some standing. Because formal education is so highly prized, Korean colleges and universities administer difficult entrance examinations in order to insure that only qualified candidates gain admission (the Korean Ministry of Education, 2000).

Prior to the 1880s, Korea’s educational system adhered strictly to a curriculum dependant upon the Chinese alphabet and Confucianism. However, in the late 19th century, the era of the Chosun Dynasty, Korean schools began to incorporate ideas from other countries, such as Japan, the United States, Russia, England, France, and Germany. In these modernized schools, subjects such as English, mathematics, geology, science, and
matters related to practical living were added to the traditional curriculum (Han & An, 1985). Thus, Korea began its transformation into a modern educational system, and to modern schools. By the beginning of the 20th century, more private secondary schools than public ones were established by Christian missionary organizations and patriotic-minded leaders. In 1910, when Japan annexed Korea at the start of the Japanese colonial period, these Christian missionaries and patriots were among Koreans that fought against the Japanese invasion (the Korean Ministry of Education, 2000).

Under Japanese colonial rule, from 1910 to 1945, the Korean public education system was distorted with the aim of converting Koreans into Japanese loyal citizens. In the 1930s and 1940s, the Japanese forced Koreans to use the Japanese language exclusively in order to suppress Korean cultural identity. Moreover, Koreans were forced to learn Japanese history instead of Korean history. Japan deliberately withheld access to secondary and higher education to prohibit Koreans from fully understanding their subjugated status. That is, Japan wanted Koreans to remain intellectually ignorant in order to prevent a revolt, and to thereby maintain its continuous colonial exploitation (Kim & Choi, 1988).

Korea was liberated from Japanese colonial rule on August 15, 1945, but sadly Korea was left a divided nation. South Korea and North Korea, separated at 38 degrees North latitude, were forced to establish and develop their own governments; South Korea fostered a democratic political system supported by the United States, while North Korea established a communist regime supported by Russia and China. Since 1945, South Korea has accepted and developed a democratic educational system influenced by the United States. The current, complicated character of the South Korean educational system, and South Korean society, in general, is a direct result of, (a) traditions derived from several consecutive dynastic governments over thousands of years; (b) Japanese influence during around 40 years of colonial rule in the early 20th century; and (c) the U.S. democratic system since 1945 (Han & An, 1985; Lee, 1999).

The educational system of South Korea has been directly and profoundly influenced by democratic educational ideals since Korea’s liberation from the Japanese in
1945. Therefore, the next sections concisely describe the national educational policy of Korea, from 1945 to the 1990s, as a foundation for understanding the mid-1990s Korean educational reforms.

The Korean Ministry of Education (2000) differentiates the educational policies of the period from 1945 to the 1999s according to the following sub-periods: (a) foundation of democratic education (1945-1950, post-liberation period); (b) expansion of democratic education in the 1950s; (c) quantitative expansion in the 1960s; (d) educational reform in the 1970s; (e) qualitative development in the 1980s; and (f) human education in the 1990s.

“Education 50 Years History” (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b) describes the history of the Korean central government’s educational policies from 1945 to 1997 including to associate educational ideology development from 1945 to the 1990s with political change as according to the following sub-periods: (a) the U.S. military government period (1945-1948)—the introduction of democratic and racial educational ideology; (b) President Lee, S. M. rule period (1948-1960)—the consolidation of “Hong-Ik-In-Gan” educational ideology (education for human well-being); (c) President Park, J. H. rule period (1961-1979)—the pursuit of developmental educational ideology; (d) President Cheon, D. H. and President Rho, T. W. rule period (1980-1992)—the proliferation of balanced human education and life-long educational ideology; and (e) President Kim, Y. S. (after 1993)—the pursuit of humanization, information, and globalization ideology.

Korean educational policy changes have closely mirrored changes in the political system. Political power in Korea derives directly from Presidential authority, and, therefore, educational policies have changed along with the change of Presidents. This chapter will describe trends within Korean educational policies or reforms, according to each President’s term of office, prior to President Kim. This is intended as background information for the discussion of the mid-1990s educational reforms, which follows in Chapter 6.
In August 1945, Korea was liberated from Japanese colonial rule when the Japanese were defeated to end World War II. The U.S. military conquered and controlled South Korea while Russia conquered North Korea. On September 11, 1945, the U.S. military government entrusted control of the educational department of South Korea to Lieutenant E. N. Lockard. Lieutenant Lockard understood little of the history, culture, or circumstances surrounding Korean education. To provide him with much-needed guidance, on September 16, 1945, Lockard organized the Educational Consultant Committee, composed of seven famous Korean educators who had studied educational science in the United States. Until May 1946, the Committee consulted on, and sometimes solved, major problems concerning Korean education (cited in the Diary of Educational History, the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b).

In November 1945, the U.S. military government organized the National Committee on Educational Planning, composed of more than a hundred Korean educators, to set up comprehensive national education policies. The Committee tried to develop educational policies to extract Japanese colonialist culture and construct a new democratic educational system. The Committee was divided into 10 sub-Committees, including elementary education, secondary education, higher education, vocational education, teacher education, educational administration, and others. The Committee suggested a single-path school system instead of the double-path system utilized under Japanese colonial rule, in order to guarantee equal opportunity for education to all Koreans.

Additionally, the Committee determined the nature and character of the schools within the system, including such attributes as school-types, school names, identifying numbers, grades, semester designations, and reciprocal relationships of schools. Depending upon their community, a student would spend six years in elementary school, three years in middle school, three years in high school, and four years at the university level, or, six years of “secondary” school in lieu of three years each of middle and high school, followed by four years at the university level. Elementary school teachers received
high school level educations, while secondary teachers received 2 or 4 years of higher education (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b).

During this period, Korean education was profoundly influenced by America. The pragmatism ideas for education of John Dewey especially affected the educational philosophy of Korea (Han & An, 1985). The Korean government tried to offer students a democratic education, which it called “a new educational movement” influenced by Dewey’s pragmatism. This movement provided for (a) education respecting each student’s personality; (b) student-centered education to promote students’ voluntary educational motives; (c) empirical education; and (d) practical life-centered education (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b).

To summarize, requisite to the removal of the oppressive Japanese colonial influence, as well as the pre-modern dynastic influences, on the Korean education system, the U.S. Military government and South Korean educational leaders reorganized a curriculum emphasizing the Korean language and Korean history, and mandated the first compulsory education at the elementary school level. This period was the genesis of South Korea’s own modern, democratic educational system.

President Lee’s Government: 1948-1960

On August 15, 1948, the South Korean government took control from the U.S. Military in accordance with the new Constitution, which took effect on July 17, 1948. The first president of South Korea was Dr. Lee, S. M., who studied in the United States during Japanese colonial rule. He tried to establish democracy in Korea, emphasizing both the elimination of Japanese colonial influence and the establishment of anti-communism. President Lee ruled South Korea for 12 years including the Korea War—a conflict from June 1950 to July 1953 between South and North Koreans, until 1960 (Lee, 1999).

In December 1949, the Education Act, characterized by democratic and traditional values, was enacted finally giving South Korea its own democratic education system. The Educational Law of 1949 has since been the foundation of the Korean education system.
The Educational Law prescribed “Hong-Ik-In-Gan,” (pursuing all people’s welfare), as the Korean educational ideology. The Korean government emphasized education to foster democratic, anti-communistic nationalism characterized by Korean racial pride, humanism, and democracy (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b).

In March 1951, during the Korea War, the Korean government developed the “single line school system” through revision of the Education Act. The single line school system mandated 6 years of elementary school, 3 years of middle school, 3 years of high school, and 4 years of university (6 years for medical college). The single line school system was designed to accomplish the following (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b): (a) develop individual potential ability, (b) offer equal educational opportunity, (c) enlarge educational access, and (d) meet the international educational system standards. The educational system did not specifically address the need for social, life-long education, or for vocational education.

In June 1952, the Korean government instituted an educational decentralization policy and set up “a 6-year plan to complete compulsory education.” The 6-year compulsory education plan of 1952 was designed to insure that all people would complete elementary education. By 1959, 96% of all 6-year old children were enrolled in elementary schools (as compared to 74.8 % in 1948; 82.5% in 1954). The rapid increase in the number of students led to educational funding shortages and over crowded classrooms, with more than 60 students per classroom. The rapid increase in the number of students left Korea short of educational facilities, and caused a diminution in the overall quality of education (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b).

To summarize, the South Korean government of the first President Lee took control from the U.S. Military with the first Composition and constructed its own modern, democratic educational system including the Education Act that enacted in 1949. The government tried to eliminate Japanese colonial influence and to instill anti-communism in students and people. The single line school system, which is 6-year elementary school, 3-year middle school, 3-year high school, and 4-year university (6-year medical college), was established and is now maintained to offer equal educational opportunity.
The President Lee’s government instituted an educational decentralization policy, but the educational system maintained still a centralized system. The government set up a 6-year plan to complete compulsory education and accomplished the increase of elementary school enrollment rate from 74.8% in 1948 into 96% in 1959. The rapid increase in the number of students left Korea short of teachers and educational facilities and caused a deterioration of educational quality.

President Park’s Government: 1961-1979

On May 16, 1961, General Park, J. H. and his followers seized power through a military revolution in the midst of social unrest. General Park was elected President by a direct vote of the people in 1963, and went on to rule South Korea for 18 years (Lee, 1999).

The Park’s government enacted national policies focused on economic development because of believing them to be of primary importance. Education had long been seen as a tool for economic development, and was utilized intensively toward that end. The government also emphasized the following educational policies: (a) anti-communism education, in contrast to North Korean communism; (b) education to cultivate Korea’s own unique democracy and nationalism; and (c) vocational education to cultivate manpower with productive and technological skills. On December 5, 1968, the government authored and enacted “A Charter for People’s Education” to explain its ideology for the direction of educational policy, both for the development of Korea and for its citizens. The government required all students to memorize the Charter, and tried to indoctrinate all people in the national developmental ideology (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b).

In November 1970, the Park government started the “Se-Ma-Eul Movement,” (“to construct a new town”). Important people were enlisted to contribute to the development of community, society and nation. The Movement emphasized the instrumental value of education for economic and national development (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997).
Beginning in 1962, Park’s government had implemented a 5-year national plan for economic development, which included the five-year plan for education development. From 1962 to 1966, the first 5-year plan for compulsory educational development was instituted, and from 1967 to 1971, the second plan for compulsory educational development was set up and carried out. At the time, Korea required 6-year compulsory education at the elementary education level. Because of the 5-year plans for compulsory education, elementary students could receive free textbooks and education with the following environmental improvements: (a) reduction in class size, from 62 in 1966 to 58 in 1971; (b) reduction in student/teacher ratio, from 58.81 in 1960 to 56.87 in 1970; (c) increase in teachers, from 61,600 in 1960 to 101,000 in 1970; and (d) the abolition of the “double session” system, with the exception of big cities, wherein twice as many students could be taught by splitting them between morning and afternoon classes (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b).

During this period, science-technology education was considered as particularly important for economic development. From 1966 to 1971, “a 5-year plan for the development of science-technology education” was designed and implemented to cultivate competent industrial manpower (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b).

In addition, the vocational education was much emphasized so that the connection between education and industry was strengthened. The education system of this period provided enough industrial manpower and contributed to the economic development. On the other side, President Park’s government had strengthened its authoritative reign to continuously maintain political power and would utilize educational system in order for people to comply with its control (Cheon, 1989, October).

In 1972, an open junior college system that taught over broadcast radio was introduced, and an open high school system by radio broadcasting followed in 1974. These systems were designed to provide young people with jobs or adults with secondary and higher education opportunities (the Korean Ministry of Education & Human Resources Development [KMEHRD], 2003).

In July 1968, the government began a process of phasing out the middle school
entrance test. This was seen as necessary in order to protect elementary students from an overly narrow, written-test-centered learning. Thereafter, in 1974, the government announced the abolishment of the high school entrance exam in big cities and devised the “High School Leveling Policy,” designed to guarantee educational equality among all high schools. During this period, the South Korean government endeavored to equalize the educational quality of elementary and secondary schools as well. Due to these policies and the greater demand for higher quality workers, secondary students and graduates increased rapidly during the 1970s (KMEHRD, 2003). This great increase of secondary students caused intense competition for college admission and the increase of higher education institutes and students.

In summary, President Park’s government that seized political power through a military revolution placed the priority of national policies on economic development. Thus, educational function as a means for economic development or industrial competitiveness was emphasized so that educational system strove to bring up skillful manpower by enhancing science-technology and vocational education.

Moreover, Park’s government emphasized spiritual education such as anti-communism, Korea’s own unique democracy and nationalism, and A Charter for People’s Education. The government accomplished the improvement of compulsory education in elementary school level such as free textbooks, reduction in class size, the increase of teachers, and the abolition of a double session system excepting big cities. The government emphasized science-technology and the vocational education for the economic development and introduced open high school and junior college systems by a broadcasting system.

In addition, the government abolished the middle school entrance test and the high school entrance exam in big cities to provide students with equal educational opportunities. Secondary education became generalized due to these policies so that 95.8 percent of primary school graduates and 84.5 percent of middle school graduates went to respectively middle schools and high schools in 1980 while 27.2 percent of high school graduates entered colleges including 2 or 3-year junior colleges (Kim, 2005, June). Meanwhile, there
is a criticism that President Park utilized educational system to maintain his political power by people’s complying with his reign.

**President Cheon’s Government: 1980-1987**

On October 26, 1979, President Park’s 18-year reign came to a tragic end when he was assassinated by his subordinate, the chief of the Korean Central Intelligence Agency (KCIA). Korean society was racked by chaos following the President’s assassination. General Cheon and his followers brought the chaos to an end in 1980, and revised the Korean Constitution through a direct vote of the people. He became President in 1981 by the indirect vote system prescribed in the revised Constitution. Since 1980, President Cheon had been responsible for sweeping educational reforms as well as a series of social and political changes (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b).

On July 30, 1980, Cheon’s government announced an agenda for educational reform to place formal education on the right track, and to prohibit private sector educational activities requiring parents to bear the expense for them. During the 1970s and the early 1980s, the number of high school students almost quadrupled—increasing from 590,382 in 1970 to 1,696,792 in 1980, and to 2,152,802 in 1985 (KMEHRD, 2003; the Korean Ministry of Education & KEDI, 1999). Accordingly, those who want to enter college rapidly were increased by the early 1980s. The number of available college placements was limited, so competition among high school students to gain college admittance became severe, and secondary school students were forced to focus on narrow, test-centered learning.

Korea’s educational reforms in 1980 were aimed at reestablishing the fundamental function of formal education. The reforms were intended to make education whole; to offer intelligent, emotional, moral, and physically balanced education to students. In addition, the reforms were designed to require college students who participated in political demonstrations to study hard. The government increased its quota of freshmen to alleviate the intense competition for college entrance, and limited the number of college graduates
by requiring rigorous study at the college level. Prior to these reforms, college students could graduate even if they did not study hard, but, under the new standards, 30 percent of college students were not able to graduate from college (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b).

On March 7, 1985, the “Presidential Commission on Education Reform (PCER)” for the creation of educational reform projects was formed (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997). It was composed of 32 members, including educators, industrialists, and others with diverse social backgrounds. In addition, the expert members in each area of educational reforms to support the activities of the PCER were organized with 20 members, including professors, educational researchers, and teachers, and was empanelled. In December 1987, the PCER articulated the direction of educational reform and then proposed 42 comprehensive educational reforms in the following 10 areas: pre-school; elementary school; secondary school; higher education; exceptional and gifted education; life-long education; professional development training system for teachers; improvements in educational facilities and environments; and improvements in educational administration and funding. Following this work, the PCER was dissolved (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b).

The PCER’s educational reforms were essentially intended to (a) accomplish the fundamental educational reform of promoting self-actualization and the balanced development of individuals, (b) cultivate individual competence to meet the needs of the 21st century, and (c) carry out educational reform agendas to be determined by a consensus of the people (Central Educational Training Institute of the Ministry of Education, 1988). The educational reform projects intended to foster self-actualizing, creative, and moral people for the 21st century, and the PCER suggested the following 10 major educational reforms:

- School systems should change from a 6-3-3-4 system to a K-5-3-4-4 system (Kindergarten education would be part of public education)
- Improvement of the high school and college admission systems (this improvement is designed to replace written-exam-centered tests with diverse entrance test
methods for high school and college)

- Update school facilities and physical environments
- Obtain competent teachers
- Improve educational contents and methods
- Develop science-technology education (this reform contains policies to nurture gifted students in science and to support the improvement of science-technology facilities and research conditions in higher education)
- Enhance competitiveness between universities
- Establish an improved life-long educational system
- Decentralize the administration of education
- Increase public educational funding dramatically

These educational reforms in 1987 suggested comprehensive changes from kindergarten education through higher and life-long education, and became the basis of the next governmental educational policies and reforms. The reforms were not implemented during Cheon’s Presidency, which ended in February 1988, but the reform agendas became the foundations of future educational reforms in Korea (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b).

In summary, the number of high school students greatly increased from 590,382 in 1970 to 1,696,792 in 1980. The sudden increase of them caused severe competition for admission to college, and secondary school students fell into narrow, entrance test-oriented learning. To cope with these phenomena, President Cheon’s government had driven educational reforms since 1980 such as (a) strengthening the fundamental function of formal education that offers intelligent, emotional, moral, and physically balanced education for students, (b) prohibiting the teaching activities of private academic institutes that focus on college entrance test, (c) restricting college students to participating in political demonstrations and introducing a graduation quota system that limits the number of college graduates in order to require rigorous study, and (d) increasing quota of freshmen to alleviate the intense competition for college entrance. The last reform, increasing quota of freshmen, brought the rapid increase of college students from 601,494

Furthermore, President Cheon’s government established the Presidential Commission on Education Reform of first time belonging to the President as an organization for educational reform in 1985, which was consisted of 32 members with diverse social backgrounds. The Commission articulated the direction of educational reform and then proposed 42 comprehensive educational reforms from pre-school and elementary education to higher and life-long education to cultivate self-actualizing, creative, and moral people for the 21st century. The reforms were not implemented during President Cheon’s government but became the foundations of future educational reforms.

**President Rho’s Government: 1988-1992**

In 1987, many civilians, including university students, demonstrated against Cheon’s government, demanding more freedom and a better democratic political system. The demonstrators were particularly insistent that the people should vote directly in the Presidential election. At the time, the President was elected by the indirect vote of about eight thousand voters. Day by day, more people participated in the civilian demonstrations, and the demonstrations had become more and more fierce. Finally, the government capitulated to the demonstrators’ demands. The Korean Constitution was revised according to the demonstrators’ demands, and included the provision for a direct Presidential election. In December 1987, Rho, T. W., a Presidential candidate with a military background who was supported by Cheon’s government, was elected South Korean President by the direct election. President Rho ruled South Korea from February 1988 to February 1993.

The Rho’s administration implemented educational policies with characteristics of the policies proposed by the Presidential Commission on Education Reform during Cheon’s Presidency. Rho’s government emphasized educational policies intended to cultivate individual potential, to respect students’ personalities, to foster a democratic education system, and to recognize the importance of life-long education. In addition, the
government intended to enhance nationalism, basic academic ability, science-technology education, and balanced “whole human” education. In March 1991, educational decentralization, a policy designed to give local educational offices more autonomy in K-12 education, was implemented through revisions of relevant educational laws (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b).

On February 17, 1989, the Presidential Educational Policy Consultant Committee, composed of 15 members, was empanelled to suggest educational reforms to the President. The Committee, between 1989 and 1991, proposed educational reforms to the President six times. On October 1, 1991, the Committee released its final report on educational reforms. The report contained the following eight major reforms (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b):

1. Construction of an educational system to meet the demands of international society of being open to the world
2. Development of compulsory education, including extending the compulsory education period from elementary school till middle school and making more flexible the age restrictions for students participating in it
3. Granting universities greater decision rights to the student admission quotas that had been decided by the Ministry of Education
4. Enhancement of education for the reunification of South and North Koreas
5. Construction of a training system to educate competent teachers
6. Establishment of cooperatives between industry and universities
7. Improvement of higher education
8. Improvement of the teachers’ personnel system for teacher unionization to be prohibited

Furthermore, Rho’s government tried to change the current college admission system, to introduce a college diploma endowment system through self-study, to establish an education-only broadcast TV system, and to introduce a special funding system for the improvement of educational environments (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b). This government’s educational policies bridged the 1980s educational reforms to the
reforms of the 1990s.

To summarize, President Rho’s government implemented some of the reform projects proposed by PCER of the previous government. The government strove to cultivate individual potentials or personalities and to construct more advanced democratic and life-long educational systems. In addition, the government tried to enhance nationalism, basic academic ability, science-technology education, and balanced “whole human” education.

Furthermore, the government put into practice a decentralization policy to endow local educational offices with more autonomy. The Presidential Educational Policy Consultant Committee with 15 members was empanelled to suggest educational reforms to the President in February 1989. The Committee suggested educational reforms such as (a) establishing an educational system to meet the demands of international society, (b) extending the compulsory education period into middle school, (c) endowing universities with more decision rights to the student admission quotas, (d) enhancing education for the reunification of South and North Koreas, (e) improving a teachers training system, (f) fostering cooperation between industry and colleges, (g) enhancing the quality of higher education, and (h) reorganizing the teachers’ personnel system. These reforms were not implemented during Rho’s government.

Advent of the Mid-1990s Educational Reform

Prior to being elected President in 1992, Kim, Y. S. became a top member of Korea’s ruling party, Min-Ja-Dang. In February 1990, as the party’s representative, he suggested that educational reform was necessary for the completion of Korean democratization during address in the National Assembly (A representative of, 1990, February 27). In January of the next year, Kim, Y. S. suggested the following educational reforms in the Korean National Assembly (A representative of, 1991, January 30, p. A1) (a) reorganizing the college admission system to promote the normalization of high school education, (b) establishing an educational reform commission within the National
Assembly to accept diverse opinions of educators and parents, and (c) creating a law for the improvement of teachers’ status. On the Korean history, it is very rare to suggest setting up an educational reform commission within the National Assembly.

Kim, Y. S. demonstrated a campaign promising the following major educational policies as a Presidential candidate of the ruling party in 1992: (a) increasing public funding for education from 3.5 percent of GNP to 5 percent, (b) gradually endowing qualified universities with complete autonomy to their admission systems and student quota decisions, (c) increasing quotas of junior college students, and (d) extending compulsory education from the current elementary and rural middle schools to all middle schools (Competition on educational policies, 1992, October 31, p. A1).

As a Presidential candidate in November 1992, Kim announced, “we cannot help relying on education to meet the requirements of the 21st century’s changing society, and I will be an educational President” (Demonstration for Presidential election, 1992, November 29). Opposing political parties and the reports of previous administrations suggested investing five percent of GNP for education, but it was difficult for people to trust the idea because of huge national defense funding required in order to cope with communist North Korea (Demonstration for President Election, 1992, November 29).

The Ministry of Education had two reasons for pushing educational reforms: to solve problems stemming from the overly competitive written college admission exams, and to promote human-centered education consistent with the campaign promises of President Kim and the ruling party (the Korean Prime Ministry, 1998, February). In order to carry out the educational reforms, President Kim and the ruling party announced the following public pledges (the Korean Prime Ministry, 1998, February): (a) promote a self-active, creative human education system to lead the 21st century, (b) improve the current college admission system and solve the problem of overly competitive college entrance examinations, (c) procure educational funding of five percent GNP by 1998 to improve the poor current educational conditions, (d) improve the quality of college education and strengthen science education, (e) develop diverse life-long educational systems that promote practical education, (f) enhance teachers’ credibility through the
improvement of their status, and (g) cultivate sound private colleges or schools by greatly increasing support for them. These public pledges for educational reform were supposed to become a basis of educational reforms of President Kim’s government.

After Kim, Y. S. was elected President by a direct vote of the people in December 1992, the ruling party announced 30 national policies to be carried out within the first year of President Kim’s 5-year term. The creation of an educational reform commission was to be a major policy of the 30 policies (Decision of 30 policies, 1993, January 9). At his inauguration ceremony on February 25, 1993, President Kim offered his Presidential vision. In his speech, he mentioned Korean “diseases,” such as (a) missing diligence and creativity, (b) experiencing confused values, and (c) losing self-confidence for our future (Inauguration address, 1993, February 26, p. A5). Then he proposed the construction of a new Korea with freedom and an advanced democratic system, and said about education, “Let’s recover our lost morals. Toward that end, the current education system has to be changed to cultivate persons with humane feelings and sound citizenship, as well as to emphasize science-technology for our prosperity in the future.”

President Kim believed educational reforms could cultivate balanced democratic citizens with intelligence, emotion, morality and competence to meet the demands of the 21st century’s globalizing and knowledge-based society (Inauguration address, 1993, February 26). Thus, the mid-1990s educational reform process began.

In the next chapter, the developmental process of the educational reforms of the mid-1990s will be described. Each developmental process of four reform blueprints from 1995 to 1997 was similar (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998a; 1998b). The first of the educational reform blueprints was the most comprehensive and dynamic, and the development process of the first one was of great interest to the researcher. Therefore, the developmental process of the first educational reforms, announced on May 31, 1995, will be discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 6
DEVELOPMENTAL PROCESS OF THE MID-1990s
EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN SOUTH KOREA

Introduction

The educational reform movements have sprung up due to political reasons or coping with social, economical changes on the South Korean modern educational history (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b). The mid-1990s educational reform occurred because of the President Kim’s willingness to cope with globalizing and information-oriented social change. In addition, the educational reform movement in the mid-1990s had attempted to solve educational problems stemming from the past Korean society and has been connected with the development of the current educational system (the Presidential Committee on Education & Human Resources Development Policy, 2002).

In a panel forum addressing the direction of educational reform in April 1993, panelists who were educators pointed out educational problems at that time as the following (Kim, 1993, April 27):

Most parents want their children to go to college regardless of their aptitudes and academic abilities, and numbers of students wanting to attend academic high schools are rapidly increasing. Some parents have even used unfair methods to get their children into college. Therefore, vocational education is withered, and high school students (two-fifths a class) who are not interested in academic study show severe laziness in classrooms of academic high schools. Students focus on learning
too much narrow knowledge to prepare for college entrance test. Accordingly, it is difficult for school education to bring up a balanced human with a sense of humane feelings or morality. (p. A14)

The panelists suggested the following directions for educational reform (Kim, 1993, April 27, p. A14): (a) education to cultivate individual potentials and aptitudes, (b) education to promote humanity instead of intensely focusing on college entrance tests, (c) education to meet the requirement of an up-coming information society, (d) education to realize the importance of environmental preservation, (e) education to prepare reunification between South Korea and North Korea, (f) the expansion of public educational funding (five percent of GNP until 1998), and (g) the attainment of competent teachers. This panel discussion showed an aspect of educational problems in those days to be solved and implied the directions of the mid-1990s educational reform.

In April 1993, the prime minister, Whang, I. S., of South Korea stated during the national policy address in the National Assembly that a presidential commission for educational reform would be organized. Then he mentioned that the government would carry out structural reform on the overall educational system so it would be soundly developed without current prevailing unfairness (Prime minister, 1993, April 29).

But, in a panel forum for educational reform of the Korean Educational Science Association in August 2003, panelists criticized the current government’s unwillingness and retardation for educational reform that President Kim and the ruling party had promised (Kim, 1993, August 24). They insisted that the government should increase public funding for education (five percent of GNP) and support needed funding for the people’s education regardless of public or private educational institutes because a nation is an ultimate beneficiary of education. Furthermore, they pointed out that the government should do its best to alleviate overly competitive entrance test-centered education and to consolidate a life-long educational system for all people.

Thus, the Korean government was forced to carry out a nationwide educational reform from educators and public opinion and then led the comprehensive educational reform. In this chapter, the researcher will describe the developmental process of the
mid-1990s educational reform in Korea and show the developmental process or pattern of making out an educational reform blueprint that the Korean government applies. The developmental process of educational reform will be described from the departure of President Kim’s government in February 1993 to the first announcement of educational reform blueprint in May 1995, a representative blueprint among four blueprints, and then its pattern will be analyzed.

**Preparation for the Departure of Educational Reform**

For the creation of an educational reform blueprint, the following major factors are necessary in Korea: (a) enacting statutes to prescribe organizations, tasks, budget, and procedures for educational reform, (b) organizing committees or staff to carry the reform out, and (c) procuring budget or facilities to support the committees or staff’s activities. In this section, the preparing activities to start the mid-1990s educational reform will be described.

**Enactment for the Composition of Educational Reform Organizations**

For the start of educational reform, it is the first step to enact statutes for making organization in charge of educational reform and endowing the organization with authority to carry out the reform. The Planning and Budgeting Division of the Ministry of Education took charge of the enactment of statutes and the procurement of budget in order to start the mid-1990s educational reform (Administrator B, personal communication, September 24, 2004). The Ministry of Education decided to enact not a law of demanding the consultation and decision of the National Assembly but a Presidential decree (Presidential rule) to compose organizations for the creation of educational reform blueprint (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1998).

The Ministry of Education made a plan to carry out a nationwide educational reform including “Educational Reform Commission Rule (ERCR, a Presidential rule)” and
received President Kim’s approval on July 3, 1993. On July 29, 1993, ERCR were passed in the Cabinet Council of Korea. Thereafter, on August 10, 1993, ERCR to set up the Presidential Commission on Education Reform was promulgated (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996).

ERCR prescribed the purpose, function, composition, term, conference procedure, sub-committees, and supporting members (etc.) of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform. The Commission was supposed to discuss and assess fundamental educational policies and reforms, short- and long-term educational development plans, processes of implementing educational reform, and educational policies that the President refers to discussion of the Commission (ERCR, Art. 2).

The Commission was supposed to be composed of 25 or less members including the chairperson and vice-chairperson (ERCR, Art. 3). The regular conference of the Commission was supposed to be opened every three months, and the temporary conference would be opened whenever the President or the chairperson demands (ERCR, Art. 6). The Commission could create Sub-Committees to efficiently carry out its tasks and appoint 10 additional special members who are educational experts to survey or research its tasks (ERCR, Art. 7, 8).

The Cooperation Commission for the Practice of Educational Reform was composed of 20 or less members including the top class officials of 10 relevant governmental ministries to implement educational reforms cooperatively and smoothly (ERCR, Art. 10). The Presidential Commission on Education Reform could demand the disposition of public officials from relevant governments supporting its activities (ERCR, Art. 9).

Composition of Organizations for Educational Reform

ERCR was promulgated on August 10, 1993, and then the educational reform was supposed to start. First, the composition of organizations prescribed in ERCR was required to start the educational reform.
Composition of Secretariat Office. On September 7, 1993, the Secretariat Office to support the composition and activities of educational reform organizations was established by the Ministry of Education in a public building near the Governmental Complex Building in Seoul. A secretary-general and 10 officials from the Ministry of Education were appointed (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1998).

The Secretariat Office consisted of a bureau with two departments. The Office prepared the departure of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform over collecting documents or data for the creation of educational reform blueprint and summarizing educational problems and policies until the Commission was composed (Administrator A, personal communication, September 15, 2004). The office took charge of the following tasks: (a) to collect and arrange data or documents relevant to educational reforms, (b) to arrange and support seminars or public hearings, (c) to operate a people proposal system for educational reform, (d) to monitor the processes of implementing educational reform projects, and (e) to carry out other general affairs to support the activities of educational reform organizations (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996, p. 301).

Composition of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform. The Presidential Commission on Education Reform was an organization to plan and lead educational reform. Accordingly, the composition of the Commission means the actual start of educational reform. But, the formation of the Commission was delayed even though it became possible by the promulgation of ERCR on August 10, 1993. On October 8, 1993, President Kim stated his concern for the urgency and importance of educational reform in a lunch meeting with educational leaders (Most urgent, 1993, October 9):

Educational reform is urgent and a very important reform compared to other areas of reform. Now, educational reform is most delayed among overall national reforms, but our education has to be changed into education to bring up competent individuals to overcome the competitive circumstances of international society in the future. (p. A2)

Because the composition of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform was
delayed, the start-up of educational reform was postponed. The composition of the Commission was delayed due to difficulty in selecting an appropriate chairperson (Kim, Lee, & Heo, 1993, October 10). The authors described that President Kim was finding a indomitable chairperson with the following competences: (a) understanding the President’s intention, (b) creating educational reform from accepting the public consensus, (c) coordinating organizations related with educational reform, and (d) leading public cooperation in carrying out educational reform.

But such a chairperson still was not found, and the educational reform was delayed. An editorial of the Chosunilbo (Editorial: Still do, 1994, January 10) pointed out that the composition of the Commission was delayed for five months and described that the retardation in selecting a chairperson of the Commission was considered as disagreement among secretary staffs of President Kim in Blue House, the Presidential office building. The editorial suggested that it not be difficult if two principles agreed on the following: (a) ‘What area the educational reform should be started from’ and (b) ‘How the reform should be carried out’ (p. A3).

President Kim finally found an acceptable chairperson who was his university alumnus and appointed a chairperson and 24 members of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform on February 5, 1994 (Administrator A, personal communication, September 15, 2004). The chairperson was Lee, S. H., a former president of a private university, and other members were 2 university presidents, 4 deans of universities, a former president of a teachers’ college, 9 university professors, a commissioner of a broad provincial educational office that was in charge of K-12 education, a vocational high school principal, an elementary school associate principal, an educational researcher of KEDI, a pressman of newspaper, an industrial leader, a representative from the parents’ association, and the president of the Private Educational Institute Association (attached the Commission members’ list in Appendix C; Choi, 1994, February 5; the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996).

To summarize, seventeen (two-thirds of all members) were from universities, and there was no teacher or governmental personnel. The government tried to involve members
with diverse backgrounds in the Commission, but the selection of its members was leaned upon university personnel. The Commission was supposed to create educational reform blueprints after opening its office on February 7, 1994. Thus, the mid-1990s educational reform was set about in earnest (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1998).

The Presidential Commission on Education Reform had the leading position for the creation of educational reform blueprint, and the Vice-Minister of Education, the Social-Welfare Secretary for President, and the Administration Coordination General of the Prime Minister participated in the conference of the Commission as executive secretaries. The Commission took charge of the following tasks (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996, p. 298-299).

- Decision for the direction of educational reform
- Selection of educational reform agenda
- Assignment of educational reform problems to Sub-Committees
- Evaluation for the implementation of educational reform
- Discussion and decision for educational reform agenda proposed by Sub-Committees
- Proposal of educational reform agenda or blueprint to President

**Composition of Steering Committee.** On February 20, 1994, the Presidential Commission on Education Reform created a regulation “Educational Reform Commission Operation Regulation (ERCOR)” by the prescription of ERCR to concretely operate the Commission.

The Commission intended to compose “Steering Committee” with 7 or less than 7 among the Commission’s members including a chairperson and a vice-chairperson to support or promote the efficient operation of the Commission (ERCOR Art. 5). The Steering Committee was actually composed of eight members: a chairperson, a vice-chairperson, a permanent member appointed by the chairperson, and the chiefs of 5 Sub-Committees of the Commission (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996; 1998). The Steering Committee discusses and coordinates the following items to support the efficient and smooth operation of the Presidential Commission: (a) the
selection of reform agenda to submit to the Commission, (b) the control of research or consensus study regarding educational reform, (c) the control or distribution of reform agenda for the Sub-Committees to handle or discuss (etc.) (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996, p. 299; ERCOR Art. 6).

**Composition of Sub-Committees.** The Presidential Commission on Education Reform could set up Sub-Committees composed of the Commission’s members to efficiently carry out the Commission’s tasks (ERCR Art. 7). The Commission’s chairperson could appoint the chiefs and members of Sub-Committees after receiving the approval of the Commission (ERCOR, Art. 9). The Commission composed five Sub-Committees of Table 2 with a chair and four more or less members (members’ list attached to Appendix D, the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996; 1998).

Table 2
Five Sub-Committees of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Sub-Committee</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| First Sub-Committee | • Diversification and flexibility of school system  
| | • Revision or creation of educational statutes |
| Second Sub-Committee | • Increase of educational funding  
| | • Professional development training and morale promotion for teachers  
| | • School-based management system |
| Third Sub-Committee | • Reform of college admission system  
| | • Reform of elementary and secondary curriculum |
| Fourth Sub-Committee | • Consolidation of university or college’s competitiveness  
| | • Renovation of vocation-technology education |
| Fifth Sub-Committee | • Enhancement of social education and its function  
| | • Consolidation of private school’s autonomy and responsibility |
The Sub-Committees handled the following items (ERCOR, Art. 9, 10; the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996): (a) to research, discuss, and draw up the reform agenda that the Presidential Commission on Education Reform assigns to them, (b) to propose reform projects to the Commission, (c) to lead and carry out experts’ conferences, public hearings, or discussions for assigned reform agenda, and (d) to get Expert Members belonging to each Sub-Committee to survey or study specific agenda.

**Appointment of Expert Members.** The chairperson of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform could additionally appoint 10 full-time or part-time special members (Expert Members) who are experts in each educational field to help each Sub-Committee’s tasks (ERCOR, Art. 13). The permanent member of the Commission managed the Expert Members (ERCOR, Art. 8). One or two Expert Members were appointed and assigned to every Sub-Committee on March 9, 1994 (Expert Members’ list attached to Appendix E; the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1998).

The Expert Members took charge of studying educational reform agenda or proposals to submit to the Commission or each Sub-Committee and preliminarily discussing and coordinating the educational reform agenda or projects (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996).

**Summary of organizations for educational reform.** The Ministry of Education started the composition of organizations by enacting ERCR and setting up the Secretariat Office in September 1993 to support the Presidential Commission on Education Reform. The composition of organizations to create the educational reform blueprint was completed by organizing the Expert Members, March 1994, and the creation of educational reform blueprint was started. Table 3 shows the summary of organizations for creating the educational reform blueprint.
Table 3
Organizations for Creating Educational Reform Blueprint.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of organization</th>
<th>Major function</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Date of composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat Office</td>
<td>Supporting activities of the Presidential Commission</td>
<td>11 members from the Ministry of Education</td>
<td>September 7, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Commission on</td>
<td>Overall control and decision for creating educational</td>
<td>25 members from professors, educators,</td>
<td>February 5, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Reform</td>
<td>reform agenda and blueprint</td>
<td>pressman, industry personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Coordination of agenda and projects proposed by Sub-Committees</td>
<td>8 members composed of chairman, vice-chairman, permanent member, chairs of Sub-Committees</td>
<td>February 7, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Committees</td>
<td>Creating and drawing up reform agenda and blueprint</td>
<td>4 or 5 members to each Sub-Committee from the Commission’s members</td>
<td>February 20, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Members</td>
<td>Studying and surveying reform agenda or projects</td>
<td>10 members, experts in field of each Sub-Committee</td>
<td>March 9, 1994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Process of Completing Educational Reform Blueprint

Both statutes and organizations with operation budget for the construction of a nationwide educational reform blueprint were completed, and then the educational reform was started. First, the Presidential Commission on Education Reform led the whole process for the creation of the educational reform blueprint. In this section, the researcher will explore the construction process of the blueprint in the mid-1990s of South Korea from the analyses of the conference records and documents of the Commission and interview data.
from informants who participated in the conferences of the Commission.

**Procedure of Constructing the Educational Reform Blueprint**

Educational reform blueprint was supposed to be made by the Presidential Commission on Education Reform and its Sub-Committees and completed by the approval of the President. The procedures of constructing educational reforms are included in the following paragraphs (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996).

First, the Commission sets up the direction and topics of educational reform to meet the requirement of the 21st century, globalization and information society. Thereafter, the Commission assigns the topics to each Sub-Committee, and then Sub-Committees study and review the assigned topics.

Second, each Sub-Committee requires that Expert Members study and summarize the assigned reform topics with materials such as documents, data, studies, proposals, educators’ opinions, and people’s consensus.

Third, each Sub-Committee including Expert Members discusses and reviews the study results to the topics researched by the Expert Members. In this procedure, Sub-Committees try to induce people’s concern and support for educational reform with events such as educators’ conferences, panel discussions, and public hearings relevant to each educational reform agenda. Each Sub-Committee sets up educational reform agenda or projects to the topics assigned to them.

Fourth, the Steering Committee discusses and coordinates the educational reform agenda or projects studied by each Sub-Committee before they are proposed to the conference of the Presidential Commission.

Fifth, the whole conference of the Commission discusses the educational reform agenda or projects proposed by the five Sub-Committees and fixes educational reform blueprint or projects to be reported to the President. Before the educational reform agenda is fixed, the Commission reviews the possibility of their implementation from negotiation with relevant governmental ministries and secretaries of Blue House.
Sixth, the fixed blueprint or projects by the Commission are proposed to the President. If the President approves the blueprint or projects, they are finally fixed as reform blueprint or projects to be implemented.

Figure 1 shows the procedure of completing an educational reform blueprint. In the next section, the researcher will explore the actual activities of organizations for creating the educational reform blueprint.

**Figure 1.** Procedure of Completing the Educational Reform Blueprint.

**Process of Creating the Educational Reform Blueprint**

The meetings of Sub-Committee and Expert Members were supposed to be held at least one time per week, as was the meeting of Steering Committee. The results of the Steering Committee and Sub-Committees’ meetings or studies were reported to the Presidential Commission usually monthly. The Commission controlled and finally decided
upon educational reform projects to be reported to the President. The meeting of the Commission was held at least one time per month (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996; 1998). Understanding meetings or activities of the Commission will be a shortcut for understanding the process of making out the educational reform blueprint.

Furthermore, the Commission held a Joint-Committee that the Commission’s members, Expert Members, and educators or administrators relevant to educational reforms together participated to discuss or review educational reform projects (Administrator B, personal communication, September 24, 2004). The Joint-Committee showed the main discussion topics for the educational reform (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996; 1998). Therefore, the researcher explored the Commission’s meetings to find out its activities and the Joint Committee’s meetings from February 1994 to May 1995, and then describe the whole process for the completion of the first educational reform blueprint.

Meetings of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform. The conference records of the Commission were found only on the records of “Direction and Problem of Educational Reform to Create a New Korea” that the Commission published in 1996. Accordingly, the following descriptions regarding the conferences or meetings of the Commission came from the records of the Direction and Problem of Educational Reform to Create a New Korea and interview data with informants who participated in the conferences of the Commission (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996; interview data with Expert A, Administrator A, & B, 2004).

At 1:25 p.m. on February 5, 1994, the first meeting of the Presidential Commission with 25 members was opened in the conference room of its office in Seoul. The chairman of the Commission stated an opening address to other members, and then the processes and missions of establishing the Commission and ERCR were explained. The Commission passed the operation plan of the Commission made out by the Secretariat Office. The Commission left the composition of the Steering Committee in the hands of the chairman and the vice chairman. In addition, the Commission decided to hold its meeting at 10 a.m.
of the second Saturday every month. The first meeting of the Commission ended at 2:35 p.m.

At 11:20 a.m. on February 20, the same year, the second meeting of the Commission was held in the Seoul Education & Culture Complex Building located in the suburbs of Seoul. The Commission revised and passed ERCOR proposed by the Secretariat Office. Thereafter the Commission was reported the results of the conference between the members of the Commission and the Ministry of Education’s officials concerning the reform of elementary and secondary curriculum and the people’s proposal system for educational reform to be managed by the Secretariat Office since February 23, 1994.

Twelve members of the Commission and 7 officials of the Ministry of Education participated in the meeting for the reform of elementary and secondary curriculum on February 12. The participants of the meeting decided the basic directions of curriculum reform such as (a) the enhancement of moral education, (b) the development of students’ creativity, (c) the diversification of educational contents and method, and (d) the enhancement of quality management in education.

Moreover, the Commission decided the English name of the Commission as the “Presidential Commission on Education Reform”. The Commission left the composition of Sub-Committees in the hands of the chairman, and the meeting ended at 12:25 p.m.

At 2 p.m. on March 12, the third meeting of the Commission was opened in the conference room of its office. The chairman of the Commission appointed 10 Expert Members (3 full-timers, 7 part-timers) supporting its activities in the meeting. The Commission decided to divide Sub-Committees into the 5 topics of Table 4 even though they were previously supposed to be divided into 9 topics. The Commission revised ERCOR in order that the chairs of Sub-Committees could appoint consultant(s) and researcher(s) who study or survey their tasks assigned by the Commission.

Chairman Lee of the Commission appointed Lee, M. H. as a permanent member of the Commission and Choi, C. O. as a permanent Expert Member, and the two permanent members played a leading role in the operation of the Commission, the activities of Expert Members, and the construction of the educational reform blueprint (Expert A, personal
communication, October 4, 2004).

Table 4
Topics on Educational Reforms Assigned to Sub-Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous topics</th>
<th>Revised topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• School system</td>
<td>• School system and statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educational statutes</td>
<td>• Educational administration and funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educational funding</td>
<td>• Curriculum and college admission system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educational administrative organization and operation</td>
<td>• Social and international education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teachers personnel system</td>
<td>• Science-technology education and human resources development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Curriculum and textbook system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality advancement on academic research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Science-technology education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social and international education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At 2 p.m. on April 19, the Commission held the fourth meeting in its conference room. A director of the Secretariat Office reported the results of both the Steering Committee meetings and the opinions on educational reforms that people proposed by the people proposal system through the methods such as (a) 119 letters received (b) 22 telephone calls received, (c) 14 faxes received, and (d) 13 visits in person. The Commission discussed or decided the following topics, and the meeting ended at 4:45 p.m.

First, the Commission discussed the proposal of holding its meeting twice a month instead of one time in order to timely deal with educational reform projects proposed by the Sub-Committees. The Commission decided to hold its meeting once per month as the previous rule. As an alternative to appropriately handle the proposed projects, the
Commission decided to open the meeting of a Joint Committee with the Commission’s members, Expert Members, and relevant officials and discuss the reform projects proposed by the Sub-Committees.

Second, the Commission decided to deal with the problem of the written test taken by each individual university in the third Sub-Committee because the problem was a hot issue even though the Commission was supposed to handle fundamental and long-range educational reform agenda.

Third, the chairs of the five sub-Committees reported the results of their activities, and the Commission decided to compose a task force to create the general principles of educational reform and make out strategic targets.

At 2 p.m. on May 14, the fifth meeting of the Commission was held in the conference room of its office. The results discussed in the Steering Committee were reported to the Commission. The five Sub-Committees reported their study results concerning the assigned tasks and the members of the Commission commented on the results. The Commission decided to hold a joint billet study conference for three days in a South Han River Training Center in the suburbs of Seoul after each Sub-Committee would complete studies on the assigned topics. Its meeting ended at 5:40 p.m.

At 10 a.m. on June 11, the sixth meeting of the Commission was opened in the conference room of its office. The Commission discussed and passed an emergent counter-plan to solve the problem of the current college admission system. The counter-plan contained the following educational policies to normalize or improve elementary and secondary school education: (a) the abolishment of individual university’s written entrance tests from 1996 school year, (b) the enhancement of test discrimination or difficulty degree in the nationwide college entrance test, (c) the maintenance of the current system using high school grades or activities as college admission data, (d) the introduction of the admission system selecting students with diverse criteria, and (e) the guarantee of rights that students can apply for two and more universities the same year. The meeting ended at 2:55 p.m.

At 10:20 a.m. on June 25, the seventh Commission’s meeting was opened in the
conference room of its office. The results of both the last meeting and the Steering Committee’s meetings were reported. The Commission discussed the date and contents of the first report for educational reform projects to be opened under the President’s supervision. The Commission decided to report both the basic direction of educational reform and the strategy to carry out educational reform in the first report. The Commission decided to delay the first report about one month to President Kim and to report the first educational reform projects after enough monitoring to public opinions because its previous report concerning the reform of the college admission system including abolishing individual university’s written tests on June 13 brought about many controversies among people and governments. The meeting ended at 12:45 p.m.

At 10 a.m. on August 20, the eighth Commission’s meeting was opened in the conference room of its office. The Commission reviewed, discussed, and corrected the draft of the first educational reform report to be opened under the President’s presidency. The Commission decided to compose a special task force to complete the first educational reform report. The Commission re-classified major educational reform topics into 11 topics and re-assigned the major reform topics to the five Sub-Committees as Table 5. The meeting ended at 12:25 p.m.

Table 5

Five Sub-Committees’ Major Educational Reform Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Committee</th>
<th>Educational reform topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Sub-Committee</td>
<td>• Diversification and flexibility of school system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Revision or reorganization of educational statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Sub-Committee</td>
<td>• Increase of educational funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional development and morale uplift for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consolidation of school-based management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Sub-Committee</td>
<td>• Improvement of college admission system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reorganization of elementary and secondary curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Sub-Committee</td>
<td>• Enhancement of international competitiveness for higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Renovation of vocation-technology education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Sub-Committee</td>
<td>• Enhancement of social education and social educational function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consolidation of private schools’ autonomy and responsibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At 10:09 a.m. on October 22, the ninth Commission’s meeting was opened in the conference room of its office. The last meeting results, the results of the Steering Committee’s meetings, and the activities and action plan of the Commission were reported. The five chairs of Sub-Committees reported their activities and action plans. The meeting ended at 6:30 p.m. Subsequently, the Joint Committee that its members, experts, and relevant officials participated together was opened in the same place.

At 10:10 a.m. on November 26, the tenth Commission’s meeting was held in its conference room. The last meeting’s results, the results of the Steering Committee’s meetings, and the activities of the five Sub-Committees were reported. The Commission discussed the following three educational reform themes, and the meeting ended at 5:30 p.m.

First, the fourth Sub-Committee in charge of reform for higher education proposed the following reform agenda for higher education, and the Commission discussed them: (a) diversified and differentiated development models, (b) the specialized development of graduate schools, (c) the development of diverse educational programs, (d) the gradual self-control of universities for students’ quota, (e) the increase of funding, and (f) the enhancement of competition system among universities.

Second, the Sub-Committee in charge of reform for a private school system proposed the following reform projects for elementary and secondary private schools, and the Commission discussed them: (a) the expansion of private schools, (b) the enhancement of autonomy for self-managed private schools, (c) the recommendation of teachers’ recruitment by a Private School Associate Organization, and (d) the increase of funding and tax-reduction for private school.

Third, the Sub-Committee in charge of reform for a private school system proposed the following revisions of the “Private School Act”: (a) the reorganization of trustee council composition, (b) the revision of trustee council’s function and authority, (c) the introduction of faculty council system, (d) the guarantee of principal and president’s term and authority, (e) the increase of funding support for private schools of central and local
governments, and (f) the opening of account balance sheets to the public.

At 10 a.m. on January 21, 1995, the eleventh Commission’s meeting was opened in its conference room. The results of the last meeting and the Steering Committee’s meetings were reported. The Commission discussed or decided the following educational reform projects, and the meeting ended at 6 p.m.

First, the Commission discussed the revision of the Private School Act. The Commission decided to reduce the members of trustee council in charge of important decision-making on private school administration, to increase the proportion of the trustees recommended by faculty council, and for the fifth Sub-Committee to review the problem of composing the trustee council.

Second, the Commission discussed the reform of the High School Leveling Policy for the admission system, quality, and condition of private high schools. The Commission decided to propose the project to bring up the self-reliance private high schools of possessing student selection and tuition decision right.

Third, the Commission discussed the reform of the current teachers’ training system. The Commission decided to increase teachers in charge of special subjects like music, fine arts, and physical education in the elementary school, to enhance teachers’ professional development, and to recommend that teachers have double majors. The Commission decided to complement the training system for vocation-relevant teachers later on.

Fourth, the Commission debated the reform of elementary and secondary curriculum. The Commission decided that the departments taking charge of curriculum in the Ministry of Education would treat the reorganization problem of curriculum. The Commission decided to negotiate the reform of textbook system with the Ministry of Education before fixing the curriculum reform project.

At 6 p.m. on April 26, the twelfth meeting of the Commission was opened in a conference room of the Palace Hotel in Seoul. The Commission reviewed and discussed the educational reform projects to be reported to the President. The Commission decided to compose a special task force to comprehensively handle the problem of private academic activities that parents pay for expense and feel much burden. The Commission
assessed that the educational reform blueprint with reform backgrounds, directions, goals, and projects (etc.) to be reported to the President were much improved more than the last version. The meeting ended at 11:30 p.m.

At 6 p.m. on May 20, the thirteenth Commission’s meeting was held in its conference room. The results of its two previous meetings were reported. The Commission’s vice-chairman explained the final version of the educational reform blueprint to be reported to the President. Its members discussed and unanimously agreed to the final version, and the meeting ended at 8 p.m. Thus, the educational reform blueprint to be reported to the President on May 31, 1995, was completed.

At 2:06 p.m. on May 27, the fourteenth Commission’s meeting was opened in its conference room. The result of the last Commission’s meeting was reported. In the fourteenth meeting, the Commission again reviewed the final version of the educational reform blueprint “Education Reform Projects I to Construct a New Educational System of Leading Globalization and Information Era” and corrected a part concerning the project to procure the public educational funding of five percent of GNP. The Commission decided to recommend that the vice-Ministers of five Ministries relevant to the educational funding including the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Finance and Economy would set up a concrete project to procure the educational funding. The Commission decided to specially report a counter-plan to solve the problem of overheated private after-school academic activities for the preparation of college entrance that parents pay for their fees.

The five Sub-Committees in charge of studying the reform topics of Table 6 to create the next reform blueprint were newly organized. The meeting ended at 4:15 p.m.
Table 6

Five Sub-Committees Organized on May 27, 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Committee</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Chairperson</th>
<th>Expert Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Sub-Committee</td>
<td>Reorganization of educational statutes and administration</td>
<td>Lee, K. H.</td>
<td>Kang, I. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Sub-Committee</td>
<td>Improvement of self-government system on local education</td>
<td>Lee, D. H.</td>
<td>Seo, J. H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Sub-Committee</td>
<td>Diversification of school system</td>
<td>Shin. I. C.</td>
<td>Choi, C. O.; Kang, C. L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Sub-Committee</td>
<td>Construction of vocation-technology educational system to meet the information society</td>
<td>Lee, K. J.</td>
<td>Jeong, T. U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Sub-Committee</td>
<td>Enhancement of autonomy and responsibility for private schools</td>
<td>Jeong, J. W.</td>
<td>Kim, J. U.; Lee, C. C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joint Committee’s meetings. The Joint Committee’s meeting composed of the Presidential Commission’s members, Expert Members, government’s administrators, and the officials of the Secretariat Office was an opened, brain storming conference on educational reforms (Administrator B, personal communication, September 24, 2004). The Joint Committee’s meeting played a role in forming rapport and solving disagreement among the members (Expert A, personal communication, October 4, 2004).

The researcher could find the conference records of the Joint Committee only on the records of “Direction and Problem of Educational Reform to Create a New Korea” like the case of the Presidential Commission (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996). Accordingly, the following descriptions regarding the activities of the Joint Committee came from the conference records and interview data with Expert A and Administrator A and B.

On June 3 through 5, 1994, the first Joint Committee’s meeting was held in a South Han River Training Center located in the suburbs of Seoul. The Joint Committee discussed the study outcomes of the first Sub-Committee in charge of the reform of school system
and educational statutes including the revision of the Private School Act. There were controversial pros and cons regarding the introduction of a new school system to fit an international system and involve kindergarten education within public education. The Committee agreed to introduce a diversified school system that parents or students select a better system between the current school system and a new one to promote international competitiveness. The Joint Committee agreed that the first Sub-Committee would handle the revision of the Education Act in order to reflect the reform projects on the Act.

Next, the Joint Committee debated the study outcomes of the second Sub-Committee in charge of educational administration and funding. The Committee discussed an individual school management system’s reform including the merge of small size farm- and sea-village schools and the construction of educational information network. The committee reviewed the reform project on the governance system of local education and agreed to study the project because the reform of the governance system was very controversial among relevant invested groups. The Committee discussed reform projects on a university management system such as the introduction of corporation management methods in national universities and the reduction of electricity price that universities use. Then, the Committee discussed reform projects on teachers’ training and personnel system including setting up a counter-plan to the problems of short industrial high school teachers and increasing opportunities for teachers to receive graduate school education. In addition, the committee discussed the methods for increasing educational funding including the topics of increasing funding for local education and imposing property tax on the rich.

Then, the Joint Committee discussed the study outcomes of the third Sub-Committee taking charge of the reform of elementary and secondary curriculum and college admission system. The Committee decided to propose a reform project on college admission system to abolish the written tests of individual universities from the 1995-school year to the President because many people including high school students were going through anguish from the current admission system. on June 13, 1994, the Commission reported the urgent reform project on the college admission system with the
result of the first Joint Committee’s discussion to President Kim by written document, but President Kim did not accept the reform project and asked more fundamental educational reform projects (Expert A, personal communication, October 4, 2004).

Lastly, the first Sub-Committee in charge of school system’s reform reported the study regarding foreign school systems such as Britain, France, German, and Japan. The Sub-Committee had visited the four countries to study their educational systems for ten days. The study described that the current school system of Korea would not fit with the upcoming information society because of being established in the 1960s and then that the Sub-Committee was making out a reform project to the current school system. The Committee decided to compose a special task force in order to complete a draft of the first education reform blueprint and to discuss the draft at the 7th meeting on June 25 of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform.

From September 24 to 25, 1994, the second Joint Committee meeting for comprehensive discussion regarding educational reform projects was opened at, Olympic Parktel, in Seoul. The Committee discussed projects to enhance the international competitiveness of higher education. The Committee agreed to describe more clearly the diversified and specialized development projects on higher educational institutes and to compose a new organization of supporting the increase of funding for higher education. In addition, the Committee agreed to the following proposals: (a) the decision right of students’ quota should be given to each university, especially private one, and (b) that higher education in the fields such as theology, medical science, and law to cultivate high-quality specialists should be started in the level of graduate school.

Next, the Joint Committee discussed a project to procure funding for the implementation of educational reform. The committee agreed to the followings: (a) introducing diverse means such as fund raising, school bonds, and lottery to procure educational funding in addition to the public governmental budget, (b) merging small size schools located in farm- and sea- villages, and (c) the President’s willingness is the most important factor in procuring educational funding. Then, the Joint Committee discussed the reform project for enhancing the autonomy and responsibility of private schools.
including the problem of increasing funding to support private schools.

From 11:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. on October 22, 1994, the third Joint Committee’s meeting was held in the conference room of the Presidential Commission. The Committee discussed reform projects concerning higher education and agreed to the followings: (a) to induce competition both among universities and within a university and to increase investment for universities in order to improve quality of universities, (b) to uplift the exchange of information and data among universities by constructing the cooperating net-work system, and (c) to get universities to play a role as the centers of education and culture for their local societies.

Then, the Committee discussed a project to enhance the autonomy and responsibility of private schools including the problem of abolishing the High School Leveling Policy that had been implemented since the mid-1970s. The Committee discussed a project to increase educational funding and decided to utilize the meeting to be opened under the control of the Presidential Chief Secretary between the Presidential Commission and the top Secretaries of Blue House relevant to educational reforms as a chance to procure funding for educational reform.

In addition, the Committee discussed a reform project on the teachers’ training and personnel system, decided to additionally study the problem of training elementary and secondary teachers in graduate school level, and agreed to propose the introduction of a chief teacher system that appoints excellent teachers who work as a teacher until retirement. The Committee discussed the reform of elementary and secondary curriculum. The Committee agreed to endow individual schools and students with more expanded rights in selecting textbooks and teaching materials and to more flexibly run the current textbook system and the teacher recruit system for it.

From December 20 to 21, 1994, the fourth Joint Committee’s meeting that was the last meeting before the completion of the first educational reform blueprint to be reported on May 31, 1995 was held in, Paradise Hotel, of Choongcheongnam-Do province located in the South of Seoul. The Committee discussed three major reform projects to be first carried out. The three projects were (a) the globalization project of higher education,
the reform project of the High School Leveling Policy and the private school system, and (c) the reorganization project of the Private School Act. The Committee agreed: (a) for the Sub-Committee in charge of the reform of higher education to review and complement the reform projects on higher education, (b) for the Presidential Commission to carefully approach or treat the problem of abolishing or correcting the High School Leveling Policy because the Leveling Policy is a hot issue with tight pros and cons among people, (c) to expand private schools’ autonomy and to increase the role of public school system for education, and (d) for the Sub-Committee to continuously handle the reorganization of the Private School Act.

Next, the Joint Committee discussed reform projects concerning the elementary and secondary curriculum including a K-10 nationwide curriculum system, which offers a common basic curriculum to all students from kindergarten to the 10th grade. The Committee agreed to review and complement continuously the reform projects on school system including the K-10 curriculum system.

Then, the Joint Committee discussed reform projects regarding the teachers’ training system such as (a) the introduction of special graduate school system for teachers’ training, (b) the improvement of the current teachers’ training system, and (c) diverse projects for enhancing teachers’ quality. Lastly, the Joint Committee agreed to organize a task force to handle the problem of educational decentralization.

**Summary of the Presidential Commission and Joint Committee’s meetings.** The Presidential Commission on Education Reform had led and played a key role in the completion of the educational reform blueprint to be reported to the President. The Commission divided its members into five Sub-Committees according to the educational reform topics. The Sub-Committees of receiving support from Expert Members drew up the concrete educational reform projects through studies and discussions to their assigned reform agenda. Reform projects or studies to reform agenda were discussed and assessed in the meetings of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform and the Joint Committee.

The Presidential Commission coordinated and shared opinions or thoughts on
educational reform ideas or projects among its members and relevant governmental officials through the four times conferences of the Joint Committee. The Commission with the Secretariat Office and Expert Members’ support completed the final version of the first educational reform blueprint to be reported to the President through its 14 conferences.

**Report of the Educational Reform Blueprint to President Kim**

On May 31, 1995, the Vice-Chairman of the Commission reported the completed educational reform blueprint to President Kim in a conference room of Cheong-Wa-Dae (Blue House) in Seoul. President Kim stated after the report finished (the Korean Ministry of Public Information [KMPI], 1997, December 30), “Today, this place is a very important one of setting up a new fundamental frame for our education. I really appreciate the endeavor of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform who has tried to construct the educational reform blueprint. (p. 334)” President Kim said that he had repeatedly emphasized the importance of educational reform after announcing to be an Educational President. Then, President Kim regarding the problem of Korean education and the direction of educational reform stated that (KMPI, December 30):

The current education system gives people mental anguish, especially competitive college entrance tests and excessive expenses that parents pay for private learning activities to pass the tests. Also, the shortages of humanity and creativity are a big problem. Therefore, we have to liberate our sons and daughters from the hell-like college entrance tests. We have to drive out the excessive private learning activities that heavily burden parents. We have to construct an educational system of cultivating student’s humanity, creativity, and innate character or aptitude. (p. 335)

President Kim insisted that the Korean uniform education should be exchanged into the diversified, specialized education and the education of utilizing up-to-date information technology. He contended to construct a life-long learning society that people can learn to want to learn whenever and wherever (KMPI, December 30). He assessed the educational reform blueprint contains appropriate directions to solve the current educational problems
and considered the blueprint very satisfactory (Administrator A, personal communication, September 15, 2004; Administrator B, personal communication, September 24, 2004).

President Kim required that the Ministry of Education establish concrete action plans to carry out the educational reform blueprint and that all of the Cabinet cooperates for the success of educational reform. He mentioned that the procurement of educational funding of 5 percent GNP would be a very important and urgent task because Korean educational condition is quite poor as compared with other countries. He required that the Cabinet cooperate and make out a project of procuring the educational funding until September 1995 (KMPI, December 30).

President Kim praised the accomplishment of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform with saying that they had paid deep attention to the private academic learning activities of burdening parents with educational expenditure. He hoped people’s burden of coming from the private learning activities to be much reduced by the success of educational reform (KMPI, December 30).

President Kim advocated that the reform of both educational system and people’s mindsets should be achieved for the success of educational reform. He proposed that all people including teachers, parents, students, and industrial personnel would exchange a school career-centered mindset of extensively wanting to enter prestigious colleges into focusing on developing children’s potentials and characters. Also, he recommended that industrial personnel would give up the recruitment and personnel system focused on academic background. He asked that parents, citizen, teachers’ organizations, and the press support governmental educational policies for the success of educational reform (KMPI, December 30).

In conclusion, President Kim said that the destiny of a nation depends on the degree of the success of educational reform. He thanked the Presidential Commission’s members, Experts, and relevant officials who participated in the completion of the educational reform blueprint. Finally, he again asked that all people cooperate for the successful accomplishment of educational reform (KMPI, December 30).

Thus, the first educational reform blueprint in the mid-1990s was completed. The
other three educational reform blueprints on February 9, 1996, on August 20, 1996, and on June 2, 1997, were completed according to procedures and methods as the first one. The Ministry of Education made the action plans to carry out the educational reform projects and implemented them (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1998).

**Summary to the Process of Completing the Educational Reform Blueprint**

The process of creating the educational reform blueprint in the 1990s shows the pattern of making a nationwide educational reform in Korea. First, the initiator of the national reform was the President. President Kim proclaimed that he would be a Educational President at the time of Presidential candidate in 1992. After becoming President, he often swore to put into practice the educational reforms that he had promised.

Then, the Ministry of Education (the Planning and Budget Division) prepared the start of the educational reform by enacting a relevant statute, procuring needed funding, setting up the Secretariat Office for educational reform, and appointing officials of the Office until August 1993 (Administrator B, personal communication, September 24, 2004).

Next, the Secretariat Office for the educational reform arraigned the composition of the Presedential Commission on Education Reform and Expert Members, collected and summerized data or documents regarding the previous educational reforms, and supported administratively the activities of the Commission, the Sub-Committees, and Expert Members from September 1993 (Administrator A, personal communication, September 15, 2004; Administrator B, personal Communication, September 24, 2004).

Then, the Presidential Commission on Education Reform led the whole process of making the reform blueprint by organizing a Steering Committee, the Sub-Committees, Expert Members and by discussing and deciding the reform projects proposed by the Sub-Committees from February 1994. The Commission decided the final version to be reported to the President.

The Commission organized a temporary “Planning Committee” of taking charge of
summarizing educational reform agenda and assigning the reform topics to each Sub-Committee. The Planning Committee was composed of 9 Commission’s members and a permanent Expert Member pre-decided to be appointed and extracted 10 reform topics to assign to each Sub-Committee from the pre-summarized topics over 30 (Expert A, personal communication, October 4, 2004).

The Steering Committee composed of Chairman, Vice-Chairman, a permanent member and the chairs of five Sub-Committees started its meeting on February 7, 1994. The Committee controlled and coordinated the tasks and opinions of the Sub-Committees and the activities of the Presidential Commission (Administrator B, September 24, 2004).

The five Sub-Committees that composed of the Commission’s members reviewed the assigned reform topics and designed educational reform projects to carry out the topics from March 1994. Expert Members supported the activities of the Sub-Committees in studying and creating educational reform projects (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1995, May 31; 1996). The Commission usually accepted the reform projects proposed by each Sub-Committee excepting some parts of only one or two important projects, and the Committee discussed or corrected the some parts (Expert A, personal communication, October 4, 2004).

Expert Members reviewed the assigned reform topics or agenda and studied the projects of practicing them after being appointed as Expert Members on March 9, 1994 (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1995, May 31; 1996). Expert A (personal communication, October 4, 2004) stated, “Expert Members were the best experts in the fields in Korea of the assigned educational reform agenda and created the drafts of educational reform projects to be discussed in each Sub-Committee.”

On March 24, 1994, the Korean government composed “the Cooperation Committee for the Implementation of Educational Reform” composed of 20 Deputy-Ministers from relevant governmental organizations. The Cooperation Committee was composed to support administratively the creation of educational reform blueprint and practically guaranteed the implementation of the blueprint (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1995, May 31).
On June 13, 1994, the Presidential Commission proposed “Urgent Counter-Plan to College Admission System” to President Kim. The Count-Plan included items as (a) the abolishment of written tests by individual universities, (b) the enhancement of differentiation power (difficulty degree) to the Korean college entrance test, (c) the use of diverse records to high school activities including academic achievement as college admission data, and (d) the guarantee of admission application chances for several colleges (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1995, May 31).

President Kim rejected the implementation of the Urgent Counter-Plan to College Admission System from 1995 because of the shortage of preparation time for the start of the Counter-Plan. The Commission announced the withdrawal of the implementation of the Counter-Plan after discussing with the Ministry of Education (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1995, May 31). Expert A (personal communication, October 4, 2004) said “the reform of college admission system on June 13 failed because the reform was urgently proposed by the request of the Blue House Office.”

On September 5, 1994, the Presidential Commission on Education Reform reported “The Direction and Agenda of Educational Reform” to President Kim. The Commission and Expert Members and three relevant Ministers including the Minister of Education participated in the report conference. The report contained the following contents: (a) the direction, necessity, and goals of educational reform, (b) 11 broad topics for educational reform, (c) principle, method, and schedule to create and implement the educational reform, and (d) 3 urgent reform topics among the 11 topics to be first carried out (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996). The urgent topics were the procurement of funding for educational development, the improvement of higher education, and the enhancement of self-control and responsibility for private schools or universities.

The 11 broad reform topics for educational reform were as follows (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996):

(1) The procurement of adequate funding for educational reform

(2) The strengthening of international competitiveness in higher education
(3) The promotion of self-control and responsibility for private schools
(4) The reform of the college admission system
(5) The enhancement of diversification and flexibility in the school system
(6) The reorganization of elementary and secondary curriculum
(7) The promotion of professional development training and morale for teachers
(8) The enhancement of school based management
(9) The innovation of vocation-technology education
(10) The reorganization of educational statutes for educational reform
(11) The consolidation of social education and social function for education

The report on September 5, 1994, became the basis of the upcoming educational reform blueprints. The Commission had created educational reform blueprints and implemented them according to the schedule of the report.

The Presidential Commission had surveyed opinions on educational reform topics such as the necessity of reform and priority among educational reform agendas to 2,500 principals, teachers, educational administrators, and parents from January 10 to February 19. In addition, the Commission had surveyed opinions regarding the enhancement of self-control and responsibility to private schools from 2,800 principals, teachers, private school trustees, educational administrators, and parents (etc.) from November 9 to December 5, 1994. The survey contained items such as (a) endowing self-managed private schools that do not receive public funding with rights of selecting students and deciding tuitions, (b) the reorganization of the Private School Act, and (c) the improvement of the High School Leveling Policy (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1995, May 31).

The Commission’s members had visited advanced nations like Australia, Britain, Canada, France, German, Japan, Singapore and the United States to investigate the merits and problems of their educational systems from May 15, 1994 to February 8, 1995 (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1995, May 31).

The Commission held 3 public hearings to accept broad opinions and induce people’s support and concern to educational reforms with topics as the followings: (a) a
project for the increase of educational funding for educational reform on September 12, 1994, (b) a project for the reform of higher education on November 10, 1994, and (c) the enhancement of the self-control and responsibility for private schools on November 18, 1994. About 1,500 people participated in the public hearings (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1995, May 31).

The Presidential Commission had collected 440 opinions from the general population regarding educational reform topics such as college admission system, the High School Leveling Policy, higher education reform, elementary and secondary education reform, the decentralization of education, educational funding, teachers’ training, and so forth through the People Proposal System from February 1994 to April 1995 (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1995, May 31).

The Presidential Commission’s members visited 80 educational institutions such as elementary and secondary schools and provincial educational offices to hear their opinions and investigate the current situation or phenomena of education from July 11 to August 6, 1994. The Commission explained, discussed, and communicated agenda or projects for educational reform to about 280 political parties’ members, Presidential Secretaries, the Ministry of Education’s officials, social leading persons, and representative educators (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1995, May 31).

The Presidential Commission tried to achieve a comprehensive reform for the construction of educational system that can meet the requirement of the 21st century globalizing and information-oriented world and at last on May 31, 1995, completed the first educational reform blueprint by receiving the approval of President Kim to it.

The Presidential Committee on Education & Human Resources Development Policy, a Presidential organization for educational reform, surveyed the degree of importance among organizations for creating, implementing, and monitoring educational reforms to the 40 members the participated in the Presidential Commission or Committee for educational reforms since the 1990s. The survey result Table 7 shows the Presidential Commission or Committee played the most important role in creating and accomplishing the educational reforms (Presidential Committee on Education & Human Resources Development Policy, 1995, May 31).
Table 7
Major Actors for Successful Creation and Achievement of Educational Reforms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most important organization for successful educational reforms</th>
<th>Number of members</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidential commission for educational reforms</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local educational offices</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central government including the Ministry of Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Process of Implementing the Educational Reform Blueprint**

The Presidential Commission on Education Reform, composed of non-governmental members such as professors, educators, industrial personnel and parents, played a leading role in creating the educational reform blueprint. The Commission completed the educational reform blueprint by operating Sub-Committees that consisted of the Commission’s members according to the educational reform topics and receiving supports from experts in the reform topics and the Secretariat Office.

The completed reform blueprint was sent to the Office of the Prime Minister for implementation. Under the supervision of the Prime Minister, the Committee for the Promotion of Educational Reform composed of 11 Ministers discussed the successful implementation of the reform blueprint and the needed inter-ministerial coordination for it. The implementation plan that coordinated by the Prime Minister and the blueprint were
sent to the Ministry of Education. The Sub-Committee for the Promotion of Education Reform composed of top bureaucrats from the 11 Ministries under the Minister of Education began to work on details for the concrete implementation of the educational reforms (S. I. Park, 2000).

The concrete action plans for the implementation of educational reforms were practiced by the departments of the Ministry of Education, local educational offices, and schools or universities. Figure 2 shows the processes of creating and implementing the educational reform blueprint.
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Figure 2. Processes of Creating and Implementing the Educational Reform Blueprint

The President finally decided the educational reform blueprint and strongly supported the implementation of the educational reforms. The Presidential Committee on Education and Human Resources Development Policy surveyed key actors that contributed to the accomplishments of educational reforms to the 40 members of the Presidential Commission or Committee for educational reform since the 1990s. The survey result Table 8 shows the President is the most important actor for the successful implementation of educational reforms (the Presidential Committee on Education & Human Resources Development Policy, 2002, p. 257).
Table 8
Major Actors for the Successful Implementation of Educational Reforms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors leading successful implementations of reforms</th>
<th>Number of members</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational offices including the Ministry of Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees or Commission on educational reforms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next chapter, the researcher will describe the background, goals, characteristics or contents of the mid-1990s educational reform. The description will provide a background context for discussion on the characteristics of the mid-1990s educational reforms in Korea that compared with the global trends of educational systems and the previous educational reforms or policies of Korea.
Since the mid-1990s, the Korean governments have powerfully driven educational reform to solve confronting educational problems, to meet effectively the requirement of social change, and to strengthen educational competitiveness (the Presidential Committee on Education & Human Resources Development Policy, 2002). Especially, President Kim’s government from February 1993 to February 1998 established the Presidential Commission on Education Reform. The Commission proclaimed four blueprints for the Korean educational reform from May 31, 1995 to June 2, 19997, and the Korean government, with the Ministry of Education at its center, aggressively undertook the tasks of implementing the educational reform blueprints (the Korean Ministry of Education, 2000).

In this section, the researcher will describe the profile including major goals and contents of the mid-1990s educational reform of Korea to provide a context for discussion on the characteristics of the mid-1990s educational reforms compared with the global trends of educational systems and the previous educational reforms of Korea.

Goals of the Mid-1990s Educational Reform in Korea

The Korean Ministry of Education (2000) stated that the underlying goals of the mid-1990s educational reform in Korea were both to enable every student to cultivate his or her potential and creativity and to improve the flexibility of educational system so that
every student might enjoy learning according to individual interest or aptitude at any time and in any place. In addition, the Ministry summarized the five major characteristics that were emphasized in the educational reforms such as the equity of education, the excellence of education, the diversification of education, learner-oriented education, and autonomous school management.

The Presidential Commission on Education Reform (1995, May 31) presented the following fundamental characteristics of the educational reform in the mid-1990s under the main principle of changing a closed educational society into an open educational society: changing a provider-centered education into a learner-center education, a uniform education into a diversified education, an out-dated education into an education utilizing information technology, and a control-centered school management system into a autonomy- and accountability-centered school management system. The Commission aimed at constructing “Edutopia (an education-welfare nation)” with characteristics of an open educational society and a life-long learning society.

The President Kim’s government presented the main needs of the educational reform in the mid-1990s such as the construction of a new educational system to meet the requirement of social change in the 21st century and the solution of Korean chronic educational problems (the Presidential Committee on Education Reform, 1996; the Korean Ministry of Public Information, 1997, December 31).

By constructing a new educational system to meet the requirement of social change in the future, the government intended to cultivate quality manpower to be needed in the information-oriented society, consolidate the status as a technological sovereign nation in the world, strengthen the status as a culture export nation in the world, and introduce diverse educational systems of satisfying the needs of diversified society (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996).

To solve Korean chronic educational problems, President Kim’s government tried to carry out goals such as (a) alleviating excessive competition for college entrance among high school graduates, (b) cultivating a balanced person with personality and morality, (c) strengthening the international competitiveness of education, especially the
competitiveness of higher education, (d) activating the practice place of education, schools and classrooms, and (e) strengthening the administrative and financial support system for education (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1996).

To summarize, the educational reforms in the mid-1990s aimed at constructing a flexible, learner-centered educational system that everybody may learn to want wherever and whenever, setting up an educational system of meeting the requirement of social change in the 21st century, and solving Korean chronic educational problems.

**Main Contents of the Mid-1990s Educational Reform**

The Presidential Committee on Education & Human Resources Development Policy ([PCEHRDP], 2002) that established by the President Kim, D. J. government in 1998 summarized the main agendas of the mid-1990s educational reforms according to the areas: (a) K-12 education reforms, (b) higher education reforms, (c) teacher system reforms, (d) vocational and life-long educational system reforms, and (e) educational infrastructure construction.

K-12 education reforms contained agenda such as including kindergarten education within public education, reorganizing curriculum, and introducing a school-base management system. Higher education reforms included agenda such as reforming college admission system, driving the diversified and specialized development of higher education institutes, and introducing a special graduate school system.

Teacher system reforms involved agenda such as activating teachers’ activities to improve schooling achievement and introducing a principal and teacher invitation system that would allow some schools instead of local educational offices to select their principals or teachers. Vocational and life-long education reforms contained agenda as constructing a new vocational education system and an open, life-long learning educational system to meet the social change of the 21st century.

As agenda for educational infrastructure construction, there were (a) utilizing information technology for education, (b) procuring educational public funding of five
percent GNP, (c) reorganizing educational statutes, (d) enhancing autonomy and responsibility of private schools, and (e) strengthening the connection between evaluation and the support of funding to educational institutes (PCEHRDP, 2002).

The Korean Ministry of Public Information published “Reform White Paper of the Five-Year Civilian Government” that summarized the reforms for five years of the President Kim’s government in the mid-1990s with documents or data coming from every ministry of the central government on December 31, 1997. The Reform White Paper contains the main contents of the Korean educational reforms in the mid-1990s according to the following areas with documents coming from the Ministry of Education: (a) the construction of an open educational system, (b) the reform of elementary and secondary education, (c) the reform of higher education, (d) the reform of vocational education, and (e) the construction of comprehensive supporting system for education. The main contents of the mid-1990s Korean educational reforms were described referring to the areas presented in the Reform White Paper (the Korean Ministry of Public Information [KMPI], 1997, December 31).

Construction of an Open Educational System

President Kim’s government aimed at constructing an open, new educational system that can provide people with educational opportunities what they need for self-actualization. The open educational system intended to enable learners to transfer easily among all educational institutes including schools or among educational programs and majors to develop their aptitudes or abilities (KMPI, 1997, December 30; 1997, December 31).

A credit bank system was introduced so that people saved credits and could receive diploma according to the level and number of saved credits. People could receive credits from colleges or social educational institutes. The Korean government tried to establish a learning society so that everybody could receive education wherever and whenever by using information and telecommunication technology. The government intended that
disadvantageous learners in farming and fishing villages or islands would have the more equalized educational chance by using the information and telecommunication technology (KMPI, 1997, December 31).

Reforms for Elementary and Secondary Education

The Korean government in the mid-1990s tried to construct the educational system of developing learners’ potentials and cultivating their personalities and creativities. The government drove the following main reforms for the improvement of elementary and secondary education (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998a; KMPI, 1997, December 30; 1997, December 31):

First, introduce a new elementary and secondary curriculum of taking the differences of students’ learning capacities into consideration.

Second, construct an educational system that schools operate diverse educational programs of fitting students’ abilities and aptitudes.

Third, strengthen teachers’ professional development and autonomy for them to educate students more efficiently.

Fourth, establish a school management system that parents and teachers can participate in the process of decision making for school operation.

Fifth, update the facilities or equipments of schools and utilize information and communication technology for education.

Sixth, enhance assessments on the performances of schools in order for educational demanders to judge every school quality.

Reforms for Higher Education

The educational reforms contained an agenda to get higher educational institutes to be more autonomous and diversified. In addition, the Korean government intended to cultivate several prestigious universities with world-class research power of leading
science-technology development and bringing up competent persons in diverse fields to meet the requirement of a changing society. The reforms contained the following main agenda for the development of higher education (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998a; KMPI, 1997, December 31):

First, establish an advanced research information center of providing comprehensive research information in order to produce more research outcomes with international competitiveness.

Second, consolidate an assessment system to support funding and other benefits according to assessment results for the quality improvement of higher educational institutes.

Third, develop diverse university models, for example, a research-oriented one or an education-oriented one and endow higher educational institutes with more autonomy in controlling the number of students and academic affairs.

Fourth, make the establishment of a private university or college easier in order for those who satisfy the criteria of educational statutes to establish a private one.

Fifth, reorganize the current college admission system to alleviate the intense entrance competition.

Sixth, construct an educational system to offer higher vocational education for those who do not enter university or college with utilizing information-telecommunication technology.

Seventh, introduce a graduate school university system without undergraduate students in order to bring up higher competent manpower that meets the requirement of opened and information-oriented society.

Reforms for Vocational Education

The Korean government planned to establish a life-long vocational educational system in order to actualize a user-centered, open life-long learning society in the educational reforms of the mid-1990s. The reforms involved the following main projects
for the development of vocational education (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998a; KMPI, 1997, December 31):

First, offer the educational opportunity at vocational high school level or junior vocational college level to adults who want to improve their job ability.

Second, strengthen connections or relationships among junior colleges, industrial-technology colleges, and universities and diversify vocational education programs in high school level.

Third, introduce a new college system that workers can study college courses with working in their workplaces.

Fourth, introduce a vocational skill certificate system to strengthen the connection between education and vocation.

Fifth, establish “National Multimedia Educational Supporting Center” and “Vocational Ability Development Institute” to support a vocational education for all people.

**Construction of Comprehensive Supporting System for Education**

The Korean government tried to construct a strong educational infrastructure to support the successful implementation of the reform. The Korean government proposed the following main reforms in addition to the previously presented reforms (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998a; KMPI, 1997, December 30; 1997, December 31):

First, procure educational funding of five percent of GNP until 1998 to guarantee practically the improvement of education and the implementation of educational reforms.

Second, construct information and telecommunication facilities for education, for example, the construction of a super-high speed information network for education and of Internet network facilities that all the elementary and secondary schools can use.

Third, reorganize educational statutes to support the implementation of educational reforms and to meet the requirement of social change in the 21st century.

Fourth, enhance the autonomy and responsibility of local educational offices.
Summary of the Main Contents of the Educational Reforms

The Korean government, from the successful implementation of the educational reforms, designed to enhance the self-control and competition of schools to promote their educational excellence, guarantee educational equality for disadvantageous classes and regions, and improve a quality management system for education by setting up a comprehensive assessment system to schools, educational institutes, and student achievements (the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, 1995, May 31).

President Kim tried to achieve the educational reforms as (a) the development of a flexible and diversified educational system, (b) the establishment of a learner-oriented educational system and the promotion of the competition among educational institutions and programs, (c) the full development of school autonomy and the reduction of government regulations, (d) the promotion of excellence as well as equality in education, and (e) the utilization of information technology for education (S. I. Park, 2000).

President Kim’s government created and implemented the educational reforms to change the centralized, supplier-oriented, formal education-centered educational system into the decentralized, learner-centered, and life long education-emphasized system to cope with the requirements of the globalizing and information-oriented world.

Educational Reform Accomplishments

President Kim’s government stated that 80 reform agenda items of 120 were executed totally or partly in December 1997 and that the remaining 40 items were going to be carried out. In this section, the researcher will describe the accomplishments of the government for the educational reforms with the documents such as “Reform White Paper of The Five-Year Civilian Government (KMPI, 1997, December 31)” and “Study on Evaluation of the Implementation of Educational Reforms (PCEHRDP, 2002)” that summarized the actual accomplishment results to the main educational reforms.
Accomplishments for K-12 Education

President Kim’s government pursued the reforms of elementary and secondary education systems to cultivate personality and creativity and presented the following main accomplishment results.

First, the government started the 7th reorganization of elementary and secondary curriculum. In 1997, the general principles of the new 7th curriculum were completed. The government reduced the required subjects in the new curriculum while increasing the selective subjects. The new curriculum included a nationwide common curriculum from the 1st grade to the 10th grade (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997; KMPI, 1997, December 31). The new curriculum was implemented from the first and second grades of the elementary school and was going to be carried out completely until high school seniors in 2004. Table 9 shows the schedule of the implementation for the new curriculum (PCEHRDP, 2002, p. 57).

Table 9
The 7th Elementary and Secondary Curriculum Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Grade 1, 2</td>
<td>Grade 3, 4</td>
<td>Grade 5, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Middle 1</td>
<td>Middle 2</td>
<td>Middle 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High 1</td>
<td>High 2</td>
<td>High 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, the government changed the textbook policy. School Operation Councils instead of educational offices were supposed to participate in the selection of textbooks. The quality of textbooks was improved, and the governmental control in making out
textbooks was reduced (KMPI, 1997, December 31).

Third, after-school activities were encouraged. The after-school programs aimed at developing the potential and creativity and complementing the insufficient academic achievements of students. In June 1997, 39.7% of elementary school students, 54.5% of middle school students, and 71.4% of high school students were enrolled in the after-school programs (KMPI, 1997, December 31).

Fourth, schools strengthened education for humanity or personality by both teaching respect for a human being and emphasizing the importance of getting along with other people. Schools tried to offer a practice-centered moral education that prefers communication, discussion, and public service to knowledge-centered moral education (KMPI, 1997, December 31). The method of recording students’ school activities was being changed from recording the academic-centered achievements into recording comprehensive school activities to bring up a balanced person with personality and creativity. The records of school activities were more importantly considered as the data for students’ admission to upper schools or universities (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997).

Fifth, the models of high schools were diversified. Specified job-oriented high schools that included curricula in areas such as information, image, broadcasting, design, and popular music were established besides traditional vocational high schools such as industrial, commercial, or agricultural ones (KMPI, 1997, December 31). A self-controlled high school system was introduced in 1997 by the revision of the Education Act. In 1999, 14 job-oriented or art high schools were designated as self-controlled high schools (PCEHRDP, 2002).

Sixth, the government tried to improve educational circumstances by constructing more schools and classrooms until the year of 1998 in order to reduce the number of students per classroom, at most 50 students per classroom and to remove double session classrooms in big cities. The government carried out the plan to invest one thousand billion Won (about one billion dollars) per year from 1996 to 2000 for the improvement of educational environment including constructing schools and classrooms (KMPI, 1997,
Seventh, the government expanded the school selection right of education-demanders, parents or students, to enhance educational quality by inducing competition among schools, education-suppliers. The government started to introduce step by step a school selection system that middle and high school students first apply for schools in their regions and then their schools are decided by a lottery method from 1996 (KMPI, 1997, December 31).

Eighth, the government introduced a new school based management system “School Operation Council System” that parents, community personnel, and teachers were able to participate in the process of decision-making to school operation, from 1995 by revising educational statutes. Public schools first introduced the School Operation Council System (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997).

Ninth, the government tried to construct a preschool educational system including the function of education and welfare for 3 to 5 years old children. The government set up a plan to include the kindergarten education of a year within the public education system in 1995. The plan was practiced in the next governments. The Ministry of Education supported kindergarten education expenses for farming-fishing villages and lower income classes from 1999 (KEDI, 1999, December; KMPI, 1997, December 31).

The Korean government enacted and promulgated the Pre-school Education Act on January 29, 2004, and the Act became effective from January 30, 2005. The Act included the reform contents for pre-school education presented in the mid-1990s educational reforms such as offering pre-school education for 3 to 5 years old children and free education for one year before entering the elementary school (the Korean Ministry of Education & Human Resources Development, Retrieved on March 16, 2005, from http://www.moe.go.kr). The free education for one year was started for the disadvantageous children such as them of lower income homes and rural area ones. Twenty one percent of all the five-year-old children were receiving free education in 2004, and the Korean government planned to increase the free education to 70 percent in 2008.
Accomplishments for Higher Education

PCEHRDP stated that the Korean governments since the mid-1990s have implemented higher educational policies such as (a) strengthening diversification, specialization, and self-control, (b) emphasizing excellence to enhance competitiveness, (c) promoting the development of provincial universities for the nationwide balanced development of higher education, and (d) enhancing connections between higher educational institutes and regional society or industry (PCEHRDP, 2002). The Korean government of the mid-1990s presented the following accomplishments in higher education reforms (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998a; KMPI, 1997, December 31; PCEHRDP, 2002):

First, the Korean government led diversified and differentiated development for higher educational institutes. The government presented four university models such as undergraduate vocation-oriented one, graduate special job-oriented one, undergraduate academy-oriented one, and graduate academy-oriented one. The government induced and supported financially the differentiated development of universities.

Second, the government introduced a graduate school university system without undergraduate programs to bring up specialists in the specific fields such as international affairs and information technology. In 1996, three graduate school universities were established.

Third, the government introduced the system of establishing a private university by the pre-proposed criteria to induce the appearance of differentiated and diversified universities. In 1996, 18 private universities were established. The system played a key role in rapidly increasing the number of private university and its students. The number of universities was increased from 131 universities in 1995 into 171 in 2004 due to the increase of private universities, and private universities occupied 84.8 % of universities. The students of private higher educational institutes occupied 74.1 % of all students in 2004. Table 10 shows the numbers of public or private universities and colleges in 2004 (The Korean Ministry of Education & Human Resources Development [KMEHRD] &
Fourth, the government started to introduce the system that provincial qualified private universities can control their student quota that the Ministry of Education had previously controlled. Six universities in 1997 and 76 universities in 1998 could control their student quota according to the criteria of the Ministry of Education (KMPI, 1997, December 31). This system also played a role in rapidly increasing the number of university students.

Over four-fifths of high school graduates (81.3 percent) entered college or university in 2004. Especially, women and vocational high school students enrolling in colleges have been rapidly increased. Over nine-tenths (90.5 percent) of general high school female graduates entered colleges, and 57.6 percent of vocational school female graduates entered colleges in 2003. Table 11 shows the rapidly increasing phenomena of high school graduates entering universities or juniors colleges (KMEHRD & KEDI, 2003; 2004).

Fifth, the government tried to enhance the research capacity of universities by financially supporting co-research projects with foreign competent scholars in publication of international academic journals. Correspondingly, it provided additional funding to the science and engineering research institutes of universities and established “Korean Research Information Center” to provide the comprehensive academic data and research
Sixth, the government strengthened the evaluation system of supporting public funding according to the results of evaluation to improve the autonomous competitiveness and the quality of education and research to colleges. Colleges should follow governmental diverse policies to procure the public funding.

Seventh, the government reformed a college admission system to alleviate the psychological and financial burden of parents and students and normalize the secondary education intensely focused on college entrance tests. It abolished the entrance written tests taken by individual university with subjects such as the Korean language, mathematics, and English to national and public universities. In addition, it recommended that universities consider more importantly the records of high school activities including academic grades and expand the entrance opportunities for disadvantaged classes as the graduates of farming and fishing villages and the disabled.
Accomplishments for Vocational Education

The Korean government tried to set up a new vocational education system to meet the requirement of changing society in the mid-1990s educational reforms and showed the following accomplishments for the reform of vocational education (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998a; KMPI, 1997, December 31; PCEHRDP, 2002).

First, the government tried to reorganize vocational high schools according to the demand of changing society. It strengthened the connection between vocational high schools and practical work places by joining industrial personnel in curriculum reorganization and operation or by employing industrial workers as vocational high school teachers. In addition, it gave vocational high schools additional funding to improve their facilities and experimental instruments.

Second, the government strengthened the connection or cooperation among vocational high schools, junior colleges, industrial universities, and general universities in order for students to learn more advanced vocational education according to their willingness. It recommended that job-oriented colleges accept more students with work career and employ professors with related work career.

Third, the government introduced a new style university system and a new style graduate school allowing workers to study upper diploma courses while employed. The new universities or graduate schools would utilize the Internet and telecommunication technology on the basis of cooperation with other general colleges.

Fourth, the government introduced special master and doctoral degree programs to bring up higher skilled specialists or professional workers in 1996. In 1997, it prescribed three graduate school kinds as the general graduate school, the special one to cultivate master or doctoral specialists, and the specific career-oriented one for master degree.

Fifth, the government strengthened career development programs for students to find and develop their aptitudes or talents. It recommended that schools offer at least a career conference per year to every student from the fourth grade of elementary school to the twelfth grade.
Sixth, the government expanded vocational education opportunities for women and disabled persons. It established six women industrial high schools and engineering colleges within women universities. It planned to offer the disabled at least the elementary and secondary education until 2000.

Seventh, the government reorganized the national technology certificate system to strengthen the relationship between formal education and the labor market. It enacted the Certificate Criteria Act in 1997 for it. It established “Vocational Ability Development Institute” to develop vocational education and job training policies or programs.

**Accomplishments for Life-Long Education**

The Korean government carried out the following projects to construct an advanced life-long educational system (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998a; KMPI, 1997, December 31; PCEHRDP, 2002):

First, the government introduced a credit banking system in 1997 so anyone could gain a junior college or college diploma according to saved credits regardless of entering college. Those who wanted to gain the diploma could study courses to get required credits from colleges or social educational institutes approved by the Ministry of Education.

Second, the government introduced a part-time registration system for those wanting to study college courses.

Third, the government enlarged transferring opportunities among high schools, colleges, or college departments. In 1995, it expanded transferable student quota to colleges and made it possible to transfer among general, vocational, and special-purpose high schools in 1996.

Fourth, the government established the “Korean Multimedia Education Support Center” to comprehensively support formal, social, vocational, and life-long education with utilizing information and telecommunication technology in 1997.
Accomplishments for Obtaining Competent Teachers

PCEHRDP mentioned that reform projects for teachers from the first to the third educational reform blueprints of the mid-1990s emphasized to cultivate competent teachers while the fourth blueprint focused on morale promotion for teachers. The Korean government presented the following accomplishments for cultivating competent teachers (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998a; KMPI, 1997, December 31; PCEHRDP, 2002).

First, in 1997, the government induced that the elementary and secondary teachers’ colleges reorganize their curricula so as to enhance the connection between schools and teachers’ colleges. In addition, it recommended that private schools employ their teachers by an open recruitment and objective test system that everyone with a teaching certificate can apply.

Second, the government comprehensively evaluated teachers colleges and supported additional funding according to the results of evaluation to improve the quality of them.

Third, from 1995 to 1999 the government enhanced professional development training for the current teachers. It connected the results of training with the promotion and bonus of teachers. Moreover, it appointed 35 teachers’ colleges as teacher training institutes to offer teachers more training opportunities.

Fourth, the government carried out the following projects for teachers: (a) the introduction of a system to support research funding for elementary and secondary teachers to study practical educational problems, (b) the improvement of facilities for teachers such as setting up a study room per subject or every grade and supplying a personal computer for every teacher, and (c) the introduction of a system that the professors of teachers’ colleges and the teachers of elementary and secondary schools can experience reciprocal work places.
Accomplishments for the Utilization of Information Technology in Education

The Korean Ministry of Education stated that the methods of education in the age of information and internationalization must be differentiated from those in the modern, industrialization era. The Ministry emphasized the utilization of information technology to offer students the education of meeting the requirement of the 21st information-oriented society. The Ministry summarized the accomplishments of the mid-1990s educational reform for the utilization of information technology as the follows (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997):

First, from 1997 to 1999 the government set up a three-year plan to make elementary and secondary schools information-oriented. All elementary and secondary schools in Korea (10,402) were provided hardware infrastructure such as multimedia tools (PC, TV, VCR) per classroom, one PC for each teacher, 1 or 2 PC practice rooms for each school by 1999, and Internet access for every school by 2000 (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997; 2003). In addition, information education was taught as a required subject for elementary and secondary schools in the 7th curriculum while as a selective subject in the 6th curriculum (PCEHRDP, 2002).

Second, the government established the Korean Multimedia Education Support Center, which belonged to the Korean Educational Broadcasting System, to develop useful educational software and to manage contents or databases for teaching and learning (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997).

Third, the systematic information education training for teachers to efficiently cope with the 21st century information society had been done. In addition, information education training courses for principals and vice-principals were set up. Twenty five percent of all teachers a year were trained from 1997, and then all teachers would be trained information education by 2000 and retrained every four years (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997; 2003).

Fourth, the government constructed “Education Network” for professors and students to use fast and freely the Internet in their universities. The government expected
that the international competitiveness of education and research would be strengthened owing to the Internet facility. Every university constructed its information system (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997; 2003).

Fifth, in 1997 the government created the “Korean Research Information Center” to offer professors, students, and other researchers the comprehensive information for their studies. The Center was merged into the Korean Education and Research Information Service (KERIS) founded in April 1999. KERIS manages academic and educational data, produces information for education and research, and distributes the information to people. The information service system of KERIS enables researchers or educators to use quality information easily, quickly, anywhere, and anytime by constructing database regarding academic or educational information produced in Korea and overseas. In addition, the system provides the comprehensive index search service regarding books stored in domestic university libraries (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997; 2003).

Sixth, each school constructed a comprehensive information management system of supporting academic affairs, teaching-learning activities, and school administration. Schools were connected with students’ homes and local educational offices by the system. The libraries of schools started to equip information system and multimedia materials and were connected with public or university libraries through the Internet (KMPI, 1997, December 31). The comprehensive information system was supposed to reduce teachers’ administrative works and support the subsequent improvement of teaching-learning activities (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997).

Seventh, the government introduced a cyber university system to give diploma or credits to those who complete required courses through the virtual space of using the Internet and telecommunication technology (KMPI, 1997, December 31). Fourteen cyber universities and 2 junior colleges using virtual space were established by 2004 (KMEHRD & KEDI, 2004)
Accomplishments for Educational Reform Supporting System

President Kim’s government realized that educational reforms could be successfully achieved only when receiving enough financial and systemic support. Thus, the government made out the projects of supporting systemically and financially to accomplish successfully the educational reforms as the followings.

First, the government planned to invest five percent of GNP for education by 1998 from less than 4 percent in 1995. Actually, the budget of the Ministry of Education was increased 45 percent from 12.5 trillion Won (about 15 billion U.S. dollars) in 1995 to 18.3 trillion Won (about 22.8 U.S. dollars) in 1997 (KMEHRD & KEDI, 2002).

Second, the government organized the “Regulation Reduction Committee” and tried to minimize various kinds of governmental regulations. The Committee screened all educational regulations and recommended to abolish or reduce unnecessary ones to the government. The government carried out the recommendation of the Committee in 1996 and expected the deregulation to bring out the autonomous, creative development of schools and offer various good educational services for education-demanders (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997; KMPI, 1997, December 31).

Third, the government established the Korean Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation in 1998 (the Korean Ministry of Education, 2000). The Institute develops nationwide curriculums for elementary and secondary schools and evaluates the schooling achievement degree. The government expected that the Institute would enhance the accountability of schools, education-providers, and give education-demanders useful evaluation information regarding schools (KMPI, 1997, December 31).

Fourth, the government introduced a system of inviting a principal or teachers by the recommendation of the School Operation Council. Local educational offices decided the disposition or appointment of all the principals or teachers before the system. The principal invitation system was started in 1996, and the teacher invitation one in 1997. The government expected the invitation system would promote the autonomy or self-control of elementary and secondary schools (KMPI, 1997, December 31).
Finally, the educational reforms contained the reforms so as to improve private schools such as the establishment of an educational conflict coordination committee, the expansion of autonomy or discretion for private elementary and secondary schools, and the increase of financial support and tax-benefit for private schools. The reforms were not carried out during the President Kim’s government excepting increasing financial support for private universities (KMPI, 1997, December 31).

**Characteristics of the Mid-1990s Educational Reform**

Expert A who played a key role in the creation of the educational reform blueprint on May 31, 1995 stated, “the educational reform in the mid-1990s was initiated with intention to change fundamental structural frame so as to meet the requirement of the globalizing and information-centered world, a big turning-point in the paradigm on the world culture and cultivation (personal communication, October 4, 2004).” Then he spoke that the educational reforms emphasized the reform of software aspect as well as hardware aspect different from the past reforms to have focused on hardware one.

The researcher investigated the different aspects of the mid-1990s educational reforms from the past reforms in Korea through interviews or surveys with a Presidential Commission’s member, an Expert Member, directors from the Secretary Office for educational reform, and the administrators of the Ministry of Education.

First, Administrator A (personal communication, September 15, 2004) stated the mid-1990s educational reform projects to be reported to President were implemented during that time government by the Ministry of Education while most of the past reform projects weren’t.

Second, Administrator B (personal communication, September 24, 2004) mentioned that economic terms like consumer or supplier in the mid-1990s educational reform were first used on educational policy. He spoke the educational reform emphasized the self-control and responsibility of individual school or university and became a basis that Korea went into a powerful nation in the information-technology industry by utilizing
nationwide information-telecommunication technology for education.

Third, Expert A (personal communication, October 4, 2004) spoke that the education reform in the mid-1990s tried to reform the fundamental structure of educational system and construct a learner-centered, open life-long learning society.

Fourth, 4 administrators (personal communications, October 2, 2004) of the Ministry of Education who participated in the implementation of the mid-1990s educational reform described that the educational reform contributed to changing a supplier-centered educational system into a learner-centered one. They stated that the educational reform projects were directly connected with implementation over receiving cooperative support from the President and relevant Ministries and emphasized the self-control, decentralization, and internationalization of educational system.

The educational reforms of the mid-1990s did not focus on agenda regarding the improvement of mathematics or science education to promote the competitiveness of economy while the global trend has it. But, international comparison tests like TIMSS (the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study) or PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) show that the competitiveness of the Korean math and science in the elementary and secondary education is top level. KMEHRD announced the 2nd graders of the middle school (13 years old) recorded the 2nd place in math and the 3rd place in science in the 2003 year test of TIMSS and that the 1st graders of high school (15 years old) placed on the 3rd in math and the 4th in science in the 2003 PISA test of OECD (retrieved from http://www.moe.go.kr, January 23, 2005).

Gahng (1998) of KEDI stated that the mid-1990s educational reforms had been immediately and comprehensively implemented on schedule by the impetus of the President and the government’s ongoing commitment while the past reforms had been minimally achieved due to the disregard of the ruling governments.

Education Reform Evaluation and Research Task Force (1997, December) mentioned that the government of the mid-1990s intended to change comprehensively the fundamental frame of the current educational system different from the past reforms as well as procured five percent budget of GNP for education.
Kim, J. S., who was the chairman of the second Presidential Commission on Education Reform that started in April 1996, commented the mid-1990s educational reforms designed to establish an open and lifelong educational system to allow everybody to receive education that he or she wants at any time and in any place (Education Reform Evaluation and Research Task Force, 1997, December). He judged the educational reform led the educational policy direction to meet the demands of the 21st century society.

PCEHRDP (2002) proposed three big characteristics of the educational reforms started from the mid-1990s such as constructing an open life-long educational system from the cradle to the grave, corroborating a learner-centered educational system, and enhancing the self-control and accountability of individual educational organizations such as schools or universities. PCEHRDP assessed the three characteristics were epoch-making ideas of basically changing the traditional system and thought.

Lee, M. H., a permanent member of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform and then the Minister of Education from August 1997 to February 1998, stated regarding the mid-1990s educational reforms after he became the Minister (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1997), “an educational reform aimed at changing the basic framework of education is in progress, which we have never seen before in our history.” In addition, he spoke the mid-1990s educational reforms opened the door for everyone to overcome the barriers of time and space and to enjoy truly open education and realize the goal of establishing an “Edutopia”.

The Korean Ministry of Education (1998a, p. 4) summarized the characteristics of the mid-1990s educational reform like Figure 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past Educational System</th>
<th>Mid-1990s Educational Reform System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplier-centered education</td>
<td>Learner-centered education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform education</td>
<td>Diversified education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-dated education</td>
<td>Information-oriented education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled school management</td>
<td>Self-controlled school management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Characteristics of the Mid-1990s Educational Reform
CHAPTER 8
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

South Korea since the liberation from Japanese colonial rule in August 1945 has accepted and developed a democratic educational system with much influence from the United States. Recently, the global phenomena that the economic or social systems of many countries become more homogeneous have appeared over the world. On the educational history for last 60 years since 1945, Korea experienced the most comprehensive and practical educational reform in the mid-1990s just prior to the 21st century when the industrialization society was being rapidly changed into the post-industrialization, knowledge-based society. Each nation has been forced to accept homogeneous social systems including the educational system from the globalization trend. Thus, globalization has affected the process of Korean educational policymaking since the 1990s.

“Globalization era” and “educational reform” were two most prevailing terms in the Korean society of the mid-1990s and a key stimulus of social change. To the globalization trend and the educational reform of the mid-1990s in Korea, the researcher reviewed the homogenizing phenomena of educational systems in terms of this trend toward globalization and then explored developmental process, goals, contents, accomplishments, and characteristics concerning the mid-1990s educational reform with a historical case study method. In this chapter, the researcher answered or commented the following research questions and relevant topics with the research results of this study.
Who initiated the mid-1990s educational reform of Korea?

The pattern of making and implementing an educational reform blueprint in Korea

The comparison of the mid-1990s educational reform and the past educational policies or reforms

The comparison of the mid-1990s educational reform and the trend of the global educational system to be homogeneous

The implications of the mid-1990s educational reforms on the Korean education.

**Who Initiated the Mid-1990s Educational Reform of Korea?**

**Key Initiator of the Educational Reform**

Korea since the establishment of its democratic government, August 1948, has had a President-centered political system that the President has decision authority to major national policies. Therefore, the Korean educational policies have been importantly changed according to the change of Presidents. President Kim, Y. S. who received information from his political and professional followers was the key player in initiating the mid-1990s educational reform.

President Kim announced that he would be an “Educational President” who put the priority of national policies on education in November 1992 when he was a presidential candidate. Prior to the announcement, he suggested as a ruling party’s representative that educational reform was necessary for the completion of Korean democratization in an address of the National Assembly in February 1990.

President Kim led the educational reform in the mid-1990s by ordering the composition of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform for creating the educational reform blueprint and the implementation of the blueprint to the Ministry of Education. In addition, he directed that other relevant Ministries of central government such as Ministries in charge of managing national budget and controlling quota of public service officials would support the implementation of the educational reforms.
President Kim intended to accomplish an educational reform of cultivating a balanced democratic citizen with intelligence, emotion, and moral and competent human resources to meet the requirement of the 21st century globalizing and knowledge-based society. He accepted the educational reform blueprint that reported by the Presidential Commission on Education Reform on May 31, 1995, and the blueprint was decided as a final version. He could appeal to people by suggesting and practicing educational reforms of satisfying the needs of people who wanted impending educational problems to be solved and coping with the requirement of social change.

President Kim practiced his ideas for educational reforms that had thought like procuring the funding of five percent of GNP for education after he became President in February 1993. He considered the accomplishments for the educational reform as a major achievement among his accomplishments as President.

Creator of Educational Reform Blueprint

President Kim directed the Presidential Commission on Education Reform would create educational reform blueprints and monitor the implementation of the educational reforms. The Commission played a leading role in creating the educational reform blueprints referring to the President’s ideas on educational reforms.

The Commission’s members were consisted of non-government personnel. They could create their ideal reform items or projects without governmental concernment. The public officials of government only supported their activities. But the Commission discussed the educational reform projects with governmental officials and accepted the officials’ comments for the successful implementation of the reform projects.

The Commission strove to attract public participation and support by collecting the opinions of people and educators to educational reform topics and reflecting the opinions on the educational reform blueprint. The Commission operated the Sub-Committees in charge of educational reform topics and the Steering Committee that composed of its members to efficiently operate the Commission. The Commission received the support of
experts (Expert Members) in the educational reform topics for surveying and studying educational reform projects.

The Commission had held its conferences fourteen times and four times joint conferences that its members, Expert Members, and public officials relevant to the educational reforms participated to discuss educational reform projects. The Commission made out the educational reform blueprint and completed the blueprint by receiving the approval of the President.

**Background Factors of Initiating Educational Reform**

An important background factor of initiating the mid-1990s educational reform was the political motives of President Kim and his followers who would strive to attract people’s support. They endeavored to attract the upholding of public opinion and achieve political success by satisfying the needs of both people who want the impending educational problems to be solved and the time that each nation should cope with the requirement of society changing into a new paradigm, the knowledge-based world.

People wanted the government to solve confronting educational problems as (a) primary and secondary education is very deficient in nurturing self-assured and creative students with self learning motive because of extremely test-oriented learning, (b) the competitiveness and quality of higher education is weak or short, and (c) the Korean educational system suffers from too many regulations (S. I. Park, 2000). Park mentioned that the educational reform in the mid-1990s were in an attempt to solve the confronting educational problems.

President Kim’s government received people’s affirmative support to the educational reforms. Expert A (personal communication, October 4, 2004) stated,

The Presidential Commission on Educational Reform intended to drive the educational reform if the reform agendas can get the support of 60 to 65 percent from the public. Then, the educational reform agendas earned the support of 78 percent from a public-opinion poll, and the government could carry out powerfully
the educational reform.

The President initiated the educational reform, and the Presidential Commission on Education Reform led the creation of the educational reform blueprints. The background power initiating the reform was the needs of society and people that hoped that those kinds of reforms would take place.

**Pattern of Creating and Implementing Educational Reform Blueprint in Korea**

The developmental process of the educational reform in the mid-1990s shows a pattern of accomplishing nationwide educational reform policies in Korea. The nationwide educational reform of Korea was started from the President’s political power. The Minister of Education in Korea endeavored to sincerely follow and practice the President’s ideas because of being appointed by the President like other Ministers. The Minister of Education prepared the start of educational reform by enacting relevant statutes, setting up organizations, and supporting budget to create an educational reform blueprint.

After the Presidential Commission on Education Reform and the Secretariat Office were organized, they took charge of creating educational reform projects. The Ministry of Education was not participated in the process of developing the reform blueprint.

The Presedential Commission of leading the completion of an educational reform blueprint was composed of only non-governmental members and controlled the whole process of making the reform blueprint. The organization pattern of the Commission composed of only non-governmental members in the mid-1990s was similar to that of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform composed of 32 non-governmental members in 1985 so as to create innovative educational reforms without the concernment of governmental officials.

The Presidential Commission on Education Reform created the final educational reform blueprint version to be reported to the President. Then the President decided the final educational reform blueprint after he was reported it. In Korea, the President had the
final decision right to educational reform policies with other important national policies. The educational reforms that decided by the President were nationwide implemented by the Ministry of Education, and local educational offices and schools or universities followed the direction of the Ministry of Education. This style shows the Korean political system or educational administration is traditionally a centralized and President-centered one.

Comparison of the Mid-1990s Educational Reform and the Past Educational Policies

Comments on the Past Educational Policies

The U.S. Military government and South Korean educational leaders had tried to construct a new educational system for the removal of the oppressive Japanese colonial influence and the pre-modern dynastic one since August 1945. The new system strengthened education for the Korean language and history. The government started the first compulsory educational system at the elementary school level. This period founded a genesis for the establishment of South Korea’s own modern, democratic educational system.

The Korean government of the first President Lee, S. M. took control from the U.S. Military government by the first Composition in August 1948 and enacted the Education Act that prescribed Korean fundamental educational systems in 1949. The government had tried to eliminate Japanese colonial influence and to strengthen anti-communism through education system. The single line school system that now is effective, which is 6-year elementary school, 3- year middle school, 3-year high school, and 4-year university (6-year medical college), was established.

President Lee’s government strove to develop a decentralized educational system and a compulsory educational system at the level of elementary school. The consolidation of compulsory educational system brought a rapid increase in the number of elementary
students because almost all children entered elementary schools and then caused the shortage of teachers and educational facilities. This period constructed the foundation of the current Korean educational system.

President Park’s government that seized power through a military revolution in 1961 drove economic development-centered policies. Accordingly, the government tried for educational system to contribute to economic development by enhancing science-technology and vocational education and cultivating skillful manpower. In addition, the government made an effort to improve the quality of compulsory education by reducing class size, increasing teachers (etc.) and introduced open high school and junior college systems by a broadcasting system to offer more educational opportunities to everybody.

Park’s government abolished the middle school entrance test and the high school entrance one of big cities that caused narrow test-centered education to elementary and secondary schools. The abolishment of entrance tests in middle and high schools caused rapid increase in the number of middle and high school students, and the secondary education became mass-education.

Moreover, President Park’s government strengthened education for anti-communism, Korea’s own unique democracy, and nationalism in order to maintain the national security in confrontation with North Korea, a communism nation, and the political continuation of the government. There was a critic that President Park exploited educational system to maintain his political power, a kind of dictatorship.

President Cheon’s government that started in 1980 tried to solve problems such as severe competition for admission to college that came from the sudden increase of secondary students and entrance test-oriented learning at the level of secondary education. The government much increased the freshmen quota of colleges to alleviate the intense competition for college entrance in company with the introduction of a graduation quota system of limiting the number of college graduates. The increase of freshmen quota provided a clue going into mass-higher education by increasing a large number of higher education students.
President Cheon’s government first established the Presidential Commission on Education Reform (PCER) that consisted of 32 members with diverse social backgrounds as the first Presidential commission for educational reform. The composition style of PCER became a model for the organization of committee or commission and the creation of educational reforms to the next governments. PCER proposed 42 comprehensive educational reforms from pre-school and elementary education to higher and life-long education with the goals of cultivating self-actualizing, creative, and moral people to meet the coming soon 21st century. The reforms were not implemented but became a basis of future educational reforms.

President Rho’s government that inaugurated in February 1988 tried to put into practice some of the reforms that proposed by PCER of the previous government such as the establishment of more advanced democratic and decentralized educational system, the enhancement of balanced education for whole man with basic academic ability and life-long education.

President Rho’s government composed the Presidential Educational Policy Consultant Committee with 15 members similar to PCER. The Committee proposed eight major educational reforms including the enlargement of compulsory education period until middle school, the enhancement of autonomy, quality, and cooperation with industry of higher education institutes, and the improvement of teachers training system. These reforms were proposed to the President and not implemented during Rho’s government but connected the 1980s educational reforms with those of the mid-1990s.

**Comparison with the Educational Policies from 1945 to 1979**

Korea started the development of its own modern educational system since August 1945. From 1945 until 1960, the foundation of the current educational system from elementary school to higher education was set up, and the compulsory education at the level of elementary school was completed. The educational policies in this period were focused on the formation of a democratic educational system like introducing a single line
schooling system (6-3-3-4) and a compulsory educational system to provide everyone equal educational opportunity. In addition, the governments of this period emphasized anti-communism education to cope with North Korea, a communism nation.

From 1961 to 1979, Korea drove economic development-centered policies and enhanced educational function for the development of economy like cultivating skillful industrial manpower. Accordingly, vocational education at the level of high school and science-technology education were strengthened. The government of this period accomplished the mass-education of secondary education due to the policies like the abolishment of entrance tests for the admissions of the middle school and the high school and the High School Leveling Policy. The government also enhanced spiritual education like education for anti-communism and Korea’s own democracy to maintain national and political security.

On the other hand, the educational reforms in the mid-1990s drove the quality development of education like cultivating the creativity or diversity of students instead of quantitative growth in the elementary and secondary education because everybody who wanted to enter secondary schools could do it. The mid-1990s educational reforms did not focus on science education or the expansion of vocational education at the level of high school but included agenda such as the change of vocational education so as to keep pace with the social change, the cultivation of higher skilled manpower at the level of higher education, and the strengthening of cooperation between industry and colleges.

The mid-1990s educational reforms did not include agenda like education for anti-communism or Korea’s own democracy. Instead, the reforms emphasized education for the cultivation of democratic citizenship and maintained educational policy for reunification between South and North Koreas that proposed since the late 1980s.

The educational reforms in the mid-1990s represented much more concern about the quality improvement of education, the development of differentiated higher education, and life-long education than educational policies until 1979. In addition, the reforms proposed the inclusion of the kindergarten education that had been managed by a private sector within public education.
Comparison with the Educational Reforms from 1980 to 1992

The style of organizing the Presidential Commission on Education Reform that created educational reform blueprints in the mid-1990s resembled that of the PCER in the 1980s in that it was composed by members with diverse backgrounds. The reforms in the mid-1990s contained major reforms that were proposed from the mid-1980s to the early 1990s.

The mid-1990s educational reforms contained reform agendas from pre-school and elementary education to higher and life-long education like those of the 1980s. The reforms in the mid-1990s were directly implemented during President Kim’s government by receiving positively systemic and financial support from the President and relevant Ministries while the reforms of the mid-1980s and early-1990s were not put into practice during that time governments.

The government in the mid-1990s educational reform practically endowed colleges with more autonomy in areas including the establishment of private higher education institute, the management of institutes, and student quota and provoked the continuous increase of college students by the private sector while the number of college students in the 1980s was rapidly increased by the control of the Korean government. Now, higher education is generalized so that over 80 percent of high school graduates including vocational high schools enter colleges.

Economic terms like consumer or supplier were used in the mid-1990s educational reform. Economic terms had been seldom written on the educational policy documents before the educational reform of the mid-1990s. This implies that an economic factor becomes more influential on the education system than that of the past.

The Korean government in the mid-1990s reinforced a decentralized educational system and implemented the policies of enhancing the self-control and responsibility of individual school or university including the introduction of School Operation Council System in elementary and secondary education, a school based management system.
Parents and community personnel could legally participate in the process of
decision-making in schools first time on the educational history of Korea.

The Korean government of the mid-1990s tried to reform the fundamental
structure of educational system and construct a demand-centered, open life-long learning
system while the past reforms had pursued the formal education-centered reforms. The
Korean government endeavored to establish the educational system of coping with the
requirement of globalization and information society. All elementary and secondary
schools could use the Internet and telecommunication facilities for teaching-learning and
educational administration by 2000 due to the mid-1990s reform movement. The
utilization of this information technology for education has provoked the change of
teaching-learning methods or instruments in formal education and life-long education.
Students now find needed information for their study through the Internet and are provided
learning programs from Internet service providers.

Lastly, the Korean government of the mid-1990s procured and invested five
percent of GNP for education so as to successfully practice reform projects while the past
educational reforms had seldom been supported appropriate funding for them. This
surprising increase of educational funding has brought the outstanding improvement in
educational environment including information-technology facilities. The increased
educational funding has contributed to the continuous procurement of funding for
education.

**Comparison of the Mid-1990s Educational Reform and the Global
Educational System Trend to Be Homogeneous**

The globalization trend of economy has induced governments to reduce their
involvement, support, or control to an educational system as in economic, political, and
cultural areas. The economic globalization has resulted in the enlargement of higher
education to satisfy the requirement of higher-level technology and knowledge that
demanded in a knowledge-based society. Each nation has expanded higher educational
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opportunity for women who can be cheap, higher-skilled manpower and strengthened the cooperation between industry and vocational schools or colleges to enhance its economic competitiveness.

Nations that receive the influence of economic globalization have implemented decentralization policy to reduce the financial support of central government for education and to enhance the efficient use of educational funding. Furthermore, they have tried to enhance the accountability of schools and enlarge higher educational opportunity through a private sector.

The Korean government of the mid-1990s put into practice the educational reforms to cope with the globalization trend that the world becomes a world village and an information society. The government increased the public educational funding by the central government instead of reducing funding according to the globalization trend. The Korean government of the mid-1990s drove decentralization policy so as to construct an advanced democratic educational system rather than reducing the governmental funding for education and promoting the efficiency of educational funding.

The mid-1990s Korean government tried to enhance the autonomy and accountability of schools or colleges and construct the cooperation system between industry and vocational schools or colleges. Especially the government endeavored to set up close cooperation between industry and colleges to provide quality manpower and support applied researches for the development of industry.

The Korean government of the mid-1990s strengthened English education and the utilization of information technology in education to keep pace with the world trend. Elementary schools formally taught English from the 3rd grade first on the Korean educational history in 1997. Most Korean students study English diligently even though it is so difficult for them to learn it. This phenomenon represents that English has become a global language. All the schools and classrooms were connected by the Internet and could utilize telecommunication instruments for education in 2000. Thus, Korea has striven to improve the English education and the utilization of information technology in education.

The mid-1990s educational reforms resulted in the expansion of the opportunity for
higher education including women just as the global trend. Most general high school female graduates (90.5 percent) and 51.5 percent of vocational high school female graduates entered universities or junior colleges in 2003 (KMEHRD, 2003).

The privatization of higher education was more promoted by the educational reform in the mid-1990s, and 84.5 percent of 171 universities and 90.5 percent of 158 junior colleges in 2004 were private (KMEHRD, 2004). Thus, the privatization of higher education becomes an outstanding characteristic of the Korean educational system like the global trend of educational system.

It was deferent from the world trend of emphasizing mathematics and science education and standardized test to promote economic and educational competitiveness that they were not emphasized in the educational reforms of the mid-1990s Korea. But, international comparison tests like TIMSS or PISA showed that the competitiveness of the Korean math and science was top level. This phenomenon is considered as the result of the Korean educational culture with the knowledge-and test-centered learning.

The mid-1990s educational reforms indicated the same directions in the areas like the expansion of higher education and the emphasis of English and information education with the global trend of educational system, but not in the areas like the emphasis of efficiency and reduction of educational funding. Figure 4 shows comparisons between the mid-1990s educational reform and the global trend of educational system to be homogeneous.
### Influence of Globalization on Education

- Reducing public educational funding
- Decentralization emphasis
- Efficiency emphasis of funding
- Math and science emphasis
- Information and English emphasis
- Standardized test emphasis
- Increase of higher education chance
- Increase of women higher education
- Increase of private higher education
- Enhancement of school accountability
- Cooperation of education & industry

### Mid-1990s Educational Reforms

- Increasing public educational funding
- Decentralization emphasis
- Democratic system emphasis
- No focus on math and science
- Information and English emphasis
- No focus on Standardized test
- Increase of higher education chance
- Increase of women higher education
- Increase of private higher education
- Emphasis of school accountability
- Cooperation of education & industry

**Figure 4.** Comparison of the Mid-1990s Educational Reforms and the Influence of Globalization on Education.
The Implications of the Mid-1990s Educational Reform on the Korean Education

President Kim’s government of the mid-1990s tried to change the fundamental frame of educational system to meet the requirement of the 21\textsuperscript{st} knowledge-based society. The government intended to set up the basis of the Korean educational policy to cope with social change prior to the coming soon 21\textsuperscript{st} century.

KMEHRD (2003) stated the Korean government since February 1998 had maintained the basic directions of educational policies initiated by its predecessor, President Kim’s government. In addition, KMEHRD commented the Presidential Commission for the New Educational Community established for educational reform on July 24, 1998, preserved the fundamental ideas of the mid-1990s educational reforms.

Implications on K-12 Education

The mid-1990s educational reform became a model for promoting the development of the public pre-school education. The Pre-school Education Act was enacted in 2004 and practiced from 2005 owing to the proposal for the pre-school education in the mid-1990s educational reforms. The current Korean government aims at increasing the number of children who receive the free pre-school education for one year from 20 percent of all children in 2004 to 70 percent in 2008.

The School Operation Council System, a school-based management system, is now generalized and every elementary and secondary public school operates the System that allows parents, teachers, and community personnel to participate in the process of decision-making. The System became the origin for the democratization of a school site, a most basic decentralization unit. Now, the Council participates in decision-making for school operation such as the creation or revision of school charter or regulations, budget operation, textbook selection, and the invitation of a principal or teachers (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b).
The introduction of School Operation Council System increased the participation of parents in education. Parents of the Council’s members participated in the vote to elect the Superintendent election in broad province. Voluntary parents associations were organized from 1989, and now three representative parents associations (Parents Association for Sincere Education, Parents Cooperation for Actualization of Humane Education, Parents Assembly Loving School) are actively influencing educational policies (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b). The parents associations participate in the decision-making process of important educational policies. For example, they oppose to teachers’ union position of refusing the introduction of teachers evaluation system and concern with the process of introducing the evaluation system under the acceptance of the government, KMEHRD (Yang & Ahn, 2005, November 12). The participation of parents and teachers in the process of setting up educational policies is increasing, and the process of educational policy making becomes more complex than that of the past.

The new 7th curriculum system for elementary and secondary education had been started in 2000 and completed in 2004. All the schools from the 1st grade through the 10th use the common nationwide curriculum while the past curriculum system was divided into elementary school, middle school, high school, and vocational high school curricula. The 11th and 12th graders can select more broadened selective subjects. The central and local educational authorities have the responsibility of assessing the implementation results of the new curriculum system and continuously improving the system to achieve the intended purposes: the promotion of creativity or personality and the cultivation of manpower to meet the requirement of the 21st century, knowledge-based society to be globalized.

Implications on Higher Education

Joint cooperation between colleges and industry is promoted throughout the country. KMEHRD (2005, May 19) judged that the cooperation for education and research between colleges and industry was still inefficient and announced to drive educational policies of promoting the cooperation between colleges and industry. Now, colleges strive
to cooperate with industry to bring up skillful manpower by meeting the requirements of industry and to promote applied research of supporting industrial development.

Higher education students and private higher educational institutes have been rapidly increased by the autonomy policy for higher education of the mid-1990s. Over four-fifths of high school graduates (81.3 percent) entered college or university in 2004. Especially, the percentage of women and vocational high school students entering colleges has much increased. Now, the colleges in rural areas experience the shortage of students because of the increased student quota of almost all colleges and the decreased numbers of high school graduates (from the unpublished document of KMEHRD, 2004). The colleges are confronted with the crisis situation of having to grope for a new survival strategy.

Implications on Other Educational Policies

The decentralization policy of Korean educational system was contained in the Education Act that first created in 1949. Thereafter, an enactment designed to give local educational offices in charge of K-12 education more autonomy was accomplished and implemented in March 1991.

In the educational reform of the mid-1990s, the government proposed agendas such as incorporating the Board of Education and the local parliamentary council and solving the problem of severe separation between the local governance system and the local educational system in order to reorganize the local education autonomy system that was implemented in March 1991. However the agendas were not implemented owing to the strong resistance of invested groups such as the members of the Board of Education and the Superintendents (the Korean Ministry of Education, 1998b; S. I. Park, 2000).

At the time of this writing, the Superintendent, who is elected by the representatives of parents and teaches, has taken charge of local education for a four-year term with less control from the central government than in the past. The heads of local governments have neither authority over nor responsibility for education (S. I. Park, 2000). If the current trend continues, problems in the local educational system like inefficiency or the shortage of
cooperation between the local government and local educational organizations may occur.

The members of the first Presidential Commission on Education Reform were mostly professors and educational experts. There was only one parent and no teacher among the members of the Commission. The participation of teachers and parents in the reform process is indispensable because both are the most important stakeholders in education reform. They feel strong responsibility if participating in the reform process and are inclined to positively join in the reform. The Korean government realized the necessity of modest amount of participation of parents and teachers in the Commission for successful reform achievement and composed the second Commission with a lot of parents and teachers in April 1996 (S. I. Park, 2000). The member composition of organization for educational reform like the Commission is an important problem for successful educational reform, and the participation of important stakeholders like parents or teachers in composing the organization becomes necessary.

At the time of this study, high school students could apply for several universities or colleges during the third grade (12th grade) of high school. They have more selection rights to the admission of colleges than prior to the mid-1990s. This shows that the Korean educational system has been changed into a student, consumer-centered system. The practical suppliers or providers of education like schools or colleges are demanded to change their systems to be attuned with the consumer-centered one.

Educational policy-makers accept and use more freely economic terms like demander, provider, and M & A since the mid-1990s. Now, they often use the term “competitiveness enhancement” and emphasize the roles of colleges and schools for supporting the development of industry or economy. This shows that a phenomenon to the influence of economic globalization on educational policies had begun.

**On-Going Mid-1990s Educational Reform**

The mid-1990s educational reforms cover overall areas from pre-school education through lifelong education. The reforms suggested the direction of educational
development for the early 21st century of Korea.

The educational policies of the current government that started in February 2003 preserved the main stream of the mid-1990s educational reform. KMEHRD (2003) described educational visions in the twenty first century as the followings: (a) making schools places with the joy of learning, (b) getting teachers to teach with pride, (c) providing all people with necessary education, (c) cultivating universities with world-class competitiveness as a foundation of a knowledge-rich country, (d) changing vocational education to meet industrial demand, (e) setting up a lifelong learning society of increasing the quality of life, (f) improving educational environment to promote creative learning and human life, (g) constructing a networking and global society that teaching-learning takes places in cyber space and in the global village, (h) enhancing a decentralized educational system, and (i) procuring stable educational funding.

Furthermore, the current government (KMEHRD, 2003) suggested the fundamental directions of educational policies as follows: (a) the elementary and secondary school education of cultivating creativity and diversification, (b) promoting educational welfare by increasing educational opportunity for pre-school education and reducing the number of over-crowded classrooms, (c) strengthening the competitiveness of higher education, (d) the vocational education that responds to the industrial demand, (e) corroborating the base of life-long learning society, and (f) the education of keeping pace with information-oriented and globalizing social change.

The educational policies of the current government hold common basic directions with the mid-1990s educational reforms in that both emphasize the fundamental directions of educational policies such as: (a) the emphasis on creative and diversified education, (b) the enlargement of pre-school education, (c) the strengthening of higher education competitiveness, (d) the vocation-technology education of satisfying the requirement of knowledge-based society, (e) the promotion of life-long educational system, and (f) the enhancement of information (networking) and English (foreign language) education. The educational reforms in the mid-1990s keep going with adjusting to the changes of social, political circumstances and needs.
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I freely and voluntarily and without element of force or coercion, consent to be an interviewee in
the research project entitled, “Globalization and the Korean Educational Reform in the Mid-1990s.”
This interview data collected by Dongjin Lee will be used for dissertation research to fulfill doctoral
degree requirements at Florida State University. The results of this study may be disseminated at
academic conference or in professional journals. The purpose of this research is to better understand the
process and characteristics of the more powerful educational reform movement of South Korea in the
mid-1990s than any other reform.

I understand that, if I participate in the project, I will be asked questions about my experiences
and opinions about the development and implementation of the Korean educational reform in the mid-
1990s. If I participate in the interview, I will have the opportunity to ask questions of the researcher, and
to review and comment on the interview data until the dissertation is completed.

I understand my participation is totally voluntary and I may stop participation at anytime.
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to the educational reform will help to historically record the process and characteristics of the reform for
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I understand that I may contact Dongjin Lee at (011) 595-8412 or at dongjin33@hotmail.com or
dj6527@asmm.acms.fsu.edu and his major professor Dr. Motlie B. Thomas at thomas@coe.fsu.edu for
answers to questions about this research or my rights.

I have read and understand this consent form.

Printed Name of Subject:
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These interview questions are designed to gain your experiences or opinions to the process of completing the educational reform blueprint in the mid-1990s educational reform of South Korea for the completion of my dissertation. All information that collected from this interview is confidential, and your identity will be anonymous in the final report of the dissertation and any other publication. You can contact Dong-Jin Lee at (011) 595-8412 or at dongjin33@hotmail.com or djl8527@garnet.acns.fsu.edu for answers to questions about this research or your rights relevant to this interview.

**Part I: Questions from February 25, 1993 to February 5, 1994.**

Questions on the process of creating educational reforms from President Kim's inauguration on February 25, 1993, to the composition of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform on February 5, 1994. Please, describes your experiences or opinions on the below questions.

[Roles of the Ministry of Education until the composition of the Secretariat Office for educational reform on September 7, 1993.]

Q1) Which department of the Ministry of Education took charge of the tasks for educational reform from March 1993 until the composition of the Secretariat Office on September 7, 1993?

Q2) Who took charge of the tasks for educational reform in the upper department?
Q3) What roles did the department in charge of the tasks for educational reform play for the educational reform in the mid-1990s?

[Events from the composition of the Secretariat Office on September 7, 1993, until the composition of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform on February 5, 1994]

Q4) What roles did the Secretariat Office play for the educational reform in the mid-1990s?

Q5) The conference record of the documents that the Presidential Commission on Education Reform published in February 1996 describes that the meeting of the assistants for the Presidential Commission on Education Reform was held on September 18, 1993.

- Who participated in the meeting?
- What topics were discussed in the meeting?

Q6) The upper conference record describes that the Secretariat Office surveyed a poll on educational reform to 2,800 educational administrators, teachers, parents (etc.) on January 10, 1994.

- Who carried out the survey of the poll?
- Who developed the questions of the poll?
- What roles did this poll play for the creation of the educational reform blueprint in the mid-1990s?

Q7) Who took charge of the task that appoints the Presidential Commission's members?

Q8) By what procedure were the Presidential Commission's members recommended to the President?

Q9) Who selected the Presidential Commission's members finally?

Q10) What was the reason that the composition of the Presidential Commission was delayed after the Secretariat Office was established?

Q11) Who participated in the conference of Blue House that the Presidential Commission on Education Reform's members were appointed?

Q12) What roles did the President play for the educational reform in the mid-1990s?
Q13) What roles did the Minister of Education play for the educational reform in the mid-1990s?
Q14) What roles did the Ministry of Education play for the educational reform in the mid-1990s?
Q15) What roles did the Officials of Blue House excepting the President play for the educational reform in the mid-1990s?


Questions on the process of creating the educational reform blueprint from the composition of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, on February 5, 1994, to the proclamation of the first educational reform blueprint on May 31, 1995. Please, describes your experiences or opinions on the below questions.

[Questions on the conference of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform]
Q1) Who presided the conference of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform?
Q2) Who read the previous conference record and recorded the conference?
Q3) Who participated in the conference of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform excepting the commission's members?
Q4) What roles did the conferences of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform play for the completion of educational reform blueprint?

[Questions on the formation of educational reform agenda and the completion of the educational reform blueprint]
Q5) How were the educational reform topics that assigned to the Sub-Committees developed?
Q6) Who assigned the educational reform topics to each Sub-Committee?
Q7) What roles did the Expert Members play for the Sub-Committees and the creation of the educational reform blueprint?
Q8) What roles did the Steering Committee play in the process of creating the educational reform blueprint?

Q9) What roles did the joint conference that the Presidential Commission's members, Expert Members, and public officials participated play for the creation of the educational reform blueprint?

Q11) By what procedure were the educational reform topics that assigned to each Sub-Committee developed into educational reform projects?

Q12) What were most difficult points in completing the educational reform blueprint?

[Comments on the first educational reform blueprint that proclaimed on May 31, 1995.]

Q13) What comments did President Kim give the first educational reform blueprint after he was reported it on May 31, 1995?

Q14) What are different points between the educational reforms in the mid-1990s and the previous educational reforms?

Q15) What are most contributing projects among the educational reform projects in the mid-1990s for the development of the Korean education?

Q16) What do you think is the most important point for the success of the educational reform?

Q17) Who most contributed to the drive of the educational reform in the mid-1990s?

Q18) Please tell me anything what you want to say about the educational reform in the mid-1990s excepting the upper questions.

※ Questions such as Part I Q5, Q11 and Part II Q1, Q2, Q6 were not used in the interview with Administrator B.
APPENDIX B.2
Interview Questions Used to Presidential Commission or Expert Member for Educational Reform

These interview questions are designed to gain your experiences or opinions to the process of completing the educational reform blueprint in the mid-1990s educational reform of South Korea for the completion of my dissertation. All information that collected from this interview is confidential, and your identity will be anonymous in the final report of the dissertation and any other publication. You can contact Dong-Jin Lee at (011) 595-8412 or at dongjin33@hotmail.com or djl8527@garnet.acns.fsu.edu for answers to questions about this research or your rights relevant to this interview.

[Questions on the process of creating the educational reform blueprint from the composition of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, on February 5, 1994, to the proclamation of the first educational reform blueprint on May 31, 1995. Please, describes your experiences or opinions on the below questions.]

Q1) What roles did the conferences of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform play for the driving or implementation of educational reform?
Q2) Who assigned the educational reform topics to each Sub-Committee?
Q3) How were the educational reform topics that assigned to the Sub-Committees developed?
Q4) What roles did the Expert Members play for the educational reform in the mid-1990s?
Q5) What roles did the Sub-Committees play for the educational reform in the mid-1990s?
Q6) What roles did the Steering Committee play in the process of creating the educational reform blueprint?
Q7) What were most difficult points in completing the educational reform blueprint?

Q8) What roles did the Officials of Blue House excepting the President play for the educational reform in the mid-1990s?

Q9) Who most contributed to the completion of the educational reform in the mid-1990s?

Q10) What are different points between the educational reforms in the mid-1990s and the previous educational reforms?

Q11) What are most contributing projects among the educational reform projects in the-mid 1990s for the development of the Korean education?

Q12) What do you think are the influence of the mid-1990s educational reforms on the development of the Korean education?

Q13) Who most contributed to the driving or implementation of the educational reform in the mid-1990s?

Q14) Please tell me anything what you want to say about the educational reform in the mid-1990s.
APPENDIX B.3
Interview Questions Used to Administrator of the Ministry of Education

These interview questions are designed to gain your experiences or opinions to the process of completing the educational reform blueprint in the mid-1990s educational reform of South Korea for the completion of my dissertation. All information that collected from this interview is confidential, and your identity will be anonymous in the final report of the dissertation and any other publication. You can contact Dong-Jin Lee at (011) 595-8412 or at dongjin33@hotmail.com or djl8527@garnet.acns.fsu.edu for answers to questions about this research or your rights relevant to this interview.

[Questions on the driving or implementation of the educational reforms since the composition of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform, on February 5, 1994. Please, describes freely your experiences or opinions on the below questions.]

Q1) Who most contributed to the completion of the educational reform in the mid-1990s?
Q2) What are different points between the educational reforms in the mid-1990s and the previous educational reforms?
Q3) What are most contributing projects among the educational reform projects in the mid-1990s for the development of the Korean education?
Q4) What do you think is the influence of the mid-1990s educational reforms on the development of the Korean education?
Q5) What do you think is the most important point for the success of the educational reform?
Q6) Who most contributed to the drive of the educational reform in the mid-1990s?
Q7) Please tell me anything what you want to say about the educational reform in the mid-1990s excepting the upper questions.
### APPENDIX C

Presidential Commission on Education Reform’s Members List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relevant organization</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lee, S. H.</td>
<td>Joongang University</td>
<td>Pre-president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chairperson)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Y. T.</td>
<td>Seokang University</td>
<td>Dean of graduate school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vice-chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pack, L. H.</td>
<td>Inje University</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, K. H.</td>
<td>Korea Foreign Language University</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shin, I. C.</td>
<td>Korea University</td>
<td>Dean of graduate school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jung, J. W.</td>
<td>Yeonse University</td>
<td>Dean of graduate school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, D. H.</td>
<td>Seoul University</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, S. I.</td>
<td>Seoul University</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, I. H.</td>
<td>Seoul University</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, M. H.</td>
<td>Seoul University</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Permanent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kweon, S. I</td>
<td>Seoul University</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, K. J.</td>
<td>Seoul University</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, S. I.</td>
<td>Seoul University</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo, U. K.</td>
<td>Kyemyeong University</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, D. K.</td>
<td>Sungkyunkwan University</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Y. H.</td>
<td>Inha University</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong, T. P.</td>
<td>Cheonrabookdo broad educational office</td>
<td>Pre-commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, K. B.</td>
<td>Busan Teacher’s College</td>
<td>Pre-president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, D. J.</td>
<td>Youhan Industrial High School</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, S. S.</td>
<td>Seongnam Dongkook Elementary School</td>
<td>Associate principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koak, B. S.</td>
<td>Korean Education Development Institute</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, K. H.</td>
<td>Kyeonghyangsinnmoon (newspaper company)</td>
<td>Chief editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, Y. S.</td>
<td>Korea Commerce &amp; Industry Association</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, C. K.</td>
<td>Korea Mother Parent Association</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moon, S. J.</td>
<td>Korea Private Academic Institute Association</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPENDIX D

Sub-Committees Members List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of sub-committee</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First sub-Committee</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Lee, K. H.</td>
<td>President of university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Kim, S. I.</td>
<td>Professor of university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lee, S. S.</td>
<td>Associate principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lee, Y. H.</td>
<td>Dean of university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second sub-Committee</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Lee, D. H.</td>
<td>Professor of university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Kim, Y. T.</td>
<td>Dean of graduate school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moon, S. J.</td>
<td>Private academic institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hong, T. P.</td>
<td>Pre-superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third sub-Committee</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Shin, I. C.</td>
<td>Dean of graduate school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Koak, B. S.</td>
<td>KEDI, director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lee, K. H.</td>
<td>Chief editor of newspaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lee, D. K.</td>
<td>Professor of university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lee, M. Y.</td>
<td>Professor of university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forth sub-Committee</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Lee, K. J.</td>
<td>Professor of university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Kweon, S. I.</td>
<td>Professor of university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kim, D. J.</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Park, Y. S.</td>
<td>CEO of industry association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lee, K. B.</td>
<td>Pre-president of teachers college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Park, S. I.</td>
<td>Professor of university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth sub-Committee</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Jeong, J. W.</td>
<td>Dean of graduate school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Kim, C. K.</td>
<td>Representative of parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paek, N. H.</td>
<td>President of university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lee, I. H.</td>
<td>Professor of university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jo, U. K.</td>
<td>Professor of university</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX E

Expert Members of the Presidential Commission on Education Reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-committee</th>
<th>Name of members</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First sub-Committee</td>
<td>Kang, I. S.</td>
<td>Professor of Su-won University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second sub-Committee</td>
<td>Seo, J. H.</td>
<td>Professor of Hong-ic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yun, K. Y.</td>
<td>Professor of Yeon-se University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Song, K. C.</td>
<td>Professor of In-je University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third sub-Committee</td>
<td>Choi, C. O.</td>
<td>Professor of Kyeong-ki University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kang, C. L.</td>
<td>Elementary school teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forth sub-Committee</td>
<td>Jeong, T. Y.</td>
<td>President of Dae-cheon Junior College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lee, J. H.</td>
<td>Researcher of Korea Development Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth sub-Committee</td>
<td>Kim, J. W.</td>
<td>Professor of Korea Open University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lee, C. C.</td>
<td>Professor of Kang-won University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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