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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

JOHN C. WEIDMAN AND NAMGI PARK

This book contains a comprehensive description of the Korean higher education system. In an effort to get a uniquely Korean point of view, the editors invited Korean scholars of higher education to write all of the book’s chapters. The book is intended for use by scholars of comparative higher education as well as by faculty and staff in higher education institutions around the world who work with Korean students and faculty. Each of the chapters includes historical background as well as more contemporary assessments of the Korean higher education system.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE 1997–98 ASIAN ECONOMIC CRISIS

It is important to reflect on the consequences for higher education of the severe economic crisis that occurred in 1997 in Korea, as well as in the entire East Asian region. The crisis was precipitated by an unexpected drop in the value of Asian currencies that posed serious threats to economies throughout the region. By early 1998, the value of the Korean won in U.S. dollars was just half of what it had been in November 1997, and interest rates in Korea were 25 percent per annum. Foreign currency problems, along with other structural issues in the banking and finance systems of many Asian countries, including Korea, led the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to intervene in an effort to stabilize the economic situation.

The Asian economic crisis has affected Korean higher education, especially the private sector, severely. Da n kook University, one of the
largest (with more than 15,000 students) private higher education institutions in Seoul, went bankrupt in March 1998. According to the Korean government, at least ten other private universities have similar problems. It could be argued that the financial problems of private higher education institutions are as much the result of government policy as they are of the broader economic problems brought about by the foreign currency crisis. Specifically, the Korean government instituted an accreditation process, which all higher education institutions were required to undergo. Those institutions receiving good evaluations were eligible for government aid and administrative support. Those that did not fare as well had to invest a lot of their own money to meet the government standards. Those institutions like Dan kook University, which borrowed heavily from foreign investors to make improvements, suffered much more financially than other institutions that met the standards. Despite the financial problems, the government pressured the private higher education institutions not to raise their tuition and fees until the economic crisis had passed, even though the price index increased by 10 percent in 1998.

Because they had problems paying the costs of higher education, many male students withdrew from classes temporarily to fulfill their military service obligations. In two private universities located in the Chula Province, as many as 40 percent of the males withdrew (Chosun Daily News, 13 March 1998). Highly regarded higher education institutions can fill vacant places with transfer students, but often the students who fill the vacancies transfer from provincial universities, which are much less likely to find new students.

There are other problems on the horizon for higher education institutions. One is an anticipated decrease in the number of traditional college-age students. By the year 2003, the number of places available in higher education institutions will be the same as the number of traditional college-age students. According to enrollment projections, in 1998 there were 810,000 students in grade 11, but only 630,000 students in grade 7 (KFTA, 1996, p. 117). In other countries such as the United States, reductions in size of the traditional college-age cohorts were offset by increases in adult and female students, so that actual higher education enrollment levels did not decrease. Because females constitute only a third of the higher education students in Korea (KEDI, 1994, p. 413), there is room for an expansion of female enrollment. There is also continual discussion of the possibility of reunification with North Korea. Should this occur, it is also likely that there would be an increased demand for higher education from residents of North Korea.
Introduction

To attract nontraditional students, it is important that reliance on the national examination for higher education admission be reduced. Beginning in 1999, private universities were able to set their own admissions policies without government restriction. Also, as the labor market becomes more fluid and people begin changing jobs more frequently, there is likely to be an increased demand for professional development courses in colleges and universities so that Koreans can keep up to date with knowledge and technical advances in professional fields.

In response to the need for continuing education among people employed in professional and technical fields, the government has authorized two new types of higher education institutions: the college of technology and the cyber university. Colleges of technology can be founded only for the education and training of company employees. If such programs meet national accreditation standards, they can be authorized to offer both two- and four-year degree programs. This will mean increased competition with junior vocational colleges and universities of industry for students. The cyber university is a new variant of the correspondence university that will offer its program over the Internet rather than through more traditional means.

Two additional avenues for attaining higher education degrees have also been offered by the government. One is a Bachelors Examination System, which allows students to sit for subject area tests administered by the government. When students have passed enough tests at sufficiently high levels to represent learning equivalent to what would be expected for earning a bachelor’s degree, they are awarded the degree. There is also an Academic Credit Bank System, which allows students to take courses in any accredited academic program and apply them toward a degree. The Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI) serves as the “bank” for accumulating credits. When KEDI certifies that requirements have been met and enough credits have been “banked,” the government awards the degree. Clearly, the Korean government is committed to expanding the opportunities for higher education through nontraditional means. What remains unclear is how long it will take for the national economy to stabilize and “trickle down” to the Korean higher education system.

CONTENTS OF THE BOOK

Chapter 2 contains a discussion of the historical development of higher education in Korea, tracing advanced education from its Chinese
Confucian roots in the fourth century A.D. through the influence of European missionaries in the late nineteenth century and of Japanese colonials in the first half of the twentieth century into the present period, in which models drawn from the United States prevail. However, despite the adaptation of influences from several regions of the world, the Korean higher education system maintains its own unique characteristics.

Chapter 3 provides a more detailed description of the structure and functioning of contemporary higher education in Korea. It includes sections on management, finance, and curriculum. The pattern of centralized government control is assessed and critiqued. Chapter 4 describes the intense examination system for admission to higher education in Korea, showing how it has evolved over the years in response to social and political pressure. This chapter highlights the pressure on students to score well on the national higher education entrance examination.

Chapter 5 presents two areas in which there continue to be unresolved issues: providing government financial assistance to private higher education institutions and the Korean faculty tenure system. Both areas are addressed in terms of the strengths and weaknesses of various policy alternatives. Chapter 6 focuses on the distribution of female students and faculty in Korean higher education, suggesting that despite huge increases in female participation, males still significantly outnumber females.

Chapter 7 assesses the so-called 5.31 Reform, a package of reforms to higher education promulgated by the Korean government on 31 May 1995. It describes government initiatives already underway and others that are under consideration. Chapter 8 provides a summary and conceptual synthesis of the process of higher education expansion in Korea, drawing from several perspectives to build a new framework for understanding the intense competition for higher education in terms of a “war” over access to and completion of advanced education.

The book’s three appendixes provide reference information about the Korean higher education system. Appendix A contains a list (complete as of 1996) of the higher education institutions in Korea, both two-year and four-year, and includes basic institutional information (type of control, year established, number of departments, number of undergraduate students, and number of graduate students), mailing addresses, and telephone and facsimile numbers. Appendix B contains tables showing statistical trends between 1965 and 1996 in Korean higher education, including numbers of institutions by type; numbers of students by institutional type, major, and sex; numbers of faculty by institutional type.
and major; and expenditure patterns. Finally, Appendix C contains a list of references for additional reading on Korean higher education.

REFERENCES


CHAPTER 2

Historical Development

JONGCHOL KIM

Higher education in Korea can be traced to the fourth century. Its history is closely intertwined with the ebbs and flows of Korean culture and patterns of colonial domination by geographical neighbors. This chapter traces important developments in the history of Korean higher education, describing events sequentially by historical period.

DYNASTIES PERIOD

Three Kingdoms Period, 57 B.C.-A.D. 918

Two traditions form the historical roots of higher education in Korea: one is of Chinese origin and the other, of European. The first type of formal higher education in Korea appeared in A.D. 372, when Tae Hak (Great School) was established following the Chinese model of higher education at that time (Kim, P., vol. 18). This was during the second year of the reign of King Sosurim in Kokuryo, one of the three kingdoms that ruled the northern part of the Korean peninsula as well as part of Manchuria. Kokuryo was under the direct cultural influence of China and, even though the Korean language was completely different from the Chinese language, Chinese characters were used in official Kokuryo documents (Kim, P., vol. 20). Pronunciations of the Chinese characters were also different in Kokuryo. The uniquely Korean alphabet (Hangul) was not developed until the fifteenth century.

Tae Hak was established concurrently with the introduction of Buddhism from Ch’ in China during a period of cultural advancement.
TaeHak of Kokuryo is the second-oldest higher educational institution in the Orient, predated only by Oh Hak (Five Great Schools) of ancient Chou China, which was founded in approximately 1000 B.C. (Committee for Compilation of a Twenty-Year History of Seoul National University, 1966, p. 1). Like Oh Hak in China, Tae Hak was a nationally established educational institution dedicated to the purpose of training young men of aristocratic descent to be higher (i.e., executive level as opposed to middle management) civil servants. Little is known of the content of education in Tae Hak of Kokuryo; it is likely, however, that the curriculum included classic Chinese texts in Confucianism, history, and literature, along with military arts like archery. Military strength was particularly prized in Kokuryo, probably necessitated by a need for defense against China from the north and possible aggression from the southern states of Paikje and Silla (Lee, B., 1959, vol. 1, p. 569).

Another form of advanced educational institution, Kyung Dang, was started in Kokuryo around the fifth century (Hahn, 1963, p. 13). It was a private boarding school, in contrast to the public Tae Hak, combining secondary and higher levels of education. Kyung Dang enrolled unmarried young men of varying ages. Instruction focused on Confucian classics, Chinese history, and literature along with military skills.

Although there is no written record of its educational system, Paikje (a kingdom to the south of Kokuryo that occupied the middle and south-western part of the Korean peninsula) is also assumed to have had some form of higher education. There are two primary reasons for this assumption. First, Paikje is well known for its highly developed system of learning, as suggested by the scholar Wang-in, who went to Japan in 285 to become a royal teacher and served as the earliest instructor of Chinese classics there (Lee, B., 1959, vol. 1, p. 13). Second, it is known that students from Paikje, Kokuryo, and the Korean kingdom of Silla were sent for study in 640 (Kim, P., vols. 20 and 27) to the capital city of Tang China, which was considered the cultural center of the Orient at that time.

Although little is known of the early period of the kingdom of Silla (located to the south of Kokuryo and to the east of Paikje in the south-eastern part of the Korean peninsula), it is probable that there was some form of higher education. Historical records document the establishment in 651 of an advanced degree (Daesa), roughly equivalent to today’s master’s degree, that was offered during the reign of King Chinduk at Kook Hak, the national higher education institution of Silla (Hahn, 1963, p. 15: based on King Kojong, vol. 207, part 6).
Silla unified the three kingdoms on the Korean peninsula in 676 and established the first Kook Hak (national college) in 682 under the reign of King Shinmoon (Hahn, 1963, p. 15: based on King Kojong, vol. 207, part 6). The official name of the institution was changed for a period to Tae Hak Kam, but the original name was soon restored and remained the same for most of the Silla dynasty. Copied from Tang China’s pattern, the institution was placed under the control and supervision of Ye Bu (the Department of Education) because it was an institution for training young men from the aristocracy for higher civil service, as had been the case for Kokuryo’s Tae Hak. Kook Hak in Silla, like Tae Hak in Kokuryo, was completely modeled on the Chinese pattern (including programs, objectives, functions, administration, and control, as well as faculty and student composition). It was headed by a Kyong, or rector, under whose control three faculties or departments were established to teach Confucian classics, Chinese history, and literature using Chinese textbooks (e.g., *The Confucian Analects, The Book of Changes, The Book of Rites*, and *The Book of History and Chinese Anthology*). Portraits of Confucius and his disciples were imported from China in 717 under Queen Sunduk and dedication services were held in their honor (Lee, M., 1947, p. 69). Each faculty was headed by a scholar with a doctoral degree, and there were some teaching assistants. Later, elective courses were added in such subjects as mathematics, medicine, astronomy, and law. The early introduction of technical education on this level may be traced to 692, during the time of King Hyoso (Lee, M., 1947, p. 68).

The maximum period of study at Kook Hak was generally nine years, but exceptions were allowed. Students with promising talents were permitted to continue their studies to the status of Nama and Great Nama, the equivalents of nondegree graduate status and master’s level, respectively (Lee, B., 1959, vol. 1, p. 669). Students incapable of meeting academic standards were expelled from school. The ages of the students ranged from fifteen to thirty. Kook Hak in Silla had particularly high prestige: the king or queen attended lectures given by prominent doctoral-level scholars, a practice that was first initiated in 765 under the reign of King Hekong. Adding to the prestige of the institution was the introduction, beginning in 799 under the reign of King Sosung, of a type of scholarship grant (Nok Up, or granted land) that was actually a special provision allowing students to collect taxes in kind from allotted lands (Lee, M., 1947, p. 69).

In summary, a type of formal higher education, established in Korea by the fourth century A.D. during the Three Kingdoms period (the early
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Middle Age of Korea), was distinctively and overwhelmingly influenced by Chinese culture and in the tradition of the Oriental world. This did not, however, necessarily mean Chinese political control. Korean higher education in this period was basically humanistic and liberal in orientation, although the germ of technical education was to be found in Silla during the postunification period. This type of higher education was solely for the family members and close associates of the ruling dynasty, primarily to train young men for higher civil service.

Era of the Koryo Dynasty, 918–1392

In the era of the Koryo dynasty, Buddhism reigned over the spiritual world of Koreans, while Confucianism remained the dominant force regulating formal governmental organization and functions, including education. The Confucian-oriented education during this period does not, however, seem to have made any lasting impression. It was only after the reign of King Kwangjong, who, in 958, adopted the national examination system for higher civil service called Kwako, that education (as well as Confucianism) made more significant headway in Koryo (Lee, B., 1959, vol. 2; Lee, Sang-paik, 1959).

The higher education institution (Kook Ja Kam) that existed during the Koryo dynasty was first established in 992 under the reign of King Sungjong, the sixth ruler enthroned. King Sungjong worked hard for the improvement of education, issuing an Imperial Decree on Education, establishing positions for doctors in twelve local provinces of the country and, finally, as his culminating effort to promote education, establishing a higher education institution (Kook Ja Kam) in the capital city of Kaisung (or Songdo, as it was called then). A period of stagnation followed during the eleventh century, primarily due to involvement in hostilities from frequent invasions by the northern tribe of Yujin.

As the national higher education conducted at Kook Ja Kam became stagnant, ambitious young men who wanted to score high on the state examination for higher civil service began to head for private higher education institutions. There were twelve renowned private institutions of higher learning, the most famous of which was the one established in 1053 by Chung Choi, a great Confucian scholar (nicknamed Haedong Kong Ja, the “Confucius of Korea”), teacher, and statesman who had been prime minister of the country. Chung Choi’s school was known as the Kuje School, or the School of Nine Halls. Students under his guidance were called Disciples of Master Choi (Lee, B., 1959, vol. 2, pp. 228–229).
National higher education became active again with the reign of Yejong, the sixteenth king of Koryo, who established seven halls of study admitting seventy budding Confucian scholars and eight warriors in 1109. He further expanded the facilities of the national institution of higher education, Kook Ja Kam, after moving the site to the outskirts of Songdo, the capital city of Koryo, in 1117. It was under King Injong, who followed in the wake of King Yejong, that higher education in Koryo perhaps reached its peak, with student enrollment at Kook Ja Kam reaching two hundred (Lee, B., 1959, vol. 2, pp. 99–100). During the reign of King Injong, the organization of higher education was completed, together with other systems of education.

Beginning with the reign of King Uijong in 1147, higher education in Koryo became less and less active. During his reign there was a revolt by warriors in protest against his neglect of the sword in favor of the pen, and there followed a time of military supremacy and consequent instability of the government punctuated by internal strife. Many scholars took refuge in temples, managing to escape violence by disguising themselves as priests. Then, in the thirteenth century, the Mongolian invasion led to a gradual downfall of the Koryo kingdom.

Some of the last kings of Koryo made gallant efforts to rebuild a national higher education system in the country. In 1304, for instance, King Chungyul, acting upon the recommendations of such prominent Confucian scholars as Yu Ahn, Shick Lee, and Mongju Chung, collected silver and cloth to be used as a fund for Kook Ja Kam, which was also supplemented by royal grants (King Kojong, vol. 202, part 1, p. 358). King Kongmin had the schoolhouse of Kook Ja Kam rebuilt on an enlarged scale. Despite these efforts, however, there was no way of preventing the kingdom from collapsing, and with it, higher education. The overall framework of the educational system in the era of the Koryo dynasty and the place of higher education in it are presented graphically in Figure 2.1.

As is shown in Figure 2.1, there were two types of national higher education institutions in Koryo, Kook Ja Kam and Tong-su Hakdang. The national institution of Kook Ja Kam was by far the more important one, even though there was a time when the private institutions were more prosperous. Kook Ja Kam, completely supported by the national government, was an institution for training in the art of being loyal civil servants, mainly through studies of Confucianism. It was composed of six different departments, differentiated on the basis of the family standing of students in the highly hierarchical, aristocratic society of the era. The administrative organization of Kook Ja Kam at the time of its
establishment was rather simple, composed of a Kook Ja Saup (president), some faculty members at what would be considered the doctoral level, and their assistants.

At the time of Moonjong, the eleventh king, a more elaborate organization was introduced. There were six advisors and/or supervisors by various titles, such as Jeko, Dong Jeko, and Kwanku; a Pansa or president; and two doctoral-level faculty for the Department of Kook Ja Hak, two for the Department of Dae Hak, and one for the Department of

Figure 2.1. The Korea Educational System in the Koryo Era (A.D. 918–1392)

* Denotes a higher education institution.

Source: Kim, Jung-ok, 1956, pp. 85–86.
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Samoon Hak. There was a Chu Bu or Dean of Students; some teaching assistants (two Hak Jung, two Hak Rok, four Hak Yu, and two Chick Hak) differentiated according to department status; and two doctoral-level faculty in each of the departments of San Hak and Su Hak (Chung, chap. 30). As a general rule, all qualified applicants were admitted to Kook Ja Kam. The maximum student quota was three hundred for each department of Confucian studies, but generally fewer than one hundred seem to have been admitted.

The curriculum was uniform for the Department of Confucian Studies, with the first year generally devoted to study of The Confucian Analects and The Book of Filial Piety, followed by specialized study in an elective chosen from one of the nine Great Books of Confucianism. Over a period of two and a half years, one among The Book of History, The Life of Kung Yang, and The Life of Ku Liang was to be studied. Works such as The Book of Changes, The Odes, or The Book of Chou China were to be mastered within two years; either The Book of Rites or The Life of Tsuo was to be studied within three years. After complete mastery of one field, the student was allowed to proceed to another (Min, 1957). A summary of the characteristics of the six departments in Koryo’s Kook Ja Kam is presented in Table 2.1.

Era of the Yi Dynasty, 1392–1910

Overview. The last kingdom of Korea, the Yi dynasty, was established in 1392 by Sung-gye Yi (known later as King Taejo) through a military revolution. Although the basic structure of the society remained nearly the same as during the Koryo dynasty, Buddhism was deliberately repressed by the new regime and became stagnant during the Yi dynasty. Increasingly, Confucian culture dominated both government affairs and the sociocultural outlook. Despite its original lofty ideals and moral principles, Confucianism’s emphasis upon traditionalism, formalism, kowtowism, and family-oriented particularism seems to have exerted a negative influence on Korean culture in general and on education in particular (Lee, B., 1964; Lee, Sang-paik, 1959).

The educational system in the Yi dynasty was similar to that of Koryo. The national higher educational institution first established in 1398 under King Taejo was called Sung Kyun Kwan (House of Higher Education), the same name used at the end of the preceding dynasty (Yang, 1964). The King made land grants available for support of this institution and had a food storage building called Yang Hyun Ko
Table 2.1. Kook Ja Kam in Twelfth-Century Koryo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Department</th>
<th>Student Qualifications for Admission</th>
<th>Student Quota</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kook Ja Hak</td>
<td>Descendants of officials in civil and military services ranking third or higher grades and their equivalents</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Doctors and assistants</td>
<td><em>Book of Changes, The Odes, Book of History, Book of Chou China, Life of Kung Yang, Life of Ku Liang</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dae Hak</td>
<td>Descendants of officials in civil and military services ranking fifth or higher grades and their equivalents</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Doctors and assistants</td>
<td><em>Book of Rites, The Spring and Autumn Annals, Life of Tsuo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoon Hak</td>
<td>Descendants of officials in civil and military services ranking seventh or higher grades and their equivalents</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Doctors and assistants</td>
<td><em>Book of Filial Piety, Confucian Analects, books on medicine and fortune telling (in common with above two departments)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yul Hak</td>
<td>Descendants of officials in civil and military services ranking eighth or higher grades and their equivalents</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su Hak</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td><em>Five Canons of Confucianism, calligraphy</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Hak</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kim, Jung-ok, 1956.

constructed on the campus. He also had a shrine built on campus, called Moon Myo, where great Confucian scholars of the past, both Chinese and Korean, were honored and worshipped. The third monarch, King Taejong, was a great promoter of education who had more schools established, produced tens of thousands of pieces of copper type for the
publication of books (revising the metal type invented earlier in Koryo), and increased land grants for the support of Sung Kyun Kwan.

Sejong, the fourth ruler of the Yi dynasty, is considered one of the greatest monarchs throughout Korean history for his unparalleled achievement in the advancement of Korean culture and the promotion of learning. His royal academy, Jip Hyun Jon, was built for scholars to devote themselves to creative work, and it was here that the Korean alphabet system known as Hangul was developed. The curriculum focused on such texts as *Shihak Julmok* (Rules on Conduct in Schools) and *Yusaing Kangsu Bub* (Handbook for Confucian Scholars), in addition to other books on history, government, agriculture, medicine, and literature. Throughout the fifteenth century, education was strongly promoted, and the Korean culture of the time was at its peak.

King Yunsan, however, used his eleven-year rule from 1495 to 1505 to undo every great thing that had been accomplished, closing educational institutions and massacring prominent scholars. Under his rule, the faculty and students were expelled, and Sung Kyun Kwan was used for banquets and entertainment. When King Chungjong took the throne in 1506, efforts were made to renew the devastated higher education system. He had the Shrine of the Great Confucian Scholars repaired and schools built. A leading scholar and reformer of the time, Kwangjo Cho, was appointed prime minister, and Toege Lee, a great Confucian scholar, was made the head of Sung Kyun Kwan. Land grants to the institution were increased. Unfortunately, Korea then lapsed into a time of hardship. Scholars differ in their explanations for this decline, but it seems safe to say that there were a combination of problems arising from internal strife among different political factions and external invasions from Japan to the east as well as from Chung China (Manchuria) to the north. It was during this period of inactivity in the national higher education system that a kind of private higher education institution, Suh Won, developed. In 1541, the renowned scholar, Sebong Chu, opened the first of these private institutes (Pailkwoondong Suh Won) at Chookke in North Kyongsang province. In 1550, it was renamed Sosoo Suh Won by the former head of Sung Kyun Kwan, Toege Lee. The private higher education institutions maintained by famous scholars flourished, enjoying such privileges as land-tax exemption for the owners of the institutions and exemption from military service for their students.

King Yungjo, enthroned in 1725, adopted the Tang Pyong Policies in order to reconcile strife among political factions in his kingdom. As a result, government was stabilized, education was promoted, and culture
Higher Education in Korea

was advanced. He restored and increased land grants to educational institutions and had a group of scholars compile an encyclopedia of Korea entitled *Tongkook Munhun Biko*. Compiled in 1770 by such scholars as Byong-han Hong under the royal order of King Yungjo, it encompassed nearly all facets of Korean life and culture, including climate, geography, music, folklore, law, finance, housing, education, and government. King Jungjo, successor to Yungjo, also demonstrated great interest in learning and education by establishing a royal library called Kyujang Kak and publishing many important books.

The eighteenth century saw the revival of learning and education, but the tradition of Confucianism continued to predominate. Scholars tended to engage in purely theoretical discussions of orthodox Confucian principles, neglecting practical application of those principles to the Korean situation. To protest this dominant orthodox tendency of Confucianism, a group of neo-Confucian scholars (including Jiwon Park and Yakyong Chung) emphasized more practical subjects and employed a scientific approach to the study of government, business, astronomy, and geography. Had they succeeded, the scientific analysis and focus on the practical (as opposed to spiritual) life advocated by these neo-Confucians might have exerted a healthy influence upon Korean culture by introducing a more flexible attitude toward the changes of the time. Traditionalism prevailed, however, with stagnant Confucianism continuing to play a rather conservative, often reactionary, role with respect to the advancement of the society.

New supplements to the encyclopedia of Korea, entitled *Jungbo Munhun Biko* (Supplements to Encyclopedia Koreana), were compiled and published under the reign of King Kojong, the last monarch of the Yi dynasty. These supplements included royal family genealogy, foreign relations, and literature. By 1871, there were also 679 private institutions of higher education flourishing in Korea. Shortly thereafter, however, Regent Daewongun, acting for his son (King Kojong), closed all but forty-seven of the private higher education institutions. Ultimately, Korea lost its vitality, was absorbed by foreign domination, and lapsed into obscurity.

**Sung Kyun Kwan.** Throughout the Yi dynasty, Confucianism played a dominant role, not only in state affairs but also in people’s social lives. Sung Kyun Kwan remained the most important center for training the Confucian scholars who became the political as well as the cultural leaders of the country. Historical antecedents to the name Sung Kyun Kwan
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(House of Higher Education) with similar meaning included Kook Hak of Kokuryo, Tae Hak of Silla, and Kook Ja Jam of Koryo. The names Yang Koong (Place of Water) and Hyon Kwan (Gate of the Wise) were also used (Lee, M., 1947, pp. 151–152). The site of the school was Sunkyo Bang, in the northeastern part of the capital, Seoul. In addition to the main building complex of classrooms, there was a shrine consecrated to the great Confucian scholars of China and Korea, a dormitory for students, a library, an archery training ground, a food-storage building, a dining room, an academic administration building, and a parking lot for the royal carriage. The original building burned down and was rebuilt in 1407. Reduced to ashes during the Japanese invasion at the end of the sixteenth century and reconstructed in 1601, it is preserved on the present-day campus of Sung Kyun Kwan University.

Sung Kyun Kwan was primarily a training center for higher civil servants that prepared entering students for the higher civil service examination called Dae Kwa (Great Kwako). This exam was divided into three stages, the last of which was taken in the royal presence. Admission to the institution required passing the ordinary level of Kwako, such as Saengwon Kwa, an examination on *The Great Books of Confucianism*, and Chinsa Kwa, an examination on literary works. In addition to the Civil Service section, to which Saengwon Kwa and Chinsa Kwa were preliminary, there were such fields as Military Service, Translation Service, Medical Service, Geography, and Law. Of these, Civil Service and Military Service were considered most important. These two examinations consisted of three stages, the first held in both the capital city of Seoul and provincial capitals, the second held in Seoul, and the third held in the royal presence. Successful candidates in the first-and second-stage examinations were given certificates written on white paper called pack-pae, and those who passed the final examination were presented with certificates of red paper called hong-pae. The winners of hong-pae could expect careers of great distinction as officials in the hierarchical, feudal government system.

Students were primarily descendants of public officials in Hansung (Seoul). The higher learning institution was completely supported by the government, and a relatively high degree of autonomy was guaranteed. In fact, a patrolman was punished because he, by mistake, trespassed on the grounds of Sung Kyun Kwan during the reign of King Injo in the seventeenth century (Lee, M., 1947, p. 225). The young scholars often engaged in discussions of state affairs, in protests against certain government policies, and in demonstrations and strikes. They impeached
corrupt government officials, pleaded for the innocent, and protested heresy in Confucianism (Kim, T., 1958; Lee, Sungmu, 1966).

The administrative organization, according to the provisions of Kyongkook Daejon (National Constitution, adopted in 1485), was under the control of a supervisor, two vice chancellors, one president, two vice presidents, seven administrative officers of various types, thirteen librarians, three professors with doctoral titles, three associate professors, and six assistants in charge of academic and student affairs. This structure remained nearly the same throughout the Yi Dynasty (King Kojong, vol. 221, part 8, pp. 588–589), with some modifications in titles of various officers made as late as 1894. The institution was completely supported by the government, primarily through land grants. Fishing grounds, and even islands, were made the property of the institution. The revenues from these sources covered expenses for dedication services, administration, and boarding of the students.

Students were selected from the Saengwons and Chinsas, the candidates who had successfully passed the preliminary civil service examination, upon recommendation of their teachers. The students, whose quota was fixed at two hundred, lived in a dormitory called Tong-su Je (East-West Hall) or Yang Je (Water Hall). When vacancies arose, they were to be filled in the following order of priority: (1) students attending secondary schools called Samoon Hak in Seoul, who were aged thirteen or above and well versed in at least one of the Four Books, (2) descendants of those recognized for their distinguished service to the king and the state, versed with The Book of Small Learning, (3) successful candidates of the lower-stage civil service examinations, and (4) volunteers among the public officials (King Kojong, vol. 221, parts 5 and 6, pp. 398–404).

When assembled, students were generally seated in order of age. Student life at Sung Kyun Kwan was routine and governed by strict rules of conduct and various other regulations. Students were required to make devotions to the past saints of Confucianism, bowing four times to their images consecrated in Moon Myo, the Shrine of the Great Confucian Scholars. They attended lectures and wrote essays, poetry, and eulogy, giving special attention to both literary style and calligraphy. Twice a month, on the eighth and the twenty-third days, they were permitted to go home for visits to their family and relatives but were not supposed to engage in playful things, even if off campus (e.g., hunting, fishing, and playing the game of Go).

There were at least ten different kinds of regulations or rules of conduct. An example is illustrated in the following excerpts taken from
the highly ethical code that appeared in the writings of Yulkok Lee (1582, reprinted in King Kojong, vol. 207, pp. 411–412), one of Korea’s most distinguished scholars:

1. A scholar should have a definite purpose in mind in pursuing the great way to becoming a scholar, a statesman, and promoter of world peace.
2. A scholar should take the utmost care in manners and conduct.
3. A scholar should devote himself to study and learning.
4. A scholar should be particularly careful about his speech.
5. A scholar should maintain serenity of mind and not be moved by external temptations.
6. A scholar should bear in mind that filial piety is the source of all good conduct and that negligence of this cardinal virtue is the root of all evil.
7. A scholar should show respect to his teachers with complete sincerity, the teacher being as important as the king and the father.
8. A scholar should associate with friends in trust, sincerity, and mutual encouragement.
9. A scholar should maintain harmonious family relationships among brothers, between husband and wife, and toward children.
10. A scholar should treat other people in kindness, with respect and tolerance.
11. A scholar should be well prepared to take the higher civil service examination.
12. A scholar should maintain the spirit of righteousness, which is completely above self-interest.
13. A scholar should be modest, neither flattering nor arrogant.
14. A scholar should be persistent and hardworking.
15. A scholar should observe carefully the rules and regulations of the school.
16. A scholar should make it a rule to read this code on the first and fifteenth day of each month.

Students could be punished on various grounds, such as mean conduct and speech, noted arrogance, tardiness and laziness, unwarranted play activities, breaking rules of etiquette, failure in one’s studies, and poor calligraphy. There were six different kinds of punishments: reprimand,
suspension from school, retirement from school, dismissal, prohibition from taking the higher civil service examination, and loss of the privilege of exemption from military service.

The curriculum at Sung Kyun Kwan was composed of Confucian studies (e.g., reading from *Four Books* and *Five Canons of Confucianism*) and history. Books on Taoism and Buddhism were absolutely prohibited. The length of time that each course took was as follows: *The Great Learning*, one month; *The Doctrine of the Mean*, two months; *Confucian Analects*, four months; *Mencius*, four months; and *The Book of History, The Spring and Autumn Annals, The Book of Rites, and The Book of Changes*, each seven months. Instruction generally consisted of lectures and exposition as well as questions on the subject at hand, which also provided the basis for the next subject. Students were given opportunities to write themes applying the principles of their learning. Evaluation occurred constantly in order to motivate learning and select candidates for the higher civil service examination. The length of a course of study was not fixed and depended on the ability of the student to master the subjects. Study was concluded by successful passing of the higher civil service examination.

A highly elaborate system of evaluation was used. There was a daily test, in which students selected by lottery had to recite the material. There was a test every ten days as well as a monthly test taken in the presence of examiners from the Department of Education (or Ye Bu, as it was then called). A test was offered twice a year (once on the third of March and once on the ninth of September) in the presence of examiners from Ye Bu and the higher education institution. Three top-honor students at these tests were given the privilege of taking the second-stage higher civil service examination. Evaluation was made on a five-point rating scale, ranging from thorough mastery to failure. Honor students were given special privileges, and extreme underachievement was punishable by dismissal. In addition to the evaluation of scholastic achievement, there was a system of attendance evaluation (Won Jom) in which daily attendance was given one point. Following a system established by King Jungjo in the late eighteenth century, students were required to earn three hundred points of Won Jom in order to qualify for taking the first-stage higher civil service examination (Kwan Si).

Special provisions were made to raise the prestige of Sung Kyun Kwan and to encourage students for study. In connection with these provisions under the feudalistic system, what the king did or said was of the greatest importance, his royal words serving as canons of conduct.
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and laws of the state. Some of the following provisions served this purpose: royal visits to the institution (Hahn, 1963, p. 112), royal addresses to students, royal lectures, summoning students to the royal palace, banquets provided for the students, royal messages carved in wooden plates or stone monuments, examination of graduates and employment in distinguished positions, punishment of failures, and publication of exemplary students’ papers and compositions (Lee, M., 1947, pp. 303–309).

There was a striking similarity between the higher education system of the Yi dynasty and that of its predecessor, the Koryo dynasty. National higher education at Sung Kyun Kwan was limited to a few privileged male members of the upper class of the feudalistic society. It was devoted to orthodox Confucian studies, and its primary aim was to prepare students for the higher civil service examinations. To do justice to the national higher education of the day, however, it should be mentioned that there were some promising practices that predated the emergence of modern higher education, such as: use of the question-and-answer method in instruction, establishment of a rather elaborate system of evaluation covering both achievement and attendance, a system of boarding school conducive to promotion of mutual understanding and development of character, a form of self-government among students, and an incentive system whereby students were encouraged to study. Private higher education remained in a secondary or supplementary role until national higher education became stagnant. At best, the private sector was similar in basic character to national higher education in terms of its aims and programs.

THE ROOTS OF MODERN HIGHER EDUCATION

Clearly, Sung Kyun Kwan dominated the scene of Korean higher education during the Yi dynasty, but there was another development of even greater contemporary importance that began to take root during this period. The beginning of modern higher education toward the end of the Yi dynasty is quite significant because it is not only the basis for present-day higher education, but, more important, it represented a shift from a Confucian to a European model. Generally, there were three major streams of modern higher education, all of which started around the turn of the twentieth century under the influences of the great political and sociocultural changes of the day. The first stream was introduced onto the Korean educational scene by Western missionaries in the form of private higher learning
institutions. The first missionaries came to Korea, then known to Westerners as “the hermit kingdom,” in the nineteenth century. According to Underwood (1926, pp. 8–9), a Russian missionary by the name of Gutzlaff landed on an island on the coast of Korea and spent a month there in 1832. The first Catholic priest to come to Korea was Father Maubant (1835), and the first Protestant mission in Korea was opened by Dr. Horace N. Allen (1884). Prior to this, Roman Catholicism had entered Korea through the missionaries working in China, beginning in the seventeenth century. Catholic converts were mercilessly prosecuted and treated as heretics.

A Protestant missionary from America, Mrs. Mary R. Scranton, is credited with establishing the first modern private higher education institution in Korea. The Ewha Hak Dang in Seoul, later known as the Ewha Woman’s University, was started in May of 1886 at Mrs. Scranton’s house, with “a single woman student of dubious character” enrolled. At inception, this educational institution was hardly distinguishable from the lower-level schools. In fact, some of the schools established at the same time with similar scale or purpose were later differentiated into various types, ranging from primary through higher education. The first student at Ewha was a concubine of a government official who was anxious to become an interpreter for the court (Oh, 1964, p. 56).

The Paijai Hak Dang in Seoul, established by H.G. Appenzeller under the Methodist Parent Board, initially combined both secondary and higher educational functions. There were departments of English, Chinese classics, and geography in the higher division of the school. Ultimately, however, it became a secondary education institution (Bishop, 1897). Another private school, Sungsil Hak Dang, established in Pyongyang by the Methodist Mission in 1897, developed into a higher education institution, becoming the first such institution of modern times to use the title Dae Hak (College) in 1907. Unfortunately, it was forced to reorganize itself into a professional school and was renamed Sungsil Jummon Hakkyo. The Severance Professional School of Medicine was started by Dr. O. R. Avison of the Presbyterian Mission in 1905, graduating its first class in 1908. During this period, Protestant and Roman Catholic missions started theological seminaries to train their missionary workers.

The second stream of modern higher education developed with the establishment of professional schools particularly geared to the needs of a modern technological society (e.g., foreign language, medicine, telegraphy, industry, mining, and agriculture). The first private school
of this kind was the English Language School established by P.G. von Mollendorf, a German, and taught by T.E. Halifax, an Englishman. Then in 1885, Kwang He Won (the House of Civilized Virtue) was established upon the recommendation of Dr. H.N. Allen of the Presbyterian Mission. In 1886, the Royal School was started as a government institution to teach English. There were thirty-five students from the royal family, and the instructors were G.W. Gilmore, D.A. Bunker, and H.G. Hulbert, all from the New York Theological Seminary. In addition to English, natural science, mathematics, economy, and geography were taught. This school had to be closed in 1894 because of financial and other difficulties. In 1891, a Japanese language school was opened in Seoul, and in 1894, concurrent with the general reform movement in government, a new order was promulgated regulating foreign language schools. In 1896, several foreign language schools (Russian, French, German, and Chinese) were opened.

In 1889, the Kyungsung Professional School of Medicine and the Commercial and Industrial School were established, followed by a mining school in 1890. The Lawyer’s Training Institute was opened in 1895 and in 1922 was reorganized into the Kyongsung Professional School of Law. The Postal Affairs School and the Electric Affairs School were established in 1897. In 1906, a school of agriculture and forestry was started at Suwon, near Seoul, which later developed into the Suwon Professional School of Agriculture and Forestry. Many of these schools continued to exist during the period of Japanese rule, 1910–1945.

A third stream started at the end of the Yi dynasty, which, though of minor significance at the time, ultimately assumed a vital role in the development of Korean higher education—the establishment of a modern, private higher learning institution by a Korean national (Young-ik Lee), the Posung Jummoon Hakkyo (Posung Professional School) in 1905. When it was founded, this private institution had two-year courses in law and economics. In 1915, the college was reorganized into the Posung Professional School of Law and Commerce, which was further developed by Sung-soo Kim into the present-day Korea University.

There was a more general movement by Koreans at the beginning of the twentieth century to establish private schools in the hope of awakening their people through education and enlightenment to the necessity of coming to the aid of their failing country. However, by this time it was too late. In May 1910, there were 2,250 private schools registered with government authorization under the Private School Ordinance of 1908.
Because many more private schools were unauthorized, it is estimated that the number of private schools at all levels and sizes reached somewhere around five or six thousand (Oh, 1964, p. 225). Many of these schools might have developed into full-fledged institutions of higher learning had it not been for the political changes and the ensuing national crisis of the Korean people under Japanese rule.

THE ERA OF JAPANESE RULE

General Background

Korea was annexed by Japan on 28 August 1910, five years after it had been made a protectorate of Japan in the wake of the Russo-Japanese War. The first governor-general of Chosen, as Korea was then called by the Japanese, was Matsutake Terauchi, known for his militant rule by force. His period (1910–1916) was known as the Saber government. The resistance of the Korean people during the administration of Yoshio Hasekawa (1916–1919) flared into the open in a national independence movement on 1 March 1919. Following a series of oppressive policies, a change took place in the general orientation of Japanese rule. Beginning with the administration of Saito Minoru (1919–1927), a more “civilized” rule employing so-called cultural policies was introduced. From 1931, when the Manchurian Incident broke out, and particularly after the Sino-Japanese War started in 1937, Korea became increasingly important to the Japanese empire because of its strategic role in Japanese geopolitical policies in continental Asia.

The governors-general of Chosen eagerly pursued their “policies of Japanization” by such methods as prohibition of the use of the Korean language in school and changing of Korean names to Japanese. At the same time, they mobilized the physical as well as human resources of Korea for the the war by controlling the economy and conscription into military service. On 1 December 1943, Korea was promised, through the Cairo Declaration (jointly issued by the United States, Great Britain, and China), that it would become free and independent in due course. Korea was ultimately liberated from Japanese rule on 15 August 1945.

Education under Japanese rule may be generally viewed in terms of three stages of historical change. The first stage, covering the period from the time of Japanese annexation in 1910 to the Korean national independence movement in 1919, was the most oppressive and repressive. The basic educational tenets of the government during this period were:
1. Education is not urgent.
2. All that is needed in the education of Koreans is practical and vocational training, which is better suited to the level of their development.
3. Higher education is superfluous for Koreans.
4. Private schools must be controlled and, if possible, eliminated.
5. Education for the Koreans and that for the Japanese must be different and separate from each other.

The official attitude at the time is represented by the following remarks by Governor-General Terauchi made in an address to the assembly of the provincial home affairs bureau chiefs in 1912:

Korea has not yet reached the level of development that demands a high level of education. Koreans should presently be trained as workers, by making a practical education available to them. Schools should educate youngsters with this basic objective in mind so that they may go back home upon graduation and become leaders of their own people. In this type of schooling, practical knowledge should be emphasized. The basic policy of this government will focus on agricultural and vocational schools. I believe the realization of this basic policy is very important. If individual schools, whether standard schools or vocational schools, and administrative organizations as well, acted independently and separately from this primary objective, I am afraid smooth rule of Korea cannot be expected in the future. (Takahashi, 1927, p. 365)

After 1919, however, a change in policy orientation began to appear that was crystallized in the revision of the Educational Ordinance of 1922. A period of appeasement and moderation had begun. The educational system was made parallel, at least in its general framework, to that of Japan. Although discriminatory practices against Koreans largely remained, some of the earlier vigorous and oppressive attitudes were removed, private schools were permitted to operate more actively, some progress in educational quality was noticeable (particularly at the lower levels), and emphasis upon vocationalism seemed to be reduced under the administration of Minoru Saito (1919–1927). However, beginning with the administration of Hanzo Yamanashi (1927–1929), who followed the brief administration of Kasunari Ugaki (1927), there was a retreat from
liberal policies in education in favor of a renewed emphasis upon vocationalism. This included emphasizing the importance for Koreans of doing simple labor. Suppression of private schools increased again. Saito was appointed a second time and returned as the sixth governor-general in 1929. He was followed by Ugaki, who returned for a second term in 1931. Throughout these years, the educational zeal of the Korean people continued to rise, manifested in the increased support of private institutions and the occasional eruption of students’ anticolonial sentiments. Despite fluctuations in policies, relatively greater progress in educational development occurred between 1919 and 1934 than during the other periods of Japanese colonial rule.

The final ten years of Japanese rule, however, became increasingly repressive because of two basic conditions. One was external—the war Japan was waging against China and the Allied Powers. The second was internal—the frantic acceleration of Japanization pursued by the administration of Jiro Minami (1936–1943) and the ensuing administrations of Koiso Kuniaki (1943–1944) and Nobusuke Abe (1944–1945). The three major educational aims as pronounced by the authorities during this period were loyalty to the emperor, a sense of unity among Japanese and Koreans, and training and perseverance in dealing with hardships. Some of the major policies and practices concerned with Korean education during this period included forcing students to worship at Japanese Shinto shrines, discontinuing the teaching of the Korean language and prohibiting the use of spoken Korean at school, forcing students to chant in unison “the oath of the loyal subjects” in assemblies, and forcing students to “volunteer” for military service.

Initial Japanese Colonial Period, 1910–1919

The Educational Ordinance of 1911 provided that “the essential principle of education in Chosen shall be the making of loyal and good subjects by giving instruction according to the Imperial Prescript on Education” (Article 2). Three kinds of education were to be available: basic education at standard schools for both the lower levels (three to four years) and higher levels (four years), vocational education (two to three years), and professional education (three to four years). Professional education, the only higher education then available, was for students aged sixteen or above who had graduated from the higher-level standard schools, or their equivalents, and aimed at “imparting knowledge and skill of higher branches of science and art” (Article 7). All provisions concerning the
subjects to be taught, their standards, staff, textbooks, and the tuition fees of the professional schools as well as those of the lower schools, were to be decided by the governor-general of Chosen (Article 29). A highly legalistic approach to administration tended to dictate the operations of higher education to the minutest details.

The government-sponsored professional schools that existed during this period were the Kyongsung Professional School of Medicine, established in 1899 and approved in 1916; the Kyongsung Professional School of Engineering, started in 1916; and the Suwon Professional School of Agriculture and Forestry, started in 1906 and recognized in 1918. In addition, there were private higher education institutions that had been established toward the end of the Yi dynasty. They included such schools as the Ewha Hak Kang, started in 1886 but whose college work was first begun in 1910; the Severance Professional School of Medicine, started in 1905 and officially recognized in 1917; the Sungsil College, better known as the Pyongyang Union Christian College, first established in 1887 but whose college division was established in 1907; the Yonhi Professional School, better known as the Chosun Christian College, started in 1915; the Posung Professional School of Law and Commerce, first established in 1905 and recognized in 1915; and some theological seminaries, both Catholic and Protestant.

These private institutions of higher learning were placed under more strict government control beginning in 1915, when the governor-general’s Ordinance for Revisions in Regulations for Private Schools was promulgated. As a result of the new regulations, private institutions of higher learning had to be authorized by the government as having been duly established, with appropriate financial backing. The subjects of study and the standards used in private schools were to be modeled after those in government schools, and no adding of subjects was allowed. Teachers in private schools were to be “those well versed in the national [Japanese] language.” Supplementary rules gave individual teachers five years, and individual schools already holding permits a ten-year grace period to conform to the regulations. These provisions allowed close supervision of private schools by government authorities (Underwood, 1926, p. 198).

The complete exclusion of religious education provoked a great deal of controversy among the missionaries. Their objections, however, were unheeded. Some missionaries would have chosen to close schools rather than give up religious instruction. Clearly, the Japanese colonial government’s intention was the “gradual elimination of all mission schools” (Underwood, 1926, p. 205). The number of private schools of all types was reduced considerably during this period.
Intermediate Japanese Colonial Period, 1919–1936

In the wake of the national independence movement, the governor-general realized that the Korean people, with their long cultural traditions, could not possibly be ruled by the sword alone. In consonance with a reorientation of policies in Korea, a sort of “carrot and stick” approach to controlling the Koreans was put into action, and the Educational Ordinance was drastically revised in 1922. The new Educational Ordinance provided for a system of education that included lower-level standard schools (four to six years), higher-level standard schools (five years), girls’ higher-level standard schools (three to five years), teacher training schools (five to six years), vocational schools (three to five years), professional schools (three to four years), and universities (a two-year preparatory program plus a three-to four-year main program). In place of the previous eleven-to twelve-year system of education, there was now a sixteen-to seventeen-year system and, most important of all, the legal foundation for university education was laid for the first time.

The most conspicuous development in higher education during this period was the establishment of a national university in Korea by the Japanese colonial authorities. The formation of the Committee for the Establishment of Chosen Imperial University in November 1923 is believed to have been a countermeasure to the establishment in March 1923 of a private university by Korean nationals that was advanced by the Promoters’ Association for the Establishment of a People’s University. In 1924, a two-year preparatory course was started in the new national university. On 1 May 1926, the Kyoungsung (Keijo) Imperial University was established, beginning with the Faculty of Medicine and the Faculty of Law and Literature. There was a controversy about whether a faculty of sciences and engineering should also be set up, but the prevailing argument was that “the Koreans, by nature, were more disposed to the social sciences, being little interested in natural sciences and engineering, and, therefore, there will be few applicants for studies in sciences and engineering, even if a department is to be established” (Committee for Compilation of a Ten-Year History of Korean Education, 1961, p. 94).

Kyoungsung Higher Commercial School, reorganized from an earlier private commercial school, was established in 1922 by the government. The Kyoungsung Professional School of Law was also established as a government institution that year. Sungsil College in Pyongyang was reorganized into the Sungsil Professional School in 1925, a demotion in
status since the original intent was to develop an institution of higher learning in accordance with the four-year American pattern. The Ewha Hak Dang in Seoul was reorganized into the Ewha Woman’s Professional School in 1925, with a department of literature and a department of music. The Chung-ang Nursery Teacher Training School was recognized with its status equivalent to a professional school in 1928. It was later to develop into the Chung-ang Woman’s Professional School and, finally, into the present Chung-ang University in Seoul.

The Pyongyang Professional School of Medicine was established as a public institution in 1929. The Kyongsung Dentistry Professional School was established as a private institution in 1929. The Teagu Professional School of Medicine was started as a public institution in 1933. Many of the private institutions of higher learning (e.g., professional schools of Posung, Ewha, Severance, and Sungsil) were expanding their educational facilities as a result of increasing educational zeal and support of private schools.

Final Japanese Colonial Period, 1936–1945

The last ten years of Japanese rule in Korea, under wartime conditions, were hectic for Koreans. The Educational Ordinance was revised twice to accelerate the Japanization of Korea through education. The first revision of the ordinance, in 1938, changed the Korean names of all except the professional schools into Japanese and discouraged teaching the Korean language by making it an elective. The second revision during this period was an emergency measure taken in 1943 under war conditions that mandated the following changes in higher education: a reduction in the number of students accepted at the Faculty of Law and Literature at the Imperial University, an increase in the number of students accepted at the Faculty of Sciences and Engineering, and government-sponsored reorganization of the private professional schools geared to the needs of war. As the war intensified, emergency measures were increased. Students were mobilized for military training, civilian air defense work, and public works projects. They were also forced to “volunteer” for military service.

In 1936, the Chosun Telegraphy Institute was established in Seoul as a secondary-level, private institution, later becoming the Kwangwoon College of Telegraphy. In 1938, the Faculty of Sciences and Engineering was established at Kyongsung Imperial University. The Kyongsung Woman’s Professional School of Medicine was started as a private
institution in 1938. This was the predecessor of Woosuck University in Seoul, now incorporated into Korea University. In the same year, the Taedong Professional School of Technology was established in Pyongyang as a private institution. The Sungsil Professional School was abolished in 1939 as the result of its resistance to government-forced worship at Japanese Shinto shrines. Also in 1939, the Kyongsung Professional School of Mining was started as a government school, and the Sookmyong Woman’s Professional School was authorized with departments of home economics, industrial arts, and general studies. In 1941, the Pusan Higher Fishery School was established by the government.

The Kyongsung Imperial University increased by 50 percent the number of students accepted to the Faculty of Sciences and Engineering as well as to its preliminary course in 1944. Three government institutions were also established in 1944: the Kyongsung Higher Technical School, the Pyongyang Higher Technical School, and the Taegu Higher Agricultural School. Major normal schools (e.g., those in Kyongsung, Pyonyang, and Taegu) were reorganized in 1943 and elevated to the status of professional schools, with a four-year preparatory course and a three-year main course. In 1944, the Posung Professional School was reorganized into the Kyongsung Professional School of Industrial Development and Economy (Chokshick Junmoon Hakkyo), the Yonhi Professional School into the Kyongje Junmoon Hakkyo, and the Ewha Professional School into the Kyongsung Rural Community Workers’ Training Institute, which, in 1945, became the Kyongsung Woman’s Professional School. In the same year, the Myungyoon Professional School, which had been reorganized as a private school in 1937 after developing out of the earlier Sung Kyun Kwan of the Yi dynasty, was abolished. In its place, a training center was established. The Hehwa Professional School, started in 1922 as a Buddhist institute and authorized as a professional school in 1940, was also abolished in 1944. The Kyongsung Professional School of Law and the Kyongsung Higher Commercial School were merged into the Kyongsung Professional School of Economics in 1944.

SUMMARY OF SALIENT FEATURES DURING THE JAPANESE COLONIAL PERIOD

General Characteristics

The basic attitude of the Japanese government toward higher education in Korea was that it was both dangerous and superfluous. What higher
education was available for Koreans under Japanese rule was based on European-Japanese tradition. This was in contrast to the earlier higher education in Korea under the dynasties, which was of Chinese origin. Higher education was revised to fit the “special conditions” of Korea prevailing under Japanese colonial rule. The professional school, called Junmoon Hakkyo in Korean and Senmon Gakko in Japanese, was the predominant type of higher education that the government saw as suitable for Koreans. With a relatively short study period, academic freedom was limited. The lack of a general education program and a one-sided emphasis on instruction completely excluded research and other related functions. The orientation was basically that of an advanced trade school. Even though the Imperial University was established in 1926 and Koreans were allowed to enter universities in Japan, relatively few Korean students were given the opportunity for university education. Consequently, for Koreans, the professional schools were the major entrance to higher education.

**Administration and Control**

Under Japanese rule, there were three different types of higher education institutions. The Imperial University was a government institution and the only university in Korea serving both Japanese and Korean students. The professional schools were divided into three different categories: government institutions, public institutions, and private institutions. All higher learning institutions were under the rigid control and close supervision of the government. The control was extensive, including student quotas, teacher standards, subjects to be taught, and student fees. This control was exercised through the bureaucracy of the central government.

The majority of the private institutions had originally been established at the end of the Yi dynasty as mission schools and were funded either by private individuals or foundations. Toward the end of Japanese rule, nearly all private institutions were completely reorganized by the government, many of them ceasing to exist. Another type of higher education—professional schools known as miscellaneous schools—were private institutions of lower standards. By 1943, there were twenty-nine institutions of higher learning: one university, eight government-sponsored professional schools, two public or local government-sponsored professional schools, eleven private professional schools, and seven private miscellaneous schools with professional school standing.
Faculty

The teaching staffs in national higher education institutions were predominantly Japanese. According to available official statistics, the Kyongsung Imperial University teaching staff was composed of 14 Koreans and 210 Japanese in 1943. The teaching staffs of ten other government and public professional schools included 84 Koreans and 208 Japanese (Bureau of Education, Governor-General of Chosen, 1944, pp. 219ff: cited in Oh, 1964, pp. 349–351). The ratio of Korean to Japanese staff was 1 to 15 in the university and 1 to 2.5 in the government and public professional schools. Corresponding ratios for students were 1 Korean to 3.1 Japanese in the preparatory course of the Imperial University, 1 to 3.2 in eight government professional schools, and 1 to 2.8 in two public professional schools (Lee, M., 1947, pp. 388–389).

In the private institutions of higher education, the proportion of Korean staff was much greater, but there were still large numbers of Japanese teachers on the staff. In the private professional schools of 1943, for instance, almost half of the staff members were Japanese (Lee, M., 1947, pp. 402–403). According to the Regulations for Private Schools revised in 1915, all teachers in private schools had to be well versed in the Japanese language. Beginning in 1938, Japanese was declared the only official language for instruction, and teachers were forbidden to speak Korean in school. The Japanese teachers were also provided with special allowances that made their salaries substantially higher than those paid to Koreans.

Students

There were 9,481 students enrolled in various types of higher education institutions in 1943, distributed as follows: university: 1,458, including 679 enrolled in the preparatory course; government and public professional schools: 3,083; private professional schools: 4,025; and miscellaneous schools of professional school status: 915. Although the ratio of Japanese to Korean residents at the end of 1942 was only 1 to 34, the ratio of Korean to Japanese students was roughly 1 to 2.4 in the government schools. As a result, for Koreans, the educational opportunity in government-controlled higher education institutions in Korea was only 1 percent of that provided for the Japanese residents of Korea. Although there were private institutions where the overwhelming majority of students were Korean, the fact that the colonial government’s higher education institutions favored the admission of Japanese students
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to such an extent indicates the severely limited opportunities for Korean students to obtain higher education. Despite admission based on a competitive entrance examination, the admission quota for Korean students was much lower than that for Japanese students in government schools (Lee, M., 1947).

Programs

Programs in the various institutions of higher learning were strictly controlled by the Japanese colonial government, including specific departments within each school, the number and names of the courses offered in each department, and the academic requirements for graduation. The programs were highly standardized and departmentalized. Except for the Imperial University, where the preparatory course provided for general liberal education, most higher education institutions (i.e., professional schools) neglected general education, concentrating on specialized subjects in fields such as medicine, agriculture, commerce, law, and engineering. Generally, high academic standards were maintained.

POSTLIBERATION PERIOD

Background

Even though Korea was liberated from Japanese rule on 15 August 1945, the entire peninsula was not immediately free and independent. Instead, Koreans found themselves divided by the thirty-eighth parallel, under the military governments of the USSR, in the north, and the United States, in the south. As political negotiations failed to establish a national government ruling over the whole of Korea, free elections were held under United Nations supervision, and the Republic of Korea was established in the southern part of the peninsula on 15 August 1948. It was recognized by the United Nations as the only legitimate government representing the Korean people, but its actual rule was limited to the southern half of the country, leaving the northern half under the rule of a Communist regime.

While the newly established democracy in the south was struggling for political stability, the North Korean Communists launched an unprovoked attack on the Republic of Korea on 25 June 1950. The Korean War, between the United Nations forces and the Communists, was fought bitterly and resulted in great devastation to the region. Under
an unstable armistice signed on 27 July 1953, Korea remained divided along the newly drawn military demarcation line. In the south, reconstruction was started under United Nations assistance, particularly with aid from the United States. Democracy, nationalism, and anti-Communism were to be the basic principles underlying the reconstruction work and nation building of the new Republic of Korea. Ironically, the First Republic, under President Syngman Rhee, was overthrown by a student revolution on 19 April 1960 that occurred in the wake of a Friday election, in diametrical violation of the basic rules of political democracy. The shaky government of the Second Republic, under Premier John M. Chang, was overthrown on 16 May 1961 by a military revolution led by General Park Chung Hee. After thirty-two months of military rule by the Supreme Council for National Reconstruction, civilian rule was restored in 1964.

The Third (1964–1972) and Fourth Republics (1972–1979), under the leadership of President Park Chung Hee, continued the struggle for political stability, economic development, and cultural advancement, as did the Fifth Republic, under President Chun Doo Hwan (1981–1988), and the Sixth Republic, under President Roh Tae Woo (1988–1993). President Kim Young Sam (1993–1998) headed a popularly elected civilian government that was expected to advance democracy and move national development to a higher level by pursuing such goals as greater democratization, liberalization, economic development and social justice, reunification of the divided nation, and internationalization. Under this process, the role of education, and in particular that of higher education, has been increasingly emphasized and is likely to become even more important in the years to come. With the inauguration of President Kim Dae Jung in March 1998, expectations for increased government support of higher education were high, but the Asian economic crisis intervened to put any significant increase in government funds on hold until economic stability returns. Higher education does, however, remain a priority on the government agenda.

**Higher Education, 1945–1948**

At the time of the Korean liberation from Japanese rule in 1945, there were nineteen institutions of higher learning in the south, and depending on the source, either 7,819 students and 1,490 faculty members (Ministry of Education, 1963, pp. 338–340) or 6,948 students and 908 faculty members (Committee for Compilation of a Ten-Year History of Korean
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This discrepancy is probably due to the way in which Japanese students and faculty were counted. When the U.S. military government took over in September 1945, it took a series of significant steps to reorganize and expand higher education based on the recommendations of the Korean Committee on Education and the Council of Education.

Two factors seemed to favor the expansion of higher education. First, there was public pressure for expanding educational opportunities on all levels, but particularly for higher education. Many promoters’ associations for the establishment of higher education institutions sprang up “like mushrooms after rainfall,” applying for government authorization. Second, the anticipation of land reform induced many landowners to invest in the establishment of higher education institutions, which apparently seemed to gratify both their national conscience and personal interests. There was also a receptive attitude on the part of government authorities to requests of the people. For example, Eukkyom Yu, the Korean director of the Department of Education under the U.S. military government in Korea, a great proponent of expansion in higher education, said: “When the people want to invest their clean money in higher educational institutions, which the government cannot afford to do, how is it possible to deny their wishes: half begun is half won. Once they start the institutions, they will apply their conscientious efforts for sound development of those institutions” (Committee for Compilation of a Ten-Year History of Korean Education, 1961, p. 94).

Consequently, many new institutions of higher learning were established and authorized by the government. Some existing institutions were reorganized, and others were promoted to higher status through government recognition. Steps were taken to make a gradual transition from the Japanese colonial system to a new system recommended by the Subcommittee on Higher Education of the Council of Education. It was decided that colleges would be four-year institutions, except for medical colleges, which were to be six years. Graduates of Junmoon Hakkyo (professional schools) were to be admitted to the sophomore class of colleges. Universities and independent colleges were to be differentiated.

The Seoul National University was established on 22 August 1946 through reorganization of the former Kyongsung (in Japanese, Keijo) Imperial University and nine other government-sponsored professional schools. The university, controlled by a board of regents, was composed of the graduate school and nine constituent colleges: College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, College of Engineering, College of Agriculture, College
of Law, College of Education, College of Commerce, College of Arts, Medical College, and Dental College. The reorganization plan met with strong resistance among the leftist wing of the faculty and the student body, resulting in great confusion and turmoil for a year. But, despite the protests, organized strikes, and violence, the plan was carried out.

Three private universities were authorized in 1946: Korea University, Ewha Woman’s University, and Chosun Christian University, all of which are leading universities in Korea today. Other institutions of higher learning established, reorganized, or authorized for promotion to collegiate status included: Korean Marine College (1945); Pusan College, Chunchon Agricultural College, Tongkook College, Pusan Fishery College, and Taegu College of Education (1946); Sungkyunkwan College, Taegu College, Kookmin College, Tankook College, Tong-a College, Hankook College, Catholic Medical College, Taegu Medical College, and Kwangju Medical College (1947); Seoul Woman’s Medical College, Sookmyong Woman’s College, Chosun College, Chungang College, Hanyang College of Engineering, Chungnam Provincial College of Education, and Korean Theological Seminary (1948).

It was during the period of the U.S. military government that the overall pattern of college and university programs was established, and many of the currently existing practices in Korean higher education developed by following a mixed model based on Japanese tradition and the newly introduced American pattern. The programs in colleges and universities were to consist of general education courses, required courses in the field of specialization, and electives. Qualification standards for college and university professors were established. The former three-quarter system of the school year was replaced by a new semester system. The total credit hours for graduation from a typical college were fixed at 180 credits, and later reduced to 160 credits. Entrance examinations for student selection were to be held in two subsequent periods, dividing the institutions into two groups. It was also during this period that the four-year evening college was first introduced. Kookmin College, first started as a miscellaneous school, had four-year evening college programs authorized in 1947.

Serious problems of higher education during that era were similar to present-day problems, for example, shortage of competent staff, lack of library materials, inadequate facilities, poor students, money-making propensity of the management of private institutions, and student and faculty involvement in political affairs. The seriousness of these problems can be easily surmised from the depth of Korean political confusion,
deep poverty, and the lack of experience in administration of higher education.

**Higher Education, 1948–1961**

When the First Republic of Korea was established, there were four universities (Seoul National, Korea, Ewha, Chosun Christian), twenty-three independent colleges (three national, four public, and sixteen private), four junior colleges (all private), and eleven miscellaneous schools of collegiate standing, with 1,265 faculty members and 24,000 students (Moonkyo Bu, 1958, p. 70). In the early days of the First Republic, colleges and universities continued to grow in student enrollment and number of faculty. The total number of higher education institutions remained constant, although there were changes in the status of individual institutions. It should be noted that many source materials were destroyed during the Korean War, so it is difficult to determine the accuracy of statistics from this period. According to one source, just before the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950, there were four universities, twenty-nine colleges, two junior colleges, and seven miscellaneous schools of higher education, with a total of 29,288 students and 2,049 faculty members (Park, 1959, pp. 71–73).

The Korean War, 1950–1953, inflicted almost irrevocable damage on faculty and administrative personnel, libraries, buildings, and other facilities. Initially, it completely paralyzed higher education. Despite the initial setbacks, however, higher education continued in refugee schools and in the so-called Wartime Union College ingeniously devised by George Paik, then the minister of education, and other educational leaders of the time. Despite the hardships and difficulties, higher education expanded vigorously during the Korean War. Under the lenient policies of education ministers George Paik (1950–1952) and Bublin Kim (1952–1954), a great number of higher education institutions, both national and private, were established or authorized to have a new status.

With the fourth minister of education, Sunkeun Lee (1954–1956), however, government policy was tightened and the growth in establishment of higher education institutions diminished. The Presidential Decree on the Establishment of College and University Standards, promulgated in 1955, was a significant landmark in this new direction of higher education policy. Efforts were made not only to curb the expansion of higher education institutions, but also to rearrange or reduce the number of existing institutions. Government efforts were not successful, however,
because of the inconsistency in policy directions and the pressures brought by the Korean people.

Even though expansion of institutions was generally slowed down, existing institutions continued to grow in size. Many colleges acquired the status of a university and, above all, many private institutions continued to grow in enrollment, defying the government-imposed student quotas. The general tenets of the policy did not change very much, even under the Second Republic (1960–1961). Meanwhile, criticisms against so-called diploma mills and demands for reappraisal of higher education were gradually mounting. The following summarizes some of the more specific developments in higher education during the period.

The Wartime Union Colleges were established in such refugee centers as Pusan, Taegu, Kwangju, Chonju, and Taegon. From February 1951 to May 1952, they served the educational needs of more than six thousand students scattered all over the country by providing essential programs. Credits earned in these institutions were transferred to the original institutions attended by the students. These institutions were discontinued as more colleges and universities were able to provide instruction to their own students.

Early in the war, the idea was developed to have a representative national institution of higher learning in each province, based on the belief that higher education should be dispersed throughout the country, rather than concentrated in Seoul. The more direct cause, however, was the immediate need to fill the void left by the abolishment of the wartime union colleges and to counterbalance the move among local provinces to establish private education institutions in reaction to increased political and social pressures. The national institutions of higher learning established in this period included Kyongpuk University in Taegu (1951), Chonpuk University in Chonju (1951), Cheju College in Cheju (1951), Chonnam University in Kwangju (1952), Chungnam University in Taegon (1952), Pusan University in Pusan (1953), and Chongju Agricultural College (predecessor of Chungpuk College) in Chongju (1953).

There was a so-called higher education boom in the private sector, as the following array of new educational institutions indicates: Shinhung Junior College (predecessor of Kyong-hi University) in Seoul (1949); Chongku College in Taegu, Dongduck Woman’s College in Seoul, Duksung Woman’s Junior College in Seoul, Sinhung College in Seoul, Masan College in Masan, Hyosung Woman’s College in Taegu, Keunhwa Junior College (predecessor of Myongji College) in Seoul (1952); Inha College of Engineering in Inchon, Sungsil College in Seoul (originally
Christian Union College in Pyongyang), Soodo Woman’s College of Education in Seoul, Hankook College of Foreign Languages in Seoul, Choyang Nursery Junior College, College of Foreign Languages in Seoul, Choyang Nursery Junior College in Seoul (predecessor of Kyonggi College), Pohang Fishery Junior College in Pohang (1954); Sinhung University in Seoul, Sookmyong Woman’s University in Seoul, Kookje College in Seoul, Korean Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Seoul (1955); Kemyong Christian College in Taegu, Taejon College in Taejon (1956); Methodist Theological Seminary in Seoul, Taejon Nursery Junior College in Taejon (1957); Kwandong College in Kangnung, Seoul Theological Seminary in Seoul, Keunkook University in Seoul, Tong-a University in Pusan, Hanyang University in Seoul (1959); Kyonghi University (formerly Sinhung University, 1960), Seoul Woman’s College (1960); and Samyuk Theological Seminary in Seoul (1961). From a peak in 1952–1954, the expansion of private higher educational institutions continued, not so much by establishment of new institutions as by changes in the status of existing ones through government recognition.

Both during the war and following the cessation of hostilities, many of the United Nations agencies as well as the U.S. government and civilian organizations helped in the reconstruction of Korean higher education. The major United Nations agencies concerned were: United Nations Civil Assistance Command, Korea (UNCACK); Korean Civil Assistance Corps (KCAC); United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency (UNKRA); and United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). The major U.S. government and civilian organizations involved included: Foreign Operations Administration (FOA); International Cooperation Administration (ICA); Agency for International Development (AID); United States Operations Mission (USOM); United States Educational Commission in Korea (Fulbright Commission); American-Korean Foundation (AKF); Armed Forces Aid to Korea (AFAK); Asia Foundation; other foundations; and religious organizations. In addition to materials and equipment, the most important help was in the field of technical assistance and exchange of personnel, both faculty and students. In this connection, particularly notable were the work of the American Education Teams (1952–1955) and the George Peabody College of Education Teams (1956–1961). Also significant was the work of interuniversity cooperation projects, a typical example being the one between Seoul National University and the University of Minnesota. The project, under the ICA-University of Minnesota-Republic
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of Korea contract, rendered assistance to Seoul National University amounting to $3 million during the period from 1954 to 1962.

Enactment of the Presidential Decree on the Establishment of College and University Standards (PDECUS) in 1955 had a significant impact on the course of Korean higher education by providing standards for teaching personnel and facilities as well as for the establishment of the Committee for the Investigation of Higher Education, which served as the basic regulatory tool for the establishment, organization, and development of higher education. This committee served, at least temporarily, as a check on the establishment of new higher education institutions and as an enforcement agency for such drastic measures as suspension of student matriculation, merging of departments, and reduction of student quotas under government orders. In 1957, for instance, as the result of application of the PDECUS standards, a student quota of 83,580 was reduced by 6,710 in twenty-eight departments. Again in 1958, a student quota of 77,170 was reduced by 1,060 in fifty-six institutions of higher education (Seoul Special City Education Association, 1957, pp. 280–283; United Press Company, 1959, p. 489). The application of the standards as set up by the PDECUS slowed in 1958, however, and the original deadline for completion of the standards was postponed from 1960 to 1963 for departments of humanities and social sciences, and to 1965 for departments of natural sciences, through an amendment to the decree in 1960 under the Second Republic.

The organization of the Hakdo Hokook Dan (Student Defense Corps) on 20 April 1949 was a significant event because that organization became the only official student organization for the next eleven years. Organized throughout the country, both on secondary and higher levels of education, the Student Defense Corps was engaged in various movements and activities. Although it was a government-sponsored organization and, consequently, the line of authority was established from the president of the Republic of Korea and the minister of education down to the heads of individual institutions and their student representatives, some room existed for autonomous control of the various student activities. It was the beginning of student self-government under the close supervision of the government and, on the institutional level, of the faculty. This organization was abolished after the student revolution of 1960.

The system of academic degree granting was established through the provisions of the Presidential Decree on Enforcement of the Education Law in 1952. Academic standards for the degrees of bachelor’s, master’s,
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doctorate, and the honorary doctoral degree were established in some detail. All four-year colleges and universities recognized by the Ministry of Education were granted the right to bestow on their graduates the bachelor’s degree, and those institutions having graduate schools were authorized to grant master’s degrees. Specific graduate schools were also authorized to grant doctoral degrees in designated areas of study. It was in 1953 that the general standards for graduate schools, involving student as well as faculty quotas, were established by the Ministry of Education.

The Educational Public Officials Law was promulgated on 18 April 1953, providing for national standards for the faculty on such matters as qualifications, appointment, salaries, in-service study, performance of duties, security of positions, discipline, and appeals. Although the law and various presidential decrees based on it were applicable only to the national and public institutions, the private institutions began to follow suit in establishing their own standards. Moreover, certain standards (e.g., qualification standards) were made applicable later to the faculty of private institutions by the Private School Law of 1963.

The UNESCO/UNKRA Education Planning Mission to Korea in 1952 made an extensive survey of education for a period of three months that resulted in a series of recommendations for the improvement of Korean education. Its recommendations on higher education included: establishment of a Korean mission to study the requirements of graduates in the several fields, the number and location of needed colleges, possible merging of colleges, and sounder entrance qualifications; repair and rehabilitation of buildings with priority given to the College of Education, College of Engineering, and Medical College of Seoul National University; development of the College of Agriculture, Seoul National University, consonant with the previous recommendation of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization; aid priority to agriculture, science, engineering, and medicine; granting of overseas fellowships to the members of the teaching staff of national medical, dental, and pharmaceutical colleges; establishment of conferences and seminars to improve teaching methods, particularly in science; production of textbooks in the Korean language; and more extensive use of visiting foreign specialists in advisory capacities (UNESCO/UNKRA Educational Planning Mission to Korea, 1954, pp. 146–168).

Based on an extensive survey conducted in 1959–1960, another report by a group of foreign experts made the following specific suggestions for the improvement of national higher education in Korea: establishment of
a board of regents in the Ministry of Education for the management, on a high-level policy basis, of all national universities and colleges; development of a centralized type of university organization together with related short-and long-range consolidations at the university, college, and campus levels; substitution of a faculty consultation method for the existing secret-ballot procedure in the appointment and promotion of members of the academic and administrative staffs; improvement of academic staff salaries; student and staff quotas on a college or university basis rather than on a departmental basis; budget and administrative procedure changes, particularly those involving retention of institutional income and appropriations by universities rather than by colleges; establishment of a staff improvement program including foreign study for Koreans and U.S. assistance and advice in the general field of administration, organization, and physical plant; continuance of the present improvement program in the fields of agriculture, health science, and engineering with preference, henceforth, to the other national universities and colleges rather than Seoul National University; and in the field of agriculture, with high priority to the unification of agricultural extension programs and research and to instruction in the national colleges of agriculture; continuance of a teacher training improvement program with emphasis on the upgrading of teacher training schools; continuation of a business administration improvement program with preference, henceforth, to one or possibly two national colleges of commerce; continuation of the public administration improvement program; extension of the improvement program to include such related natural sciences as mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, and geology and such supporting social sciences as economics, psychology, sociology, political science, and geography; provision of more adequate funds for building and equipment maintenance and repair; provision of equipment and books with preference to the above fields; and provision of new construction and rehabilitation funds only after the completion of planning studies on building and only when in accord with the recommended campus changes (Ministry of Education and the United States Operations Mission to Korea, 1960, pp. 211–212). Although these two reports made important recommendations for the improvement of Korean higher education, not all of the recommended changes were realized.

The Student Revolution on 19 April 1960 was a significant event in the historical development of higher education in Korea, not so much because it resulted in the overthrowing of the ruling government, but because it highlighted the importance of students and their need for
guidance. The establishment of student guidance centers and greater emphasis on student self-government as well as student welfare services in recent years may well be considered the products of the trauma of the Student Revolution and the subsequent student activities on and outside the campus. It must also be noted that one year after the Student Revolution of 1960, there were a number of open disputes in colleges and universities in Korea. In late 1960, more than thirty institutions of higher learning were involved in internal disputes, which disrupted the development of the institutions concerned, at least temporarily. It is ironic that the heyday of democracy in Korea was punctured by turbulence on the campuses of higher education institutions.

Higher Education, 1961–1979

Under the military government (1961–1963), higher education in Korea went through a series of radical reforms. Enforcement of so-called organization plans involved drastic changes in the status of existing higher education institutions, causing a great deal of controversy and conflict of interest. Although the plans proved a failure, with most of the reforms being nullified by the end of the military rule, many valuable lessons were learned and, most important, a new direction in the policies of higher education began to crystallize. Primarily aimed at improving the quality of higher education, steps were taken to provide government research grants for professors, increase support for science and technology, and even provide government grants to private institutions.

It was during the period of military rule that the system of higher education in Korea became much more diversified through the establishment of two-year junior colleges of education for training elementary school teachers and five-year vocational professional schools for training advanced-level technicians in various fields. Under the Third Republic, the government expressed its interest in the establishment of long-range, comprehensive, national educational planning for higher education. As a prelude, it took significant steps to sponsor scientific investigations of higher education in cooperation with the United States Operations Mission (USOM), a new undertaking of self-analysis and evaluation. Higher education was now under critical reassessment, not only by the government but also by individual institutions.

With the beginning of military rule, most of the internal disputes of previous years were terminated. A significant contribution to this development was the introduction of a faculty consultation method to
replace the previous secret-ballot procedure in the appointment and promotion of the faculty and administrative staff. This change was a result of the recommendation of the USOM survey report on national higher education in 1960. The boards of trustees of private institutions were reorganized under government prodding, and student participation in administration and management, prevalent in the heyday of grassroots democracy under the Second Republic, ceased.

The military government was committed to a reorganization of higher education from the beginning of its rule. The basic policy was first made public in June 1961 in a press interview by the minister of education, Hisuck Moon. The Law of Temporary Exceptions on Education (Law No. 708), promulgated on 1 September 1961, officially authorized the government to reorganize schools, departments, and student quotas regardless of the national, public, or private status of the institution. In fact, all educational institutions were subject to government policy directives issued by the Supreme Council for National Reconstruction, the all-powerful legislative, judicial, and executive authority during military rule. The reorganization plans involved such drastic policies as: reducing the overall student quotas from around 100,000 to 75,000 (20,000 for national and public colleges and universities, 40,000 for private colleges and universities including 5,000 for evening institutions, and 10,000 for junior colleges); merging departments and colleges of national institutions within the same geographic region; enforcing “normalization” of the management and operation of colleges and universities, by increasing financial support from appropriate private persons, reducing the retirement age for the faculty and administrative staff from sixty-five to sixty, introducing national qualification examinations for college and university entrance and for granting of bachelor’s degrees, and rating faculty research achievements as a part of appointment and promotion procedures; establishing a ratio between liberal arts and vocational or technical student quotas; downgrading the theological seminaries to the status of miscellaneous schools; downgrading substandard colleges to junior college status; increasing vocational junior colleges; and reforming teacher education.

The 1961 organization reduced four-year colleges and universities from seventy-one institutions with 686 departments and a 91,540 student quota to forty-four institutions with 584 departments and a 55,410 student quota (Committee for Compilation of the History of the Military Revolution in Korea, 1961, p. 1394). The rearrangement resulted in a dramatic increase in two-year junior colleges from twelve institutions
with a 3,208 student quota to twenty-seven institutions with a 10,590 student quota. In addition, ten of the eighteen normal schools were reorganized into junior colleges of education in 1962. The organization plans were criticized severely and, consequently, greatly modified in 1962 and 1963. Acting on the recommendations of the Educational Policies Reappraisal Council established within the Supreme Council for National Reconstruction, subsequent readjustments involved such measures as: increasing the quota for students admitted to private colleges and universities from 40,000 to 46,000, with an additional number to be permitted for women’s institutions; restoring departments within the authorized student quotas; increasing the number of students able to pass the national qualification examination for college and university entrance; excluding evening college students from the national qualification examination; and increasing the quota for junior college students from 10,000 to 20,000.

By 1963, most of the private institutions had not only restored original departments and quotas, but many institutions had also added new departments through redistribution of student quotas. In addition, many new junior colleges and ten vocational professional schools had been newly established. In 1964, the previously downgraded theological seminaries were restored to college status. The national qualification examinations for entrance to and graduation from colleges and universities were also discontinued. All major policies were rolled back, with the result that the numbers of both higher education institutions and students enrolled were substantially increased.

Even though the organization plans were executed with determination under strong administrative power by the government, they did not achieve the original purpose of curtailing the quantity and improving the quality of higher education. The failure of the organization plans, however, seemed to suggest that a turning point was being reached in the administration of higher education in Korea, with increased attention to the qualitative aspects; under the existing conditions quality was not the opposite of quantity, but rather quality and quantity were to be mutually complementary; the normalization of operations as well as the improvement of the quality of higher education could not possibly be achieved without autonomous efforts and cooperation by the individual institutions; the improvement of academic standards of higher education could be realized only through consistent pursuit of comprehensive and long-range plans; and educational investment in the normalization of operations and improvement of standards in higher education should not

Amendment of the Private School Law in 1964 resulted in more rigid control of the private schools by the government, authorizing it to exert control over the presidents of private institutions as well as over the boards of trustees under broadly specified conditions largely determined by government authorities. The government, in the wake of a series of student demonstrations in 1964 and 1965 protesting the then-proposed Korean-Japanese agreement, also amended the Presidential Decree on Enforcement of the Education Law, authorizing the minister of education to order private as well as national and public schools to suspend operations under certain conditions. Consequently, Korea University and Yonsei University were temporarily suspended in September 1965. Although such high-handed policies may have been necessary under emergency conditions, it was most unfortunate that such actions had to be imposed by government authorities instead of through autonomous decisions by the university authorities.

In the 1960s, the government strengthened its control over student quotas through the Presidential Decree on College and University Student Quotas (Decree No. 2231, 22 December 1965) and simultaneous changes in the provisions of the Presidential Decree on Enforcement of the Education Law relating to government registration of bachelor’s and master’s degree holders beginning in 1966. The government also increased its efforts to provide research grants to individual professors as well as to research institutions attached to colleges and universities. This practice was introduced in 1963, when 17 million won was granted for 126 research projects. In 1967, the grant was increased to 60 million won. Government-sponsored research grants have been continuously increased in terms of the amount of money and number of both projects and faculty involved. By 1991, the grants exceeded 20 billion won, involving 3,796 projects and 6,464 faculty members.

Also in the 1960s, higher education in Korea became more diversified through the establishment of junior colleges, junior colleges of education, and vocational higher professional schools or five-year technical colleges, which combined three-year senior vocational high school courses and two-year junior vocational college courses. Specialized graduate schools (e.g., graduate schools of public administration, education, and social development) were inaugurated. In 1978, junior colleges and five-year junior professional schools were reorganized into two-to three-year junior technical colleges. Since 1979, junior technical colleges aimed at
producing mid-level technical expertise have constituted a major segment of the higher education system in Korea. As of 1992, there were 128 junior technical colleges playing an important role in Korean higher education.

The ten-year Seoul National University Development Plan, ratified early in 1968, was a complete reorganization and reconstruction plan for the most prestigious university in Korea, including development of a unified campus at a new site. The reorganization plan involved redistribution of academic disciplines and reorganization of constituent colleges based on increased specialization, strengthening of the decision-making process within the university, and reorganization of the undergraduate curriculum from 160 to 140 credits. This plan was the precursor to reform movements in other higher education institutions, particularly other national universities.

The Preliminary College Entrance Examination System, a national standardized examination for college aspirants, was introduced in 1969. Started as an examination to screen unqualified college aspirants before they applied for admission, it was later incorporated into the college entrance examination that was used for admissions purposes together with high school records and examination results provided by the universities concerned.

In 1972, the Junior College of Radio and Communication attached to Seoul National University was inaugurated as a lifelong postsecondary institution modeled after the Open University in England. It gradually expanded its scope and became independent. Now called the Korean National Open University, its enrollment exceeds 180,000 students in seventeen departments.

In 1973, ten pilot universities (nine private universities and one national university) inaugurated a series of reforms (e.g., reduction of credit-hour requirements for graduation from 160 to 140, curriculum reorganization, inauguration of the system of minoring in a subject, and admitting students into broader subject fields). In 1974, an advanced placement program and the double major system were added to the reforms. By 1979, the pilot institutions had increased to thirty-nine, which included most of the major universities in Korea. In 1981, the 140-credit-hour system was made a standard feature of all Korean university undergraduate programs; admission of students on a nondepartmental basis was discontinued; and other phases of the pilot university programs (e.g., minor and double major systems and advanced placement programs) were preserved in some, but not all, institutions.
Beginning in 1974, a university specialization plan was introduced, which constituted one of the two major pillars of university reform in the 1970s. It was aimed at promoting specialization of university programs in line with geographical, sociocultural, and economic conditions, by providing certain types of aid and encouragement. Designed to promote excellence and efficiency in higher education, it started with fifty-one departments in various vocational education fields, with an emphasis upon engineering. Later, it developed into specialized colleges, such as colleges of engineering concentrating on such fields as electronics and chemical engineering.

From the mid-1970s, Korean society encountered some new problems in its higher education system. Repeaters and private tutoring are two examples. These problems arose from the widened gap between enrollment quotas for high school and those for higher education. The Ministry of Education issued “The Comprehensive Measures of Dealing with Repeaters” on 23 July 1978 in order to relieve these problems by such measures as: (1) increasing admission quotas to 112.5 percent annually until 1980, (2) changing two-year colleges to four-year colleges, (3) establishing new institutions of higher education for women, (4) increasing admission quotas at the Korean Air and Correspondence College, (5) establishing evening undergraduate programs or colleges for young workers, (6) adjusting the wage gap between high school graduates and college graduates, (7) excluding requirements for school diplomas in job interviews and tests, (8) considering high school records in the university entrance examination, and (9) reducing the number of examination points required of third-year repeaters of university examinations. As a consequence of these policies, the numbers of students increased rapidly, with the cohort enrollment ratio jumping from 8.2 percent in 1978 to 19.2 percent in 1979. As social and political conditions changed, these policies were insufficient to resolve fully the problems Korea faced in higher education.

Higher Education, from 1980 to the 1990s

President Park Junghi, leader of the military coup in 1961, was assassinated in 1979, and a new military government was established in 1980. Under the Fifth (1981–1987) and Sixth (1988–1992) Republics, higher education in Korea was given even greater attention than previously. The Fifth Republic reformed many parts of Korean society, hoping to solve social problems and control the people. In reforming higher education, the key
policy measures of the 30 July 1980 government declaration (7.30 Educational Reform) were: (1) an unprecedented expansion of enrollment quotas, with an additional 30 percent quota granted to colleges and universities; (2) an upgrading of institutional status—teachers colleges’ status from two to four years, the Korean National Open University from two to four years, and of some junior technical schools to open industrial universities; and (3) reform of entrance examinations, abolishing entrance exams administered by individual higher education institutions, and replacing them with the National Exam. They also included a section on Special Measures Banning Out-of-School Classes for College Entrance Preparation. Most of the higher education reforms during the Fifth Republic grew out of those so-called 7.30 Reform Measures.

The practices of determining college admission on the basis of high school records and preliminary entrance examination scores and of abolishing written examinations administered by individual colleges and universities continued until 1988, when some universities restored their own examinations under a new liberalization policy. Since the graduation quota system allowed admission of students in excess of the previous student quotas (in 1981, an excess admissions quota of 30 percent), it forced more students to drop out. Although some flexibility was introduced in 1983, it was untenable due to the uniform application of the quotas regardless of the prevailing economic conditions. The whole system was finally discarded in 1988.

Introduction of the open colleges and/or universities in the 1980s began a new phase in Korean higher education. These institutions were open in the sense that they admitted part-time working students on the basis of work experience rather than academic records alone. As of 1992, there were eight such institutions limited to industrial or vocational fields.

The inauguration of the Korean Council for University Education in 1982 started a new epoch in the development of higher education. Its constituent members are presidents of four-year colleges and universities, and it has been active in the development of such higher education policies as promotion of financial aid to private higher education institutions and university accreditation. The Higher Education Research Institute serves this purpose, and the Society for the Study of Higher Education works in close cooperation with it.

In 1987, the government agreed with the people’s request and declared a new schedule for democratization which was contained in the Six-Two-Nine Declaration. Making higher education institutions more autonomous
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was part of that declaration. In September 1987, the Ministry of Education announced the University Autonomization Plan, with the following key points: (1) autonomy and accountability of university management, (2) widening participation of the faculty, (3) excellence of higher education through extension of the rights of the faculty, (4) carrying out of autonomization on the basis of each institutional situation, and (5) protecting and fostering the autonomy and individuality of private universities and colleges. Some confusion has arisen, however, about the proper role of various elements of the academic community (e.g., the administrative staff, the faculty, the student body, the general staff), causing conflicting demands among faculty, students, and staff unions. More recently, most institutions seem to be gaining both stability and vitality through gradual reform.

The Presidential Commission on Educational Reform (PCER) issued Recommendations for Educational Reform to Build a New Educational System on 31 May 1995. The overall approach of this commission was to deregulate and liberalize the educational system in order to supply human capital with diverse abilities needed by the society. With regard to higher education, the PCER included six policies: (1) diversifying and specializing the higher education system, (2) diversifying the criteria for founding a private school, (3) giving power to individual institutions to decide admissions quotas and overall school management, (4) making a special support system for research, (5) raising the quality of research to a world-class level, and (6) tightening the connection between university and college evaluation and financial support. These policies provide the basic foundation for contemporary higher education reform efforts.

Education in Korea since 1945 has been characterized by its continued expansion. The most extraordinary growth in educational facilities on all levels has been spurred by such prevailing currents of thought as democracy, nationalism, humanism, and utilitarianism. The rising educational expectations of the people, however, can hardly be satisfied. The rapid expansion of education raises a tremendous national problem because of the competition it creates for financial resources to fund other pressing national resources, particularly economic development. Increasingly, therefore, government policies for the allocation of funds aim at a balance between quality and quantity in education as well as between education and other aspects of national development.

Another serious problem facing Korean education today is whether it
can keep up effectively with significant international sociocultural changes, in general, and the politicoeconomical and sociocultural changes of Korea, in particular. Some of the more significant general factors of international sociocultural change in modern times include progress in science and technology; increases and structural changes in population; industrialization and increase of productivity and wealth, with resultant changes in industrial structure and the labor market; struggle and/or harmony between nationalism and internationalism as well as between democracy and totalitarianism; changes in the roles and functions of the family; changes in human ways of thinking; and economic development plans. These and other changes undoubtedly have a great impact on education. Serious questions remain about whether Korean education has been flexible enough to meet the changing conditions of the country in order to serve as both an effective means of self-realization for the Korean people and the motivation behind continuing national development.
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This chapter describes the basic operation of higher education institutions in Korea. The first part is a discussion of the curriculum, tracing its historical roots and describing its contemporary structure. The second part deals with the administration, governance, and finance of Korean higher education. The concluding section assesses some continuing controversies that affect the structure and functioning of higher education in Korea.

CURRICULUM

In spite of the wider social significance of what is taught to students in colleges and/or universities, college curriculum in contemporary Korea has been left largely to the discretion of individual institutions or professors under the cloak of academic freedom (as is the case in the United States and Western Europe). Periodically, however, attention has been paid to the status of the higher education curriculum. One important effort was the Central Education Research Institute studies of higher education in the mid-1960s (Lee, Y., 1967). A second effort was the establishment of the Educational Policies Council in 1972 under the Ministry of Education, which included a Policies Council for Higher Education.

Concurrent with the promotion of higher education reforms in the 1970s and 1980s was the greater attention paid to the college curriculum. In part, this was due to the continuing growth, expanding educational opportunities for postsecondary students, and increasing organizational
and institutional diversity. In 1980, higher education accommodated 16.7 percent of the traditional college-age cohort; as of 1992, it was estimated to have reached 38 percent, driven by the widespread belief in Korea that development of higher education is a major factor in national development. The country relied on its higher education system to supply high-level workers and in the development of sciences, technology, and arts, believing this would position Korea well in the highly competitive, international marketplace. Higher education has also become a major focal point of educational reform, promoting discussions and controversies founded on scientifically based discoveries, including pressing for more and better research in higher education, college curriculum not excepted (Kim, 1979, 1991; Lee, S., 1987).

The following discussion of the curriculum in Korean higher education is based largely on a study conducted by the author of this chapter and his colleagues (Kim, 1991), which focused primarily on the four-year undergraduate curriculum. Only the 121 regular four-year colleges and universities (of the 286 higher education institutions operating in 1992)—the major stream of the Korean higher education system—were taken into consideration. This naturally excludes such schools as short-term technical colleges, elementary teacher training colleges, open universities, and correspondence schools. Although they are part of the university system, the 400 graduate schools of both general and specialized types are not considered.

Historical Development of the University Curriculum

Four stages in the historical development of the university curriculum in Korea may be identified. The first period (1945–1954) had a 180 credit-hour system, the second period (1955–1972) a 160 credit-hour system, the third period (1973–1980) both 160 credit-hour and 140 credit-hour systems, and the last period (1981 to the present) a 140 credit-hour system. In the centralized Korean system of higher education, the minimum number of credit hours required for graduation is mandated in the current Education Act.

The First Period (1945–1954)

After national liberation on 15 August 1945, South Korea followed the model of the U.S. system in rebuilding higher education: four-year college and/or university undergraduate programs, two-semester academic years,
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and other features of the U.S. university system, particularly those related to its formal framework. The higher education system that evolved was a mixture of the traditional European-Japanese system and the more recently introduced American one. In the postliberation period from 1945 to 1954, a 180 credit-hour system was adopted as the minimum standard for graduation. During the years of the U.S. military government, four universities and twenty-three independent colleges were either reorganized or newly established on a 180 credit-hour basis. In most instances, this was accomplished by keeping the traditional emphasis on specialized courses and neglecting general education courses. Gradually, however, some leading universities and/or colleges, including the Seoul National University established in 1946, began to introduce a general education program.

Building from enactment of the Education Act in 1949, the 1952 Presidential Decree for Implementation of Education Act mandated national standards for the university curriculum and established the minimum level of instructional time annually. These legally established standards served as the minimum criteria for university curriculum, unifying university curriculum development under the very difficult conditions present at the time and despite pressures for increased institutional autonomy.

The university curriculum consisted of both required (general and foundational as well as academic major) courses and elective courses offered on a two-semester system. General education programs and electives were significant features of the new curriculum. Basic criteria for organization and operation of the university curriculum would usually be provided in the rules and regulations of the university/college. In practice, there was wide variation from institution to institution, depending on prevailing conditions (e.g., availability of faculty, financial stability, and management philosophy). In most institutions, the general education program and the elective system tended to be regarded as less important than the major courses. Nevertheless, they were legally mandated and were essential to the evolving curriculum structure.

Although legal provisions and individual university standards for the curriculum changed as time passed, the basic framework of the university curriculum retained a tripartite division into a general education program, major specialization, and electives. Table 3.1 shows the distribution of credit hours under the 180 credit-hour system as practiced by major universities in Seoul. The table illustrates wide interuniversity differences. Even within the same university, there was also considerable variation across different colleges and departments.
The 180 credit-hour system would seem excessive by current standards, but it was thought necessary because the lecture was the primary modality for teaching and learning at the time. Libraries were poor, opportunities for independent studies severely limited, and other accompanying conditions that might have facilitated learning were absent. By law, elective courses were limited to less than one-third of the total credit hours, and general education courses were limited to less than one-third of the required courses. Consequently, universities tended to allocate around forty credit hours for general education courses, ninety credit hours for the major specialization, and fifty credit hours for electives.

The Second Period (1955–1972)

In 1955, the Presidential Decree for Establishment of College and University Standards was promulgated. This decree has become a landmark for establishing standards for faculty and facilities. Set up under the sponsorship of the Ministry of Education, the standards were concerned primarily with the instructional function of the university. Yet they have since served as criteria for establishing new colleges and universities as well as for administrative evaluation of the existing institutions. As part of the government-sponsored efforts for qualitative improvement of university education, external criteria for the university curriculum were also reformed, involving reduction of the number of credit hours for graduation and reform of the general education program. Beginning with the 1955 college entrants, a 160 credit-hour system was applied. The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of University</th>
<th>Required Courses</th>
<th>Electives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>Specialization/Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seoul National</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>110–130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yonsei (Chosun Christian)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewha Woman’s</td>
<td>60–70</td>
<td>80–90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukmyong Woman’s</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

standard maximum for credit hours per semester was reduced from 28 credit hours to 24 credit hours. The tripartite structure of general education, specialization, and electives was maintained, but reorganization and redistribution of credit hours and course contents continued.

In general accordance with legal provisions, the Korean language, English, a second foreign language (e.g., German, French, Spanish, Chinese), history of human civilization, introduction to philosophy, and physical education were common courses taken in most universities. Some private universities required unique courses suited to their own purposes, particularly those with a religious orientation. According to a comprehensive survey conducted in 1966, the forty-one colleges and universities then surveyed showed the following average tripartite distribution of credit hours: 49 hours (31 percent) for general education, 82 hours (51 percent) for major specialization, and 29 hours (18 percent) for electives. The study found great variation among universities and among departments representing different fields of study within the same institution. It recommended increasing emphasis on general education programs (Lee, Y., 1967).

A more recent study of the 160 credit-hour system of university curriculum analyzed thirty-nine institutions in 1972 and reported the following representative picture of credit hours: 41–50 hours for general education courses, 81–90 hours for requirements in the major field, 21–30 hours for electives in the major field, and 21–30 hours for pure electives unrelated to specialization (Kim, 1991). Table 3.2 shows the results from this 1972 survey.

The Third Period (1973–1981)

During this period, the 160 and 140 credit-hour systems coexisted. The 160 credit-hour system was applied to the traditional institutions, while the 140 credit-hour system was applied to the so-called pilot universities. In the 1960s, university reforms were promoted through such measures as government-initiated rearrangement plans involving reduction of student quotas, the merging and reorganization of colleges and departments, a unified national entrance examination, and introduction of a national graduation examination system with resultant national award of bachelor’s degrees. At the cost of university autonomy, these reforms were promoted unilaterally. Not surprisingly, they failed.

Introduction of the pilot university concept was an attempt to ameliorate the problems of such radical and one-sided reform in the 1960s. A
new approach had to be adopted that would reflect a more experimental, progressive, and self-participatory method. Instead of a national reform covering all higher education institutions, only a small number of carefully selected universities would be designated as pilot universities, experimenting with certain reform projects. In 1973, ten pilot universities were selected by the Ministry of Education. They were to experiment with three reforms: (1) reduction of credit hours required for graduation from 160 to 140, necessarily involving a university curriculum reorganization; (2) entrance of students by broader fields or colleges, involving quotas by fields rather than by departments; and (3) adoption of a minor field system in addition to the existing major field system.

In 1974 and later, other reforms were added, including: (1) advanced placement and reduction of minimum length of study for graduation from four years to three, (2) introduction of double majors, (3) utilization of summer and winter vacations for accumulation of credit hours for graduation, and (4) reform of the student fee-paying system, moving from the block payment method to a more flexible one. By 1980, forty-three colleges and universities had joined the pilot institutions, constituting

Table 3.2. Credit-Hour Distribution of the University Curriculum (1972)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education</th>
<th>Required Courses in Major Fields</th>
<th>Electives in Major Fields</th>
<th>Pure Electives Unrelated to Specialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hrs.</td>
<td>No. of Insts.</td>
<td>Credit Hrs.</td>
<td>No. of Insts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Up to 50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51–70</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81–90</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51–60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>91–100</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>101–110</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111–120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121–130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the mainstream of Korean higher education. The pilot university movement in the 1970s had both merit and drawbacks. Some features of the reforms were continued as permanent parts of Korean higher education, while others were discontinued in the 1980s after being found unsuitable for the changing conditions. Probably most significant was reorganization of the traditional 160 credit hour system. In most pilot universities, not only did reduction of credit hours result, but in the process of curriculum reorganization such other improvements occurred as elimination of overly specialized 1–2-hour courses, integration of related courses, and more systematic coordination between the undergraduate and the graduate curriculum. The current 140 credit-hour system was adopted as the legal minimum standard required for graduation by all colleges and universities in 1981.

**Overall Structure and Features of the Existing System**

The outline of the existing system of the university curriculum is provided in the Presidential Decree on Implementation of the Education Act. Some of the more important legal provisions as related to curriculum include the following: (1) the university undergraduate program, except for medical and dental courses, should be four years; (2) the university curriculum should consist of general education courses and specialization courses, both divided into required and elective courses; (3) credit hours for general education courses should be 30 percent of the total credit hours required for graduation, selected in a balanced way among the humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, physical education, and the arts; (4) a student may major in one or two subjects while in the university as well as take a minor according to provisions in the university rules and regulations; (5) 1 credit hour is defined as 1 hour of instruction per week (16 hours of instruction per semester) for ordinary subjects or 2 hours per week (32 hours per semester) for laboratory work; and (6) a student is required to complete a minimum of 140 credit hours for graduation.

Based on these legal provisions, the existing system of university curriculum has the following specific features: (1) the basic structure of the university curriculum may be regarded either as dual (composed of general education courses and specialization courses) or as tripartite (composed of general education, specialization courses, and electives), where electives may be in general education, the major, or the minor, as well as education courses or professional courses for prospective teachers;
(2) since 1989, national ethics, Korean history, military training for men, and physical education are no longer legally required general education subjects, but are left to the discretion of individual universities; (3) since 1974, academically talented students who test above a certain level may take 3 more credit hours per semester than ordinary students, or they may be allowed to take advanced placement examinations in such courses as foreign languages rather than attending the actual courses; and (4) there is flexibility to exceed the legally mandated 140 credit-hour minimums in certain fields (e.g., pharmacy, law, veterinary medicine, and teacher preparatory courses). The university undergraduate curriculum structure in terms of distribution of credit hours is shown in Table 3.3. This table is somewhat oversimplified but suggests the general trend of change toward reduction of total credit hours and the long tradition of emphasis on the specialization or major in Korean universities.

The distribution of credit-hour standards in 1989 that was found in a more recent study of five national/public institutions and six private ones from different parts of Korea is shown in Table 3.4. This table also illustrates the interuniversity as well as the intrauniversity variability of curriculum standards.

Some of the more important findings brought to light by this study included: (1) in addition to the tripartite structure of general education, specialization, and elective courses, the university curriculum structure is complicated by such factors as the minors, double majors, and additional requirements for certain specialization programs (e.g., medicine, law, teacher training, etc.); (2) general education courses occupied 17–43 percent of total credit hours; (3) the specialization programs in majors
Table 3.4.
Distribution of Credit-Hour Standards for Undergraduate Curriculum in Eleven Korean Universities (1989)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of University</th>
<th>Required Courses in Major Fields</th>
<th>Electives in Major Fields</th>
<th>Other Related Courses</th>
<th>Total Minimum Requirements for Major</th>
<th>Required Courses in General Education</th>
<th>Electives in General Education</th>
<th>Total Minimum Requirements for General Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kangwon National</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>14–31</td>
<td>12–26</td>
<td>81–84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30–</td>
<td>45–48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duksung</td>
<td>17–43</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12–30</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sung-shim</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33–48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51–66</td>
<td>27–33</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>27–33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chungang</td>
<td>50–70</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6–24</td>
<td>56–85</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changwon National</td>
<td>18–48</td>
<td>16–42</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>54–74</td>
<td>32–</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chungbuk National</td>
<td>30–45</td>
<td>31–40</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30–9</td>
<td>43–52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanyang</td>
<td>27–42</td>
<td>21–36</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38–</td>
<td>2–4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ranged from 34 to 62 percent of the total credit hours, and required courses in majors generally constituted from 30 to 40 percent of the specialization programs; and (4) in most cases, electives occupied less than 20 percent of the total credit hours.

Some Observations on Curriculum Operations

It is difficult in view of the wide variability existing in undergraduate curriculum standards and operations in Korean universities to make any absolute generalizations, especially since we do not have any comprehensive survey to provide definitive data. Based on the studies at hand (Kim, 1991), however fragmented they may be, it is reasonable to make some tentative observations. The general education program, occupying around 30 percent of the undergraduate curriculum, is concerned with developing in students the capacity to think and express themselves, inquire into facts and understand phenomena, analyze and synthesize, and create or discriminate among values in order to reach sound judgments. Some universities have developed core programs emphasizing these skills for a wide variety of students; others are keeping to formalized and somewhat fragmented traditional subject matter from the academic disciplines.

Although there are certain university standards for minimum credit hours in the specialization or major field, varying across different fields, departments, or colleges, there is an even wider range, in practice, in number and availability of curriculum offerings as well as student selection of specific courses. Electives mean different things for different universities. For some, electives are those courses selected in the general education and specialization programs that were not required. For others, they are courses selected from any field or area, outside formal requirements. In some institutions, electives are construed as courses taken as minors as well as professional education courses not directly related to the specialization or major. Broadly conceived, electives may be considered courses taken to broaden the narrow scope of intellectual isolation and reduce the compartmentalization caused by specialization. Although there has been a persistent tendency to emphasize specialization programs in most universities, both among faculty members and students, there has also been a consistent effort to emphasize the role of general education programs as an integral part of the university curriculum. Some universities have recently developed new models of general education programs of their own, involving reorganization of traditional subject
Curriculum and Management

matter, development of new materials and textbooks, and cultivation of a series of reading programs similar to a sort of “great books” curriculum.

The university curriculum is under development, an always unfinished task. As pointed out in the author’s 1990 study of the university curriculum (Kim, 1991), major problems of the Korean university curriculum remain. Despite the uniqueness of each university in terms of basic philosophy, history, composition of the faculty and students, conditions of teaching and learning, and financing, there tends to be a uniformity in the development of the university curriculum. Although distinctions among the component parts of a university curriculum structure are generally established, lack of articulation between those parts (e.g., between general education and specialization programs) tends to be problematic. The traditional tendency to neglect the importance of the general education programs seems to persist in many universities. Finally, although the elective system is generally accepted, it is still ambiguous and ill defined.

The Korean higher education system must face the continuing challenge of curriculum reform. In particular, it faces the challenge of a new era of internationalization and globalization, scientific and technological revolution, and the national reunification of North and South Korea, all of which have great implications for the future direction of university development. To cope with such challenges, the university curriculum must also be developed, renewed, and reformed, a tremendous and continuous challenge for all concerned. The next section of this chapter describes the organizational structure under which Korean higher education institutions operate and deliver their curriculum to students.

MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Under the U.S. military government established in South Korea in 1945, an attempt was made to set up an autonomous higher education institution under a board of trustees by establishing Seoul National University through the reorganization of previously existing national higher education institutions. In addition, a few private higher education institutions, including former imperial universities, were to be incorporated into the emerging university. But in August 1946, despite repeated recommendations for appointing a board of trustees, the administrative authorities did not comply, and an independent board was never appointed. Consequently, the Ministry of Education took control over external
Higher Education in Korea

decision making as well as administration of both national and public higher education institutions.

When the Republic of Korea was established in 1948, a Ministry of Education was also organized. The Bureau of Higher Education (the predecessor of what is now called the University Education Office) was established within the Ministry of Education to deal with both overall higher education policies and specific external administrative functions. The Science and Technology Education Bureau was established in 1967 to deal with junior technical college matters. The minister of education, vice minister of education, and other officials within the ministry were directly involved in the formulation and implementation of higher education policies. For matters such as appointment of national university presidents and submission of draft legislation for higher education to the National Assembly, the executive branch of the government, including the cabinet and the president, might be involved. Advisory councils both within the Ministry of Education and under the presidential office of the Republic have had a significant impact on educational policies, in general, and higher education policies, in particular.

A legacy of Japanese colonial rule is the highly legalistic approach in higher education administration, expressed through laws and presidential decrees. The National Assembly also has played a significant role, as in 1993 when its Subcommittee of Education and Youth took charge. Among the more important laws and presidential decrees related to higher education policies and administration are the Education Law, the Educational Public Officials Law, the Private School Law, the Industrial Education Promotion Law, the Public Officials Annuity Law, the Private School Teachers Annuity Law, the Presidential Decree on the Establishment of College and University Standards, the Presidential Decree on Appointment of Educational Public Officials, and the Presidential Decree on the Salaries of Educational Public Officials.

The legislative process in Korea is largely a political process, with the government responsible for recognizing educational problems and taking public opinion and discussion into consideration during its deliberations in the National Assembly. Because political parties, especially the ruling party, influence the process, many higher education policies in Korea are directly or indirectly related to the nature and functioning of the political process. For example, the Constitution of the Republic of Korea states, “University autonomy shall be guaranteed in accordance with the provisions of laws.” However, although university autonomy is recognized in principle, it has fluctuated from time to time due to legal limits and
administrative discretion as well as the lack of maturity and self-governing ability on the part of colleges and universities.

Private universities, through the provisions of the Private School Law (1963), are under the control and management of boards of trustees. In 1980, these boards of trustees, presumably responsible for the establishment and management of colleges or universities, lost their authority for decisions relating to university personnel and budgeting, except for appointment of the university president. Amendments to the Private School Law since 1991 have returned power to these boards. The role of the boards remains controversial in Korean higher education today because of the reluctance by some private corporations to delegate or to share power with university presidents.

Internal governance within the university is generally composed of three levels: a university-wide decision-making body, a constituent college-level decision-making body, and departmental units. In this type of governance structure, the faculty have had a powerful role in the administration of the national higher education institutions. More recently, however, the emergence of collective student and staff entities, such as student councils or staff unions, has challenged faculty power. In some universities, student and staff participation in governance is a cautious experiment; in others, the faculty is regaining its power, allowing other groups to participate only in limited matters directly related to the immediate concerns of students.

Private universities have a similar, three-level organization of governance. In general, however, the nature and scope of participation vary widely from institution to institution. In some private institutions, faculty participate broadly in governance; in others, only deans and other managers participate. When major decision making is concentrated at upper administrative levels, without broad participation on the part of university constituents, internal conflicts or dissatisfaction may occur.

**Autonomy and Control**

Autonomy in higher education may be broadly interpreted to include all the aspects of academic freedom: research, instruction, and publication for faculty; learning and self-government for students; and self-government for the institution. More narrowly, autonomy may be equated to institutional freedom. According to the Robbins Report (Committee on Higher Education, 1963, pp. 229–230), autonomy is essentially freedom of the institution from government control: to make faculty appointments,
to determine curricula and standards, to control student admissions, to determine the balance between teaching and research, and to determine development strategies. How priorities are set varies considerably within each institutional context. In practice, institutional freedom cannot be completely separated from other aspects of academic freedom.

According to the Constitution of the Republic of Korea, “All citizens are entitled to the freedom to pursue sciences and arts.” The state must safeguard each citizen’s right to pursue free inquiry into truth through learning sciences and arts. In a constitutional lawyer’s view, the right given to citizens is “freedom from interference of the State in pursuit of the truth, including in research, publication, discussion and instruction, ultimately aimed at keeping the truth from being thwarted, oppressed and stagnated” (Park, 1964, p. 229).

Higher educational institutions, particularly universities, are considered the houses of learning, where such freedom of inquiry into the truth must be jealously safeguarded. It is in this context that academic freedom becomes a point of emphasis in higher education. On the other hand, all educational institutions in Korea, including those for higher education, are placed under the supervision of the state. In Korea, educational institutions are considered “public instruments” to serve the general good of society, regardless of whether they are national, public, or private. Article 7 of the Education Law provides that all schools are the public instruments of the state and must be established in accordance with the standards provided by the relevant statutes. Thus, according to the degree of control exercised, there may be limitations on institutional freedom.

Academic freedom is generally considered an essential condition for creative development of intellectual capacities in pursuit of truth. In practice, however, it has never existed as an absolute freedom; it has been placed under different limits, varying from time to time and from place to place. This may be natural, in a sense, because the concept of freedom always presupposes the existence of certain conditions (e.g., political tyranny, economic pressures, cultural biases and dogmas) that aim to impose limits on freedom.

Although government supervision of education can benefit the public at large, it should not infringe upon academic freedom, but should rather safeguard such freedom on a higher dimension. In this context, it is well to remember that the Constitution also provides that “autonomy and political neutrality of education shall be guaranteed” (Article 27–4; since 1980, 29–4). By the same token, the Education Law also provides that “education shall be carried out in accordance with its original aims and
shall never be utilized as an instrument of propaganda for any political, partisan and other personal prejudices” (Article 5).

In reality, however, two basic factors seem to be strangling institutional autonomy and academic freedom. One is the authoritarian, collectivist mode of administrative control. In Korea, such a mode of control has prevailed since the early days of colonial rule, when institutional autonomy was suppressed by centralized power. The second factor contributing to suppression of institutional autonomy is the lack of self-discipline and self-reliance on the part of the faculty who have little interest in research, students who have little interest in studying, and administrators who have no concern for academic standards. Particularly problematic are those professors and students who invite external political interference by their misguided participation in political issues, and those administrators, members of the faculty, and students who engage in unproductive internal disputes.

These two factors are complementary. The argument is often advanced that stringent government control is necessary because the individual institutions lack the ability to self-govern. In fact, any kind of control, however stringent, may be rationalized on the grounds of institutional and individual incompetence. On the other hand, it may be equally eloquently argued that as long as government control persists to strangle initiative, creativity, and a sense of responsibility, there is little room for development of self-governing abilities on the part of the individual institutions. The basic problem, then, is whether it is desirable for the government to continue to micromanage every institution of higher learning or to give them an increasing degree of autonomy.

Pattern of Government Control

There are two major channels of government control of higher education institutions, legislative and administrative. Major policies on higher education in Korea are determined by government authorities through statutory provisions, particularly laws and presidential decrees. Although the scope and extent of legislative control differs between national/public and private institutions of higher education, it is pervasive in nearly all aspects of higher education policies. During the Japanese colonial period, the Educational Ordinance of 1911 provided for governmental control over the subjects of study, standards, staff, textbooks, and tuition fees for all higher education institutions. In comparison with developments in other fields, this strongly legalistic approach to administration and the
subsequent bureaucratic control of everything except textbooks do not seem to have changed in any fundamental ways.

It is likely that the prevailing attitudes of the government bureaucrats in educational administration, not the legal provisions, have institutionalized the centralized patterns of control because the statutory provisions were made under the bureaucrats’ influence. In the hands of more progressive bureaucrats, the statutory provisions might be revised to reduce government control and provide greater freedom for the individual institutions. Administrative policy in Korea, unfortunately, seems to be strengthening centralized bureaucratic control and giving less freedom to institutions, even to the point of turning all private institutions of higher education into “quasi-governmental” ones.

What kinds of government control and how much of it should be exercised in Korean higher education remain controversial, particularly since so many institutions of higher education seem to be lacking a sense of responsibility to the society. But the sentiment seems to be growing that existing practices of governmental control may very well be the greatest stumbling block to the future development of higher education in Korea. It is difficult to find a pattern of government control as pervasive and stringent in any other democratically oriented nation. For example, through amendment of a presidential decree in 1965, the government assumed the right to suspend private institutions as well as government schools under emergency conditions (Article 76, Presidential Decree on Enforcement of the Education Law). The existing patterns of government control may be subdivided roughly into seven broad areas:

1. The establishment of a higher educational institution must be approved by government authorities on the following ten points: objectives; name; location; regulations of the institution; expenses and methods of support; facilities; ground plans of the site, buildings, playground and practice-ground; starting date of instruction; plans of attached schools, cooperating institutions and research institutes; and documents and charters for verification of the financial juridical persons. (Article 64, Presidential Decree on Enforcement of the Education Law)

2. These regulations of the institution must specifically provide for such matters as: length of study programs, school year, semester and vacations; student quotas for departments; course offerings and schedules; tests and standards for course completion; requirements for entrance, dismissal, transfer, suspension,
graduation, awards and punishments; constituent colleges when
the institution is a university; academic departments; aids to
students and obligations of such students after graduation, in the
case of teacher training institutions; attached and cooperating
institutions, research institutes, dormitories, in cases where such
are available; and departmental organization, faculty meetings,
degree granting, graduate school and graduate education
committee, foreign students, extension courses, auditing system,
evening classes, seasonal courses in the case of universities and
colleges and in other institutions of higher education where such
are available. (Article 65, Presidential Decree on Enforcement of
the Education Law)

3. A wide range of control also exists concerning faculty personnel,
such as: setting minimum qualifications for all teaching personnel
regardless of the type of institution; appointment, promotion,
remuneration, termination, and disciplining of presidents, deans,
and individual faculty members of the national/public institutions,
with the provision that certain faculty (consultation mechanisms)
be established in the individual institutions and/or the Ministry of
Education; establishment of faculty quotas by departments and
rank; and approval of the presidents or principals of private
institutions, with the right of governmental authorities to withdraw
such approval under certain conditions without needing to go to
court for such a decision.

4. Some of the more significant measures of control concerning
students are: establishment of student quotas by department;
approval of the time schedule and method of student selection;
and mandatory provision to make scholarships and fellowships
available to at least 15 percent of the school population.

5. Government control of programs and academic standards
includes: regulation of the minimum requirements in terms of
credit hours for graduation, e.g., 140 credit hours for the
bachelor’s degree; requirements for general education courses in
colleges and universities, such as Korean language, Korean
history, national ethics, and military training; establishment of
210 as the minimum number of school days; and government
registration of academic degree holders in order to apply stringent
control to the student quotas.

6. In financing, budgeting, and facilities, some of the more important
regulations include: financing the national/public institutions;
uniform standards in budgeting and accounting procedures for all institutions; and establishing minimum standards on facilities, land space, library, and laboratory facilities.

7. One of the most important mechanisms for government control is reporting and audits. All institutions of higher education are required to submit periodically on government request various reports covering nearly all aspects of their operations, including financing, staff personnel, and students. Government authorities also make audits on every institution, annually and as needed, on all aspects of the institutional operations.

Assessment of Major Issues

With regard to the organization and control of higher education, the following issues seem the most significant: position of the junior college in the organization of higher education, government monopoly of elementary teacher training, position of the specialized graduate school, the Board of Regents for national higher education, proposal for an autonomous body of control for private colleges and universities, and the nature and extent of government control. Although some of these problems have been touched on in the previous discussion, they will be examined more closely now.

The junior college in Korea is in a precarious position. It was developed primarily as a two-year postsecondary institution for training of technicians in various vocations and for the general education of women at this level. Many who believe that two years of study is too short for a terminal education in vocational fields find a solution in the newly emerging vocational professional school. Others contend that the junior college, as established in Korea today, is too narrow in its objectives and functions, particularly since so many graduates of junior colleges are anxious to go on to colleges and universities. In view of the increasing demand by students for admission to higher education and the diversified needs of students, the junior college, if it is going to have a place in the organization of Korean higher education, may have to expand its objectives and functions and diversify its programs and services. In this regard, the example of the American community college may suggest a path for Korean junior colleges in which they serve more directly the needs of those who want to continue their education after graduation, those who need terminal education in vocations, and those adults who need to broaden their cultural perspectives and/or to improve their vocational competencies.
Government monopoly of elementary teacher training is a tradition that was handed down from the teacher training schools under Japanese rule and today is provided categorically in Article 128 of the Education Law. Apparently this is based on a traditional philosophy of teacher training that emphasizes uniformity and conformity under government control, with the advantage of controlling the supply and demand of teachers. However, there is no reason to stick to such a closed system of teacher training today. In view of the worldwide trend in teacher training, the expected teacher shortage, and the need for improvement of the quality of teachers, a new system should be introduced. With the introduction of a more open system allowing for private institutions to participate in elementary teacher training (as is the case on a very limited basis at the Ewha Woman’s University in Seoul), government expenditure on teacher education could well be reduced and resources may be used more effectively for other priorities. Instructive in this regard is the postwar experience of Japan in changing from a traditional, closed system of elementary teacher training to a new, more open one (Nakashima, 1962, pp. 250–283).

The emergence of the specialized graduate school is a recent phenomenon. The earliest of this type, the Graduate School of Public Administration and the Graduate School of Public Health, were established in 1959 as part of Seoul National University. Today, there are sixteen such institutions attached to both national and private universities. Many of these institutions must cater to the needs of professionals who are already employed full-time and, consequently, must be open in the evening. For this reason, there is a tendency among them to be less academically oriented than other graduate schools. While the new emphasis on practical aspects in the curriculum is generally recognized as desirable, it is feared that academic standards might suffer. In some cases, there are conflicts and tensions in the administration and duplication of programs between the general and the specialized graduate schools within the same university. Despite these problems, the emerging specialized graduate schools are likely to be established as new types of professional schools on the level of graduate institutions.

A 1960 U.S. Operations Mission survey (Ministry of Education and USOM) recommended the creation of a board of regents for all national higher education institutions in Korea, but this has not materialized. In fact, the Board of Regents of Seoul National University faded away after just two years of existence. The ultimate reason for this failure may be the tight bureaucratic control exerted by the central educational administrative authorities, who are unwilling to give up their vested interests and powers.
It will take political action under new leadership to make the government education bureaucracy relinquish control. If a system of independent governing boards is to be introduced in Korean national higher education, there are at least two minimum basic conditions for its success: willingness on the part of the government bureaucracy to delegate some of its powers and responsibilities, and assurance that the people who serve in the organization will demonstrate ability, ingenuity, and integrity.

Autonomous control among the private institutions of higher education has also been proposed (Oh, 1965). Since Korean colleges and universities are vested with the right to grant degrees, there is a strong need to maintain and improve, where necessary, the academic standards of these institutions. There are two alternative courses for improving such standards. One, of course, is through strengthening government control over the individual institutions. Unfortunately, past experience and the present situation do not seem to suggest that this is a desirable approach. It should be remembered in this connection that the national qualification examination for entrance to colleges and universities and the national examination for the bachelor’s degrees that were established in 1962 and 1963 failed for various reasons. The existing practice of government registration of bachelor’s and master’s degree holders seems ineffective.

A more drastic government control has even been suggested, that is, for the Ministry of Education to issue the bachelor’s degrees for each individual institution. However, this seems impractical because such a policy would involve new legislation, and political opposition is mounting. The basic fallacy of this approach seems to be the defeatism underlying the policy, since it assumes that all institutions lack the capacity for self-control. An alternative course of action would be gradual relaxation of governmental control along with the introduction of an autonomous body of control among the private colleges and universities, beginning with institutions of high academic reputation and established standards and gradually expanding the scope to include others.

Judging from the historical development of higher education, autonomous control necessarily involves organization to facilitate cooperation among the institutions involved. Since autonomous control is possible only through voluntary and sincere efforts on the part of the individual institutions, the process must begin with internal preparedness. Such an organization for cooperation must be initiated by pioneer institutions, with doors kept open for others to join when and if they are ready. Also, there must be established procedures to ascertain both preparedness and willingness on the part of individual institutions.
The nature and extent of government control of higher education has been a controversial issue for some time. An extreme point of view would advocate much more stringent government control, to the point of asserting that private schools must be eliminated and turned into government schools (Hyun, 1962). An extreme opposing view would advocate complete freedom from government control, a laissez-faire policy on higher education. Neither of these views seems, however, justifiable.

A more moderate and realistic viewpoint would be to reduce government control gradually, progressively allowing for increased institutional freedom. In this regard, both structural and operational changes need to be introduced. The idea of a board of regents for national higher education and of an autonomous control structure for private colleges and universities is pertinent in this regard. Other groups such as the teacher organizations and advisory committees within the Ministry of Education should also be given increased powers and responsibilities. Pluralistic control should replace the existing monopolistic pattern. The Ministry of Education should begin delegating its powers to other organizations and individual institutions. Such a change may take diplomacy on the part of a responsible government leader and perhaps political action involving various groups and individuals who realize the dangers of the present trend and see the urgent need for a change in the control and administration of higher education.

Administration

The Ministry of Education is the major external and internal management organization within the university, but it has begun decentralizing by delegating some administrative functions and powers to the Korean Council for University Education (KCUE), as well as to the individual universities. Established in 1982, the KCUE is dedicated to research, university cooperation, and university accreditation through self-regulation and assessment. It has played an important role in university education and policy formulation related to higher education, serving as liaison between the Ministry of Education and individual institutions.

University presidents are appointed for a four-year term by the president of the Republic in the case of a national institution, in accordance with the provisions of the Public Educational Officials Law, with the possibility of reappointment for additional terms. In the 1950s, the appointment required approval of the university faculty through an official voting procedure. In the 1960s and 1970s such an approval procedure was withdrawn, and appointment was based mainly on government judgment.
Since 1988, it has been based largely on the wishes of the faculty as expressed through faculty voting. In the case of a private university, presidential appointments are made by the Board of Trustees, in some cases upon the recommendation of the faculty and in others without such recommendation. Some institutions include student representatives and general staff along with faculty representatives for the recommendation procedure. Private universities characteristically have a greater variety in methods of selecting the university president than do public institutions.

A university president is expected to be a representative of the institution; the integrator of the university community; the core decision maker and top administrator with respect to academic governance related to the education, research, and service functions of the university; and the top manager of supporting services and functions, including planning, organizing, personnel management, facilities, and financial management. Expectations are high, responsibilities are heavy, and work is never ending. The university president needs to be an educator, an administrator, and an educational statesman (Kim, 1984, p. 12).

There are four categories of university faculty members: full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and full-time instructor. There are also part-time instructors and research and teaching assistants, full-time or part-time. The retirement age for full-time faculty is normally sixty-five, but there are some exceptions in a limited number of private universities, generally until sixty-eight or seventy. For both national and private university teaching and administrative staff, well-established retirement plans with annuity and pension plans are provided: with more than thirty-three years of service, 76 percent of the monthly pay is guaranteed for the life of the retiring person and 50 percent guaranteed to the surviving spouse. Beginning in 1976, faculty had legal contracts for a specified term of one to ten years. This practice was, however, maintained only until 1987, and now most appointments are for unlimited terms. Maternal leave, medical care, and other welfare services are provided.

Generally, a full-time university teacher has a minimum teaching load of nine to ten hours of instruction per week, but actual loads often exceed this minimum standard. More and more universities have begun to provide for sabbatical leave, interuniversity exchange programs, and overseas training and travel programs. University professors are generally held in high esteem in society. Movement of university teachers from one institution to another is considered exceptional, so there is relatively low mobility compared with other professions. As of 1992, 54.0 percent of full-time faculty members in regular four-year colleges and universities
in Korea (excluding elementary teacher training colleges, open universities, and miscellaneous collegiate institutions) held doctoral degrees and 27.9 percent held master’s degrees. Women are gradually increasing in number, but in 1992 they constituted only 18.7 percent of the university faculty (Ministry of Education, 1992).

Finance

According to a recent study, 38.1 percent of the normal college-age cohort in Korea were enrolled in higher education institutions, representing a gross national population enrollment rate of 395 per 10,000. However, despite having a high enrollment rate, the Korean higher education system depends heavily on student fees, unavoidably leading to financial difficulties. In 1991, student fees in national universities provided 34.4 percent of university financial revenues, and 60.0 percent was derived from government subsidies. For private universities, student fees provided 75.7 percent of revenues, while transfers from the financial corporation managing the university and private contributions accounted for only 16.3 percent. National government support was only 0.7 percent of revenues. Owing to rising student political power, it has been very difficult to raise student fees (Yoon, 1992; Kang & Yoon, 1990, pp. 22–23).

Although government subsidies to remedy financial difficulty for private universities (accommodating around two-thirds of the Korean higher education population) have been increased since 1991, such support is insignificant in comparison with ever rising financial needs. In 1991, a billion won (around 125 million U.S. dollars) was provided to private institutions by the government. In 1993, this subsidy was more than tripled, and yet it fell far short of the needs.

In terms of 1991 expenditures in national universities, 58.8 percent was expended for salaries and other personnel, 24.4 percent for operations, and 16.8 percent for plants and facilities. In private universities, the personnel accounted for 55.8 percent of the total cost, operations accounted for 24.1 percent, and plants and facilities accounted for 20.1 percent (Yoon, 1992, p. 188). Increasing student fees, national subsidies, and foundation grants all have their limitations. As a result, an alternative plan to accept individual contributions from wealthy donors has been suggested. This has naturally become a controversial issue, particularly since cultural norms of reciprocity lead to expectations that “contributions” will result in the admission of donors’ children to private universities over and above the government-set student quotas. This, of course, gives special privileges to the wealthy,
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contrary to a sense of social justice. The whole problem is intertwined with university autonomy, limits of some private universities in self-discipline and autonomy, and public opinion. Even so, the government is inclined to implement the plan on an experimental basis.

President Kim Young Sam pledged to increase the public expenditure rate to 3.7 percent of the gross national product (GNP) by 1993 and to 5.0 percent in 1998, at the end of his term of office. Unfortunately, that campaign promise was not realized due to the Asian economic crisis that enveloped Korea. There is, however, increasing public pressure for a greater share of government educational expenditure to be allocated to higher education, including increasing allocations to private higher education. In the concluding part of this chapter, several fundamental issues that have influenced Korean higher education curriculum and management are discussed and implications are drawn for the future development of the system.

CONTROVERSIES OVER KOREAN HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY

Developing policies that give direction to the administration and operation of higher education in Korea has been a controversial process. Several basic philosophical or ideological issues related to higher education policies underly these controversies. On the Korean scene, the major contrasting ideological differences on higher education may be reflected in the following dichotomies: (1) control vs. autonomy, (2) equality vs. excellence, (3) conformity vs. diversity, (4) liberalism vs. vocationalism, (5) specificity vs. universalism, and (6) social demand vs. human resources demand.

Control vs. Autonomy

Korean higher education policies in the 1940s and 1950s were characterized by a laissez-faire philosophy. Since the early 1960s, however, government control and support have been greatly strengthened. Control has often been rigid, thus shrinking the autonomy of individual institutions, professors, and students. Although government control was considered inevitable in Korea to control social and political conflict as well as for various other reasons, autonomy naturally became problematic. Autonomy, in both its institutional and individual aspects, has long been regarded as the core ethos of academic freedom, which in turn has been guarded as
the lifeblood of a college or university. Although the nature and conditions of autonomy gradually became subject to change in the politicoeconomic and sociocultural environments of nations, its essence has been continuously guarded as part of tradition and as the basic principle that academic freedom is essential to preserve creativity and a spirit of critical inquiry in higher education.

To its credit, the Korean government gradually has been moderating external control and augmenting institutional and individual flexibility and autonomy in higher education, particularly in four-year institutions. This is reflected in the easing of student enrollment and graduation quotas and the loosening of rigid curriculum guidelines. Such decisions as the election of university presidents and faculty transfer among departments or colleges have largely been left to the discretion of individual institutions. All these changes have been directed toward greater flexibility and autonomy.

Although the Ministry of Education and some experts still seem to believe that centralized government control is necessary for maintaining standards and quality, there are other voices advocating moderation in control and greater autonomy as individual colleges and universities mature and as environmental conditions direct policy toward openness, pluralism, internationalism, and universalism. The controversy over the problem of control vs. autonomy will continue, not so much because of the arguments put forward but rather because of the extent and scope of autonomy accorded to individual institutions in particular time periods. Political variables and bureaucratic attitudinal changes may well be the critical factors in this regard.

**Equality vs. Excellence**

Because access to higher education has become easier, mass higher education is now well established in Korea, although there are those who dream of the good old days when an elite group with less heterogeneity was characteristic of the student body. Easier access has meant expanding equality of educational opportunity along existing gender, regional, and social class lines. It also has meant that the student population is becoming more heterogeneous in terms of family background, attitudes, interests, and capacity for learning. The national trend has been toward improving the opportunity for attending higher education, teaching-learning conditions, and employment opportunities, but it will take some time for full equality of opportunity to occur (Kim, 1982). Korea has, however,
made remarkable progress toward greater equality as far as access to higher education is concerned, primarily due to rapid expansion of the higher education population, the eagerness of families and students to pursue higher learning, and concerted government policy efforts directed toward greater equality and balance.

As the college/university population increased, the issue of maintaining excellence also arose, generating such questions as: In the context of Korean national development, what is the optimal number for the higher education population, balancing social demands and national needs? Is the present size of the higher education population too large, optimal, or too small? Does mass provision of higher education necessarily involve lowering its quality? If so, what are the proper measures for preventing lowering of standards? What specific tasks lie ahead if excellence is to be maintained against the background of expansion?

Those who believe the higher education population is too large seem to insist that: (1) because of drastic increases in enrollment, it is inevitable that the quality of higher education must suffer due to poorer conditions for learning (e.g., higher student/teacher ratios, overcrowded classes, lack of facilities); (2) the future prospect for employment is by no means bright, with the increase in enrollments far surpassing the increase in job opportunities, thus creating the possibility of producing an “unemployed intelligentsia”; and (3) when some advanced nations are reducing or nearly stopping the growth of their higher education population, it may be a mistake for Korea, a latecomer society, to continue expanding higher education, very possibly at the cost of excellence.

Conformity vs. Diversity

In the Korean system of higher education it is somewhat ironic that while institutions are characteristically diverse in terms of programmatic emphasis, policy making and administrative patterns tend to be characterized by conformity. In other words, diverse institutions with so many different factors and conditions tend to be treated uniformly. Historically, this has been due to highly centralized bureaucratic and legalistic control leading to a resultant lack of institutional autonomy. Individual institutions tend to rely on the Ministry of Education for guidance on institutional policies and work within a tradition of docility. Although diversity in historical roots, size, constitution of the faculty and the student body, surrounding social milieu, prestige, and social reputation are factors that cannot be changed in a day, conformity in policy and administration is something transitory and changeable.
From a general government perspective, some of the merits of conformity are that: (1) it makes it easy to administer and supervise so many institutions; (2) it tends to promote centralized control, which is justified by the bureaucratic system of administration; (3) it can help certain below-standard institutions raise their standards; (4) it coincides with tradition and can be continued without conspicuous resistance on the part of individual institutions; and (5) it is convenient for the Ministry of Education to apply a legalistic approach to policy making, planning, and managing higher education. Despite providing administrative ease and convenience, conformity also has drawbacks: (1) it tends to suppress creativity and innovation on the part of individual institutions; (2) it tends to choke autonomy, the long-cherished and forward-looking ideal of higher education; (3) uniform policy tends to be inappropriate to the circumstances where diverse conditions of individual institutions prevail, lacking flexibility and adaptability; (4) it tends to develop formalism in higher education; and (5) it tends to bureaucratize higher education institutions, contrary to their essential nature and functions.

Korea is moving slowly toward becoming a more open, international, and universalistic society in which traditional conformity may not be appropriate. In pursuit of excellence, it may be increasingly necessary to make distinctions and discriminate among priorities, allowing those institutions with a capability for autonomy and self-reliance to be kept as free as possible from unnecessary government constraints and interference.

Liberalism vs. Vocationalism

The tension between liberalism and vocationalism in Korean higher education has been controversial for some time. For instance, a special report sponsored by the Central Educational Research Institute favored the liberal tradition by advocating an increase in the share of college curricula devoted to general education (Lee, Y., 1967). In the curriculum of the specialized vocational colleges, implemented since 1974, the general education program was weakened while the vocational program was greatly strengthened.

Those who favor liberalism in Korean higher education curricula tend to believe that: (1) the basic objective of a college is to produce a liberal, free, and creative person and to cater to the need for individual self-realization; (2) the long tradition of human history shows that liberalism is a permanent phase of college education; and (3) a truly educated person under the liberal tradition will be able to adjust easily to the changing needs of society, including vocational preparation.
On the other hand, those who advocate the importance of vocational preparation claim that school and college curricula should be more directly linked to vocational skills, because: (1) educational institutions should prepare students for the reality of life, the main goal of which is employment; (2) the long tradition of humanistic liberalism did more harm than good to the national life of the Korean people, which now should be corrected; and (3) in order to cope with new demands in an era of scientific and technological revolution, vocational as well as scientific-technological education are essential. Government promotion of vocational education has long been a priority for policy making since the early 1950s, in conjunction with a series of economic development plans. Over the years, however, Korean students continue to favor what they perceive to be the higher status, non-vocationally oriented programs in higher education institutions. This has occurred despite government intervention based on national staffing plans. The struggle between the liberal and vocational traditions is likely to continue in the years to come, exercising a significant influence on higher education policy.

**Specificity vs. Universalism**

Higher education institutions grew out of a medieval university notion of universalism over and above nation and class. As modern states emerged, however, higher education became subject to an ethos and to legislative and administrative controls determined by the environmental conditions of the time and nation in which they existed. In some countries, this original universality was zealously guarded along with the idea of autonomy; in others, however, national educational institutions were gradually modified to cultivate and shape national identity, traditions, and cultures.

Because knowledge and skills developed through the academic disciplines apply beyond national boundaries, universities still conserve universalistic traditions of what is taught and studied as well who the students should be and how the products, whether human resources or knowledge explored and created, should be utilized. In many developing nations, however, there exists a tendency to strengthen the sense of national identity by glorifying what are perceived to be the traditional values of that particular nation. In the course of development and modernization, cultivating national self-identity can be considered (especially by politicians) an important function of higher education institutions. Thus, the problem of specificity vs. universalism is by no means an abstract philosophical question detached from the reality of university life. It is
related to such day-to-day problems as curriculum, admission of students, faculty quality, and faculty research. Korean higher education is facing a transitional period, shifting from a traditional emphasis on national identity, leaning toward specificity, to gradually realizing that the challenges of a new era that is open and international must be met.

Social Demand vs. Human Resources Demand

In planning for higher education, the social demand approach stipulates that the availability of fields of study and types of institutions should be based on the individual aspirations and interests of students. The human resources demand approach is based on the belief that enrollment in higher education institutions should reflect projected staffing needs in each economic sector. Consequently, planning in higher education should be closely linked to staffing needs in a targeted period in order not to waste trained high-level personnel and to ensure nearly full employment.

The merits of the social demand approach are: (1) it is relatively easy to measure student interest in various fields, (2) it is not vulnerable to political pressure because it focuses on those who aspire to go to college, and (3) at least in the short-term, it is more acceptable to society, thereby leaving less leeway for social controversy. The social demand approach also has drawbacks: (1) it is likely to increase the financial burden of the government because of the need to accommodate short-term shifts in students’ interests, (2) it does not always correspond with societal needs for graduates in fields needed for national development, with the accompanying danger of creating shortages in certain critical areas and oversupply in others, and (3) in the long run, there could be a problem with unemployed intelligentsia.

The human resources demand approach, in turn, has its own pluses and minuses. The major merits are: (1) owing to coordination between economic and educational development, assuming that planning is effective, there is little waste of high-level personnel; (2) educational development plans are likely to be supported more effectively by the governmental financial authorities concerned; and (3) if full employment is realized, it will reduce political instability and unrest. Difficulties with this approach include: (1) there is no direct match between higher education and employment except for a few professions (e.g., medicine and teaching); (2) staffing needs can change rapidly due to unforeseen economic, political, and social change; and (3) technically, it is very difficult to forecast staffing needs with great precision.
In Korea, as elsewhere, there was a time when the human resources demand approach was emphasized. Few countries in the world, however, apply it strictly in actual planning, especially given the now well-known failures of this approach in former socialist bloc countries. It remains a difficult task for Korean higher education to find an optimal point harmonizing these two different approaches. Considering demand based on individual economic returns or using international comparisons may supplement these two more traditional approaches.

**Implications for Management of Korean Higher Education**

In the highly centralized Korean higher education context, government policies direct the management of higher education, both internal and external. Consequently, any changes in government higher education policies will affect management. As has been suggested, resolution of long-standing controversies over higher education policies is in flux and depends on diverse influences such as the values of the top-level political decision makers, public opinion about the professions, financial feasibility, and the absorptive power of the national labor market for high-level personnel. Nevertheless, there continues to be a strong consensus among Koreans on the extremely important social and economic significance of higher education.

This means that, for the foreseeable future, demand for higher education will continue to outstrip supply, leading to continuing policy debate about expansion of the Korean higher education system. The current economic crisis will certainly affect the capacity of the government to fund any expansion. Relying on the private sector to accommodate the excess demand will require systematic regulation to ensure the maintenance of a high level of quality as enrollment expands.

With Korean higher education institutions becoming increasingly autonomous, they can no longer rely on the government to direct their operations. Consequently, higher education institutions will have to: engage in strategic planning activities; maintain institutional planning offices to deal with medium-and long-range development; engage in periodic evaluation of institutional operations, for both external authorities such as accreditation agencies and internal assessments; and provide orientation or in-service training courses for the administrative staff. Student guidance centers, including special advisory functions for foreign students, have become a necessity.
In the changing climate for higher education in Korea, the leadership of the university president is becoming increasingly important. Typically, a university community of scholars tends to reject the bureaucratic style of management, functioning in ways that have been characterized as organized anarchy. Faculty, students, and administrators all have their own power bases that are not always congruent with one another. Reaching consensus in the decision-making process is often a prolonged and sometimes ineffective exercise. Presidents will have to take an increasingly important mediating role as the power and influence of faculty and students grows. Even though modes of faculty consultation and student participation vary widely from institution to institution, it seems inevitable that broader participation will occur in Korean higher education.

The higher education curriculum must be sufficiently flexible to meet the individual needs of a more heterogeneous student population as well as the economic and social needs of the country. Promotion of science and technology has long been a priority in planning higher education, despite the age-old tradition of emphasizing the humanities and social sciences. Today, such fields of study as electronics, genetic engineering, and medicine are drawing the brightest students, along with law, economics, and business administration. Development of curriculum, as well as of new instructional materials and methodology, is drawing greater attention, involving a wide range of specialists and requiring greater administrative support. The whole process naturally must involve change in management patterns, including interuniversity cooperation.

Government support to private higher education institutions is drawing increasing interest, especially now that the private sector accommodates two-thirds of the total student population. Measures are needed to ensure that private higher education institutions maintain programs and facilities of good quality. Increasing government support to private higher education may, however, affect management of private higher education institutions, quite possibly reducing institutional autonomy in the name of accountability and/or public interest.

Some universities in Korea are now beginning to turn to a more universalistic and international orientation, not only in terms of programs but also in terms of management style and methodology. Admissions are opening to foreign students; exchange of personnel, information, and resources information is increasing; and use of modern technological tools and techniques, including wider application of computers, is becoming more prevalent. Some universities are attempting to emulate the advanced universities of the world, not only in their organization and operation, but
also in their capacity to adapt and cope with changing conditions. There continues, however, to be a well-recognized hierarchy of institutions in terms of the quality of students and faculty, achievements and employment, and institutional reputation and prestige. Because so many higher education institutions in Korea are lagging far behind the very best ones, broadly based and systemwide improvement will remain a formidable task for some time to come.
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One of the hottest issues in Korean higher education is admissions policy, particularly as it relates to the national entrance examination system. Korea does not have a rigorous screening process for prospective students until the stage when Korean students have to pass the university entrance examination to gain admission to colleges and universities. High school students compete with one another intensely for admission into the prestigious universities, because they believe this is the best path to a successful career. An “entrance examination industry” has emerged to provide students with additional preparation for taking the national tests (Kim, J.-C., 1992, p. 93; Kwyon, 1992, pp. 75–89). Many companies have become prosperous by producing books, test materials, monthly or weekly magazines, computer disks, and audio tapes on these exams. There are also many private academies preparing students for the university entrance examination.

The university admissions system has, in fact, shaped extensively the Korean secondary school system as well as the society at large. This chapter describes how the Korean educational system is structured with respect to university admission. It reviews the features of the Korean university admissions system and examines how this system shapes secondary education. Using data gathered from a representative group of five four-year higher education institutions, it analyzes how government policy relating to the university admissions system has affected these schools and discusses implications for the future of the Korean higher education system.
THE STUDENT SELECTION SYSTEM IN KOREAN EDUCATION

The Korean educational system had a rigorous selection mechanism at the lower levels until the 1960s. However, this selection function became ineffective because of the growth of the student population. In the late 1960s, students in Korean primary schools utilized private tutoring because of the tight competition for admission to highly regarded junior high schools. To alleviate the competitive climate of primary education, the government adopted the No Entrance Examination System for Junior High School Admission in 1969. Without an entrance examination at this level, competition among students was pushed to the next level with the introduction of a high school entrance examination. To deal with the problem of intensified competition for entrance to secondary school, the Lottery and Allocation System for Screening of High School Students was launched in 1974. These are but two examples of how a series of such policies for advancement at the lower levels of education in Korea affected the higher education admissions system, beginning in the mid-1970s.

The Korean government initiated an educational reform in 1980 that included admission and graduation quota systems for higher education. The government had been controlling admission quotas since the 1960s, but in order to increase opportunities for higher education, the quota policy was relaxed for admission but applied to graduation in 1980. Consequently, competition intensified within higher education institutions because more students were admitted than were allowed to graduate under the government quotas. In 1998, however, the government succumbed to public pressure and changed the policy back to its former status as an admissions quota.

Despite adopting an expansion policy for higher education, the supply of higher education opportunities fell short of the demand, as shown in Table 4.1. In Korea, 65 percent of the total high school graduates in 1990 graduated from general high school (Ministry of Education, 1990), and most of them aspired to advanced education. As a result, problems relating to excess social demand for university admission remained unchanged in the 1990s. In fact, the problem was of such intense national concern that the Korean Society for the Study of Education featured higher education admission in its journal (Han, 1992).
FEATURES OF THE UNIVERSITY ENTRANCE SYSTEM

The Korean university entrance system has undergone many changes since the country’s liberation from Japanese rule in 1945. Initially, each higher education institution used its own test to select students. Each institution decided autonomously on the subjects and timing of the university entrance exam, though there was often consultation with other colleges. There was the perception that individual institutions did not impose the most rigorous standards for admission, thereby lowering the general academic quality of college entrants. Consequently, the government introduced a new system in 1954 in which students had to pass a national Unified Exam in addition to the exam administered by each higher education institution. After one year, this two-stage system was changed back to one based entirely on the exams administered by individual colleges and universities.

In 1962, the government decided that colleges should select students only on the basis of the government’s Qualified Examination for College Admission. A year later, there was a change back to a two-stage system requiring both the government and institutional exams. Under this system, some departments could not attract the number of qualified students needed, so the government again decided that each college could select students based solely on its own test. Under this one-test admission system
in effect from 1964 to 1968, there were again problems with the quality of applicants’ academic preparation and insufficient controls on the number of college entrants. Consequently, the government returned to a two-test system (the national Preliminary Examination and a test administered by each college), following this policy until 1980.

By the end of the 1970s, high school students were again suffering greatly because of heavy competition for gaining college admission. The competition was fueled by several factors such as the gap between the social demand for college education and the actual opportunities available, Koreans’ zeal for higher education, and the hierarchical order among colleges and universities based on reputation and prestige. Moreover, although students could gain good grades with relative ease on the Preliminary Examination (a multiple choice test), they had to prepare thoroughly to gain a high grade on the tests administered by particular institutions. As a result, many high school students’ families paid the substantial expense of private tutoring, and students neglected regular classes in high school.

Considering these problems, the government in 1981 instituted graduation quotas instead of admissions quotas in order to increase opportunities for admission to higher education while also encouraging college students to improve their academic achievement. The government also decided that colleges should select students based on the government’s Scholastic Achievement Test and high school records. Each college had to base admissions decisions on these two indicators and could no longer require its own tests. Students who majored in the arts, music, and athletics were required to have an additional performance test. See Table 4.2 for a summary of the changing system.

In the 1980s there were some changes relating to the number of colleges to which students could apply, additional sources of evidence (e.g., essay tests and interviews), the Scholastic Achievement Test, and application procedures. In 1982, students were permitted to submit two applications, but the multiple applications caused problems for competing schools and/ or departments within schools. In 1983, students were again restricted to a single application. In 1986, an essay test was introduced in order to measure applicants’ higher-order mental abilities such as creativity, reasoning, and writing ability.

In 1988, the government reduced the number of subjects for the Scholastic Achievement Test from seventeen to nine. The essay test was abolished, and colleges were required to utilize an interview test. The Scholastic Achievement Test was modified to include both objective and
subjective items, and renamed the Scholastic Ability Test in order to make it a more accurate indicator of students’ aptitude for the advanced study required by higher education institutions. Colleges could also give some weight to the field of study in which applicants were going to concentrate. Because of the change in application procedures, students applied for college first and took the Scholastic Ability Test later.

In 1992, the government decided that it would develop a new admissions system for implementation in 1994 (Ministry of Education, 1992, pp. 1–5). Under the new system, the individual higher education institutions would decide their own admissions criteria within some limits, including requiring a minimum score from high school records (at least 40 percent of total scores). The high school records score should comprise

Table 4.2. University Entrance System and Its Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Exam by Government</th>
<th>Exam by College</th>
<th>High School Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945–1953</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955–1961</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962–1963</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964–1968</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969–1980</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986–1993</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X(^1)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994(^2)–1996</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X(^3)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)College and universities could utilize an essay test in 1986 and an interview test in 1988.

\(^2\)High school records is a mandatory criterion, but both an exam by government and an exam by college are optional.

\(^3\)Colleges and universities should utilize only an essay test instead of tests in other subjects, including English, mathematics, and Korean.

academic performance (80 percent), attendance (10 percent), and extracurricular activities (10 percent).

Each college could decide on whether it would utilize the Scholastic Ability Test and its own test as admissions criteria. The Scholastic Ability Test itself was revised in 1994, focusing on applicants’ aptitude for university education. The nine subjects on the test were combined into three major fields: Korean language, mathematics and inquiry (science), and foreign language. Each college could also use its own test, but there could not be more than three subjects for the test. Under this new system, most colleges decided to select students by high school records and the Scholastic Ability Test. Some colleges announced that they would utilize their own test as one of the admissions criteria.

In 1995, the government decided that it would again implement changes to the admissions system two years later (Ministry of Education, 1995). The new admissions system, introduced in 1997, allowed colleges to play a bigger role in student selection by utilizing more diverse admissions criteria. Under the new system, private colleges and universities could determine their own admissions system. Colleges and universities could use diverse admissions criteria such as school records, scholastic ability tests, essay tests, and other data. Colleges and universities were to use only essay tests instead of subject tests such as English, mathematics, and Korean language. Colleges and universities were also allowed to admit students who had shown high academic achievements on the Scholastic Ability Test prior to the general period of college admission, as long as their admissions quotas were not exceeded.

In summary, the Korean university admissions system may be characterized as having several main features (Table 4.3). First, it has been changed frequently in such matters as management responsibility (college vs. government), admissions criteria (entrance examinations, high school records, special talents), test format (multiple choice, essay), and application procedure (exam followed by application; application followed by exam). Over the years, the Korean government has tended to take steps that increased its influence on student selection for higher education. However, since the late 1980s, higher education institutions have been recovering autonomy with respect to student selection. High schools have also played an increasingly important role because students’ high school records have been adopted as a criterion for admission.

Second, the Korean university admissions system consistently used an academic achievement test (based on subject matter knowledge)
instead of an academic *aptitude* test (based on more general knowledge and academic skills). Since 1994, however, a Scholastic Ability Test has been used that is designed to measure whether applicants have the academic aptitude required for a college education. Third, the admissions system has emphasized entrance examinations instead of other criteria such as recommendations by high school principals, extracurricular activities, and other contributions. This is based on the assumption that

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Period & Admissions Criteria & Nature of Government’s Exam & Admissions Procedure \\
\hline
1982–1985 & Government’s exam,\(^1\) high school records, performance test (arts, athletics) & Fourteen subjects, Multiple choice & Exam first, apply later \\
\hline
1986–1987 & Government’s exam, high school records, essay test, performance test & Seventeen subjects, Multiple choice & Exam first, apply later \\
\hline
1988–1993 & Government’s exam, high school records, interview test, performance test & Nine subjects, weight system, subjective items, multiple choice & Apply first, exam later \\
\hline
1994–1996 & Government’s exam, high school records, exam by college, performance test & Three major fields, Multiple choice problem, Situation items & Prior admission \\
\hline
1997– & Government’s exam, high school records, exam by college, performance test & Three major fields, Multiple choice problem, Situation items & Prior admission \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\(^{1}\text{In 1981, the government’s higher education admissions examination was called the Preliminary Examination. The name of this examination was changed to the College Scholastic Achievement Test in 1982 and to the College Scholastic Ability Test in 1995.}\)


the examination is a reliable, objective measurement of academic excellence. The admissions system did not utilize high school records, essay tests, or the relative weight assigned to a subject area of concentration until the 1980s. Because the move from high school to college is so competitive, Korean society does not accept willingly admissions criteria requiring the use of more “subjective” criteria than scores on the national examinations.

In the 1990s, scholars who had found private colleges in financial difficulty argued that a small number of students in each institution should be admitted based on their financial contribution to the institution. Admission by financial contribution is a controversial issue among scholars, college administrators, government officials, college students, and parents (Park, H., 1992, pp. 1–8; Kim, S.-B., 1992, pp. 9–21). In 1992, the Minister of Athletics and Youth proposed that extracurricular activities (including sports and physical training) should be recognized as college admissions criteria, but this proposal was not accepted as a formal government policy. It seems that the majority of Koreans still support what they believe to be an objective merit system based on students’ scores on national tests.

Fourth, the selection policy has been affected considerably by sociopolitical change. Because Korean parents have such a strong desire for their children to obtain a university education, issues relating to admissions policy easily attract public concern through the mass media. This puts legislators and policy makers under pressure to address public concerns by trying to reform the university admissions system, a complicated endeavor. Fifth, selection has affected students at lower levels of the educational system. A serious problem in urban secondary schools has been the great attention paid to preparing students for the national university entrance examination, often to the detriment of subject area instruction.

UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS SYSTEM AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

In 1980, the government initiated several reform policies relating to the university admissions system in order to normalize secondary education. The government required that colleges and universities utilize high school records as one of the admissions criteria, thus giving secondary schools a significant role in university student selection. The government also ruled that high school students could not have private tutoring.
Instead, high school students were encouraged to attend supplementary classes offered through television and after-school programs. The government’s enrollment policy, which relaxed admissions quotas while introducing a graduation quota system, resulted in a substantial increase in college entrants. For secondary education, the measures helped alleviate the high pressure existing in the early 1980s with respect to preparation for the university entrance examination. Of course, this just shifted the pressure to the next higher level because graduation quotas prevented all who were admitted to higher education from qualifying for graduation.

In 1990, the government was forced to increase the autonomy of higher education institutions. High school students were again allowed to use private tutoring, and the graduation quota policy was abolished, reverting to an admissions quota policy only. Individual higher education institutions could decide whether they would require their own entrance examination. Under this policy shift, secondary schools were again subject to the strong influence of the university admissions system (Han, 1992, pp. 41–49), resulting in the following problems:

1. General high schools teach a large number of subjects, usually twenty-six or twenty-seven. Students have to learn from nineteen to twenty-two subjects per term, which means they often learn in a superficial way. Moreover, high schools often either emphasize or neglect subjects according to whether the subject is included in the university entrance examination (Han, 1992, p. 44; Kang et al., 1990, pp. 137–138).

2. Teachers coach students by cramming in fragmented information instead of really educating them. In spite of students’ different levels of academic preparation, teachers tend to utilize uniform, lecture-oriented, test-oriented instruction (Kang et al., 1990, p. 148; Park, B., et al., 1991, pp. 94–95). Teachers in charge of seniors play the role of drill sergeants.

3. Students’ learning is assessed primarily by their academic performance on the standardized higher education admissions tests. Seniors in many high schools take a monthly test to prepare for the entrance examination. In addition, they take a variety of mock entrance examinations administered by commercial companies. The results are evaluated against a large database, which provides students with indications of their academic performance compared with other students.
4. After regular classes, many students remain after school to take supplementary classes and independent study to prepare for the university entrance examination. This means that many high school students spend from eleven to fourteen hours a day at school (Han, 1992, p. 48; Park, B., et al., 1991, pp. 148–157).

5. Student life in school is focused on preparation for university entrance. High schools do not encourage club activities, and high school students as well as teachers reported that extracurricular activities are neglected because of the pressure to prepare academically for university entrance examinations (Kang et al., 1990, pp. 152–153).

6. There is no proper career guidance for students in secondary schools. Students have to understand their own interests, aptitudes, and abilities as a basis for tentative career choices, but the only career guidance is for postsecondary education. Guidance programs in high schools focus on helping students to make reliable estimates of their chances for success in a particular higher education institution, with the result that most secondary students choose advanced education instead of job opportunities. Moreover, even those who do not enter a higher education institution aspire to one (Kang et al., 1991, pp. 92–93).

7. A large number of secondary school students take preparatory courses and hire private tutors for remedial work or cramming purposes. Students with private tutors have relatively higher academic achievements than those who just take preparatory courses (Kang et al., 1990, p. 181).

The foregoing suggests that secondary education is dominated by the college entrance examination, a situation that may make some positive contributions to Korean education. In particular, it may contribute to the academic achievement level of college entrants and also help some high school students build character through hard work. However, the more usual assertion is that the university admissions system affects secondary education in a negative way (Kim, J.-C., 1992, p. 91).

GRADUATION QUOTA POLICY IN THE 1980s AND ITS IMPACT ON COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

In 1980, the Korean government changed the enrollment policy for all higher educational institutions from one based on an admission quota system to
one based on a graduation quota system. Although the goal of the former policy controlled the number of students entering each college or university, the latter controlled the number graduating. The new policy was designed to expand opportunities for higher education and also to foster a more studious atmosphere on campuses. The policy required all higher education institutions to expand admission substantially while instituting graduation quotas, thus requiring that “excess” students be dismissed before they graduated.

Even though the Ministry of Education prepared the implementation of the graduation quota system in consultation with scholars and university administrators, the policy faced considerable opposition (Joo, 1990). Following complaints about the policy, including student demonstrations against enforced dismissals, the government instituted relief measures (Kim & Kang, 1984; Kang et al., 1986). Based on recommendations from the presidential commission and the Office of the President, the graduation quota system was withdrawn and the admission quota system was reinstated in 1988.

While the graduation quota policy was in effect, colleges and universities were significantly influenced in terms of student population and educational climate, academic standards, students’ campus life, student movements, job prospects for college graduates, and the attitudes of the faculty and administration. Implementation outcomes at colleges and universities differed slightly, primarily because of each school’s unique situation, tradition and culture, and relationship with the Ministry of Education. In general, however, institutions across the full spectrum of the Korean higher education system experienced similar events and phenomena. To examine how the policy influenced individual colleges and universities, five higher education institutions representing the full range of types in Korea were selected for study: Old (private, coeducational, prestigious); Western (private, women’s, prestigious); South (national, coeducational, prestigious); Eastern (private, coeducational, less prestigious); Young (private, women’s, less prestigious). Names given to institutions are pseudonyms (Joo, 1990). Data collected from multiple sources were analyzed, primarily utilizing qualitative methodology (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Miles & Huberman, 1984; Patton, 1980).

**ENROLLMENT CHANGE AND EDUCATIONAL CLIMATE**

The student population in all five schools expanded rapidly. Each school’s undergraduate enrollment increased by at least 60 percent, while four schools (O, W, E, Y) doubled their enrollment over five years. Even after the policy
had been changed, three schools (O, E, Y) maintained expanded enrollments, and two schools (W, S) slightly reduced enrollments. In particular, Old and Eastern Universities built second campuses in the provinces. In 1988, Eastern’s student enrollment was triple what it had been in 1980. Student enrollments in these schools did not all expand at equally high levels, but all did increase compared with 1980 figures. Efforts to improve the educational climate of these higher education institutions by increasing the number of faculty members and improving physical facilities could not keep up with the rapid increase in students. Consequently, the overall quality of education in all five universities deteriorated.

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND STUDENT DISMISSALS

As the policy was altered, the academic standards of the five schools also changed. This led individual schools to revise internal regulations many times. The five schools had academic standards of differing quality before the graduation quota system was adopted (e.g., South and Old Universities had higher academic standards than those of Eastern and Young). After the policy was adopted, all five schools strengthened their academic standards, but as time went on, the criteria were lowered. When the policy was changed in 1986, the academic standards of all five schools were even lower than before 1980. Owing to the strengthened academic standards at the beginning of the new graduation quota system, large numbers of students were dismissed from all higher education institutions where the policy was in effect. A fair number of students were dismissed directly by the Process Dismissal regulation, but many students were dismissed on the basis of academic standards (Table 4.4).

Among the five institutions in this study, South University dismissed a particularly large number of students because its high academic standards as a prestigious institution were reinforced by the graduation quota system. Western and Young Women’s Universities also dismissed a fair number of students, because women’s institutions normally had lower attrition rates than other types. Western Women’s University had an especially low attrition rate, which led to a larger number of academic dismissals (Table 4.5).

CAMPUS LIFE

Owing to more rigorous academic standards, the new norm-based evaluation criteria, and the graduation quota system, students paid more
Table 4.4. Student Dismissals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Dismissal</th>
<th>Non-Registration</th>
<th>Academic Dismissal</th>
<th>Process Dismissal</th>
<th>Student Movement</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>20,841</td>
<td>15,071</td>
<td>4,285</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>20,661</td>
<td>15,253</td>
<td>5,088</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>22,741</td>
<td>17,471</td>
<td>4,849</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>25,523</td>
<td>19,415</td>
<td>5,523</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>21,957</td>
<td>17,780</td>
<td>3,679</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1The total number of student dismissals was 10,816 in 1980, 14,493 in 1981, and 28, 494 in 1982.
2Includes dismissal by regulations such as the repetition clause and because of unethical behavior.

Table 4.5. Number of Academic Dismissals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Western Women’s University</th>
<th>South University</th>
<th>Young Women’s University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>—1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Statistics are not available.
Data Sources: Western University: Institutional newsletters, 1980–1988; South University: Registry Office; Young Women’s University: Registry Office.
attention to formal course work. Predictably, students’ involvement in extracurricular activities decreased. Competition among students was particularly severe in the more popular departments in the women’s or prestigious schools. Western Women’s University students were especially affected because they had been accustomed to little competition and a very low natural attrition rate. Students at Young Women’s University were also affected somewhat, because it also had a low attrition rate as a women’s institution. Students in popular departments or women-dominated departments from South and Old Universities were also influenced considerably. Students at Eastern University were the least affected, although there, too, women-dominated and popular medically related departments were affected. Students’ increased attention to formal course work resulted in a studious atmosphere on the campuses in the short term. But there were also negative impacts such as the students’ focusing more on grades than on learning and experiencing greater stress due to excessive competition.

STUDENT PROTEST MOVEMENTS

Immediately after the graduation quota system was introduced, student movements at the five schools decreased considerably, primarily because of political restrictions on higher education campuses. Compared with previous years, there were fewer student protests and larger numbers of students attending classes. However, students began to demand the abolition of the policy in 1983. Protests at the five schools increased dramatically in 1984, as students were allowed to organize self-governing associations in response to the government’s new campus policies. The graduation quota system contributed to a reduction of student movements for its first two years, but it fueled student movements after that.

COLLEGE GRADUATES’ JOBS

After 1984, the number of college graduates increased annually, which led to high competition for jobs. Graduates from non-prestigious institutions or women’s institutions had particular difficulty in getting jobs, because they were at the end of the line. In contrast, male South University graduates who majored in popular fields of study such as business management worried less about getting jobs than did graduates from other fields of study or from any of the other four universities.
IMPACT ON THE FACULTY

The faculty members at the five schools were also affected by the policy. They had to adapt teaching and evaluation methods to the new situation. Faculty faced difficulty in grading students, and students were more removed from contact with the faculty because of increased student numbers. Faculty members could not advise students properly. In particular, the faculty of those universities that experienced the most rapid increase in numbers along with low attrition rates faced greater problems, including enforced dismissals of students (Josun Daily News, 1982, February: 23; Josun Weekly, 1982, September: 5).

FINANCIAL CONDITION

The policy did not have much effect on the financial condition of South University, which is largely supported by the government. However, the other four private schools benefited financially from the increased student population. The private institutions could thus invest in physical improvements as well as faculty recruitment.

In sum, the five schools in this study show very similar patterns on four of the eight policy ramifications studies. As shown in Table 4.6, all five schools experienced similar consequences in terms of declining educational quality due to enrollment increase. In the short term, academic standards were raised, and student protest movements decreased. Later, however, academic standards were lowered, and student movements again emerged. The impact on student life and the faculty was moderate in Eastern University but high in the other four universities. The impact on employment was moderate for South University graduates and high for graduates from the other four schools. The financial impact was low in South University but high at the other four schools.

In 1980, policy makers established several goals for educational reform, including solutions to widespread private tutoring, repeaters, student protest movements, and private institutions’ misuse of their finances (Committee on Emergency Measures for National Security, 1980). The specific measures adopted were tailored to problems in the higher education institutions: to reduce the number of repeaters, opportunities in higher education were expanded; to solve problems of widespread private tutoring, the ban on private tutoring was enforced; and to control student movements and upgrade educational quality, the general graduation quota system was adopted. However, improving educational quality
also depended on such factors as the faculty, teaching methods, curriculum, and physical facilities. Instead of improving the educational conditions of individual schools, policy makers focused on controlling student movements.

Student movements were closely related to sociopolitical problems, but policy makers failed to deal with macro issues. Moreover, from the perspective of those students who saw the problem as a failure in social justice and who wanted to change the existing institutions and policies, identifying a small policy target was a mistake. To promote a studious atmosphere, policy makers tried to regulate the number of graduates, but controlling students by a uniform quota of graduates was not desirable, as the goal of education is to foster students’ potential through learning.

In short, the policy did not achieve its original goals, although in the short term the policy seemed to contribute to the reduction of the number of repeaters trying to gain admission to colleges and the promotion of a more studious atmosphere (Song, K., 1988, pp. 133–135). Moreover, colleges and universities did not have educational conditions conducive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Dimension</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>Western</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Eastern</th>
<th>Young</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enrollment Increase(^1)</td>
<td>Double</td>
<td>70 percent</td>
<td>50 percent</td>
<td>Triple</td>
<td>Double</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Educational Condition</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Academic Standards(^2)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Impact on Student Life</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Movements(^3)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Impact on Faculty</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Impact on Jobs</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Financial Benefit</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Student enrollment in 1980 is compared with that in 1988.
\(^2\)Before the policy, there were differing academic standards, but the policy prompted schools to raise their standards. By the time the policy changed again in 1986, the schools’ academic standards had fallen.
\(^3\)During the initial years, student movements were considerably reduced, but these movements at the five schools increased after the policy changed.

Source: Joo, 1990.
to new policy adoption. Owing to the expansion of the student population, the educational climates in higher education seemed to decline greatly in educational quality. Finally, a large number of students were dismissed from the institutions and suffered both psychologically and physically, calling policy makers’ and implementers’ attention to the moral consequences of the graduation quota system.

WHERE IS THE UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS SYSTEM GOING?

The university entrance examination and admissions policy have affected Korean society considerably (Song, B., 1992, pp. 19–30), and the university admissions system has been under the influence of sociopolitical, cultural, and educational forces. Consequently, the Korean university entrance examination and admissions policy have been changed often. It could be said that Koreans have tried almost all of the existing admissions policies in the world.

Koreans are still exploring student selection systems relevant to their society. It is expected that the university admissions system will be transformed in the following directions (Han et al., 1991, pp. 18–72; Kim, J.-C., 1992, p. 94; Advisory Council on Educational Policy, 1991, pp. 97–99):

1. Competition for university admission will be lessened. Owing to the present low birthrate, the student population at the primary school level is already decreasing, as is the student population in secondary schools. The government is planning to reduce the number of general high schools, while increasing the number of vocational high schools. Most vocational high school graduates are expected to get jobs after graduation instead of continuing on to advanced education. Although the social demand for higher education might be reduced, opportunities for colleges and universities will be steadily increased. Consequently, the competition for university admission is expected to be reduced.

2. Colleges will exercise more autonomy in student selection. Colleges will decide admissions criteria within some limits and are expected to play a bigger role in student selection. Colleges and universities will adopt diverse admissions criteria such as extracurricular activities, recommendation letters from high school principals, and financial contributions.
3. The university entrance examination will be a more comprehensive test. Since 1994, the Scholastic Ability Test has been used to measure whether college applicants are prepared for higher education. The government test still emphasizes academic performance rather than the aptitude for study. An aptitude test will be used as a supplementary measure to help predict long-term performance.

4. Secondary education will be less affected by the university admissions system. Secondary school students will be relieved of the high pressure resulting from preparation for the university entrance examination.

5. An admissions quota for colleges and universities will be regulated by the government in the short run. The government’s enrollment policy will be replaced by an accrediting system in the long run.
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This chapter addresses two aspects of Korean higher education in which there are continuing controversies over the role of the government in regulating and controlling the system: financial aid to private institutions and the faculty appointment and tenure system. The historical backgrounds of the debates on each of these issues are presented and placed in national and international context. Each section concludes with suggestions for reforms that might be initiated in order to alleviate some of the problems that are identified.

GOVERNMENT AID TO PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION

Before 1989, there were no direct government grants to private universities. In 1990, the Korean government promised financial aid to private universities and colleges, including a five-year commitment to increase grants by up to 10 percent of private institutions’ total operating expenses (Dong-Ah Daily News, 23 August 1990). Although the 10 percent goal was not reached, by 1994 government aid had reached 2.4 percent. This chapter addresses the rationale and purposes of government grants for private higher education institutions, the amount of these grants, and their distribution across institutions. Comparisons are also drawn between private and public institutions, in the context of Korean society and higher education tradition.

Although the amount of government subsidy for private institutions is an important policy issue, this is a political as well as an economic concern. Consequently, no recommendations are made about what the
amount of government grants should be, nor is the problem of resource allocation among the various education levels (e.g., primary, secondary, and tertiary) considered. The intent is to provide insight for future policy discussions with regard to Korean government funding of the private education sector.

The Role and Financial Situation of Private Universities and Colleges in Korea

Table 5.1 illustrates the rapid enrollment growth of Korean private higher education institutions and shows that, by 1997, private institutions enrolled more than two-thirds of all higher education students in Korea. The income structure of Korean higher education institutions is shown in Table 5.2. Private institutions received approximately 1 percent of government grants, and national institutions received about 50 percent of government grants. Although the Ministry of Education’s statistical yearbooks estimated that 1 percent of governmental grants were given to private institutions, almost no private institutions received government grants directly.

Some defining characteristics of the Korean higher education system can be summarized as follows (Park, 1989, p. 4):

1. The private sector has three-quarters of the total enrollment of students.
2. There are no big differences in the roles of private and public institutions.
3. There is little financial support for the private institutions.

Table 5.1. Number of Enrolled Students in Higher Education (1955–1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (A)</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>141.6</td>
<td>238.7</td>
<td>602.0</td>
<td>1,277.8</td>
<td>2,343.9</td>
<td>2,792.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/Public</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>157.8</td>
<td>303.9</td>
<td>759.0</td>
<td>871.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (B)</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>168.9</td>
<td>444.2</td>
<td>973.9</td>
<td>1,584.9</td>
<td>1,921.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B/A) Percent</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. All higher education institutions are under the control of the Ministry of Education.

5. The ratio of higher education students to the general population is larger than that of many other developed countries, but the conditions in higher education institutions are poor by comparison.

6. Students pay most of their own educational expenses. In private universities and colleges in 1994, 72.8 percent of total income was student tuition, whereas in national institutions, the comparable figure was 36.7 percent.

An important aspect of Korean private higher education has been its rapid expansion, due largely to such factors as an explosion in demand for higher education fueled by Koreans’ traditional enthusiasm for education, the salary differences between high school and college graduates, and the government policy of developing highly qualified people for national economic development (Park, 1989, p. 2). The demand for higher education has always been high, but social and public resources have been unable to meet this demand. Consequently, the government has allowed the establishment of private higher education institutions. Unfortunately, the basic standards for founding this type of institution were so easily attainable that many were formed in a short time. “Except for some private universities that have a long history, most private universities moved their campus from one place to another, and the founders were changed often...most private institutions were in poor condition” (Kim, 1979, p. 57).

### Table 5.2. Income Structure of Korean Universities and Colleges (1986–1988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Private Institutions (Grants)</th>
<th>National Institutions (Grants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>Govern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Agricultural Land Act enacted in 1949 led landowners to use the opening of universities and colleges as a way to keep their land. According to this act, the government could buy all private agricultural lands cheaply and redistribute them to farmers. There were some exceptions in which the government could not force owners to sell their land, such as land on which the government, public organizations, and educational institutions wanted to change usage; land owned by schools, religious bodies, and public welfare organizations; and land used for special purposes such as scientific research (Agricultural Land Act, Article 6). Many large landowners founded private schools or donated the land to schools to avoid being forced to sell their property to the government. At this time, twenty-three universities and colleges were founded in a period of just three years (Lee, C, 1990, p. 42).

Many founders at that time regarded opening schools as a kind of safe investment for profit rather than as a donation of their property to society (Lee, H., 1990, p. 25). Although these new universities and colleges were to be nonprofit institutions, many founders managed these institutions as if they were profit making. Usually the founder of the institution was also chairman of the board of trustees, whose members were relatives of the proprietor. The founder also became president in most private higher education institutions. The government regarded private schools as the property of the founders that was used for educational purposes (Shin, 1990, p. 77). Consequently, private universities in Korea had the mixed characteristics of the nonprofit private and for-profit proprietary institutions in the United States. These private institutions in Korea were called ox-bone towers (instead of ivory towers) from the popular joke that universities and colleges expanded and the founders became rich because parents had to pay their children’s tuition by selling the family’s ox (in traditional Korean agricultural society, the most important and expensive type of cattle).

Rationale for Government Aid to Private Institutions

The issue of whether public funds should be used to support private education raises rather than resolves such fundamental issues of education in a free society as religious divisiveness, socioeconomic isolation, racial integration, equity, and excellence (Gaffney, 1981, pp. 71–72). If a nation does not have enough resources to support private education, a discussion about the rationale for such funding is meaningless. The Korean government regards the relationship between the public and private higher
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education sectors as one of “pragmatic partnership.” Although private universities and colleges enroll more than two-thirds of the students, the first concern of Korean government higher education policy has been the national universities and colleges, leading to what might be called a private institution alienation policy. In Korea, where the central government controls private higher education institutions’ enrollment and governance, the government and private sectors share functions and roles. Even religiously affiliated private institutions and others having their own special goals share a role with the national institutions. Private institutions are an important component of the total system of higher education and, like the state-funded institutions, promote the public good through meeting the high demand and expanding the range of educational opportunities for Koreans. Because government and private institutions complement each other in meeting national needs, private institutions should be considered along with national ones in establishing policies for the allocation of government aid.

A second rationale for government aid to private institutions is to maintain equity with respect to the financial burden for the students attending public and private institutions. The increasing public demand for higher educational opportunities compelled the Korean government to respond. The policy choice selected was to encourage expansion of the private sector by making regulations less restrictive for the establishment of private higher education institutions rather than by providing additional public facilities. A concern with providing educational opportunity most cost effectively was at the heart of the government’s deliberations. However, in encouraging citizens to build private education institutions, the government clearly regarded the schools as private property that happened to be used for education and therefore not eligible for direct financial support. Although all students and their parents pay taxes to the government, only the one-third of the total Korean student population enrolled in national universities and colleges benefits from government financial support.

Under the strong central government regulation that characterized Korea for centuries, higher education institutions were relatively unified and homogeneous. Since 1945, however, as Korean society has become increasingly more democratic and the government system became less centralized, more flexibility and responsiveness to the rapidly changing international society has become necessary. To accommodate both internal and external changes, national governments around the world have been looking to private sector institutions as a means of stimulating more rapid
adaptation. Korean society is no exception, so rather than viewing private education with suspicion and hostility, the government should consider the private sector as an ally for education as a whole, rather than as a competitor with national institutions.

Issues of government policy for providing financial support to private higher education continue to be the subject of political debate in public forums (Gaffney, 1981, pp. 71–72). It is possible, however, to identify the following basic reasons why governments might consider aiding private higher education institutions: extending control by increased regulation of the conditions under which private institutions qualify for aid, increasing the diversity of a national higher education system, increasing the quality of private institutions through improved resources, and expanding access due to excess student demand when expansion of the public sector is not feasible.

Perhaps the most important issue is the extent to which government control would be expanded as a condition for private higher education institutions to qualify for funding. Before 1987, the Korean government regulated private universities strictly, even though no direct financial aid was provided. Now that the Korean government has begun providing financial support to private higher education institutions, it remains to be seen if this will reduce institutional autonomy. To maximize the flexibility and adaptability of private higher education institutions to ongoing social and economic changes, it is desirable to establish mechanisms for increasing institutional autonomy, perhaps by establishing a nongovernmental body to oversee the allocation of government funds. Such a body could assume responsibility for government funding allocations to both public and private sector higher education.

Current government policy is not increasing the diversity of higher education institutions. Even though almost 80 percent of universities and colleges in Korea are private, most do not contribute diversity to the system, but rather focus on trying to become universities. Rather than concentrating on specific areas of specialization, they concentrate on expanding enrollment and emulating more comprehensive universities (Lee, C., 1990). The Korean government could use public funding to encourage diversity by offering incentives for developing particular emphases.

Korean government aid policy for private institutions should also focus on raising the quality of private institutions. This might be achieved by providing funding aimed at specific improvements identified as necessary through an independent assessment and institutional accreditation.
process. At the extreme, this might also include closing private institutions that had little likelihood of meeting standards. Fundamentally, it is necessary to harmonize government funding policies in order to improve the general condition of private higher education institutions and to encourage their diversity.

Methods of Government Aid for Private Higher Education Institutions

Government support for higher education can be classified into four types: financial aid to students, general support grants to institutions, support for specific programs or purposes, and indirect assistance (Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1977, pp. 32–45). With respect to the various approaches to funding, “the strengths and weaknesses are mechanisms employed that themselves reflect public policy decisions and values” (Gaffney, 1981, p. 76), depending on social and economic context as well as the purposes of the government aid.

Grant methods should be chosen that alleviate the burden on state facilities and taxpayers, enable the students to choose their colleges for academic rather than financial criteria, and assist private institutions in attracting new students and solidifying their financial situations (Shulman, 1972, p. 3). According to Shulman, direct assistance to students in the form of academic scholarships, loans, and tuition grants satisfies these criteria and is the most common form of aid to the private higher education sector in the United States. The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1977, pp. 12–13) suggests the following general order of preference among the major alternative programs for state support:

1. Need-based student financial assistance, including measures to encourage the interstate portability of student grants
2. Tuition-offset grants for all students in private institutions
3. Contracts for services, such as operation of a medical school
4. Categorical grants, such as for support of library operations
5. Direct grants to institutions (assuming careful accreditation of institutions, control over quality of degrees awarded, and respect for institutional autonomy)

The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education places need-based student financial assistance first because it facilitates student
access and choice, creates a program that both taxpayers and public institutions can support, and encourages constructive competition among institutions.

But Korean private universities and colleges have a somewhat different situation from other countries. Since 1990, the Korean Council for University Education (KCUE) has been required to allocate government grants for private universities and supplementary government aid to national universities and colleges. According to the KCUE (1990, pp. 79–87), the financing crisis of private higher education institutions in Korea lies in the quality of programs and facilities. Comparing Korean higher education with other countries on such measures (1989 data) as cost per student ($1,850), students per full-time faculty (26.0 in national institutions, 39.4 in private institutions), and library facilities (16.6 volumes per student), the KCUE report found that the condition of Korean higher education did not compare well with that of the other developing and developed countries studied.

Programs of financial aid to students are usually based on need, on merit, or simply on attendance at a particular type of institution (tuition offset grants). Levin and Osman’s (1970) study analyzed the impact that various methods of financing private colleges and universities would have on California’s responsibility to provide higher education to its residents, including: student subsidies, institutional subsidies based on enrollment, a combination of these two methods, and institutional grants for specific purposes. They found that implementation of either student or institutional subsidies would have the same effect on enrollment; a choice, therefore, would have to be made by political or other criteria. The authors pointed out that the state would gain only if the formula restricted aid to those students with demonstrated financial need. In Korea, unrestricted student subsidies could encourage students to choose private institutions regardless of their high tuition. If private higher education institutions were permitted to reduce the legally mandated tuition remission ratio (10 percent of all students must be given tuition support), resources could be released to invest in quality improvement. This type of support could also augment the independence of private institutions because the funds would not be coming directly from the government but rather through student fees.

General support grants for private higher education are most commonly across-the-board grants (usually on the basis of enrollment or numbers of degrees conferred), aid for specified institutions, or aid for specific programs/purposes (Carnegie Council, 1977). While direct government
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grants to institutions can infringe on the autonomy of private universities and colleges, the needs for institutional autonomy must be balanced against the needs of the government for making certain that institutions are accountable for expenditures of public funds.

Support for specific programs and purposes is divided into contracts for services (e.g., operation of a medical school), categorical grants (e.g., support of libraries and laboratories), and awards for construction and renovation of facilities. Since 1990, the Korean government has awarded private higher education institutions categorical grants as well as funds to improve facilities, both of which are expected to improve the quality of private institutions. There is also encouragement for the development of facilities that can be shared by more than one institution.

Indirect assistance for private higher education institutions includes tax breaks and other privileges for the institution (e.g., exemption from property, sales, and excise taxes; the right to issue tax-exempt bonds for construction of new facilities; the right to use eminent domain in condemnation proceedings; and the opportunity to make purchases through a state purchasing agency) and tax concessions for parents and/or donors (Carnegie Council, 1977, p. 33). The government can also contribute indirectly to private higher education through tax exemptions for foundations, businesses, and private individuals making contributions. Compared with private universities and colleges in the United States, Korean private institutions receive very few donations. Among the total income of Korean private universities and colleges, less than 5 percent is provided by private donations. By changing tax policies, the Korean government could stimulate an increase in private donations to both private and public higher education institutions.

Private universities and colleges in Korea provide a wide choice of higher education, have educated almost 70 percent of the total students in higher education, and have also contributed to Korean economic development. Given the important contributions of private higher education institutions, there are no compelling reasons why they should be excluded from receiving government aid in Korea. The rationale for government aid to private higher education institutions can be summarized as follows:

1. The relationship between Korean public and private higher education institutions should be cooperative since the two sectors share basic functions and roles.
2. Private institutions of higher education provide a means of satisfying the excess demand for advanced education in Korea without requiring significant government investment in developing new institutions or expanding existing ones.

3. International society is changing rapidly, and Korean society will need a diverse and flexible higher education system in order to maximize its capacity to cope with changing conditions.

4. Institutional autonomy is essential for enhancing the effectiveness of the entire higher education system.

As the government goes ahead with implementing additional funding for private higher education in Korea, it will be necessary to base policy on systematic consideration of the issues raised in this chapter, adapting approaches to the particular conditions of the country as well as international changes so that government funding can have a significant impact on the quality and cost effectiveness of the entire system.

**FACULTY TENURE**

A second area with considerable public policy and human resource implications is the employment and tenure system in Korean higher education. According to the Korean Educational Public Service Law, no faculty member has tenure. Following an initial appointment, an evaluation is conducted to determine whether the faculty member should be reappointed for another period (professors and associate professors for a six-to ten-year period; assistant professors and full-time instructors for a two-to three-year period). Although the law states that professors’ contracts have to be renewed periodically, the actual appointment system amounts to a kind of permanent tenure system. Once appointed as a full-time faculty member, a professor normally holds the position until reaching retirement. Professors are promoted in rank over the years as long as they meet the promotion criteria, which are not particularly demanding. There is no rigorous, systematic evaluation of faculty by students or by the institution in either public or private sector higher education institutions. Consequently, Korea may be called a paradise for faculty. In fact, a 1990 survey published in *Dong-Ah Daily News* showed that the position of professor topped the list of job preferences by Korean higher education students.

Although Korea has imported many aspects of foreign education systems and policies, most of them have not worked well. Some critics
even suggest that scholars who studied abroad brought home ideas that made the Korean education situation worse, especially if foreign systems or policies were imported without considering the social, political, economic, and cultural context of the country. The following discussion provides a brief historical background of the Korean faculty tenure system and then suggests advantages and disadvantages of several changes that might be considered by national policy makers. In this discussion, tenure, unless qualified by another word or phrase, will mean permanent or indefinite employment status by a higher education institution.

**Evolution of the Korean Faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure System**

Before 1976, every faculty member had tenure. Once appointed to a full-time position, faculty members had no probationary period and could keep their jobs until they reached retirement age. This “all faculty tenure system” originated during the rapid expansion of Korean higher education and the accompanying shortage of qualified faculty after World War II. When Korea was emancipated from Japan’s control in 1945, the demand for higher education increased dramatically, and many institutions were founded within a short period of time. In 1945, Korea had nineteen higher education institutions and 7,819 students. Three years later, in 1948, the number of higher education institutions had jumped to forty-two, and the number of students had increased to 24,000 (Lee, C., 1990, p. 26). Even though this trend continued, very few Koreans had attended institutions of higher education during the Japanese colonial period, and the supply of faculty after the war was limited.

When strongly threatened by students and faculty, the autocratic Korean government formulated a faculty reappointment system in 1975 to control faculty members. Because some faculty members had been criticized for academic laziness, the government took the opportunity to change the system under the slogan of raising the quality of the faculty. On 23 July 1975, the Korean government issued a revised Education Law, Educational Public Officer Law, and Private School Law. Taken together, these laws constitute the legal basis of the faculty reappointment system. Under the old Educational Public Officer Law, all full-time faculty had been reappointed at the ends of their legally designated contract terms. But with this new law, suddenly all faculty in both public and private higher education institutions were subject to periodic evaluation for reappointment, thereby effectively losing their tenure.
The law establishing a Faculty Reappointment Evaluation Committee, adopted on 15 September 1975, stated that each university and college must have such a committee consisting of no more than fifteen associate and full professors appointed by the minister of education. The president of the higher education institution is required to chair this committee. Faculty evaluation criteria are: (1) demonstrating research activity in the professor’s special field during the appointment period, (2) teaching and advising students, and (3) observing laws and maintaining dignity as a faculty member. The Korean government ordered all universities and colleges to evaluate their faculty for reappointment by these criteria in 1976, but only 212 of the 4,260 faculty at national institutions and 104 of the 5,511 faculty at private institutions failed to be reappointed (Korean Federation of Education Associations, 1977–78, p. 117). Hence, in actual practice, reappointment continued to be virtually automatic.

Although the purpose stated for formulating this reappointment system was to improve the quality of the faculty, the hidden purpose was to expel those faculty who expressed antigovernment sentiments. The political nature of this process is suggested by the stipulation in the law that the minister of education was to formally appoint each Faculty Reappointment Evaluation Committee. Evaluation criteria included faculty members’ observance of laws and maintenance of dignity. By controlling committee appointments and using such political criteria for evaluation, the government could expel any faculty members who demonstrated antigovernment sentiments. According to Dong-Ah Weekly News (29 September 1990, p. 5), the government pressured all universities and colleges to expel so-called incompetent faculty, most of whom coincidentally expressed antigovernment views. Most institutions yielded to government pressure and did not reappoint the faculty identified by the Ministry of Education as taking an antigovernment stance. The only exception was the president of Ewha Woman’s University, Okgil Kim, who resisted the government on the premise that the university rather than the Ministry of Education should decide whether professors are incompetent. She refused to expel any of her faculty. The ultimate irony was that even though she was removed from her position, under the subsequent government she was appointed Minister of Education!

Because a primary underlying purpose of this reappointment system was to expel antigovernment faculty, there was no change with regard to faculty tenure. Once faculty received full-time appointments, they were reappointed and promoted, except for the small number of faculty who
expressed views critical of the government (Lee, G., 1989, pp. 8–15; Kang, 1990, p. 39) and a few faculty in private institutions who criticized corruption in their foundations (Kim, 1989, p. 316). More than one hundred Duksung Women’s University students fasted to protest the expulsion of a professor (Saegyae Daily News, 27 October 1990, p. 5), asserting that the reason for his expulsion was to prevent the participation of a “democratic professor” in the university’s governance. But the university claimed that the faculty member was excluded from reappointment through due process and listed as its rationale: (1) his poor service record, (2) his criticism of the university foundation, and (3) his participation in student demonstrations.

The political overtones of this reappointment system had some serious consequences for Korean faculty members. Respect toward professors decreased. Some faculty members were criticized and even terrorized by students for being servants of the autocratic government (“Uh-Yong” professors). Academic freedom was threatened because faculty were no longer permitted to criticize the government. This situation continued until 1987, when the government agreed to the people’s request for democratization and issued a new law, the Six-Two-Nine Declaration, in which the government could no longer order universities and colleges to expel antigovernment professors. In 1990, the Ministry of Education requested that private universities and colleges make their own reappointment system and suggested that they choose one of three proposals: (1) using the reappointment system only for full-time lecturers and assistant professors, (2) using the reappointment system for all faculty members, or (3) abolishing the reappointment system. The Ministry of Education indicated that the new reappointment periods should not be shorter than the old ones (Dong-Ah Daily News, 4 October 1990). In addition, under this new law the tenure systems of private institutions were permitted to be different from those of national institutions.

Korean Faculty Qualification Standards

After the overthrow of the Korean government by a military coup in 1961, the foundation was laid for the current faculty qualification standards. The revolutionary government promulgated the Temporary Exception Law on Education, which states, “Higher education institutions can appoint or promote faculty members only from those who submit their research papers or books to the Faculty Qualification Evaluation Committee and pass the committee’s evaluation” (Article 10). The Ministry of Education
promulgated the Faculty Research Evaluation Rule in November 1961 to support this law. This system was discarded in December 1963 because of strong resistance, but it was reinstated in 1975 under the faculty reappointment system (Kim, 1989, p. 262).

The Education Public Officer Law sets out the minimum standards defining basic qualifications for faculty ranks in both public and private higher education institutions. Table 5.3 summarizes the standards by rank and level of higher education degree (i.e., more years of experience are required for faculty holding junior college degrees, to compensate for their shorter duration of study). At least two research papers and one year of teaching experience (or a total of three research papers or three years of teaching experience) are required for appointment as a full-time lecturer. A lecturer can be promoted to assistant professor in two years, and an assistant professor can be promoted to associate professor in two years if he or she publishes one more paper. The minimum qualification for a professor is four published research papers and six years of teaching experience. Private universities and colleges use the same faculty qualification criteria, but each institution has different promotion criteria based on its financial and organizational status. In national universities and colleges, faculty members are usually promoted if they meet minimum requirements.

### Appointment Procedures

The present appointment system was also started in 1961 under the revolutionary government. It was modified later when the government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>University or Four-Year College Graduates</th>
<th>Junior College Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Years</td>
<td>Teaching Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Lecturer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Research and teaching years are exchangeable.*

*Source: Education Public Officer Law of Korea, 1975.*
authorized the prime minister, rather than university presidents, to appoint faculty members to the national universities and colleges. The government’s aim in this new procedure was to control higher education institutions. National university and college professors and associate professors are proposed by the higher education institution’s president with the agreement of the minister of education and formally appointed by the president of Korea. Assistant professors are proposed by the institution’s president and appointed by the minister of education. Full-time lecturers are appointed by the university or college president with the agreement of the University Personnel Committee. This committee is appointed by the president and consists of the dean of the graduate school, academic affairs provost, student affairs provost, deans, and no more than ten faculty members. The academic affairs provost becomes the chairperson (Education Public Officer Personnel Committee Rule). Before 1987, the university president or the dean had the power to appoint new faculty members; now department faculty members usually exercise this power.

The Private School Law, formulated in 1963, gave the boards of trustees of private higher education institutions the power to appoint faculty members. This system led to allegations that the boards were abusing their power, since one-third of the board members in private higher education institutions can be relatives of the founder (who is usually also the board chairman). In response to these allegations, the power to appoint was given to the university president, but in 1990, the Korean government changed the Private School Law, and the power to appoint was returned to the board of trustees. Although private institutions may also have a faculty personnel committee to deliberate personnel affairs, the board of trustees still has the power to appoint faculty.

**Termination and Appeals of Termination**

The criteria for dismissal of a faculty member are stated in the Education Law and the Private School Law. Dismissal from an institution can occur:

1. when a faculty member has not been able to teach for more than one year because of physical and psychological problems;
2. when a faculty member’s service records show a pattern of inactivity;
3. when a faculty member joins and helps an antigovernment group;
4. when a faculty member participates in political activity or a labor movement;
5. when a faculty member makes an unjust evaluation of a student’s academic record or makes a false statement;
6. when a faculty member’s personality is recognized as wicked;
7. when a faculty member is declared incompetent, quasiincompetent, or bankrupt; or
8. when a faculty member is sentenced to prison.

Korean universities and colleges use the following general criteria for faculty evaluation and reappointment:

1. research and participation in professional societies;
2. teaching and guidance of students; and
3. observance of laws and keeping one’s dignity as a faculty member.

According to the Education Public Officer Law and Education Public Officer Disciplinary Rule, each university and college must have its own disciplinary committee. Disciplinary action and appeals follow strict guidelines prescribed in the Education Public Officer Disciplinary Rule. Disciplinary committees are appointed by the president and comprise assistant, associate, and full professors, with the vice president serving as chair. The decision process requires that the committee must allow the faculty member to state his or her position. A minimum of four committee members must be present at the meeting, which is held in secret. Committee members are not permitted to reveal information obtained during the meeting. Any action taken requires a majority and must be enforced within sixty days after the decision of the disciplinary committee. A faculty member can appeal within twenty days after receiving a disciplinary judgment explanation document.

Private universities and colleges use the same type of disciplinary committee. If a case is appealed, the university or college foundation must organize a retrial committee. The five to nine members of the committee are appointed by the board of trustees and approved by the Ministry of Education. The disciplinary decision must be reported to the Ministry of Education.
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Problems with the System

The reappointment system limits the academic freedom of Korean faculty because the process is controlled by the government. Before 1987, faculty classified as antigovernment were terminated. With few exceptions, professors compromised their beliefs about the autocratic government in order to survive. Machlup (1967, p. 180) observes, “The dismissal of a professor from his post not only prevents him from performing his function in society, but, by intimidating thousands of others and causing them to be satisfied with ‘safe’ subjects and ‘safe’ opinions, it also prevents the entire profession from effectively performing its function.”

A probationary employment system is rare in Korea. Elementary and secondary teachers, for instance, have tenure as soon as they are appointed as new teachers without having to undergo a probationary period. The lack of a probationary period for higher education faculty to earn tenure leads to inflexibility in staffing and discourages professional mobility. A case in point was the situation that occurred in 1981, when the government ordered every university and college to double the number of new students. All institutions needed new faculty and appointed many master’s-degree holders as tenured full-time instructors. In later years, the institutions could not make new appointments from an increasingly highly qualified applicant pool because positions had already been filled.

The combination of a faculty system in which all faculty were effectively tenured at the time of their initial appointment, together with easy promotion criteria, has tended to produce a nonproductive faculty. David Mathews (1969, p. 34), president of the University of Alabama, said that the idea of tenure in America emerges as “the picture of the aspiring professor who, having finally been granted tenure, buries his earlier dedication and begins to look into fishing equipment.” Korean institutions do not have tenure as an incentive for increasing faculty productivity. Thus, many institutions have to live with faculty who have little academic commitment. Finally, new faculty appointment and reappointment procedures are secret, which can lead to a situation in which informal norms such as alma mater, place of birth, and private relationships with other faculty or the board of trustees can be the dominant criteria for appointment.
Reform of the System

The current Korean faculty employment, promotion, and tenure system tends to maintain the status quo by strengthening the conservative characteristics of the faculty, which increases complaints from students and university managers, and perpetuates government restrictions on academic freedom. In order to address these issues, Korean university and college faculty work together to revise the Korean tenure system in both public and private institutions. However, to do this they may need to give up part of their vested rights and focus on improving overall faculty quality and strengthening academic freedom. A new system would feature changes in purpose; a pretenure probationary period; criteria for appointment, promotion, and acquisition of tenure; governing procedures; criteria and procedures for nonreappointment of faculty and termination of tenure; and appeals of nonreappointment procedures, denial of tenure, and termination of tenure (Shaw, 1971, pp. 100–103).

Purposes

Richard Miller (1987, p. 90) asserts that the primary purpose of promotion and tenure decisions should be “assuring students of sound teaching and learning opportunities by providing the most competent professionals.” Service to students should be placed first, in Korea as well as in other countries. A second purpose should be to guarantee academic freedom of the faculty. As Fritz Machlup (1967, pp. 177–209) contends, in order to reserve the public interest in free inquiry and the generation of new ideas, professors need more than constitutional guarantees of free speech and protection from being jailed for expression of their thoughts; they also need protection from arbitrary dismissal. A third purpose should be encouragement to improve the quality of faculty work through feedback from periodic review and evaluation.

Probationary Period

The probationary period offers institutions the opportunity to evaluate a faculty member’s potential prior to the award of tenure and can also provide a buffer for a sudden increased demand for faculty. In the context of Korean society, the use of a probationary period may have harmful effects (e.g., allowing not only evaluation of a faculty member’s academic and teaching ability, but also information on such characteristics as level
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of rebelliousness or contentiousness that could limit academic freedom). In appointing faculty members without a probationary period, administrators normally assessed only academic ability and contacts with faculty or board members. Sometimes the critical views of young faculty members can provide needed perspectives for changing the highly conservative Korean academic society. If, however, the institutions had used a probationary period, young faculty who challenged the status quo would not have been reappointed under an autocratic government. Because the market for Korean faculty is very small, there is a strong possibility that a faculty member who did not get tenure after a probationary period would not get another position because most higher education institutions prefer to hire new Ph.D.s. To survive in this system, young scholars might have to hide their propensities to be critical until they get tenure, or else change their beliefs.

Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Acquisition of Tenure

According to the Korean Faculty Qualification Standards, faculty can now be promoted easily, and there are no big salary and status differences between faculty ranks. Consequently, criteria for promotion should be strengthened, and there should be a bigger salary differential between faculty ranks. Korean universities and colleges should also clarify their criteria in order to prevent the predominant influence of informal norms (e.g., alma mater, place of birth, and private relationships with the department faculty or board of trustees) in faculty appointment and promotion decisions. The criteria for tenure decisions may focus not only on the merit of the instructor’s professional and scholarly contributions and promise, but also on the long-term worth of the instructor to the institution. In this case, clarification of what is meant by “long-term worth” is essential.

Governing Procedures

Procedures governing new faculty appointments, promotion, and acquisition of tenure should be clear and detailed. They must include the specific methods of evaluation and recommendation, and the roles of the department or division chairman, dean of the college or school, the faculty, the president, and the governing board in the process. Although the president or the governing board would continue to make final decisions, it is desirable that department faculty have a say in
making new faculty appointments. For promotion and tenure decisions, Korean universities and colleges can use their personnel committees. To prevent the abuse of the promotion and tenure system, the governing procedure should be clear to every faculty member. If the procedure is not disclosed, academic freedom among Korean faculty may be threatened by the central government or by the foundation supporting the institution.

**Nonreappointment of Faculty and Termination of Tenure**

The present criteria for nonreappointment and dismissal of faculty contain some aspects that threaten academic freedom. Any faculty member can be dismissed if they join a political activity, lead a labor movement, or are evaluated as losing their dignity as a faculty member. Korean universities and colleges should replace such criteria with clear descriptions of specific standards for nonreappointment and termination of tenure, perhaps adding criteria such as moral turpitude, plagiarism, and excessive outside work.

Shaw (1971, p. 103) suggests that the procedures for termination of tenure should cover the following areas: (1) “procedure for informal adjustment and conciliation”; (2) “procedure preliminary to and in preparation for a formal hearing”; (3) “procedure by which the hearing body is constituted”; and (4) “procedure in formal hearing and subsequent procedure relating to decision and appeal.” Even though the Korean Education Public Officer Law and Educational Public Officer Disciplinary Rule describe procedures for nonreappointment and termination of faculty, operational procedures are little more than what the central government or the foundation wants. This is not a system problem but a problem of application. The procedures for appeals should be clear, easily available, and not unduly burdensome to the faculty.
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The tradition of male-only education in Korea began with the establishment of the first school in the year 372 (Tae Hak) and continued well into the Yi dynasty (Chosun era, 1392–1910). Excluded from formal education, Korean women were traditionally educated at home by their mothers in feminine morality and virtue based on Confucian doctrine that strictly limited their roles to the domestic household. After the establishment of friendship treaties with Western nations such as the United States, England, and Russia in the early 1870s, Korean society started to open its doors to Western countries, and the opportunity for higher education was given to Korean women (Kim, Y., 1979; Han, 1996). During that time, with rapid changes in all areas of society, women’s education also changed its mode from the traditional Confucian style to a modern, more Western-oriented one.

The early rationales for women’s education involved a mixture of religious prescriptions, democratic and domestic imperatives, and arguments for socioeconomic utility (Allen, 1990; Rowe & Kim, 1996). With the introduction of Western religions, Korean women started to participate in religious gatherings and public ceremonies, which was quite revolutionary in comparison with how they had been confined to their houses and denied public education during the Chosun period. In spite of a severe suppression against Western religions by the dominant class, religious participation had a great impact on the awakening of Korean women’s self-consciousness.

Along with many changes in the society between 1885 and 1908, forty-nine private, thirty-nine missionary-sponsored, and seven government-
sponsored women-only schools were established in Korea. Although there were many schools established for girls’ formal education, the curriculum and classes in those schools emphasized the traditional teachings for women. For example, the curriculum for girls’ education included several courses and many hours in learning household affairs such as sewing, needlework, knitting, and home management, while the curriculum of boys’ education had none of these activities.

From 1910 to 1945, when Korea was governed by the Japanese empire, the Korean formal education system was essentially reconstructed following more Westernized, Japanese models. During this time, the central focus in Korean women’s education shifted from more equitable access to nationalism, and this provided some opportunity for women to raise their consciousness to the same level as men’s. Unfortunately, the school curriculum remained very much the same, so formal schooling for women during the period of Japanese control also emphasized traditional Confucian virtues and roles for women.

In summary, during Korea’s open-door period the first stage of girls’ formal education was established, with women-only schools providing a crucial stepping-stone toward more equitable access to education for both women and men. It also provided opportunities for women to be educated outside the home and, thus, to become more active participants in society. However, although educational opportunities increased for women, the strong influence of Confucian values still remained in both the school curriculum and in educational practices (Ro et al., 1996).

After World War II, the entire Korean education system was reconstructed, following Western models. The higher education system of Korea, in particular, was restructured using an American model. Since independence from the Japanese, the total number of institutions, female student enrollment, and full-time teachers in all levels of the formal education system have increased greatly. Table 6.1 shows these data and presents the expansion rates of the education system, using 1945 as the base year for all levels except the junior college, for which 1975 is the base year.

Examining the expansion rate of the institution in each level of the education system reveals that the number of higher education institutions at the college/university level increased much more than any other levels of institution between 1945 and 1995 (6.89, as opposed to 2.04, 4.41, and 6.47 for elementary, junior high, and high school, respectively). Female student enrollment also increased dramatically during the past fifty years, an expansion rate of 151.9, which is, by far, the highest among fe-male
student enrollments at all levels of the formal education system. Since the early 1970s, with rapid economic development and growth in Korea, two-year junior colleges started to appear, and their numbers increased rapidly over the next twenty years, from 10 in 1975 to 145 in 1995, and female student enrollment increased from 3,787 to 569,820 (an expansion rate of 150.47) during the same period.

### Table 6.1. Expansion of South Korean Higher Education from 1945 to 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Institution</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Expansion Rate</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Expansion Rate</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Expansion Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,366,024</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>6,367</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2,831,282</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>108,126</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>5,772</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>3,905,163</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>138,369</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. High School</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>609</td>
<td></td>
<td>291,648</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2,026,823</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>46,917</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2,683</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>2,481,848</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>99,931</td>
<td>14.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td>83,514</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>648,149</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>20,415</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>1,246,427</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td>56,411</td>
<td>17.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. College</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>569,820</td>
<td>150.47</td>
<td>10,384</td>
<td>64.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,819</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>208,986</td>
<td>26.73</td>
<td>10,080</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>1,187,735</td>
<td>151.90</td>
<td>45,087</td>
<td>32.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### ENROLLMENT DISTRIBUTION OF WOMEN STUDENTS IN KOREAN HIGHER EDUCATION

As shown in the previous section, the female student population has increased dramatically in Korean higher education institutions since 1945. However, the statistical data show that the actual percentage of female
students making up the student body at colleges changed much less over the years. Table 6.2 shows that the total enrollment of students in the entire South Korean higher education system was 25.2 percent female in 1965. This percentage has been slowly increasing over the years and reached 30.5 percent in 1990, for a total gain of only 5.3 percent.

The data also reveal that the percentage of women in teachers college is always the highest among all types of higher education institutions (42.1 percent in 1965 and 64.5 percent in 1990). This suggests that a strong traditional notion about teaching being a woman’s job has persisted over the years. It is important, however, to note that the percentage of women enrolled in graduate programs has also increased quite a bit over the years, from 7.8 percent in 1965 to 22.5 percent in 1990. For the last twenty-five years, however, the percentage of women in four-year colleges has not increased as much compared with that in other higher education institutions (22.5 percent in 1965 and 28.5 percent in 1990).

The data in Table 6.3 show that the gender ratio of students enrolled in four-year colleges has improved since 1975. However, the female-to-male student ratio remained at .46 in 1995, indicating that there are more than twice as many male as female students on campuses of four-year colleges and universities in Korea. This also strongly indicates that there continues to be a severe underrepresentation of women in four-year higher education institutions.

Table 6.2. Percentage of Female Students by Type of Higher Education Institution and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Junior College</th>
<th>Teachers College</th>
<th>Four-Year College</th>
<th>Graduate School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Table 6.4 reveal that, in 1975, women constituted 61 percent of two-year college student enrollment. This was due to the predominance of traditionally female fields of study in the earliest two-year institutions to be established. However, as the number of two-year institutions increased and the available fields of study expanded, the percentage of women decreased dramatically and then stabilized at just over a third. Even though the percentage of women students has increased since 1975 in both two-year and four-year colleges, the percentage of women in two-year colleges continues to be higher than in four-year colleges.

The data presented in Table 6.4 reveal that, in 1975, women constituted 61 percent of two-year college student enrollment. This was due to the predominance of traditionally female fields of study in the earliest two-year institutions to be established. However, as the number of two-year institutions increased and the available fields of study expanded, the percentage of women decreased dramatically and then stabilized at just over a third. Even though the percentage of women students has increased since 1975 in both two-year and four-year colleges, the percentage of women in two-year colleges continues to be higher than in four-year colleges.

Table 6.3. Enrollment Distribution of Four-Year College Students by Gender and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208,986</td>
<td>402,979</td>
<td>931,884</td>
<td>1,040,166</td>
<td>1,187,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55,439</td>
<td>90,634</td>
<td>250,088</td>
<td>296,129</td>
<td>378,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/M Ratio</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 6.4. Enrollment Distribution of Junior College Students by Gender and Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>151,199</td>
<td>242,114</td>
<td>323,825</td>
<td>569,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>39,883</td>
<td>87,123</td>
<td>119,345</td>
<td>214,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>111,316</td>
<td>233,991</td>
<td>204,480</td>
<td>355,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/M Ratio</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADVANCEMENT FROM HIGH SCHOOL TO COLLEGE

The data in Table 6.5 show that the rate of advancement from high school to higher education institutions has been consistently higher for men than for women. The male/female ratio of advancement from high school to higher education institutions was 1.14 in 1965 and steadily increased to reach its peak in 1980 (1.83) and then decreased to 1.20 by 1990. This trend is similar in both two-year and four-year colleges, with the lower rates of female high school graduates proceeding to the four-year college level. Considering that the gender ratio among high school students has remained almost the same since the 1980s, this result is a clear indication that women and men in Korea have unequal access to higher education. This suggests, in general, that women’s opportunity to obtain four years of higher education is substantially lower than men’s in Korea.

Table 6.5. Advancement of High School Graduates to Higher Education by Type and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Two-Year Colleges</th>
<th>Four-Year Colleges</th>
<th>All Types of Higher Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (%)</td>
<td>Female (%)</td>
<td>M/F Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Advancement Rate=(Number of entrants for each type of higher education institution/Number of high school graduates)×100; based on total enrollment of entire higher education system (junior colleges, teachers colleges, four-year colleges and universities).

GENDER AND ACADEMIC FIELD OF STUDY

Along with the gender differences in enrollment distribution among college students and the advancement rates from high school to college, there are also gender differences in choice of college majors in Korea. As suggested in the foregoing, gender segregation among academic field of study has been a consistent characteristic of the Korean college environment. Based on traditional Confucian teachings, there still exist very definite stereotypes of sex roles that strongly affect the student’s choice of higher education institution and college major.

In the Korean education system, students are expected to choose their major or field of study before they apply for a certain college or university. The final decision on college major is based heavily on the student’s scholastic aptitude test scores, high school performance scores, recommendations, and other personal and socioeconomic factors. One of the personal factors that has a great impact on such a decision is the student’s gender. Since there is a clear segregation by gender among academic fields of major, it is very difficult for girls to apply for traditionally male fields of study and expect to succeed in those majors. Tables 6.6 and 6.7 present the distribution of four-year and two-year college students by gender and field of study. The data in both tables clearly show a strong gender segregation among college majors: traditionally, male-dominated fields of study are social sciences, natural sciences and engineering, and medical programs; teacher education, humanities, home economics, and fine arts are areas considered more suitable as women’s majors.

Although there has been a steady increase in women’s enrollment in higher education institutions in general, by 1995 only 38 percent and 32 percent of the students in two-year and four-year colleges, respectively, were women. A noticeable difference in the representation of women in fields of study in 1995 is that two-year colleges show a higher percentage of women students in all fields of study compared with the same fields in four-year colleges. These results imply that during the expansion of higher education in Korea in recent years, men benefited with more opportunity to gain access to a four-year college education while women received more opportunity to obtain a two-year college education as opposed to four years of higher education. This occurred because the government allowed the establishment or expansion of traditionally male-dominated major fields in four-year colleges and universities while it
Table 6.6. Distribution of Four-Year College Students by Gender and Field of Study: 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Fields</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Pharmacy</th>
<th>Arts, Physical Ed</th>
<th>Teacher Ed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>402,979</td>
<td>52,387</td>
<td>84,626</td>
<td>137,013</td>
<td>24,179</td>
<td>44,328</td>
<td>52,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>90,634</td>
<td>25,378</td>
<td>6,344</td>
<td>5,438</td>
<td>7,251</td>
<td>18,127</td>
<td>25,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>312,345</td>
<td>28,111</td>
<td>78,086</td>
<td>131,185</td>
<td>15,617</td>
<td>28,111</td>
<td>28,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/M</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31,884</td>
<td>149,101</td>
<td>260,928</td>
<td>335,478</td>
<td>55,913</td>
<td>37,275</td>
<td>93,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>250,088</td>
<td>65,023</td>
<td>37,513</td>
<td>50,018</td>
<td>32,511</td>
<td>12,504</td>
<td>55,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>681,796</td>
<td>88,633</td>
<td>224,993</td>
<td>286,354</td>
<td>20,454</td>
<td>27,272</td>
<td>40,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/M</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,040,166</td>
<td>156,025</td>
<td>29,138</td>
<td>416,066</td>
<td>41,607</td>
<td>72,812</td>
<td>72,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>296,129</td>
<td>74,032</td>
<td>50,342</td>
<td>79,955</td>
<td>14,806</td>
<td>38,497</td>
<td>38,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>744,037</td>
<td>81,844</td>
<td>238,092</td>
<td>342,257</td>
<td>29,761</td>
<td>29,761</td>
<td>29,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/M</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,187,735</td>
<td>166,283</td>
<td>308,811</td>
<td>522,603</td>
<td>47,509</td>
<td>83,141</td>
<td>59,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>378,418</td>
<td>87,036</td>
<td>79,468</td>
<td>109,741</td>
<td>18,921</td>
<td>49,194</td>
<td>41,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>809,317</td>
<td>80,932</td>
<td>226,609</td>
<td>412,752</td>
<td>24,280</td>
<td>40,466</td>
<td>24,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/M</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.7. Distribution of Junior College Students by Gender and Field of Study: 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Fields</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Natural Sciences</th>
<th>Medicine, Pharmacy</th>
<th>Arts, Physical Ed</th>
<th>Teacher Ed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151,593</td>
<td>19,707</td>
<td>13,643</td>
<td>92,472</td>
<td>12,127</td>
<td>12,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,890</td>
<td>9,574</td>
<td>4,787</td>
<td>7,180</td>
<td>8,377</td>
<td>9,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>111,703</td>
<td>11,170</td>
<td>8,936</td>
<td>86,011</td>
<td>3,351</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(77)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/M</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       | 1985       | 242,114    | 4,842           | 43,581           | 128,320           | 19,369           | 31,475     | 14,527    |
| (%)   | (100)      | (2)        | (18)            | (53)             | (8)               | (13)             | (6)        |
| Female|            | 87,123     | 1,742           | 15,682           | 20,910            | 11,326           | 22,652     | 14,811    |
| (%)   | (100)      | (2)        | (18)            | (24)             | (13)              | (26)             | (17)       |
| Male  |            | 154,991    | 3,100           | 29,448           | 106,944           | 7,750            | 9,299      | 0         |
| (%)   | (100)      | (2)        | (19)            | (69)             | (5)               | (6)              | (0)        |
| F/M   | .37        | .44        | .35             | .17              | .60               | .71              | 1.00       |

|       | 1990       | 323,825    | 9,715           | 58,289           | 174,866           | 38,859           | 29,144     | 12,953    |
| (%)   | (100)      | (3)        | (18)            | (54)             | (12)              | (9)              | (4)        |
| Female|            | 119,345    | 5,967           | 26,256           | 29,836            | 26,234           | 17,902     | 14,321    |
| (%)   | (100)      | (5)        | (22)            | (25)             | (22)              | (22)             | (15)       |
| Male  |            | 204,480    | 4,090           | 32,717           | 145,181           | 12,269           | 10,224     | 0         |
| (%)   | (100)      | (2)        | (16)            | (71)             | (6)               | (5)              | (0)        |
| F/M   | .37        | .53        | .44             | .17              | .69               | .63              | 1.00       |

|       | 1995       | 569,820    | 22,793          | 119,662          | 296,306           | 56,982           | 56,982     | 17,095    |
| (%)   | (100)      | (4)        | (21)            | (52)             | (10)              | (10)             | (3)        |
| Female|            | 214,310    | 12,859          | 55,721           | 57,864            | 36,433           | 36,433     | 17,145    |
| (%)   | (100)      | (6)        | (26)            | (27)             | (17)              | (16)             | (8)        |
| Male  |            | 355,510    | 10,665          | 60,437           | 238,192           | 21,331           | 24,886     | 0         |
| (%)   | (100)      | (3)        | (17)            | (67)             | (6)               | (7)              | (0)        |
| F/M   | .38        | .55        | .48             | .20              | .64               | .57              | 1.00       |

encouraged two-year colleges to build or expand traditionally female-dominated majors and departments.

In addition, areas such as the natural sciences, engineering, and medical programs, which are traditionally male fields of study, remain firmly so in both types of higher education institution. There are only 21 percent and 20 percent of women among students majoring in natural sciences in four-year and two-year colleges, respectively. However, teacher education programs have much higher percentages of women students. In fact, virtually all of the two-year college students enrolled in teacher education are women. This appears to be because the purpose of the teacher education programs offered in Korean two-year colleges is to prepare kindergarten teachers, and that profession is regarded as exclusively for women—another example of stereotypic sex roles. Taken together, these data suggest very strongly that, despite some gains in recent years, there continues to be significant gender segregation by field in Korean higher education, such that female students are situated at a relatively disadvantaged position with respect to men.

There are three important implications from examining the data on women students in higher education institutions in Korea. First, there is a consistent gender difference in college enrollment rate and advancement rate from high school to college over the years. Even though the number of college students, as well as the number of women students, has increased steadily since 1945, the percentage of female students in higher education institutions has remained much lower than the percentage of males.

Second, even though gender gaps in the college environment appeared to be decreasing in the 1980s, when gender ratios of the 1990s are compared with those for the 1960s, one can easily see that women students’ disadvantaged position in higher education institutions has not changed much over the years. This is a clear indication of the existence of continuing gender problems in the college environment in Korea. Third, during the last twenty-five years, when the rapid expansion of higher education was occurring, male students benefited much more than females from the opportunity to obtain a four-year college education. As a result, male students still dominate the highest positions in the Korean education system, and women students have substantially less education than men. The next section of this chapter presents an analysis of the situation for women faculty in the higher education institutions of Korea.
Before and during the Japanese colonial period (1910–1945), educational advancement for Korean women was restricted to junior college education; fewer than five Korean women, either self-supporting or supported by sponsors, were able to earn a bachelor’s or a more advanced degree abroad. Male students were provided with the opportunity for a college education, but the quality remained low. Since independence from the Japanese, the percentage of women students, as well as the total student enrollment in colleges, has increased remarkably. Korean college enrollment was 141,626 in 1965 and 786,354 in 1981. The percentage of women college students also increased, from 24.8 percent of 786,354 in 1981 to 30.4 percent of 1,490,809 in 1990 (Ministry of Education, 1990, 1981).

Along with the huge increase in the number of women college students in Korea, the number of women faculty reached 3,135 (15 percent) of the 20,900 total for full-time faculty members in 1980. A decade later, the number of women faculty had increased to 4,454. However, the female percentage of total faculty had decreased to 13.8 percent (of 32,281 full-time faculty). The percentage of full-time women faculty remained less than one-half the total percentage of women students enrolled (Ministry of Education, 1990, 1980).

One of the most significant aspects of this continuous increase in the number of Korean women in higher education is that they earned their degrees under a legal framework that guaranteed equal opportunity and no gender restrictions. These policies of equal opportunity in higher education were fueled by the increase in demand for college-educated citizens in the industrial and cultural spheres of Korea. Not only did the number of higher education institutions for women increase, but an even more significant aspect of change was the increased number of fields in which women could study. As women began to enter nontraditional fields of study, their new orientations fundamentally widened the door for women in higher education (Ministry of Education, 1990, 1980).

Women have, in the past, chosen their specialization based on social traditions. They engaged in such fields as home economics, health sciences, social work, and education (National Institute of Educational Evaluation, 1990, 1980). In the early 1980s, most Korean women faculty were engaged in the traditional fields of home economics, nursing, fine arts, education, and languages (Ministry of Education, 1980). By 1990, women faculty were more diverse in their specialization: The percentage of women had
decreased from 21 percent to 17 percent in medicine and nursing, from 17 percent to 12 percent in home economics, from 14 percent to 13 percent in arts and music, and had remained the same in languages and literature (13 percent) and in natural sciences (11 percent).

However, from 1980 to 1990, the percentage of women in education increased from 7 to 10 percent, in social sciences from 6 to 10 percent, and in humanities from 3 to 7 percent. Not many women are yet engaged in the fields of agriculture, business, and engineering (Ministry of Education, 1990, 1980). In addition, the continuous increase of women in higher education is also due to the trend for men to avoid pursuing academic careers because of low economic returns, which leaves vacancies in academic positions (personal communication, 3 June 1992).

**ACADEMIC RANK**

The criteria for being appointed a professor in Korea are primarily based on research and teaching experience and appropriate academic degrees from institutions of higher education. Specific criteria vary from institution to institution, but the minimum conditions for a professorship are established at the national level. The minimum criteria regarding research and teaching also vary with rank. Research criteria refer to work in research institutes as well as scholarly achievement in the form of theses, journal articles, and publications. The required number of years of research experience can be replaced with teaching. For example, four-year colleges and universities have the following *minimum* requirements for each faculty rank:

1. Appointment as a full-time instructor: two years of research and one year of teaching experience
2. Promotion to assistant professor: two years of research and two years of teaching experience
3. Promotion to associate professor: three years of research and four years of teaching experience
4. Promotion to full professor: four years of research and six years of teaching experience (Yoon, 1991)

Compared with men faculty in Korea, the percentage of women faculty remains low, 13.8 percent, distributed by rank as follows: 2.6 percent at full professor, 4.3 percent at associate professor, 4.3 percent at assistant professor, and 2.6 percent at full-time instructor. It is interesting to note
that over 60 percent of women who are full professors are concentrated in four-year institutions located in Seoul (Pang, 1993b).

More Korean women taught at four-year colleges and universities and held higher-ranking positions in 1990 than in 1980. Three out of every four women faculty in 1990 were employed by four-year institutions, compared with two out of every three women faculty in 1980. The percentages of Korean women in the various academic ranks also changed positively from 1980 to 1990. The percentage of those who were full professors increased from 17 percent to 19 percent; associate professors increased from 20 percent to 31 percent; assistant professors decreased from 40 percent to 31 percent; and full-time instructors decreased from 23 percent to 19 percent (Ministry of Education, 1990, 1980). That Korean women rank lower than their male colleagues is partly attributable to a tendency for women to have less teaching experience, lower academic credentials, a lack of mobility, and less interest in full-time or higher-level positions due to family responsibilities.

Most Korean institutions have their own regulations that are supposed to grant tenure to those promoted to the rank of associate and/or full professor, and to recontract with those at the rank of assistant professor or full-time instructor. The reality is that those at the rank of assistant professor or full-time instructor are treated as if they are tenured; almost all of them are gradually granted tenure (Lee, 1992). In other words, newly recruited full-time instructors are ensured lifetime employment at the institution, except in cases of serious misconduct. The tenure regulations exist as a mere formality to Korean professors. This phenomenon has led many to question the quality of the teaching in higher education institutions. Currently, faculty evaluation has become an important issue in Korean academia.

Not many Korean women professors complain of gender discrimination in the process of promotion. In fact, women faculty in Seoul show neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction with their opportunities for promotion (Pang, 1993a). In general, however, Korean women show satisfaction with their promotion (Pang, 1993a). Very few Korean women hold senior administrative positions. This can be attributed to the shorter experience of women in higher education and their tendency to be uninterested in positions that would take a considerable amount of time away from their families (Shin, 1981).

Another reason for the low number of women faculty is that they tend to be less qualified than their male counterparts. In general, they have less teaching experience, less research achievement, and fewer substantial
contributions to institutional development, and they tend to take earlier retirement than their male colleagues. In 1990, 40.2 percent of the total women faculty nationwide had less than ten years of teaching experience, whereas 28.0 percent of their male counterparts had a similar amount of experience. Approximately the same percentage of women, 42.9 percent, as men, 40.1 percent, had ten to twenty years of teaching experience. Some 16.9 percent of the total women faculty and 31.9 percent of the total men faculty had more than twenty years of teaching experience (Ministry of Education, 1990).

ACADEMIC DEGREES

The percentages of Korean faculty holding baccalaureates and master’s degrees are greater for women than for men, but the percentage of faculty holding doctorates is lower for women. In 1990, 31 percent of the women faculty held baccalaureates, 42 percent held master’s degrees, and 20 percent held doctorates. In comparison, 12 percent of the men faculty held baccalaureates, 34 percent held master’s degrees, and 47 percent held doctorates. Korean women made up only 9 percent of the total faculty with doctorates (Ministry of Education, 1990, 1980). This disadvantaged status is one of the major reasons why women have lower academic rank and salary than men.

The percentages of Korean men and women faculty who earned master’s degrees or doctorates overseas increased dramatically between 1980 and 1990. In 1980, the percentage of women who had earned their degrees overseas, 16 percent, was slightly higher than that of men, 14 percent. In 1990, however, the percentage of men who had earned degrees both in Korea and overseas, 34 percent, was more than double that of their women counterparts, 15 percent. The percentage of faculty with doctorates earned overseas increased from 36 percent to 82 percent between 1980 and 1990. In 1990, 62 percent of the women with doctorates had earned their degrees overseas (Ministry of Education, 1990, 1980).

It is noticeable at first glance that the percentage of those who earn degrees overseas has dramatically increased, especially that of doctorate holders, from 36 percent to 82 percent. The increase is, however, not interpreted as an absolutely good sign for Korean academia. The increase has resulted in academic degree inflation and has made it extremely difficult for degree holders to find jobs in institutions of higher education. The difficulty is becoming more serious. People with doctorates may be positioned as only part-time instructors for at least two to three years.
Many of them may not be employed as full-time teaching staff. Their insecure professional status makes it harder for them to manage their lives. Higher academic degrees are no longer the key to earning high economic return, and this negatively influences the decisions made by the general population (particularly men) with respect to the desirability of preparing to earn an advanced academic degree. The resulting stagnation will continue unless there is both a generational shift, resulting in a younger faculty cohort, and strategic planning, resulting in a lowered ratio of students per professor in the higher education classroom.

AGE

The modal age for Korean men faculty of 35–39 did not change between 1981 and 1990. The modal age for women faculty has, however, increased from 30–34 to 35–39 in the same period, matching their male counterparts (Ministry of Education, 1990, 1981). The change in modal age of women faculty is a clear indicator that women are not retiring as early as they did in the recent past.

PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS

Because of its high social status and the respect accorded to teachers, becoming a professor is considered one of the best occupations that either women or men can pursue in Korea. However, women face considerably more conflict than men in the process of fulfilling their professional career goals. Women professors have to struggle more than their male counterparts to conduct the research necessary for expanding their expertise and meeting the expectations of their institutions. Considering women’s roles at home, investing such devotion in their profession can be very daunting. Professors often conduct their research in a very intense, solitary way, unlike other professionals who work in close association with colleagues. This can lead to isolation and sometimes even despair, which is best overcome through the exhilaration of publishing the results from their research (Lee, 1992). Professors must spend long hours, often in solitary work, striving to gain the most up-to-date expertise and recognition in their fields of specialization. For women professors who feel obligated to home and family as well as to their professional careers, it can be very difficult to reach the same levels of accomplishment as their male colleagues.

Furthermore, many women faculty think (perhaps due to societal and cultural pressure) that their capabilities for research are lower than those
of their male counterparts. They tend to have fewer publications and research projects than their male colleagues (Shin, 1981). Korean women faculty perceive the professoriate as a respected profession that allows utilization and advancement of their knowledge under conditions that favor their male counterparts, despite legal stipulations of equality.

A majority of Korean women faculty perceive that the professorial role conflicts with family life and limits available leisure time (Shin, 1981). Their perception seems to be exemplified by two demographic trends. One is that the percentages of single women and single men faculty differ greatly. In 1981, 15.3 percent of women faculty were single, a rate almost quadruple that (4.4 percent) of their male colleagues (Ministry of Education, 1981). Women faculty also tend to have fewer children than their male colleagues, which may be evidence of their efforts to make family life more compatible with their professions (Shin, 1981). In the late 1970s, a majority of Korean women faculty had only two children, a figure that was lower than the general population. Child rearing and larger families are significant hindrances to the channeling of the energies of women faculty into scholarly and other related professional activities and to their career advancement (Koh, 1987). Korean women generally possess a strong sense of obligation as nurturers and help-mates, are less competitive than their male colleagues (Moon, 1992), and exhibit feelings of guilt for pursuing their own careers (Shin, 1981). A majority of Korean women faculty, however, have reasonably strong self-esteem, presumably because most are from families where less emphasis is placed on traditional gender stereotypes (Koh, 1987).

One report illustrates that male professors, in order to do their professional work, spend less time than their female counterparts with their families and on housework (Lee, 1992). Wives of male professors do not seem to complain about their husbands’ work patterns or feel that home life is disrupted. Such a pattern would, however, most certainly cause conflict for women professors. There are signs of some change, since younger male faculty do tend to spend more time with their families and on housework than do their older male colleagues. Even so, housework is not divided evenly between wife and faculty husband unless they share equally strong orientations to gender equality.

All of these distinctive features situate women in disadvantaged circumstances. Despite some changes, women faculty are less able to devote the time required for advancement than their male counterparts, primarily because of societal and cultural pressure. As a result, the choice of an academic career may still not be the best for an academically talented Korean woman.
Female Students and Faculty

Note: The first section of this chapter, on women students in Korean higher education, was written by Jaelim Oh. The second section, on women faculty, was written by Jeannie Myung-Suk Pang.
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President Kim Dae Jung was inaugurated in March 1998. In order to cope with the economic crisis caused by the Asian currency collapse, his government is concentrating on reforming and restructuring the entire national economic system, including higher education. The current government is following the basic structure for higher education reform established under the government of his predecessor, Kim Young Sam, whose Presidential Commission on Educational Reform (PCER) published its report, *Recommendations for Educational Reform to Build a New Educational System*, on 31 May 1995. The so-called 5.31 reforms put forward in this report were based on the expressed goal of enacting a system of “open education and life-long learning” that emphasizes “learner-centered,” diversified, and autonomous education. The nine general policy goals recommended for education in this report were:

1. Building a basis for “Edutopia” and a life-long education for society;
2. Diversifying the higher education system and making the universities and colleges more specialized;
3. Building a school community for autonomous management of elementary and secondary school systems;
4. Making curriculum to enrich the humanity and creativity of students;
5. Admission policies of colleges and universities that relieve suffering of people;
6. Building a learner-centered, diversified, and autonomous secondary education system;
7. Building an evaluation and support system of education providers;
8. Building a training system to produce teachers who will be respected and able; and

The overall approach of the PCER is based on deregulating and liberalizing the nation’s educational system from government control. The basic direction and intentions of the reform seem appropriate and were welcomed by most parents. However, it has been reported that the parent group did not approve of some proposals, and that 82 percent of teachers disliked the overall reform proposals (Korean Education Weekly, 9 August 1995). In order to address the implications of the PCER report for contemporary higher education reform, it is important to describe the basic features of the system. Subsequent analysis will then focus on each institutional type.

THE KOREAN HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM

There are seven different types of higher education institutions in Korea: (1) colleges and universities offering four-year undergraduate programs, with the exception of six-year medical and dental colleges; (2) four-year teachers colleges (now designated as national universities of education); (3) vocational junior colleges; (4) the Korean National Open University; (5) polytechnics (open industrial universities); (6) miscellaneous schools; and (7) graduate schools. Table 7.1 summarizes basic characteristics of these institutions.

Colleges and Universities

This category includes 24 national, 2 municipal, and 105 private colleges and universities. Four-year colleges and universities offer programs leading to the bachelor’s degree. However, programs in medicine, Oriental medicine, and dentistry are six years in duration. Four-year colleges and universities may have graduate schools, which are classified into three types in accordance with their functions and goals: professional, general, and open graduate schools. Professional graduate schools, which number 315 (64 national, 4 public, and 247 private), prepare students for careers in education, business administration, public administration, and other fields. Professional graduate schools confer the professional master’s degree.
General graduate schools, whose aims are fostering creativity, initiative, and leadership in specialized academic disciplines, number 106 (23 national, 2 public, and 81 private). General graduate schools award the Master of Arts or the Master of Science degree. Among the six open graduate schools, which belong to open industrial universities, three are national and three are private. All applicants applying for master’s programs must have a bachelor’s degree or its equivalent from a college or university with approved standing. Minimum course work of twenty-four credit hours in four semesters or two years, a comprehensive examination, an examination in foreign language, and a thesis are required for a master’s degree.

Doctoral program applicants must have a master’s degree or its equivalent, a scholarly background in the field of specialty with demonstrated research experience, and recommendations from individuals in the field of specialization. Traditionally, master’s and doctoral programs have been managed separately—students wanting a doctoral degree had to apply to a doctoral program after finishing a master’s program. Beginning
in the 1997 school year, however, the graduate schools were allowed to integrate their master’s and doctoral programs. A doctoral program requires students to take a minimum of sixty credits in three or more years. Credits taken in the master’s program are included in the sixty credits. Students must pass exams to demonstrate their ability to comprehend at least two foreign languages. Students are also required to pass a comprehensive examination, complete the course work with a B average or higher, submit a dissertation that is accepted by a committee, and pass an oral examination.

**Teachers Colleges (National Universities of Education)**

Korea has a closed system for elementary school teacher education, limited almost entirely to eleven national teachers colleges that are located in eleven different provinces. In addition to these, the National University of Teacher Education has a program for elementary teacher education. The curriculum, student quotas, admissions policy, and finance of the national teachers colleges are controlled by the government. The government paid all educational costs and was obligated to employ all graduates as elementary teachers until 1992. The only exception to this closed system is the Department of Elementary Education at Ewha Woman’s University, the only private school that has been allowed to operate a program for elementary teacher education.

Since 1945, elementary teacher education has gone through three stages: normal schools (1945–1961), two-year colleges (1962–1980), and four-year colleges (1981–present). After independence, repatriation of Japanese teachers who had taken most of the teachers’ positions and expansion of Korean demand for education caused an unforeseen shortage of teachers. The U.S. military government (1945–1948) founded seven secondary-level, or “normal,” schools for teacher training and various kinds of temporary teacher training centers. In the early 1950s, the Lee Sung Man government transferred all eighteen normal schools from local government control to national government control. In 1961, the new government passed the Temporary Exceptional Law on Education, requiring upgrading of all teacher training programs. Consequently, all normal schools were upgraded to two-year teachers colleges, and in 1962 all two-year teachers colleges were upgraded to four-year colleges that grant bachelor’s degrees.

In 1989, the Ministry of Education chose an open employment test policy that abolished the privileges of national teachers colleges, repealing the Enforcement Ordinance of the Law for Education in order to abolish
tuition remission, special scholarships for all students, and the obligation for graduates to be employed as teachers for four years. At the same time, the Ministry of Education was also freed from an obligation to hire most of the graduates of the national teachers colleges and schools of education, beginning with new students who were admitted in 1990.

**Junior College**

The development of junior colleges went through three stages: vocational higher schools (1963–), professional schools (1970–), and junior colleges (1979–). Two-year colleges were first established in 1948, and by 1963, there were thirty-nine such institutions. Strictly speaking, the predecessors of the present junior colleges are the vocational high schools established in 1963 to train middle-level workers needed for Korea’s first Five-Year Project for Economic Development. The length of study was divided into three years of senior high school courses, followed by two years of professional courses. There were, however, difficulties for graduates in getting jobs or going on to universities. Consequently, vocational higher schools were gradually changed to professional schools after 1970. By 1976, all vocational higher schools had been phased out except for the ones serving students already enrolled.

In 1979, all two-year colleges (including professional schools) were restructured to today’s junior colleges. Their programs are two years in length, with the exception of the fisheries/marine colleges, which offer an additional six-month course for navigation practice, and the nursing and public health programs, which are three years in length. The 5.31 Educational Reform in 1995 allowed junior colleges to delete the name “junior” from their schools and diversify the length of their programs. This has led to no big changes, at least for the present. Among the 145 vocational junior colleges in 1995, 8 are national and public. The remaining 137 private institutions register 96 percent of Korea’s junior college students. Junior college enrollments represent approximately 22 percent of all students in Korean higher education. The most popular fields are engineering, technology, and nursing.

**Korean National Open University**

The Korean National Open University developed from the Air and Correspondence University, which was originally founded as a junior college at Seoul National University in 1972. It separated from Seoul National University and began operating as an independent institution in 1982, ultimately developing a five-year university program leading to a
bachelor’s degree. The Air and Correspondence University was renamed Korea National Open University in 1994. For the in-class components of its programs, thirty-two affiliated schools offer facilities twice a year during summer and winter vacations. In order to maintain the quality of its educational programs vis-à-vis that of other universities, the Korean National Open University has a fairly rigorous system of student and curriculum management that results in only 30 percent of the students enrolled reaching graduation. Instruction involves a variety of methods, including self-learning with programmed textbooks, broadcast lectures, class attendance, home assignments, and correspondence. Its graduates are considered to achieve the same levels of academic excellence as those of conventional colleges and universities.

Polytechnics (Open Industrial Universities)

The polytechnics, first established in 1982, provide an alternative higher education to employed youths and adults who missed opportunities. As of 1995, there are seventeen polytechnics—nine national and eight private. To meet the needs of employees and low-income students who want to pursue higher education, tuition fees are cheaper than those of other four-year colleges and universities. The polytechnics require applicants to have high school diplomas and at least one year of working experience in industry. However, many polytechnics manage their schools like other colleges and universities, and this causes conflict between polytechnics and the government.

Miscellaneous Schools

The category of higher education miscellaneous schools was established to provide learning opportunities in highly specialized fields of study. These schools are relatively poor, in general, compared with other conventional higher education institutions. Of the twenty-two miscellaneous schools, eighteen provide undergraduate courses, and four provide junior college courses. They are predominantly theological or arts institutions. Miscellaneous schools may, with the Ministry of Education’s approval, have four-year programs. Graduates receive a diploma and certification on completion of their programs and may be accepted into graduate-level programs of other colleges and universities, if the programs offered by the miscellaneous schools are approved by the Ministry of Education.
Students

Higher education in Korea has achieved enormous progress since 1945. The growth in the number of higher education students has been phenomenal, particularly after the 1950s, and is hardly rivaled by any other country. The cohort enrollment ratio in higher education is also rapidly rising, from 7.1 percent in 1965 to 54.6 percent in 1995. There were 2,342,798 students enrolled in all Korean higher education institutions in 1995: 1,187,753 students in colleges and universities; 112,728 in graduate schools; 19,650 in teachers colleges; 569,820 in junior colleges; 17,200 in miscellaneous schools; 120,670 in polytechnics; and 314,977 in the Korean National Open University. The number of college and university students per 10,000 population rose to 480 in 1994 from 50 in 1965. About half of the higher education students are enrolled in colleges: 43 percent of them are enrolled in natural sciences and engineering, 26 percent in social sciences, and 14 percent in humanities. About 53 percent of the junior college students major in either natural sciences or engineering.

The employment rates of graduates are 68.8 percent for vocational junior colleges, 56.4 percent for colleges and universities, and 74.3 percent for graduate schools. The employment rate of women graduates is lower than that of men graduates (Table 7.2).

Table 7.2. Trends in Employment Rates of Higher Education Graduates (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Voc. Junior Colleges</th>
<th>Colleges and Universities</th>
<th>Graduate Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty

The total number of faculty has increased from 6,801 in 1965 to 54,135 in 1994. About 20 percent of the faculty members are in engineering, 15 percent in social sciences, 12 percent in medicine, dentistry, and pharmacy, 12 percent in natural sciences, 9 percent in linguistics and literature, 7 percent in music, fine arts, and physical education, and 6 percent in humanities. During the thirty-year period, there has been a below-average increase in the faculty of agriculture (4.8 times), and fishery (2.5 times), and an above-average increase in arts (9.7 times), engineering (14.0 times), and teaching professions (13.0 times). The below-average ratios of agriculture, fishery, and engineering reflect the industrialization of Korean society. The government has encouraged private school founders to open engineering programs, and it has built up the programs of national universities.

In 1965, only 11.3 percent of faculty had doctoral degrees, but by 1994 this had increased to more than half (57 percent). Since the mid-1980s, many Korean students who earned advanced degrees from foreign countries returned to Korea because they were attracted to its economic development, and many Korean universities have opened doctoral programs. From the mid-1980s, however, even people holding earned doctoral degrees could not find a job in Korean colleges and universities. This oversupply of doctorates led colleges and universities to raise faculty qualification standards. Without a doctoral degree, it became hard to apply for faculty positions in many schools, and the changed situation pressured other faculty to obtain doctoral degrees. Table 7.3 shows the percentage of faculty holding doctoral degrees by institutional type.

The percentage of women faculty has increased slowly. In 1965, only 10.7 percent of faculty were women. Even though the number of women faculty has increased, the faculties in Korean higher educational institutions are still dominated by men. The percentage of women faculty in junior colleges is higher than in other institutions—around one-third. An important reason for larger numbers of female faculty is that junior colleges offer many specializations for women students, such as secretarial, kindergarten teaching, and nursing.

One of the most interesting profiles in Korean higher education is that for foreign faculty. In 1994, only 405 persons (0.8 percent) among 54,135 faculty were foreigners. Around 60 percent (235 persons) of the foreign faculty were from the United States. Most of the foreign faculty
were teaching in foreign language departments or in religious schools. Along with government restrictions, lack of facility with the Korean language has been a continuing problem in attracting foreign faculty. Korean higher education institutions use only the Korean language for lectures because few students can speak and understand foreign languages, including English. Recently, the government encouraged its institutions to hire excellent foreign scholars to internationalize the colleges and universities as well as to teach foreign languages (mainly English). This change of circumstances will lead some of the better colleges and universities to hire more foreign faculty. Increasing numbers of higher education institutions are also hiring native English speakers to teach English.

Table 7.4 shows the number of students per faculty member by institutional type and control. Three important points in this table are, first, the number of students per faculty has increased continuously since 1965. Until the early 1970s, higher education was confined to the elites. Even though student enrollment increased rapidly from the mid-1970s, when the government began to open the universities to a broader spectrum of the population, higher education institutions did not hire enough faculty. Because of a perceived drop in the quality of higher education by the middle of the 1980s, the government focused on improving higher education to compete more effectively with other countries. By using institution and program accreditation systems, and
by its globalization policy, the government pressured colleges and universities to hire more faculty.

Second, the number of students per faculty in the private schools is much larger than that for the public and national higher education institutions. Until 1990, the government did not give any financial aid to private schools, so most private schools had no other funding sources except students’ tuition. Third, the student/faculty ratios at junior colleges (54:1) and miscellaneous schools (45:1) are so high that it may be questionable for these schools even to be considered higher educational institutions.

BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURES OF THE NEW EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Education has been of crucial importance throughout Korea’s history, and most new presidents’ first target has been educational reform. Even

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public &amp; National</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; University&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public &amp; National</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous School</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Excluding graduate schools.

The military governments tried to accommodate the people by reforming education. On the list of reforms proposed by democratically elected President Kim Young Sam, education was one of the most important. In February 1994, President Kim Young Sam’s government organized the twenty-five-member Presidential Commission on Educational Reform (PCER) and appointed ten researchers the next month.

The PCER consisted of scholars from various fields but, in contrast to former educational reform initiatives, the government intentionally excluded educational scholars and appointed persons who majored in philosophy. The most influential members of the PCER, the chair and the senior commission member, were graduates of the Department of Philosophy, Seoul National University. That Korean President Kim Young Sam is a graduate of that department goes a long way toward explaining why the initiative went to them. However, although most of the educational reform proposals developed under previous regimes were not realized, those from the PCER have already been actualized and have changed the educational system.

The initiating group ultimately invited some educational scholars because they found that professionals who were highly knowledgeable about education were needed. Consequently, five educational scholars were included in the PCER. Some critics said that educational scholars were initially excluded because it had been argued that educational scholars who had studied in America were responsible for the failure of Korean education. Ironically, the PCER’s proposals were also seen as being based on America’s educational system and criticized as being ill suited to the Korean situation.

The PCER was organized with a steering committee and five subcommittees. These groups decided the basic direction and strategies two weeks after they had organized. Based on the research done by the five subcommittees, the proposals for each field were made in February 1995. About a year after the PCER was organized, the new educational reform document was completed and presented as a proposal. A distinct characteristic of this new educational reform proposal was confidentiality. The PCER kept the proposal secret until it was announced publicly on 31 May 1995. Only the few who were involved in the process knew even the basic direction and intentions of the reform until that day. The proposal then faced criticisms from teachers and parents, which brought unexpected side effects.

On 31 July, two months after the proposal was recommended, President Kim Young Sam formed the Commission for Educational Reform
Propulsion. The chair of this commission was the prime minister, and the vice chairs were the minister of education and the minister of economics and finance. This commission was charged with doing two things: finding sources that guarantee 5 percent of the gross national product (GNP) for education in the government budget, and revising and making a detailed schedule for activating the recommendations made by the PCER. The Executive and Planning Committees of the Commission for Educational Reform Propulsion were headed by officers of the Ministry of Education.

GENERAL FEATURES OF HIGHER EDUCATION REFORM

Diversification and Specialization of the Higher Education System

There are five problems that Korean universities and colleges have with respect to system diversity and specialization. First, most Korean universities and colleges have a similar structure because they are modeled after Seoul National University. Second, most schools focus on expansion and try to be a university, but without the necessary accompanying efforts to improve the quality of education. Third, Korean undergraduate departments at universities and colleges are subdivided to include what would be the graduate school level in American universities and colleges, resulting in 557 different departments in the universities and colleges. Fourth, the development and efficiency of individual institutions have been hampered, and education, research, and technology development are hindered by various kinds of governmental control as well as by rigid university management. Fifth, the present system is insufficiently prepared to meet the social demands of the expansion of higher education, technology, and the global informational society of the twenty-first century. Because of this, the PCER asserted that the higher education system must be reformed drastically in order to survive under conditions of increasing global competition.

In order to solve these problems, the PCER suggested four strategies to diversify the higher education system. First, it suggested revising the Education Law and related laws so that individual institutions can specialize without difficulty. Second, it suggested encouraging universities and colleges to make their own plans for diversification so that they can supply the human capital that society demands. Third, it suggested decreasing the minimum credits for a major so that students can major in more than one discipline that crosses the boundary of a
department. Fourth, it suggested giving management and financial support to those universities and colleges that diversify and increase specialization in their institutions.

Criteria for Founding Private Schools

A significant problem for those wishing to establish a private school is the requirement that court approval is needed, because only a juridical person is authorized to found schools. A Committee for University Foundation Approval examines the submitted plan and evaluates whether it meets legal standards, including conditions of the area in which the school will be located and the purposes of founding the school. When a school passes the evaluation, the committee gives provisional approval. The school receives final approval when it fulfills the plan. These approval criteria and procedures help the government to control the quality of newly founded higher education institutions and make certain that governmental policy is followed. However, the criteria make it hard to found small and specialized colleges. It is also hard for those with small capital to get into the higher education market. Table 7.5 shows applications and approvals from 1990 to 1994.

To overcome these problems, the government planned to lower and diversify the criteria in order to make it easier to found higher education institutions. Criteria will also be made more diverse, depending on the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approvals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approvals</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open University</td>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approvals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

purpose and character of each school. The Committee for School Foundation Criteria was organized to include representatives of higher education, industry, lawyers, the press, parents, educational administrators, and officials from the related ministries. The committee was to consider public opinion in making the criteria. Existing institutions had to meet the new criteria in three to five years, and this policy became effective in 1996.

Every school was required to make a charter, and the government would evaluate schools based on their charters, which were to include the purposes of the school, the content and character of its educational programs, school management principles (faculty hiring, student quota management, and educational finance disclosure), student admissions policy, information on faculty, academic affairs management principles, and graduates’ job chances. The charter was to be published so that students and parents could have access to it. The government would supervise institutions so they would follow their charters, and evaluation results would determine the extent of government support.

**Revitalizing Junior Colleges and the Polytechnics**

Koreans prefer four-year colleges to junior colleges and polytechnic schools for advanced vocational education. Consequently, in order to prepare traditional students to move into lifelong vocational education for adults, the government established policies to revitalize junior colleges and polytechnics. Junior colleges were authorized to extend their programs from two to three years, and the graduates of junior colleges could be awarded an industrial associate degree. The junior colleges and the polytechnics were permitted to be members of a consortium to found the New College, a special junior college that would have only one or two departments in a field such as animation, propaganda, or automobiles. The polytechnics would form the center of a vocational education network made up of junior colleges, four-year colleges and universities, and an open university.

**The New College System**

The PCER proposed the New College as an alternative way of providing wider higher education opportunities for workers and adult learners who had less education than those in the developed countries. The New College, which is a continuing education system, would provide industrial associate and bachelor’s degree courses so that workers would be able
to complete courses without leaving their jobs. A New College that conferred the industrial associate degree would award that degree to a person who had a job and had finished a junior college program connected to his or her job after two or three years of vocational education in high school. A New College that conferred the bachelor’s degree would be for persons who had a job after junior college or the industrial associate program of a New College. This New College would award graduates the bachelor’s degree after one or two years of education in a field of or closely related to their former education. Junior colleges, polytechnics, the open university, colleges and universities, and industries could all found a New College.

A New College for the industrial associate degree could be founded by junior colleges and industries, including industries that are located near one another and can afford to provide educational facilities. A New College for the bachelor’s degree could be founded by four-year polytechnics and industries. Both programs could not be offered at the same New College. Applicants to a New College would not be required to pass any entrance examinations, only to show their academic and work records. New Colleges would also provide theoretical and general vocational education through high technology and telecommunications. A New College could even confer the highest degrees in the vocational field by introducing a practical master’s degree and professional doctoral degree program. With the introduction of these programs, the New College intended to resolve the problem caused by conventional colleges’ and universities’ unwillingness to embrace the professionalization of vocational fields.

Reforming the Professional Graduate School System

The PCER recommended policies to reform professional graduate schools in the fields of medicine, divinity, and law. Traditional medical education programs require students to study in an undergraduate-level medical school for six years and to pass the nationwide exam for medical certification. As an alternative, according to the new policy, a graduate-level medical school program would be offered for students who had bachelor’s degrees. The students who graduate from this medical school will be awarded a Doctor of Medicine (M.D.) degree after completing a certain period of practice, which includes work as a general practitioner. To advance the development of the medical and life sciences, the professional medical school may offer a joint M.D. and Ph.D. program,
but students cannot register for both programs simultaneously. Individual institutions may choose whether to adopt this new professional medical school system or the present six-year undergraduate system. Graduates of the professional medical schools are exempt from military service if they work in designated research centers listed in the Military Service Law, and they can delay entry into military service until age twenty-eight, as long as they register in the school.

A professional graduate school of divinity was planned (but not opened as of mid-1999). This type of institution will offer three-year programs for graduates of the various majors and is authorized to provide both master’s and doctoral programs for divinity students. Existing divinity school programs in universities can be transformed into this type of professional graduate school. A professional graduate school of law was introduced in 1997. It offers three-year programs for the graduates of various majors in order to train highly qualified lawyers who can compete with those educated in other countries. The graduates will be awarded master’s degrees after finishing course work and a thesis. Existing graduate schools of law that have master’s and doctoral programs may open this new type of professional program.

**Making the Student Quota and School Management Systems Autonomous**

The Ministry of Education has officially controlled virtually all aspects of higher education management and set student quotas for the past fifty years. During the period from 1945 to the late 1950s, government policy on higher education was not yet fully formulated. The government was so weak that it could not develop effective regulatory means. As a result, some institutions had virtual autonomy in their institutional establishment, program opening, enrollment quotas, selection of students, and academic standards, resulting in a remarkable expansion of higher education institutions. Until 1960, considerable numbers of students beyond the quota were admitted at the discretion of college or university presidents. But after the military coup in 1961, the government strictly enforced its quota system and intervened in the entrance examination system, set enrollment quotas, and determined tuition levels.

The enrollment policy for all higher education institutions changed from an admission quota system to a graduation quota system in 1981. The new policy was designed to expand opportunities for higher education and also to foster a more studious atmosphere on campus. After the
Ministry of Education instituted several relief measures, including a Qualifying Examination for Bachelor’s Degrees, the policy evolved and changed. The PCER (1985–1987) of the Fifth Republic recommended that the policy be changed formally. President Chun strongly recommended abolishing the policy in 1986, so the government decided finally to return to the former admission quota system.

The school and department student quotas have a great financial impact on colleges and universities because the budgets of most Korean private colleges and universities depend heavily on tuition. As a result, colleges and universities have constantly sought to raise their enrollment by negotiating higher enrollment quotas. The Ministry of Education issued guidelines concerning enrollment quotas, within which each institution proposes its own quotas. Based on these proposals and national manpower projections, the Ministry of Education prepared a draft of enrollment quotas to be approved by the government.

Since 1994, the Ministry of Education has granted the decision-making power on student quotas to individual institutions. In order to prevent problems caused by the sudden increase in students, the Ministry of Education planned to connect institutional evaluation with financial and managerial supports and to require institutions to publish the results of evaluations. The PCER stressed that each college and university should be given the right to determine its own enrollment size, after accreditation and external evaluation are fully institutionalized. The Education Reform Plan proposed by the PCER had three phases in its execution. In the first phase, the ministry set the quota for colleges and universities, while quotas of divisions and departments within them were set by the individual institutions. In the second phase, which took effect from the beginning of 1997, the conditional student quota system was put into practice at provincial universities. Those universities and colleges with proper educational facilities and research accommodations were allowed to freely increase their student quotas. In the final phase, which began in 1998, most universities and colleges were allowed to determine their enrollment sizes by their own quota policies. However, the student quotas of national universities and colleges, medical schools, and colleges of pharmacy will continue to be decided by the Ministry of Education. The PCER also recommended autonomy in overall school management. Beginning in 1996, all higher education institutions began managing themselves without special regulations from the Ministry of Education.
Admission and Entrance Examination

The entrance examination for colleges and universities in Korea is one of the most important annual events for the whole society. Those who apply to colleges or universities must have one of the following qualifications: (1) graduation from an accredited high school, (2) certification from the college entrance qualifying examination given by the Ministry of Education annually, (3) graduation from a school recognized by the Ministry of Education as equivalent to high school, or (4) graduation from a high school in a foreign country.

The admissions policy has been changed ten times since 1945. Until 1968, colleges and universities were authorized to select their own students on the basis of each applicant’s score on the entrance examination conducted by each college or university. From 1969 to 1980, based on the admission rules for college entrance, high school graduates who passed the Preliminary Examination for College Entrance (PECE) took the examination administered by each individual college. The 30 July education reform in 1980 abolished entrance examinations conducted by individual higher education institutions and adopted the high school records system. It also replaced PECE with the Scholastic Achievement Examination for College Entrance (SAECE). Universities and colleges then selected their freshman class on the basis of the composite score of the SAECE, the high school grade point average, and an essay test (from 1985 to 1987).

Autonomy of individual institutions was enhanced by allowing them to select their own students. In addition, students were allowed to choose the major field based on their own scholastic aptitude. This policy was also intended to ease the problem of memorization-oriented education in which academic abilities of students were judged by multiple choice tests without considering differences in individual scholastic aptitude. The entrance examination system was blamed for heavy reliance on a single test in which scores obtained by choosing the right answers for multiple choice questions and guesswork in true and false questions were the sole indicators of individual academic aptitude. Recognizing these problems, the Ministry of Education hastened to promulgate a new entrance examination, which was first administered to the high school senior class of 1991. The number of subject areas to be tested was reduced from eight to twelve subjects to three to five subjects, and universities were allowed to have more flexibility in selecting their own students.
The admissions policy was changed again in 1993 and implemented in 1994, requiring institutions to use the Korean SAT (a scholastic aptitude test modeled after the one used in the United States) scores, high school grades, and examinations administered by individual institutions. According to this admissions policy, the high school grades should count for more than 40 percent of the total score. It is up to the individual school whether it will use only high school grades, high school grades and SAT scores, or require students to take the examinations administered by the school itself.

This admissions policy has been criticized for not alleviating the problems of the previous system. According to a survey by the PCER, 80 percent of high school students are suffering from various kinds of ailments such as stomach problems, migraine, and astigmatism caused by preparation for examinations. Sixty percent of them are suffering from psychological ailments such as a nervous breakdown and anxiety. Besides these ailments, 30 to 40 percent of high school students drink or smoke in order to find relief from the stress of study. Further, 20 to 30 percent of students are addicted to some kind of drug. Even though it is hard to believe this survey, it suggests very strongly that Korean high school students experience significant stress in gaining admission to universities and colleges. According to the PCER, the present admissions policy standardizes every university and college admission policy, and there is no room for institutions to make diverse and creative admissions policies. This admissions policy has had side effects such as creating the need for private tutoring, which can be a financial burden for parents.

The PCER recommended different admissions policies for public and private institutions. Beginning in 1997, the public universities and colleges used the Student Complex Achievement Records (SCAR) as the main source of data on which to determine admission. The SAT score, writing, interview, and other sources of evidence are optional. The SCAR includes academic transcripts and class standing by subject, aptitude and special abilities in subjects, attendance, extracurricular activities, social service activities, certification, participation in contests, awards, personality, and demeanor from grades one to twelve. The SCAR aims at absolute rather than relative evaluation. It shows achievement level and class standing in each subject instead of a total score. The SCAR also makes it possible to evaluate various kinds of activities and social services as well as academic achievements. The institutions have options in using SCAR, by choosing the items they want and deciding on the value of each subject and item.
Private universities and colleges were to determine their own admissions policy, beginning in 1997. The following principles were, however, to be maintained. First, admissions policy should be geared to the standard curriculum of Korean elementary and secondary schools so they are not forced to become preparatory institutions for the university entrance examination. Second, the new admissions system should lessen the need for parent expenditure on private tutoring. Third, each school should publicly announce its admissions policy so that students and parents can have enough time to prepare. In effect, this means that private schools cannot have an admissions policy drastically different from public ones.

Universities and colleges were authorized to admit students at any time of the year, rather than only at certain periods permitted by the government. This has been a problem, because many universities and colleges have their admission interview/examination on the same day, making it hard for students to apply to more than one school. With the new policy, the government can regulate schools’ admissions schedules so that students can apply to as many schools as they like in a year. According to the new admissions policy, higher education institutions are strongly encouraged to have special quotas for high school graduates from the farming and fishing provinces as well as to provide advantages to industrial workers and disabled students.

The new admissions policy has had some effects on education at the elementary and secondary levels. Rather than being forced to focus on preparing students in the academic subjects included in higher education admission tests, elementary and secondary schools will be able to emphasize extracurricular activities, social services, and citizenship as well as academic subjects. The SCAR system has also encouraged primary and secondary schools to develop the various individual talents of students and to vary their program offerings.

The University Evaluation and Accreditation System

The current system for evaluation and accreditation in Korea was implemented in 1992, after a decade of trial and error. An independent, non-governmental legal entity, the Korean Council for University Education (KCUE), is now recognized by the Ministry of Education and universities as the agency responsible for accreditation of educational programs in all four-year colleges and universities in Korea. Two complementary levels of assessment are carried out, one at the departmental (discipline or field) level and the other at the institutional level.
Some interesting changes have occurred since this evaluation system was established. For example, the student/professor ratio has been reduced from 37.7:1 in 1985 to 34.6:1 in 1994. The number of books in university libraries per student increased from 23.1 in 1990 to 27.9 in 1993. There are improvements in other areas, including laboratory space per student, research space per professor, and laboratory equipment. Evaluation and accreditation have brought visible changes and reorientation in Korean universities, including building an atmosphere of increased competition among various universities, among faculty members as well as students.

The PCER, however, suggested that this evaluation system does not fit the new era of educational reform because founding a new school will become easier and powers to decide admissions quotas and overall school management will be given to the universities and colleges themselves. In this situation, evaluation will be even more vital in order to guarantee institutional accountability and educational quality. The PCER recommended that the government lead institutions in doing a general self-evaluation annually and in doing more detailed evaluation of research and teaching every three to four years. The government, the KCUE, or a higher education evaluation organization consisting of representatives of industry, students, and parents could evaluate higher education institutions and programs and survey the satisfaction level of students and parents every year or two.

The PCER recommended that the government provide more financial aid to the institutions in order to obtain better internal and external evaluation results. In order to encourage specialization in selected fields as well as curriculum diversification, aid would be given at the department or school level instead of the university or college level. Government financial aid would be awarded only to those institutions that demonstrate excellence. Finally, in an effort to connect faculty research more directly to governmental aid, the PCER recommended that the government give funding priority to institutions with faculty who have received government research contracts. This policy is expected to encourage institutions to hire more research-oriented faculty.

Finance

The funding for higher education comes from tuition and fees, government aid, grant and research contracts, endowments, and other sources. Table 7.6 shows that the share of the total government budget spent on higher
education has been about the same since 1980, but that the Ministry of Education’s proportional share of higher education expenditures has declined.

Private as well as national and other public higher education institutions rely heavily on student tuition and fees for their funding, about 80 percent and 40 percent, respectively. Corresponding figures for government aid are 20 percent and 55 percent, respectively. Endowments represent less than 1 percent of the total revenue of Korean higher education institutions. Even though tuition and fees have been rising steadily, the ratios of tuition and fees to both GNP per capita and to urban workers’ gross incomes have been decreasing (at least until the 1998 economic crisis occurred).

The government provides private universities with aid in the form of grants for expansion of facilities as well as for the expansion of science laboratories and research facilities and loans through foundations for the advancement of private universities. In 1995, government aid to private universities amounted to 166 billion won or about 1.3 percent of the national education budget. Private universities are working toward the creation of a University Development Fund as a means of reducing their financial problems. In addition, they are demanding that the government give them permission to institute a donation-based admissions policy.

Table 7.6. Trends in Government Expenditures for Higher Education (Unit: Billion Won)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GNP (A)</th>
<th>Government’s Budget (B)</th>
<th>Budget of MOE (C)</th>
<th>MOE Budget for Higher Ed. (D)</th>
<th>D/B (%)</th>
<th>D/C (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2,776</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>10,064</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>36,672</td>
<td>5,804</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>78,088</td>
<td>12,532</td>
<td>2,492</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>168,437</td>
<td>22,689</td>
<td>5,062</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>299,436</td>
<td>47,593</td>
<td>10,879</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for public universities, government aid is distributed on the basis of such factors as the numbers of students, employees, and majors offered. The universities themselves are responsible for drawing up their own budgets and expanding sources for supplementary funds needed for education or research. Contributions to national or public universities are exempted from income tax, but contributions to other kinds of schools and private universities are exempted only up to an amount not exceeding 10 percent of total annual income. Students who enroll in teachers colleges pay the lowest tuition and fees. Tuition and fees in science fields and private institutions are 10 to 50 percent higher than those in humanities fields and national institutions.

Calculated in constant prices, public educational expenditures per college student have doubled over the past twenty years. Public educational expenditures per college student by national and private universities were 220 percent and 145 percent, respectively, of per capita GNP in 1967. By 1994, the similar proportions of public expenditures had decreased to 41.3 percent and 43.6 percent, respectively, of per capita GNP in 1967 indicating that government university finance did not follow the growth of GNP. This is a major reason why students’ tuition and fees have been rising every year.

The total educational expenditure per student in national institutions is higher than that in private institutions and much higher than that in vocational junior colleges. The expenditure structures of higher education institutions vary widely, according to their type and control. For example, national and public colleges and universities allocate the largest portion of their total budgets to personnel expenses (more than 50 percent), while private institutions spend more money on operations. This is largely because the student/teacher ratios of private institutions tend to be much higher than those for public institutions. Table 7.7 shows these data.

Personnel and operational costs have been growing, apparently due to a rapid increase in the student population through the implementation of the graduation quota system during the 1980s. Because government controls on tuition and fees have not allowed revenues to increase proportionately to costs, expenditures on facilities have decreased. In 1994, colleges and universities allocated 81.7 percent of their total budgets to current expenditures and 18.3 percent to capital outlay.

Before 1989, there were no direct government grants given to private higher education institutions. In 1990, the government started financial aid to private universities and colleges with a long-term goal of
providing grants amounting to 10 percent of the private universities’ budgets. Despite the fact that government aid is fairly small, it is crucial to private institutions. The rationale and purposes for government grants to higher education institutions, and their distribution, have been prominent issues since 1995.

### Internationalization and Globalization of Higher Education

In order to encourage internationalization and globalization of higher education, the government has stimulated higher education institutions to prepare themselves by announcing a detailed schedule for opening the education market, including higher education. The government is encouraging schools to open international affairs programs, build institutions for regional studies, and exchange faculty, students, and programs. It also has increased funding for international scholarships. In 1995, the PCER recommended some policies for internationalization of research that have led to initiatives by two institutions to build a special support system for research and to build an Advanced Academic Information Center.

---

**Table 7.7. Public Educational Expenditures per College and University Student (Unit: Thousand Won)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>National &amp; Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Per Capita GNP (B)</th>
<th>National &amp; Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>219.5</td>
<td>144.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>138.6</td>
<td>162.6</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>162.3</td>
<td>190.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>350.4</td>
<td>298.7</td>
<td>282.4</td>
<td>124.1</td>
<td>105.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1,198.2</td>
<td>971.9</td>
<td>966.0</td>
<td>124.1</td>
<td>100.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1,227.5</td>
<td>1,203.6</td>
<td>1,782.0</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2,105.2</td>
<td>1,840.9</td>
<td>4,007.0</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>3,508.1</td>
<td>3,702.8</td>
<td>8,500.0</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Only four-year colleges and universities are included.*

Korea ranks twenty-seventh in the world with respect to the numbers of articles in the fields of engineering and the natural sciences by Korean scholars published in international academic journals. In the fields of the arts and social sciences, it is hard to find any Korean scholars in the international academic journals. There are also no internationally known Korean academic journals. The PCER provided two suggestions for raising the quality of research to a world-class level. First, financial support should be provided for publishing internationally known journals that could be coedited with well-known foreign scholars. Second, exceptional financial support should be given to qualified research centers and collaborative efforts with international scholars. It is hoped that this will raise the quality of Korean scholars’ research to an international standard, globalize Korean research, and improve the quality of the academic journals that are published in Korea. The government is committed to building an Advanced Academic Information Center in the Korean Congressional Library. The center will manage and supply information and data in all areas of research, networking with worldwide information centers. All libraries of universities and colleges in Korea are to be linked with this center.

ISSUES AND PROBLEMS OF THE NEW EDUCATIONAL REFORMS

The Commission for Educational Reform Propulsion and its executive committee have developed a concrete plan for implementing the higher educational reforms proposed by the PCER. Although the basic direction and strategies are quite promising, there are some dilemmas and problems to overcome. According to the PCER (1995, p. 5), “for the success of the new educational reform, Koreans’ perspectives and perceptions of education, and of employment and the wage system should be changed.” That is, if Koreans still believe that diplomas from higher education institutions are the primary qualification for better jobs and wages and that companies still use them as important criteria to employ persons and to decide wage levels, then the new educational reforms cannot succeed. Perhaps the PCER should have based the proposal on Koreans’ present perception of education in order to make it succeed in the short term, while making a change in people’s perspectives on education a long-term goal.

One proposal for higher education reform is to reduce the resource requirements for founding a private school. The aim of this change is to encourage the establishment of more higher education institutions, but
there is a possibility that the quality of higher education will deteriorate. To prevent that, the PCER is requiring every higher education institution to develop a school charter that includes such elements as the purpose of the school, the content and character of educational programs, and school management principles (faculty employment, faculty-to-student ratio, and finance). According to the PCER, the government will decide whether to provide financial and administrative support by evaluating the school charter. Based on the history of Korean higher education, it seems impossible for the government to control the quality of higher education once the founding of new schools is permitted. This is a dilemma for the PCER. If the PCER does not reduce the criteria for founding private schools, then it cannot attain the original goal of encouraging the establishment of more private schools. On the other hand, if the PCER does reduce the criteria, then it cannot accomplish the goal of increasing the international competitiveness of Korean higher education.

There is also a critical issue related to tightening the connection between institutional evaluations and financial support in order to guarantee institutional accountability and educational quality. Despite providing increased autonomy in setting enrollment quotas and institutional management, many uncompetitive, small, local institutions are against this proposal. They assert that giving more financial aid to the wealthy institutions is unfair, and they ask for equal chances to improve themselves in order to survive in the coming century. Under the present circumstances, in which small, local institutions are still needed, the PCER may have to make other provisions to increase the quality of these institutions.

There are some additional problems related to admissions policy reform. First, the PCER expects that the new admissions policy will lessen students’ and parents’ stress over entrance examinations. However, this policy could cause even more stress to students and parents. As long as the diploma in higher education remains an important step to a better life, adding new criteria for higher education admission increases the stress. To take a simple example, if blood donation is included as a factor in the Student Complex Achievement Records (SCAR), then even weak and sick students will consider donating blood an important act to improve their SCAR.

The PCER and the Executive Committee for Educational Reform Propulsion also face a dilemma in specifying the items for the SCAR. In the highly competitive Korean situation, evaluators and higher education institutions will have to face strong arguments from students and parents about subjective evaluations of applicants and about their selection of
admissions criteria. If the PCER chooses to mandate inclusion only of "objective" items in the SCAR, then it may not achieve its original goal to broaden admissions criteria to include various kinds of nonacademic activities and social services.

The PCER has already found that it cannot include all items originally proposed because of teachers’ resistance. Teachers’ organizations argue that the SCAR will make heavy demands on teachers, who are already overburdened. However, if the PCER chooses only a few items, the SCAR will be almost identical to the present evaluation system. In addition, if an “objective” item, such as a student’s academic record, is mandated to be the most important criterion, then this may raise a number of practical issues. Students and parents are already questioning whether the SCAR can be objective and universal when academic standards seem to differ widely among various high schools. A more troublesome issue is whether schools will be able to prevent parents from unduly influencing teachers’ subjective evaluations of students’ extracurricular activities.

An additional issue related to the new admissions policy is the autonomy of higher education. The PCER is requiring the public colleges and universities to use only the SCAR and abolish written entrance examinations administered by the institutions. This invites the criticism that such a policy is contrary to building autonomy. It seems that the new admissions policy cannot achieve its main goals—solving the private tutoring problem, relieving students and parents from the stress related to university entrance, and normalizing elementary and secondary education—until the competition for higher education is lessened and the public’s perception of the importance of a higher education degree for the future of all Koreans is changed.
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Almost half of the total population of eighteen-year-olds in Korea in 1992 entered higher education. Despite the rapid growth of higher education enrollments (215 times larger in 1992 than in 1945, when Korea gained independence from the Japanese), Koreans seem still to be engaged in a battle over education. In 1992, the university entrance examination sheets were stolen on the eve of the examination, an event considered one of the biggest disasters since the Korean War (1950–1953). A year later, however, an even bigger scandal erupted when it was revealed that 102 students had been admitted to four prestigious universities through various illegal means. A host of people connected to the illegal admissions procedures (including admissions brokers, presidents and officers of universities, high school principals, teachers, parents, and students) were indicted. This scandal was the top story for a month in every newspaper and media broadcast. Because of the public outcry, the government was forced to admit that admissions irregularities had occurred in other years as well. We view the extreme demand for higher education in Korea and the accompanying social and psychological pressure on young people and their families as being analogous to a war for education.

In this chapter, we develop a conceptual framework for understanding the battle over higher education in Korea, situating it in the particular temporal, cultural, and geographic context of Korea (e.g., Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991, p. 61). Primarily through research literature, but also through conversations with colleagues and friends, we address the following questions: How can Koreans’ compulsion to pursue higher
education be explained? What drives parents to put so much pressure on their children to gain admission to higher education? Can anything be done to reduce the intensity of the competition for admission to four-year colleges and universities? How appropriate are predominantly Western social theories for understanding social phenomena that occur in Eastern societies?

Most parents in Korea believe that the education of their children is their foremost responsibility, and they endure any suffering necessary to make certain that excellent schools and other educational resources are available. For example, many people move into large cities to find better schools for their children, and if fathers are ordered to work in the provinces, only the fathers relocate while the rest of the family members remain so that their children can stay in the urban schools. From elementary school to high school, it is not unusual for parents to give teachers presents and cash in hopes that this will insure that their children will get adequate attention in the classroom.

Parents devote time to helping with their children’s homework, hire private tutors, or register their children in private institutes that teach, on an extracurricular basis, such subjects as abacus calculation, speech, drawing, musical instruments, and martial arts (e.g., Tae Kwon Do). According to some surveys, the amount spent by parents on private tutoring exceeds the national budget for education. Some families with children in middle or high school put their television sets in storage so time that could be used for studying is not lost in watching television.

On the day of the national university entrance examination, mothers can be seen at the school gate praying for their children to pass the exam. Because attendance at prestigious universities and colleges is so important, some parents resort to illegal methods to insure that their children are admitted. In fact, many Korean parents sacrifice their lives for their children’s education because they are intensely committed to the goal of having their children attend the top universities and colleges.

Understandably, the pressure on students is tremendous. Most students do their best to meet their parents’ expectations by studying diligently in order to finish with a good record. Both students and their parents believe strongly that getting an advanced education is the best way to succeed in life. Those students who cannot stand this pressure and do not succeed (perhaps even committing suicide) are forgotten and dismissed as losers. On the other hand, students who succeed in getting admitted to prestigious universities are praised for having repaid parents for their sacrifices.
Over the years since 1945, the government has changed the university entrance examination system by shifting the responsibility for administering the examinations back and forth between the individual institutions and the government, and changing the relative importance placed on the various tests and other evidence (e.g., high school academic records and extracurricular activities) of accomplishment required with admissions applications (Park, Do Soon, 1989, pp. 134–135). The government has found, however, that when it changes the system to solve one problem, others appear, and the system has to be changed yet again. Students adapt quickly to any changes and continue pursuing their goal of achieving high scores and getting admitted to prestigious universities and colleges.

Because of the intense pressure for students to gain admission to the most prestigious higher education institutions in Korea, the passage of students through the educational system could be characterized as a battle for education. The word “battle” implies that survival requires the defeat of competitors under intense pressure, that a whole family group depends on the fighting ability of a few members (children), and that the family group will sacrifice itself for the victory of its children (soldiers). The primary objectives of the battle for education are students’ test scores and school records, with the ultimate victory signified by admission into the most prestigious universities. Until recently, social background, recommendations, parental donations to a school, parental employment as a teacher in a school, and even outstanding extracurricular performance have not been considered in the higher education admissions process. Thus, parents continue to believe the best path to victory in this battle is to arm their children with the best test scores on the national entrance examination or other tests required for higher education admission. Guerilla warfare (e.g., stealing tests, bribing officials, etc.) is highly dangerous because of the potential disgrace that it could bring (even including imprisonment).

DEMAND FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

In order to explain the high demand for education and the concomitant educational expansion in Korea, we reviewed twenty-seven related studies and categorized the perspectives reflected in them according to assumptions about the state, education, class conflict, and individual autonomy. The categories used were developed by reviewing existing theoretical perspectives and related studies of Korean scholars and
discussing them with Korean colleagues. Because we accepted the possibility that any one source could include multiple perspectives, some sources are referenced with respect to more than a single category in our framework. In categorizing the perspectives, we followed the analysis process suggested by Marton (1988, pp. 197–199): (1) selecting statements relevant for the issues under investigation from both the literature and conversations with colleagues, (2) reviewing these statements and focusing on embedded meanings, with particular attention to borderline cases in order to clarify the dimensions of each category, and (3) classifying the clusters of statements and associating each group with relevant existing theories.

An important factor in the expansion of Korean higher education is the extremely high social demand. We found three qualitatively different ways of viewing this phenomenon: the historical and cultural perspective, the social environment perspective, and the educational stratification perspective. Table 8.1 illustrates how the dimensions of each perspective can be described.

The Historical and Cultural Perspective

A distinguishing feature of the historical and cultural perspective on demand for higher education in Korea is that it considers historical factors to be independent of the intentions and point of view of the dominant social class. The major historical and cultural factors covered in these studies include the Japanese colonial experience (Lee, M., 1990; Kim, I., 1991), the closed door to study abroad, the emergence of the demand for education after the release of Japanese control (Paik, 1986), the delay of military service for university students during the Korean War (Park, H., 1987), the demolition of the traditional class system and the resulting homogeneity of the society (Kim, Y., 1990), and the role of education in the cultural tradition and value system (Choi et al., 1989).

Inhwaee Kim (1991, p. 77) and Mina Lee (1990) diagnose Koreans’ high demand for education as a distorted perspective that originated in Japanese colonial education and was spread by Korean educational leaders trained during the colonial period. According to Seungtak Paik (1986), the demand was increased because many people who returned from Japan and other foreign countries after independence aspired to the same high levels of education for their children as were available in the countries where they had been living. Consequently, after Japanese control ended, the demand for education in Korea burgeoned.
Table 8.1. Perspectives on the High Demand for Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspectives</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Class (Group) Struggle</th>
<th>Individual Autonomy</th>
<th>Important Factors of High Demand</th>
<th>Practice (Related Studies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical and Cultural</td>
<td>Given and embodied condition</td>
<td>assumption free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colonial experience</td>
<td>M. Lee (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Korean War</td>
<td>I. Kim (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crushed-down social structure</td>
<td>S. Paik (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional view of education</td>
<td>H. Park (1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Important role of education in rebuilding the social structure</td>
<td>Y. Kim (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Homogeneity of the society</td>
<td>Y. Choi (1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parents' will to sacrifice for their children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Environment</td>
<td>The present, temporal, and changing circumstances</td>
<td>assumption free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased GNP per capita</td>
<td>J. Yoon (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demographic change</td>
<td>Y. Kim (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact from the lower-level education system</td>
<td>A. Kim (1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Stratification</td>
<td>Status competition</td>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>Credentials for social status defined by a dominant group</td>
<td>Middle-High</td>
<td>Low-Middle</td>
<td>Gap in salary</td>
<td>D. No (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possibility for acquiring political power</td>
<td>J. Han (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job change</td>
<td>I. Kim (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>B. Jung (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. Kim (1991)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Heechan Park (1987, p. 77) lists the Korean War as another stimulant leading to increased demand for higher education. During the Korean War (1950–1953), the government enacted the Ordinance for Temporal Delay of Conscription of University Students, which served as an incentive to induce young men to seek higher education, thereby increasing enrollment. Even with the Korean War cease-fire of 1953, the possibility of another war encouraged parents to register their sons in institutions of higher education in order to prevent their conscription into the military. This reflects the traditional Korean family culture that values sons as its most precious resource.

Younghwa Kim (1990) notes two forces encouraging Koreans to seek higher education. First, education became the only means for social mobility after the traditional Korean social class structure was crushed during the Japanese colonial period. Second, the social, cultural, and linguistic homogeneity of Korean society led to the use of education rather than ethnicity or language to rebuild the social class structure.

Youngpo Choi et al. (1989, p. 16) argue that Koreans’ traditional view of education as an instrument for acquiring socioeconomic status is an important cultural factor that led many people to attend institutions of higher education. Taesoo Jung (1991, p. 26) sees Korean parents’ particular willingness to sacrifice for their children’s education as one of the factors fueling their zeal for higher education. His focus on Korean parents’ love for their children and concept of sacrifice is different from the focus of social stratification theory. Although social stratification theory argues that parents are willing to sacrifice in order to get their children into special groups (e.g., elites) that use higher education as a criterion for admission, the cultural view argues that the parents must first have a special view of children in order to be willing to sacrifice their whole lives for a specific goal.

The Social Environment Perspective

From the social environment perspective, the high demand for higher education is viewed in terms of gross national product (GNP), demographic characteristics of the national population, and the prevalent type of school system. This perspective differs from the historical and cultural view in finding its elements in the present, changing environment, which includes the economic situation, demographic change, and impacts of the lower-level education system. Jungil Yoon and Gichang Song (1990) listed economic development and the improvement of living standards as
important factors that increase the social demand for higher education. Youngchul Kim (1978), using aggregate data, found that demand for higher education is positively related to GNP, family income, average income of university graduates, education costs per student, and employment rate of university graduates, and negatively related to the cost of tuition. Anna Kim (1988) suggests that there is also a “warehousing effect” in times of high unemployment because higher education absorbs students who have no chance for obtaining good jobs.

Several authors list demographic change as a significant factor affecting the demand for higher education (Kim, A., 1988; Yoon & Song, 1990; Jung, T., 1991). The increase of the school-age cohort in the lower grade schools caused by the postwar baby boom pressured the government to expand both the primary and secondary school systems (Kim, A., 1988). The larger numbers of high school graduates, in turn, increased the demand for higher education (Choi et al., 1989, pp. 215–216). Although not entirely the result of demographic growth in the higher education age cohort, a related factor was an increase in higher education enrollment quotas promulgated by the government in 1980.

Educational Stratification Perspective

Studies in this category use Randall Collins’s (1979) educational stratification theory to explain the social demand for higher education. This view is based on the assumption that there is an “autonomous state” that controls the provision of education. From this perspective, the primary function of education is to provide the credentials necessary for attaining social status, as defined by the dominant elites whose interests are served by the higher education system. There are marked distinctions in wages and social status between high school graduates and university graduates. Consequently, individuals are “credential seekers” who compete for status within these educational and occupational structures, often under conditions of restricted autonomy that depend on the levels to which they aspire. According to this perspective, high demand for education results from competition over the potential “payoffs” perceived to accrue to advanced educational credentials.

Dere No (1980) finds large differences between Korean high school and university graduates in salary, access to political power and influence, employment opportunities, and marriage. No suggests that the social, economic, and political advantages that accrue to higher education graduates are strong inducements to attend higher education institutions.
Joonsang Han (1990) also argues that social, political, and economic differences in occupational status and salary between college graduates and noncollege graduates are the main factors causing the high demand for higher education. Finally, Byungjoo Jung (1985, p. 101) finds that one cause of demand for higher education in Korea is “the competition for acquiring an educational career” that will lead to elite status.

HIGHER EDUCATION EXPANSION

Table 8.2 summarizes the range of views represented in studies of higher education expansion in Korea, highlighting their underlying assumptions and conceptual dimensions. It should be remembered that the Korean government chose to expand the higher education system by authorizing the establishment of new private institutions rather than by significantly increasing the numbers or size of public institutions. This policy reduced the financial burden on the government for the provision of higher education by shifting it to the private sector. In addition to the social environment and educational stratification perspectives used to explain demand for higher education, three other qualitatively different views emerged from our analysis: human capital, radical, and social dynamic. Each perspective is discussed in light of its contribution to an understanding of Korean higher education expansion.

Social Environment Perspective

Joonsang Han (1990) identifies three factors influencing higher education expansion in Korea that may be said to illustrate the social environment perspective: demographic changes, the peer effect (register because age-mates are also registering for higher education), and the inexperience of the Ministry of Education. Demographic pressure brought about by the post-Korean War baby boom (Joo, 1990) was a major factor in government policy that enabled the expansion of Korean higher education. The following illustrates this pattern of policy shifts: “In 1968, the Ministry of Education (MOE) adopted the No Entrance Examination System for junior high school admission to alleviate the high pressured competition for junior high school. But the competition for education then moved to senior high school. The government adopted the Senior High School Allocation System through a Lottery in 1974 in order to alleviate this competition for senior high schools. Consequently, the pressure of competition moved to the higher education level” (Joo, 1990, p. 22).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspectives</th>
<th>Class (Group)</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Autonomous</th>
<th>High Demand</th>
<th>Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>The present, circumstances</td>
<td>organic, bureaucratic</td>
<td>Government planning for national development</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital Environment</td>
<td>Demographic change</td>
<td>Assumption free</td>
<td>General phenomenon of</td>
<td>Developing countries</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectives</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Will of the dominant class</td>
<td>Instrumental status</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions (View) of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational competition</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Autonomous credentials for</td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stratification</td>
<td>Social status defined by</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>as a dominant group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational bourgeois interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Competition for status group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interests of the new &quot;colonials&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value of credentials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interests of the new &quot;colonials&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class rebuilding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimizing political power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Controlling student movements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</table>
Human Capital Perspective

This perspective sees the expansion of higher education as the result of governmental planning to develop human capital and of technological advancement. Focusing on education, this view can be characterized as promoting an “organic bureaucratic state” with very limited class conflicts or group struggles, assuming that the national interest and peoples’ interests are the same, and focusing on structure rather than individuals in a structure. Higher education expansion can be explained in terms of macrolevel planning as an instrument for national development and change in the social structure.

Youngchul Kim (1979, p. 49) and Junggyu Hwang (1980, p. 122) argue that the rapid expansion of Korean higher education is due to industrial needs for highly educated personnel that are generated by economic development. As industry expands and the need for educated people grows, the government increases higher education enrollments to meet these needs. Using a human capital framework, Bosung Hwang asserts: “Generally speaking, higher education in South Korea appears to have expanded in response to technological improvements in the economy requiring higher levels of ability among employees…. The traditional view that education serves the state as well as the individual and the enterprise may also be a positive factor” (1990, pp. 730, 732).

After the late 1960s, human resources demand and investment priorities were the most important criteria for determining the admission quotas for higher education (Yoon, 1979, p. 17). Owing to problems with estimating manpower needs and student demand accurately, there were large imbalances between the numbers of students seeking admission to various majors and the number of spaces available under the admission quotas (Yoon, 1979, p. 48). Sail Park (1982, p. 151) asserts that some of the negative consequences of higher education expansion were based, in part, on the political and administrative shortcomings of the government. For instance, an oversupply of higher education graduates occurred when higher education policy was developed and executed without considering employment policy and labor market conditions. The government was, however, clearly influenced by economic development theorists and international aid organizations that stressed the importance of human capital for economic development. Consequently, it supported the expansion of Korean higher education (primarily through the private sector), which, in turn, provided the highly educated people who were needed for continued expansion of the burgeoning Korean economy (Park, S., 1982, pp. 149–150).
Radical Perspective

This perspective assumes that the government functions as an “instrumental state” in which education is fundamentally an apparatus for status allocation. It assumes that society is characterized by a high level of social class conflict, views individuals as lacking autonomy, and explains higher education expansion as resulting from pressure exerted by dominant social class interests that legitimate the use of political power for controlling student movements (and other forms of dissent) and serving the interest of elites.

Soonwon Kang’s (1988, p. 184) study of Korean education policy in the 1970s uses a radical perspective, framed by Marxist and imperialist assumptions, to argue that the state “cannot be neutral in any society. The state guarantees only the interests of the dominant class and itself becomes the dominant group.” She assumes that educational policy reflects the economic interest of Korean monopoly capital and asserts that schools work for legitimizing and reproducing the capitalist order. According to her, Koreans have become overeducated because of capitalists’ interest in having an inexpensive yet highly qualified labor force. Focusing on secondary education, she concludes that expansion was demanded by Korean monopoly entrepreneurs, resulted from adopting an educational system based on the nonselective and inclusive model of the United States, and provided the Korean government with the means for political socialization of working class children. Taemi Kim (1987), in analyzing Korean higher education reform during the U.S military period, also concludes that reforms were based on the education system of the United States and implemented in support of its interests in Korea.

Hyeyoung Kim (1989) asserts that rapid higher education expansion during the 1980s resulted from collaboration between bourgeois economic interests and government political interest. He asserts that high demand for higher education results from privileges in the labor market given to university graduates and by the zeal for education originating in traditional Confucianism (Kim, H., 1989, p. 97). In a related vein, Chulan Joo (1990) argues that the government expanded higher education in the early 1980s as a means of legitimizing its political power and controlling student movements. The competition for higher education led to social problems such as class conflict because the poor were disadvantaged in comparison with the more affluent in terms of number of grade repeaters and access to private tutoring. Arguing from an imperialist framework, Soonwon Kang (1988, p. 127) asserts that since the modern Korean educational
system was imported from other countries, educational policies did not necessarily reflect people’s wants and needs but rather the demands of foreigners and dominant Korean social class interests.

When a military leader, Jun Duhwan, became the president of Korea through a coup on 12 December 1979, his goal was to strengthen and legitimize his power by reforming the social system, including higher education. The military government tried to control student dissent and demonstrations by introducing a graduation quota system, which permitted only 70 percent of the students admitted into higher education to graduate, in the belief that this would pressure students to spend all of their time studying instead of participating in student movements.

**Educational Stratification Perspective**

The important factors leading to higher education expansion in Korea, according to this perspective, were the value of educational credentials, the interests of the educational bourgeois, and an intense competition for membership in high-status social groups. Joonsang Han (1990) concludes that status competition is the most powerful factor underlying higher education expansion. In extensive interviews with students entering universities and colleges, he found that students’ goals are less focused on gaining knowledge and specialized skills than on obtaining the credentials necessary for gaining membership in high-status social groups. He asserts that “according to a perspective focusing on status competition, higher education expansion is caused by conflicts among special groups” (Han, 1990, p. 227). Although his data do not provide evidence that employers consider credentials in hiring decisions, it is clear that students believe educational credentials are important.

Byungjoo Jung (1985) used Randall Collins’s (1979) educational stratification theory to analyze the expansion of Korean higher education. In accordance with Collins’s (1979) theory, the high value of credentials, competition for status-group membership, inflation of educational credentials, and interests of the educational bourgeois are important factors in Korea. Virtually all of the Korean political, economic, and academic elites are graduates of the most prestigious Korean universities. This suggests the importance of solidarity among graduates of the top-ranking universities in sponsoring fellow alumni/ae for high positions (Jung, B., 1985, p. 63).

Joonsang Han (1990, p. 229) asserts that the expansion of higher education was a by-product of educational reform led by education
specialists who believed that the most important function of higher education was increasing the numbers of highly educated people, thereby expanding the size of “special status groups” composed of educated elites and skilled professionals. He does not, however, accept the notion that the education specialists advising the government worked to subordinate Korean education to the interests of foreign countries, nor does he question the specialists’ devotion to developing the system (Han, 1990, p. 302).

Bootae Kim (1991) extends Collins’s (1979) theory to the level of individual needs and competition for social status within the national social structure, but in an international context. The fixation on credentials in Korean society evolved through the development of technology and industrialization, growth of an educated elite, collective orientations of individuals for attaining high-status jobs requiring advanced education, Japanese colonial suppression of higher education, and the legacy of Confucian tradition. He argues that the structure of schooling reflects the needs of both influential social status groups and the government, but suggests that the emphasis on credentials has been encouraged as a means of fortifying the government’s weak base of political power (Kim, B., 1991, p. 228). He concludes by arguing that a more inclusive theory needs to be developed for understanding the dynamics of Korean society with respect to education: “The individual characters should be understood within a structured pattern or syndrome. Such a view requires that we overcome the dogmatic limitations of existing theories and build a dialectic view to explain the social dynamics” (1991, p. 232).

**Social Dynamic Perspective**

This perspective uses group dynamics to explain higher education expansion in Korea and has a “liberal state” or “autonomous state” view that assumes that many groups influence educational policy, that there is a high level of group struggle, and that the relative power of each social group changes through time and place rather than being fixed. According to this perspective, educational institutions are a battleground for contesting group interests. Consequently, higher education expansion in Korea results from the dynamic relations and struggles of each group rather than from the imposition of dominant social class or political interests. Like the other perspectives discussed, this is a structural, macrolevel view that does not consider individual autonomy within a structure or a group.
According to Heechan Park (1987), higher education expansion results from dynamic relations among related groups such as the government, the Korean people, and private schools. The government emphasizes higher education as an ideological tool and an important means for economic development. The Korean people view higher education as a necessity for social mobility. Private schools try to increase admissions quotas in order to increase revenues and shore up their financial situation.

Youngpyo Choi et al. (1989, pp. 215–216) identify four major factors that affect higher education expansion: (1) structure of the educational system—single track, rigid entrance examination system, admissions policy, curriculum focused on social sciences and humanities; (2) labor market—net wage differentials by educational level, demand for higher education graduates, segregated labor market; (3) culture and history—high value placed on educational credentials as an avenue for success, the legacy of Japanese colonial control, which emphasized credentials; and (4) the demographic and social structure of Korea—class structure, class mobility based on education, increased size of school-age cohorts due to the postwar baby boom. This model focuses only on the factors that led to “the phenomenon of overeducation.” It does not consider what made higher education supply possible.

Using Margaret Archer’s (1982) model to analyze the social dynamics underlying Korean higher education expansion, Hyeyoung Lee (1992) identified four important social forces: students aspiring to higher education, colleges and universities, industry, and the government. However, the relative influence of each group varied by historical period. Higher education expansion from 1945 to the 1950s was led by parents and students who demanded higher education as an avenue of social mobility, and by private schools that wanted to increase enrollments in order to bolster their institutional finances by the accompanying increase in tuition revenue. During this period, the government adopted a laissez-faire policy (pushed by elites) for the establishment of a new democratic nation. This was accompanied by a socially explosive demand from Koreans for higher education after decades of repression by the Japanese.

In the 1960s and the 1970s, the government controlled admissions quotas for four-year colleges and universities to suppress antigovernment movements of students. This policy led to such intense competition for admissions, including the use of private tutoring and a significant increase in grade repeaters, that the government was forced to expand
the admissions quotas at the end of the 1970s. Demands from industry forced the government to increase the supply of college and university graduates and increased the social demand for higher education as employers began using academic credentials in hiring practices and salary distribution. In Hyeyoung Lee’s (1992) view, the government has two agendas: one is to increase social efficiency, and the other is to maintain its own power.

Most of the studies chosen in the foregoing analysis of research were of the “theory consuming” type, namely, research adapting existing theories in order to find a “best fit” explanation of a phenomenon. However, a drawback of using existing theories is that researchers may over-look unique aspects of the Korean situation. Consequently, the following is an attempt to expand on the work already discussed and develop a more comprehensive conceptualization that can widen our understanding of the zeal in Korea for higher education and the remarkable expansion of its higher education system.

THE BATTLE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN KOREA

To supplement the review of published research, fifty-two Koreans were interviewed early in 1992 about their perspectives on the demand for higher education. Because the intent was to interview a group of people who were reasonably representative of the Korean higher education structure, five presidents of educational institutions (two from the public sector and three from the private sector), ten professors (four from the public sector and six from the private sector), eight students (four from the public sector and four from the private sector), seven parents, five second-generation (offspring of the original founders) private school founders, seven educational specialists, one congressman, and eight public officials were included.

In analyzing the interviews, a perspective emerged that was not found in any of the research reviewed. This perspective, which focuses on the individual while admitting the existence of a “loosely coupled system and structure,” can be called the individualistic structural view. From this perspective, the Korean context cannot be described adequately by the words “struggle” or “competition”; rather, it characterizes the Korean people as actually being involved in a war for survival due to insufficient natural resources, high population density, inadequate job opportunities, and conflict over government policies aimed at various types of social and economic control. This war for survival has spilled over to the
education sector, pushing people into increasingly intense battles over higher education.

Because the traditional Korean social class structure was shattered during the Japanese colonial period, and a somewhat rebuilt structure was shattered again during the Korean War (1950–1953), schooling became the battlefield for individual survival and fulfillment of aspirations. Because education was not perceived to be under the monopoly of a special social class group, educational credentials became objective and fair criteria for selection to career positions. Education was also believed to contribute to social development. The esteem accorded to education is consistent with the Korean cultural tradition of respect for educated people, especially those who teach others. Schooling became a battlefield for individual survival and success, not because it is the best system, but because it is better than others in its capacity to concentrate on the nature and development of human beings.

Engagement in a war for education is a social and educational phenomenon that can occur only when people in a social class or other group are perceived to have at least limited autonomy. The primary combat unit in this war is the family, with its platoons of children the major individual combatants. This individualistic structural view sees the group or class as a loosely organized structure. Group interests are not perceived to be as cohesive as other views assert, with intragroup conflicts sometimes larger than intergroup conflicts. This view assumes that when there are conflicts between group or social class interests and personal interests, people choose to protect their personal interests rather than those of their group. Individuals are seen as having free will that may be different from the will of groups to which they belong. This includes taking on the government in instances in which state policy conflicts with personal goals (e.g., resistance to the Korean government’s imposition of admission and graduation quotas for higher education).

Like the context perspective, it assumes that the role and will of the state change according to the political, social, and economic situation. The state participates in the war for education by developing educational policies, by sometimes trying to reduce the public demand for education, and by sometimes encouraging people to fight on the educational battlefield. The battlefield framework for understanding the pressure exerted for educational attainment in Korea is shown in Figure 8.1.

The individualistic structural view differs from the context perspective in its focus on human nature. Although the social context perspective argues that each country’s current situation can be understood in terms of
its historical and cultural context, assuming that the past has a strong influence on human behavior, the individualistic structural view assumes that the original intentions of past systems have minimal influence on the present behavior of people. The individualistic structural view focuses on human nature and places priority on personal survival and self-interest when they conflict with group interests.

The individualistic structural view is similar to the status competition and educational stratification point of view in that both focus on the individual’s effort to survive and succeed in life. The two views are differentiated by their assumptions about group solidarity. The educational stratification perspective assumes there are special groups with well-defined identities and common interests. According to this view, when hiring people, employers use the very particularistic criterion of “sharing their culture” rather than
assessment of individual skills and ability to work. If we view employers’ hiring decisions from the individualistic structural perspective, employers are seen to be concerned primarily with guaranteeing high productivity. If a credential is unrelated to productivity because of changing social and economic conditions or any other reason, employers will no longer use that credential as a criterion for employment. According to the individualistic structural perspective, protecting group interests is just an approach to protecting personal interests. Finally, unlike the educational stratification perspective, the individualistic structural point of view does not view the government as necessarily representing the dominant ruling class.

This battlefield framework suggests a particular way of understanding Korean higher education that takes into consideration the unique historical and social structural context of the country. This perspective can also be adapted to societies that are similar to Korea with respect to such characteristics as lack of natural resources, high population density, social structure repressed by war and colonial domination, the important role of education in national development, and parents’ will to sacrifice for their children. The battlefield framework will become less relevant as conditions in Korea change. Because most frameworks are constructed for a particular time, place, and people, they require periodic revision and reformulation. For now, it is hoped that the battlefield framework might stimulate thought and debate among educational experts and policy makers over the most appropriate and effective ways to facilitate the continued development of Korea’s higher education system.
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APPENDIX A

Institutional Information
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Appendix A contains a brief description of the different types of higher education institutions in Korea, both two-year and four-year, and presents a complete list of the institutions, including basic institutional information (type of control, year established, number of departments, number of undergraduate students, and number of graduate students) as well as mailing addresses and telephone and facsimile numbers.

TYPES OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN KOREA

There are several types of higher education institutions in Korea: colleges and universities, graduate schools, teachers colleges, junior colleges, miscellaneous schools, and open universities, including the Korean Air and Correspondence University. Under the Korean Education Law and subsequent presidential and ministerial decrees, all higher education institutions (whether national; other public, including municipal; or private) come under the purview of the Ministry of Education, which exercises control over such matters as student quotas by academic field, qualifications for teaching staff, curriculum and degree requirements, and general education courses.

Colleges and Universities

These are four-year institutions offering programs leading to the bachelor’s degree. Some also offer programs in medicine, Oriental medicine, and
dentistry, which take six years to complete. By permission of the Ministry of Education, a four-year college or university may also have a graduate school and some professional schools.

Graduate Schools

Korean graduate schools are classified into three types, according to their functions and goals: professional graduate schools, general graduate schools, and open graduate schools. The professional graduate schools prepare students for careers in education, business administration, public administration, and other fields. The academic degree conferred is the professional master’s degree. General graduate schools are aimed at fostering creativity, initiative, and leadership in specialized academic disciplines. Usually, the general graduate schools confer the Master of Arts or Master of Science degree to students who meet academic standards through examinations, the submission of a thesis, and completion of other graduation requirements. Every graduate school is a part of a college or university, with the exception of open graduate schools, which belong to open universities.

Students requesting admission to a doctoral program must have a master’s degree or equivalent, a scholarly background in the field of specialization with some demonstrated research experience, and recommendations from individuals in the field. Generally, a doctoral program requires a minimum of sixty credits taken over three or more years. Students must pass a foreign language test to demonstrate an ability to comprehend and write in at least two foreign languages. They must also pass a comprehensive examination, complete their course work with a 3.0 average (B) or better, submit an acceptable dissertation, and pass an oral examination. A faculty advisory committee is appointed for students at the doctoral level.

Teachers Colleges (National Universities of Education)

These institutions, national in their funding and control, are distributed across Korea by province and major city. Graduates from these colleges receive a bachelor’s degree and certification to teach in primary schools. Begun as two-year (“normal”) schools, these institutions were upgraded to four-year institutions in 1981. Students provided with tuition to attend the national universities of education are obligated to teach for at least four years after graduation in the primary schools to which they are assigned by the Ministry of Education.
Junior Colleges

Junior colleges offer programs, most of two years’ duration, in several general categories including: commerce, kindergarten education, engineering/technical (e.g., agriculture, fisheries, civil and electronics technology), liberal arts, nursing and health, and textiles and design. Although the majority of programs for the training of kindergarten teachers are offered by junior colleges, there are also programs offered by a few four-year colleges and universities. The fields of greatest interest to students are engineering, technology, and nursing. Junior college programs are two years in length, with the exception of the fisheries/marine colleges, which offer an additional six-month course for navigation practice, and the nursing program, which is three years in length.

Miscellaneous Schools

This category was established by the Ministry of Education to indicate institutions which are highly specialized in their academic programs. As a rule, these schools lack a sufficient liberal arts core or basic general education program to meet the standards for an accepted undergraduate program in Korea. They are predominantly theological and other single-purpose institutions. Miscellaneous schools that have received Ministry of Education approval may have four-year courses for which students receive a diploma upon completion of their programs. Students from these institutions may be accepted for graduate-level work by colleges or universities if their specialized training constitutes adequate preparation for graduate-level studies in their chosen fields.

Open Universities

Open universities provide higher education to employed youths and adults who missed the opportunity for higher education. Included in this category is the Korean Air and Correspondence University, the only higher education institution offering distance education. It started as a junior college within Seoul National University in 1972 and began developing bachelor’s degree programs in 1982, when it became an independent institution. The program of the Korean Air and Correspondence University is fairly rigorous, with a dropout rate of approximately 70 percent.
INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

Information on each higher education institution is grouped by institutional category and includes data presented according to the following scheme:

Name of Institution
1) Type of Control
2) Year Established
3) Number of Departments
4) Number of Undergraduate Students
5) Number of Graduate Students

The country telephone code for Korea is 82. This code must be dialed for all international calls to Korea, followed by the local area code and telephone number. Within Korea, callers must dial 0 before the area code. The listings show, in parentheses, the local area code for each institution’s main telephone number, preceded by a 0.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Ajou University
1) Private 2) 1973 3) 33 4) 7,151 5) 639
Address: San 5 Wonchon-dong, Kwonson-gu, Suwon, Kyonggi 441–749, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0331) 219–2114 FAX: (0331)213–5158

Andong National University
1) National 2) 1947 3) 32 4) 4,550 5) 105
Address: 388 Songchun-dong, Andong, Kyungbuk 760–749, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0571)55–1661 FAX: (0571)50–5599

Anyang University
1) Private 2) 1952 3) 24 4) 3,460 5) 0
Address: 708–113 Anyang 5-dong, Manan-ku, Anyang, Kyung-gi 430–714, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0343)49–5271 FAX: (0343)48–3870

Asia United Theological College
1) Private 2) 1981 3) 3 4) 400 5) 67
Address: 151–1 Ashin-ri, Okchun-myun, Yangpyong, Kyunggi 476–751, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0338)72–5339 FAX: (0338)71–5675

The Catholic University of Korea
1) Private 2) 1947 3) 21 4) 4,597 5) 603
Address: 90–2 Hyehwa-dong, Chong no-gu, Seoul 110–530, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)741–6326 FAX: (02)741–6470
Catholic University of Taegu-Hyosung
1) Private 2) 1952 3) 62 4) 10,079 5) 625
Address: 330 Keumnak-dong, Hayang-eup, Kyongsan, Kyongbuk 713–702, R.O.K.
Telephone: (053)852–8001 FAX: (053)852–8030

Changwon National University
1) National 2) 1979 3) 36 4) 4,648 5) 254
Address: 9 Sarim-dong, Changwon, Kyungnam 641–773, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0551)83–2151 FAX: (0551)83–2970

Cheju National University of Education
1) National 2) 1962 3) 1 4) 252 5) 0
Address: 4810 Hwabuk-dong, Cheju 690–060, R.O.K.
Telephone: (064)20–0700 FAX: (064)55–5061

Cheju National University
1) National 2) 1962 3) 55 4) 7,480 5) 450
Address: 1 Ara-dong, Cheju 690–756, R.O.K.
Telephone: (064)54–2114 FAX: (064)55–6130

Cheongju National University of Education
1) National 2) 1962 3) 1 4) 992 5) 0
Address: 135 Sugok-dong, Cheongju, Chungbuk 360–150, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0431)279–0800 FAX: (0431)279–0797

Chinju National University of Education
1) National 2) 1940 3) 1 4) 1,960 5) 0
Address: 380 Sinan-dong, Chinju, Kyongnam 660–756, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0591)43–6001 FAX: (0591)745–8741

Chonbuk National University
1) National 2) 1947 3) 92 4) 15,580 5) 1,813
Address: 664–14 Dokjin-dong, Dokjin-gu, Chojbu 560–756, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0652)70–2114 FAX: (0652)70–2188

Chongju University
1) Private 2) 1947 3) 60 4) 9,921 5) 496
Address: 36 Naedok-dong, Chongju, Chungbuk 360–764, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0431)51–8114 FAX: (0431)51–8110

Chonnam National University
1) National 2) 1952 3) 97 4) 17,071 5) 2,022
Address: 300 Yongbong-dong, Puk-gu, Kwangju 500–757, R.O.K.
Telephone: (062)520–6114 FAX: (062)524–6713

Chosun University
1) Private 2) 1946 3) 65 4) 17,364 5) 1,317
Address: 375 Suseok-dong, Dong-gu, Kwangju 501–759, R.O.K.
Telephone: (062)230–7114 FAX: (062)232–8834
Chuncheon National University of Education
1) National 2) 1939 3) 1 4) 1,280 5) 0
Address: 339 Soksa-dong, Chuncheon, Kangwon 200–703, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0361)261–4321 FAX: (0361)261–4328

Chung-Ang University
1) Private 2) 1918 3) 83 4) 16,440 5) 2,692
Address: 221 Huksuk-dong, Dongjak-ku, Seoul 156–756, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)810–5114 FAX: (02)812–5384

Chungbuk National University
1) National 2) 1951 3) 76 4) 11,720 5) 1,237
Address: 48 Gaesin-dong, Cheongju, Chungbuk 360–763, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0431)61–3114 FAX: (0431)63–0612

Chungnam National University
1) National 2) 1952 3) 92 4) 15,605 5) 2,281
Address: 220 Kung-dong, Yousung-ku, Taejon 305–764, R.O.K.
Telephone: (042)821–5114 FAX: (042)823–8589

Dae Bul University
1) Private 2) 1992 3) 13 4) 4,920 5) 0
Address: 72–1 Samho-ri, Samho-myon, Youngam-kun, Chonnam 526–850, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0693)70–1114 FAX: (0693)71–0165

Dae Jin University
1) Private 2) 1992 3) 34 4) 4,760 5) 0
Address: 11–1 Sundan-ri, Pocheon, Pocheon-kun, Kyonggi 487–800, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0357)530–9114 FAX: (0357)530–9399

Dan Kook University
1) Private 2) 1947 3) 96 4) 16,735 5) 2,089
Address: San 8 Hannam-dong, Yongsan-gu, Seoul 140–714, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)709–2114 FAX: (02)792–5814

Dong-A University
1) Private 2) 1946 3) 75 4) 17,162 5) 1,348
Address: 840 Hadan-dong, Saha-gu, Pusan 604–714, R.O.K.
Telephone: (051)200–6114 FAX: (051)201–5430

Dongduck Women’s University
1) Private 2) 1950 3) 24 4) 4,172 5) 135
Address: 23–1 Wolgok-dong, Sungbuk-ku, Seoul 136–714, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)913–2001 FAX: (02)913–0731

Dongeui University
1) Private 2) 1978 3) 42 4) 8,720 5) 333
Institutional Information

Address: 24 Kaya-dong, Pusanjin-gu, Pusan 614–714, R.O.K.
Telephone: (051)890–1114 FAX: (051)895–3727
Dongguk University
1) Private 2) 1906 3) 81 4) 15,489 5) 1,935
Address: 3–26 Pil-dong, Chung-gu, Seoul 100–715, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)260–3114 FAX: (02)277–1274
Dongseo University
1) Private 2) 1992 3) 8 4) 3,560 5) 0
Address: San 69–1 Jurea-dong, Buk-ku, Pusan 616–010, R.O.K.
Telephone: (051)313–2001 FAX: (051)312–2389
Dongshin University
1) Private 2) 1986 3) 17 4) 3,120 5) 24
Address: 252 Daeho-dong, Naju, Chonnam 520–714, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0613)30–3114 FAX: (0613)33–2909
Dong Yang University
1) Private 2) 1993 3) 8 4) 2,200 5) 0
Address: 574 Sombum-ri, Poonggi-eup, Youngpoong-kun, Kyungbuk, 251–800, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0572)30–1114 FAX: (0572)636–8523
Duksung Women’s University
1) Private 2) 1950 3) 27 4) 5,160 5) 109
Address: 419 Ssangmun-dong, Dobong-gu, Seoul 132–714, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)901–8000 FAX: (02)901–8060
Ewha Woman’s University
1) Private 2) 1886 3) 60 4) 15,147 5) 2,456
Address: 11–1 Daehyun-dong, Sudaemun-ku, Seoul 120–750, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)360–2114 FAX: (02)393–5903
Full Gospel University
1) Private 2) 1953 3) 8 4) 1,800 5) 57
Address: 604–5 Dang Jung-dong, Kunpo, Kyunggi 435–742, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0343)56–8054 FAX: (0343)57–6517
Gyeongsang National University
1) National 2) 1948 3) 68 4) 11,750 5) 1,242
Address: 900 Kajwa-dong, Chinju, Kyongnam 660–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0591)54–8331 FAX: (0591)54–8061
Hallym University
1) Private 2) 1982 3) 27 4) 4,280 5) 216
Address: 1 Okchon-dong, Chunchon, Kangwon 200–702, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0361)58–1000 FAX: (0361)55–4650
Handong University
1) Private 2) 1994 3) 12 4) 2,400 5) 0
Address: 3 Namsong-ri, Heunghae-eup, Puk-gu, Pohang, Kyungbuk 791–940, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0562)60–1111 FAX: (0562)60–1149

Hanil Theological Seminary
1) Private 2) 1923 3) 7 4) 1,460 5) 0
Address: 694–1 Shim-ri, Sangkwan-myon, Wanju-kun, Chonbuk, 565–830, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0652)83–7011 FAX: (0652)84–7863

Han Nam University
1) Private 2) 1956 3) 51 4) 9,072 5) 602
Address: 133 Ojung-dong, Taeduk-gu, Taejon 300–791, R.O.K.
Telephone: (042)629–7114 FAX: (042)625–5874

Hankuk Aviation University
1) Private 2) 1952 3) 9 4) 2,320 5) 86
Address: 200–1 Hwajon-dong, Koyang, Kyonggi 411–791, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)300–0114 FAX: (02)307–5769

Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
1) Private 2) 1954 3) 62 4) 12,738 5) 1,531
Address: 270 Imun-dong Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul 130–791, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)961–4114 FAX: (02)960–7898

Hanseo University
1) Private 2) 1991 3) 34 4) 3,860 5) 0
Address: 360 Daegok-ri Haemi-myun Susan-gun, Chungnam 352–820, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0455)60–1111 FAX: (0455)60–1119

Hanshin University
1) Private 2) 1939 3) 16 4) 2,462 5) 234
Address: 411 Yangsan-dong, Osan, Kyounggi 447–791, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0339)72–3341 FAX: (0339)72–3343

Hansung University
1) Private 2) 1972 3) 21 4) 2,880 5) 123
Address: 2–389 Samsun-dong, Sungbuk-gu, Seoul 136–792, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)760–4114 FAX: (02)745–8943

Hanyang University
1) Private 2) 1939 3) 97 4) 20,739 5) 4,041
Address: 17 Haengdang-dong, Seongdong-gu, Seoul 133–791, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)290–0114 FAX: (02)292–1285
Honam Theological College and Seminary
1) Private 2) 1955 3) 2 4) 640 5) 0
Address: 108 Yangrim-dong, Suh-Ku, Kwangju 502–756, R.O.K.
Telephone: (062)66–1552 FAX: (062)675–1552

Honam University
1) Private 2) 1978 3) 30 4) 5,940 5) 140
Address: 148 Ssangchon-dong Seo-ku, Kwangju 502–791, R.O.K.
Telephone: (062)370–8114 FAX: (062)370–8008

Hong-Ik University
1) Private 2) 1946 3) 46 4) 10,030 5) 1,545
Address: 72–1 Sangsu-dong, Mapo-ku, Seoul 121–791, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)320–1034 FAX: (02)320–1122

Hoseo University
1) Private 2) 1979 3) 30 4) 5,578 5) 138
Address: San 29–1 Sechul-ri, Baebang-myun, Asan, Chungnam, 337–850, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0418)40–5114 FAX: (0418)44–1831

Hyup Sung University
1) Private 2) 1982 3) 22 4) 13,605 5) 0
Address: 8–1 Sang-ri, Bongdam-myun, Hwasung-kun, Kyunggi, 445–890, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0331)292–7131 FAX: (0331)292–3131

In Je University
1) Private 2) 1979 3) 30 4) 7,000 5) 268
Address: 18–3 Obang-dong, Kimhae, Kyongnam 621–749, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0525)34–7111 FAX: (0525)34–0712

Inchon National University of Education
1) National 2) 1962 3) 1 4) 2,084 5) 0
Address: San 59–1 Kyesan-dong, Puk-ku, Inchon 403–050, R.O.K.
Telephone: (032)540–1114 FAX: (032)541–0580

Inha University
1) Private 2) 1954 3) 53 4) 14,688 5) 1,521
Address: 253 Yonghyun-dong, Nam-gu, Incheon 402–751, R.O.K.
Telephone: (032)860–7114 FAX: (032)863–1333

Jeonju National University of Education
1) National 2) 1962 3) 1 4) 929 5) 0
Telephone: (0652)81–7114 FAX: (0652)81–0102

Jeonju University
1) Private 2) 1964 3) 42 4) 7,768 5) 222
Address: 1200 Hyoja-dong, Wansan-gu, Jeonju, Jeonbuk 560–759, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0652)220–2114 FAX: (0652)220–2464

Jung Bu University
1) Private 2) 1983 3) 6 4) 3,520 5) 0
Address: 2–25 Masan-ri, Chubu-myon, Keumsom-kun, Chungnam 312–940, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0412)52–5671 FAX: (0412)52–5813

Kangnam University
1) Private 2) 1948 3) 28 4) 4,064 5) 0
Address: San 6–2 Kukal-Ri, Kiheung, Yongin, Kyungki 449–702, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0331)280–3500 FAX: (0331)281–3604

Kangnung National University
1) National 2) 1979 3) 32 4) 4,180 5) 189
Address: San 1, Chibyon-dong, Kangnung, Kangwon 210–702, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0391)42–7001 FAX: (0391)43–7110

Kangwon National University
1) National 2) 1947 3) 83 4) 12,030 5) 1,215
Address: 192–1 Hyoja–2–dong, Chunchon, Kangwon 200–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0361)50–6114 FAX: (0361)51-9556

Kaya University
1) Private 2) 1992 3) 3 4) 2,438 5) 0
Address: 120 Jisan-ri, Koryung-eup, Koryung-kun, Kyungbuk 717–800, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0543)954–1437 FAX: (0543)954–6094

Keimyung University
1) Private 2) 1954 3) 81 4) 14,923 5) 1,116
Address: 2139 Daemyung-dong, Nam-gu, Daegu 705–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (053)626–1321 FAX: (053)623–9935

Kongju National University
1) National 2) 1948 3) 42 4) 4,570 5) 495
Address: 182 Sinkwan-dong, Kongju, Chungnam 314–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0416)50–8114 FAX: (0416)43–7110

Kongju National University of Education
1) National 2) 1962 3) 1 4) 1,404 5) 0
Address: 376 Pongwhang-dong, Kongju, Chungnam 314–060, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0416)50–1114 FAX: (0416)54–1578

Konkuk University
1) Private 2) 1946 3) 84 4) 16,423 5) 2,149
Address: 93–1 Mojin-dong, Seongdong-gu, Seoul 133–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)450–3114 FAX: (02)477–1544
Konyang University
1) Private 2) 1991 3) 19 4) 3,840 5) 0
Address: San 30 Naedong, Nonsan, Chungnam 320–711, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0461)33–2071 FAX: (0461)33–2070

Kookmin University
1) Private 2) 1946 3) 32 4) 6,828 5) 941
Address: 861–1 Chongnung-dong, Songbuk-gu, Seoul 136–702, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)910–4114 FAX: (02)919–2100

Korea Baptist Theological College and Seminary
1) Private 2) 1954 3) 3 4) 1,120 5) 270
Address: 14 Hagi-dong, Yuseung-gu, Daejeon 301–070, R.O.K.
Telephone: (042)825–1330 FAX: (042)825–1354

Korea Christian College
1) Private 2) 1957 3) 1 4) 173 5) 0
Address: San 204 Whagok-dong, Kangseo-ku, Seoul 157–702, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)698–8641 FAX: (02)698–8876

Korea Institute of Technology and Education
1) Private 2) 1992 3) 8 4) 1280 5) 0
Address: 307 Kajeon-ri Pyungchun-myun, Cheonan, Choongnam 330–860, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0417)60–1000 FAX: (0417)61–9504

Korea Maritime University
1) National 2) 1945 3) 17 4) 3,800 5) 214
Address: 1 Dongsam-dong, Yeongdo-gu, Pusan 606–791, R.O.K.
Telephone: (051)410–4114 FAX: (051)414–2475

Korea National University of Education
1) National 2) 1984 3) 21 4) 2,060 5) 2,020
Address: San 7 Darak-ri, Kangnae-myun, Chong-Won, Chungbuk 363–791, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0431)230–3114 FAX: (0431)233–2960

Korea University
1) Private 2) 1905 3) 84 4) 19,648 5) 4,664
Address: 5–1 Anam-dong, Sungbuk-ku, Seoul 136–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)926–2641 FAX: (02)921–0533

Korean National College of Physical Education
1) National 2) 1977 3) 3 4) 1,120 5) 99
Telephone: (02)410–6700 FAX: (02)418–1877

Korean Sahmyook University
1) Private 2) 1906 3) 12 4) 1,880 5) 88
Address: 26–21 Kongmeung-dong, Nowon-gu, Seoul 139–742, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)972–3606 FAX: (02)979–5318

Kosin University
1) Private 2) 1946 3) 13 4) 2,640 5) 283
Address: 149–1 Dongsam-dong, Yeongdo-gu, Pusan 606–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (051)400–2200 FAX: (051)403–5349

Kumoh National Institute of Technology
1) National 2) 1979 3) 15 4) 3,616 5) 103
Address: 188 Shinpyung-dong, Kumi, Kyungbuk 730–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0546)467–4114 FAX: (0546)461–0136

Kunsan National University
1) National 2) 1979 3) 43 4) 5,731 5) 42
Address: 68 Miryong-dong, Kunsan, Chonpuk 573–360, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0654)60–1114 FAX: (0654)62–5334

Kwan Dong University
1) Private 2) 1955 3) 36 4) 6,870 5) 332
Address: 72–1 Naigok-dong, Kangneung, Kangwon 210–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0391)41–1011 FAX: (0391)41–1010

Kwangju Catholic College
1) Private 2) 1962 3) 1 4) 182 5) 25
Address: 305 Ssangchon-dong, Seo-gu, Kwangju 502–260, R.O.K.
Telephone: (062)372–0124 FAX: (062)372–4377

Kwangju National University of Education
1) National 2) 1938 3) 1 4) 1,490 5) 0
Address: 1–1 Punghyang-dong, Puk-ku, Kwangju 500–703, R.O.K.
Telephone: (062)520–4114 FAX: (062)524–6022

Kwangwoon University
1) Private 2) 1963 3) 23 4) 4,810 5) 631
Address: 447–1 Wolgye-dong, Nowon-gu, Seoul 139–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)910–5114 FAX: (02)917–6147

Kyonggi University
1) Private 2) 1957 3) 57 4) 9,840 5) 631
Address: Yiui-dong, Poiltol-ku, Suwon, Kyonggi 440–760, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0331)40–7114 FAX: (0331)43–2194

Kyung Hee University
1) Private 2) 1949 3) 74 4) 17,680 5) 2,969
Address: 1 Hoeki-dong, Dongdaemoon-gu, Seoul 130–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)961–0114 FAX: (02)962–5156

Kyung Won University
1) Private 2) 1982 3) 42 4) 6,450 5) 545
Address: 65 Pokjong-dong, Sujong-gu, Sungnam, Kyonggi 461–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0342)752–3220 FAX: (0342)753–8828

Kyungju University
1) Private 2) 1987 3) 13 4) 3,600 5) 0
Address: 42–1 Hyohyun-dong, Kyongju, Kyongbuk 780–210, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0561)748–5551 FAX: (0561)748–5553

Kyungnam University
1) Private 2) 1946 3) 48 4) 13,077 5) 1,184
Address: 449 Wolyong-dong, Masan, Kyongnam 630–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0551)45–5000 FAX: (0551)46–6184

Kyungpook National University
1) National 2) 1946 3) 92 4) 17,160 5) 3,297
Address: 1370 Sankyuk-dong, Puk-ku, Taegu 702–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (053)955–5001 FAX: (053)954–6806

Kyungsan University
1) Private 2) 1980 3) 15 4) 2,932 5) 109
Address: San 75 Jumchon-dong, Kyungsan, Kyungbuk 712–240, R.O.K.
Telephone: (053)813–5555 FAX: (053)813–5554

Kyungseo University
1) Private 2) 1955 3) 54 4) 9,200 5) 676
Address: 109–1 Daeyeon-dong, Nam-gu, Pusan 608–736, R.O.K.
Telephone: (051)622–5331 FAX: (051)623–7803

Methodist Theological Seminary
1) Private 2) 1895 3) 3 4) 817 5) 288
Address: 31 Naingchun-dong, Sudaemoon-gu, Seoul 120–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)361–9114 FAX: (02)361–9299

Mokpo National Maritime University
1) National 2) 1950 3) 3 4) 959 5) 0
Address: 571 Jookkyo-dong, Mokpo, Chonnam 530–729, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0531)40–7114 FAX: (0531)42–5176

Mokpo National University
1) National 2) 1979 3) 39 4) 5,210 5) 252
Address: 61 Torim-ri, Chonggye-myon, Muan, Chonnam 534–729, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0636)450–2114 FAX: (0636)52–4793

Mokwon University
1) Private 2) 1954 3) 30 4) 5,200 5) 141
Address: 24 Mok-dong, Chung-ku, Taegjon 301–729, R.O.K.
Telephone: (042)220–6114 FAX: (042)256–2315
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Type of Education</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myong Ji University</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8,880</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 38–2 Nam-ri, Yongin, Yongin-kun, Kyunggi 449–728, R.O.K.</td>
<td>Telephone: (0335)30–6114 FAX: (0335)32–2459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazarene Theological College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 44–1 Ssangnyong-dong, Cheonan, Chungnam 330–090, R.O.K.</td>
<td>Telephone: (0417)565–0011 FAX: (0417)568–5912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pai-Chai University</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3,880</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 439–6 Doma-dong, Seo-gu, Taejon 302–162, R.O.K.</td>
<td>Telephone: (042)520–5114 FAX: (042)533–7354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pohang Institute of Science and Technology</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 31 Hyoja-dong, Pohang, Kyungbuk 790–784, R.O.K.</td>
<td>Telephone: (0562)75–0900 FAX: (0562)79–2099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 353 Kwangjang-dong, Sungdong-ku, Seoul 133–756, R.O.K.</td>
<td>Telephone: (02)453–3101 FAX: (02)452–3460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian General Assembly Theological College and Seminary</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 31–3 Sadang-dong, Dongjak-ku, Seoul 156–763, R.O.K.</td>
<td>Telephone: (02)537–5101 FAX: (02)536–2602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pukyung National University</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12,580</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 599–1 Daeyeon-dong, Nam-gu, Pusan 608–737, R.O.K.</td>
<td>Telephone: (051)622–3951 FAX: (051)625–9947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pusan Catholic College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 8–12 Pugok-dong, Kumjung-gu, Pusan 609–323, R.O.K.</td>
<td>Telephone: (051)515–0432 FAX: (051)515–0435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pusan National University of Education</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 263 Koje-dong Tongnae-gu, Pusan 607–736, R.O.K.</td>
<td>Telephone: (051)500–7114 FAX: (051)505–4908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pusan National University</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>17,180</td>
<td>3,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: San 30 Changjeon-dong, Kumjeong-gu, Pusan 609–735, R.O.K.</td>
<td>Telephone: (051)512–0311 FAX: (051)512–3368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pusan University of Foreign Studies
1) Private 2) 1982 3) 28 4) 5,760 5) 186
Address: 55–1 Uam-dong, Nam-gu, Pusan 608–738, R.O.K.
Telephone: (051)643–5111 FAX: (051)645–4525

Pusan Women’s University
1) Private 2) 1964 3) 29 4) 4,760 5) 59
Address: 1–1 Gaebup-dong, Sasaong-gu, Pusan 617–736, R.O.K.
Telephone: (051)309–5000 FAX: (051)305–5206

Pyungtaek University
1) Private 2) 1912 3) 11 4) 2,020 5) 0
Address: 84 Yongyi-dong, Pyungtaek, Kyungki 450–130, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0333)655–8701 FAX: (0333)54–1863

Sang Ji University
1) Private 2) 1974 3) 38 4) 5,720 5) 197
Address: San 41 Woosan-dong, Wonju, Kangwon 220–702, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0371)42–1121 FAX: (0371)45–2433

Sang Myung University
1) Private 2) 1965 3) 36 4) 6,077 5) 291
Address: 7 Hongji-dong, Chongno-gu, Seoul 110–743, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)287–5114 FAX: (02)396–6116

Sejong University
1) Private 2) 1947 3) 31 4) 3,662 5) 362
Address: 98 Gunja-dong, Sungdong-ku, Seoul 133–747, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)460–0114 FAX: (02)460–0200

Semyung University
1) Private 2) 1990 3) 16 4) 5,855 5) 0
Address: San 21–1, Sinwol-dong, Chechon, Chungbuk 390–230, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0443)45–1125 FAX: (0443)44–2111

Seokkyung University
1) Private 2) 1947 3) 18 4) 2,980 5) 60
Address: 16–1 Chongnun-dong, Songbuk-ku, Seoul 136–704, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)940–7114 FAX: (02)919–0345

Seonam University
1) Private 2) 1990 3) 30 4) 5,110 5) 0
Address: 720 Kwangchi-dong, Namwon, Chonbuk 590–170, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0671)33–9300 FAX: (0671)33–9306

Seoul City University
1) Public 2) 1918 3) 33 4) 4,380 5) 655
Address: 8–3 Chonnong-dong, Tongdaemun-gu, Seoul 130–743, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)210–2114 FAX: (02)244–5301
Seoul National University of Education

1) National  
2) 1946  
3) 1  
4) 2,980  
5) 0

Address: 1650 Seocho-dong, Seocho-ku, Seoul 137–742, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)580–5114 FAX: (02)581–7711

Seoul National University

1) National  
2) 1948  
3) 106  
4) 19,963  
5) 8,014

Address: San 56 Shinrim-dong, Kwanak-gu, Seoul 151–742, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)880–5114 FAX: (02)885–5272

Seoul Theological College and Seminary

1) Private  
2) 1911  
3) 4  
4) 1,539  
5) 282

Address: 101 Sosa-dong, Bucheon, Kyunggi 422–742, R.O.K.
Telephone: (032)349–9381 FAX: (032)349–9400

Seoul Woman’s University

1) Private  
2) 1961  
3) 26  
4) 3,658  
5) 251

Address: 126 Kongnung–2–dong, Nowon-gu, Seoul 139–774, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)970–5114 FAX: (02)978–7931

Seowon University

1) Private  
2) 1967  
3) 32  
4) 4,840  
5) 0

Address: 231 Mochung-dong, Chongju, Chungbuk 360–742, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0431)61–8000 FAX: (0431)62–8822

Sogang University

1) Private  
2) 1960  
3) 21  
4) 6,080  
5) 2,120

Address: 1 Shinsu-dong, Mapo-gu, Seoul 121–742, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)705–8114 FAX: (02)701–8962

Songsim University for Women

1) Private  
2) 1964  
3) 17  
4) 830  
5) 102

Address: Yokkok–2–dong, Nam-gu, Puchon, Kyonggi 422–743, R.O.K.
Telephone: (032)611–9611 FAX: (032)665–9798

Sookmyung Woman’s University

1) Private  
2) 1938  
3) 44  
4) 6,573  
5) 1,061

Address: 53–12, 2–ka, Chungpa-dong, Yongsan-ku, Seoul 140–742, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)710–9000 FAX: (02)718–2337

Soonchunhyang University

1) Private  
2) 1978  
3) 29  
4) 5,670  
5) 347

Address: 53–1 Eupnae-ri, Shinchang-myon, Asan, Choongnam 337–745, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0418)530–1114 FAX: (0418)42–4615

Soong Sil University

1) Private  
2) 1897  
3) 30  
4) 6,850  
5) 995

Address: 1–1 Sangdo–5–dong, Dongjak-gu, Seoul 156–743, R.O.K.
Institutional Information

Telephone: (02)820–0114 FAX: (02)816–1513
Suncheon National University
1) National 2) 1982 3) 37 4) 4,830 5) 138
Address: 315 Maegok-dong, Sunchon, Chonnam 540–742, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0661)50–3114 FAX: (0661)50–3117

Sung Kong Hoe University
1) Private 2) 1914 3) 8 4) 1,120 5) 0
Address: 1–1 Hang-dong, Kuro-gu, Seoul 152–140, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)615–0005 FAX: (02)683–8858

Sung Kyul Christian University
1) Private 2) 1962 3) 13 4) 2,266 5) 0
Address: 147–2 Anyang-dong, Anyang, Kyunggi 430–742, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0343)43–3831 FAX: (0343)49–0529

Sung Kyun Kwan University
1) Private 2) 1936 3) 37 4) 14,880 5) 2,454
Address: 53 Myungryun-dong, Chongro-ku, Seoul 110–745, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)760–0114 FAX: (02)744–2453

Sungshin Women’s University
1) Private 2) 1936 3) 37 4) 5,720 5) 791
Address: 249–Longsun-dong, Sungbuk-ku, Seoul 136–742, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)920–7114 FAX: (02)926–3120

Sunmoon University
1) Private 2) 1991 3) 31 4) 5,920 5) 0
Address: 100 Kilsan-ri, Tangjung-myon, Asan, Chungnam 337–840, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0418)530–2114 FAX: (0418)41–7424

Suwon Catholic College
1) Private 2) 1983 3) 2 4) 400 5) 60
Address: 226 Wangrim-ri, Bongdam-myon, Hwasong, Kyonggi 445–744, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0331)292–4521 FAX: (0331)292–4526

Taegu National University of Education
1) National 2) 1962 3) 14 4) 2,320 5) 0
Address: 1797–6 Taemyong-dong, Nam-gu, Taegu 705–715, R.O.K.
Telephone: (053)620–1114 FAX: (053)651–5369

Taegu University
1) Private 2) 1956 3) 72 4) 14,150 5) 676
Address: 15 Naeri-ri, Jinryang-myon, Kyongsan, Kyongbuk 712–714, R.O.K.
Telephone: (053)850–5700 FAX: (053)850–5009
Taejon Catholic College  
1) Private 2) 1992 3) 1 4) 160 5) 0  
Address: 263–3 Shinbang-ri, Jeoneui-myon, Yeonki-kun, Chungnam 339–850, R.O.K.  
Telephone: (0415)362–8060 FAX: (0415)362–8069

Taejon University  
1) Private 2) 1980 3) 30 4) 5,150 5) 276  
Address: 96–3 Yongwoon-dong, Dong-gu, Taejon 300–716, R.O.K.  
Telephone: (042)283–8811 FAX: (042)283–8808

University of Incheon  
1) Public 2) 1979 3) 31 4) 6,280 5) 310  
Address: 177 Dohwa-dong, Nam-ku, Incheon 402–751, R.O.K.  
Telephone: (032)760–8114 FAX: (032)762–1548

University of Suwon  
1) Private 2) 1982 3) 43 4) 6,340 5) 448  
Address: San 2–2 Wauri, Bongdam-myun, Whasung-gun, Kyonggi 445–743, R.O.K.  
Telephone: (0331)222–2101 FAX: (02)745–8545

University of Ulsan  
1) Private 2) 1970 3) 44 4) 9,920 5) 521  
Address: 29 Mookeo-dong, Nam-gu, Ulsan, Kyungnam 680–749, R.O.K.  
Telephone: (0522)77–3101 FAX: (0522)77–3419

Wonkwang University  
1) Private 2) 1951 3) 75 4) 15,957 5) 1,347  
Address: 344–2 Shinyong-dong, Iri, Chonbuk 565–749, R.O.K.  
Telephone: (0653)50–5114 FAX: (0653)50–6666

Woosuk University  
1) Private 2) 1979 3) 34 4) 5,920 5) 201  
Address: 490 Hujong-ri, Samrye-eup, Wanju-kun, Chonbuk 565–800, R.O.K.  
Telephone: (0652)290–1114 FAX: (0652)291–9312

Yeungnam University  
1) Private 2) 1947 3) 69 4) 18,551 5) 2,178  
Address: 214–1 Tae-dong, Kyongsan, Kyungbuk 712–749, R.O.K.  
Telephone: (053)810–2114 FAX: (053)813–0188

Yong In University  
1) Private 2) 1953 3) 24 4) 4,120 5) 0  
Telephone: (0335)32–6471 FAX: (0335)32–6479


Yonsei University
1) Private 2) 1885 3) 81 4) 21,333 5) 6,357
Address: 134 Shinchon-dong, Sudaemoon-ku, Seoul 120–749, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)361–2114 FAX: (02)392–0618

Yosu National Fisheries University
1) National 2) 1917 3) 16 4) 2,150 5) 24
Address: 195 Kuk-dong, Yosu, Chonnam 550–749, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0662)40–6114 FAX: (0662)41–5520

Young Dong Institute of Technology
1) Private 2) 1993 3) 8 4) 3,166 5) 0
Address: 12–1 Sulgye-ri, Youngdong-eup, Youngdong-kun, Chungbuk 370–800, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0414)40–1114 FAX: (0414)40–1024

Young Nam Theological Seminary
1) Private 2) 1953 3) 3 4) 533 5) 0
Address: 117 Bonghee-dong, Jinoyang-myon, Kyungsan, Kyungbuk 712–830, R.O.K.
Telephone: (053)850–0500 FAX: (053)852–9815

OPEN UNIVERSITIES

Anseong National Politechnic University
1) National 2) 1939 3) 22 4) 3,076 5) 0
Address: 67 Seokjung-ri, Ansung-eup, Ansung-kun, Kyonggi 456–749, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0334)73–2700 FAX: (0334)73–2704

Chinju National University
1) National 2) 1910 3) 24 4) 4,268 5) 0
Address: 150 Chilam-dong, Chinju, Kyungnam 660–280, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0591)52–2378 FAX: (0591)52–9554

Chodang University
1) Private 2) 1993 3) 17 4) 4,800 5) 0
Address: 419 Sunnam-ri, Mooan-eup, Mooan-kun, Chonnam 534–800, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0636)453–4960 FAX: (0636)453–4969

Chonbuk Sanup University
1) Private 2) 1977 3) 23 4) 6,648 5) 0
Address: 663 Soryong-dong, Kunsan, Chonbuk 573–400, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0654)60–3114 FAX: (0654)60–3254
Chung Ju National University  
1) National 2) 1962 3) 23 4) 4,990 5) 0  
Address: 123 Kumdan-ri, Iryu-myon, Chungwon-kun, Chungbuk 383–870, R.O.K.  
Telephone: (0441)841–5000 FAX: (0441)853–1236  
Chungnam Sanup University  
1) Private 2) 1994 3) 15 4) 4,160 5) 0  
Address: 29 Namjang-ri, Hongsung-eup, Hongsung-kun, Chungnam 350–800, R.O.K.  
Telephone: (0451)30–3114 FAX: (0451)30–8700  
Dong Myung University of Information Science and Technology  
1) Private 2) 1995 3) 4 4) 1,000 5) 0  
Address: 535 Yongdang-dong, Nam-gu, Pusan 608–080, R.O.K.  
Telephone: (051)620–3596 FAX: (051)627–8362  
Hanlyo Sanup University  
1) Private 2) 1994 3) 19 4) 4,560 5) 0  
Address: 199–4 Duckrae-ri, Kwangyang-eup, Kwangyang-kun, Chonnam 545–800, R.O.K.  
Telephone: (0667)761–6700 FAX: (0667)761–6709  
Kwangju University  
1) Private 2) 1984 3) 29 4) 14,378 5) 106  
Address: 592 Chinwol-dong, Seo-gu, Kwangju 502–703, R.O.K.  
Telephone: (062)670–2114 FAX: (062)674–0078  
Kyungpook Sanup University  
1) Private 2) 1985 3) 26 4) 8,590 5) 84  
Address: 33 Booho-ri, Hayang-eup, Kyongsam, Kyungbuk 712–701, R.O.K.  
Telephone: (053)853–8001 FAX: (053)853–8800  
Milyang National University  
1) National 2) 1923 3) 19 4) 3,158 5) 0  
Address: 1025–1 Naeyee-dong, Miryang, Kyungnam 627–130, R.O.K.  
Telephone: (0527)354–3181 FAX: (0527)355–3186  
Pusan National University of Technology: Consolidated with National Fisheries University of Pusan into Pukyung National University  
Samchok National University  
1) National 2) 1938 3) 22 4) 5,140 5) 0  
Address: San 253 Gyodong Samchok, Kangwon 245–080, R.O.K.  
Telephone: (0397)72–8611 FAX: (0397)72–8620  
Sangju National Polytechnic University  
1) National 2) 1921 3) 19 4) 3,180 5) 0
Institutional Information

Seoul National Polytechnic University
1) National 2) 1910 3) 29 4) 8,260 5) 213
Address: 172 Kongneung–2–dong, Nowon-gu, Seoul 139–743, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)970–6114 FAX: (02)970–6088

Southern Seoul University
1) Private 2) 1993 3) 16 4) 5,480 5) 0
Address: 21 Maeju-ri, Sungwhan-eup, Chonan, Chungnam 330–800, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0417)580–2000 FAX: (0417)582–2117

Taejon National University of Technology
1) National 2) 1927 3) 25 4) 6,920 5) 80
Address: 305–3 Samsung-dong, Dong-gu, Taejon 300–172, R.O.K.
Telephone: (042)630–0114 FAX: (042)625–1485

Woosong Sanup University
1) Private 2) 1994 3) 11 4) 3,150 5) 0
Address: 17–6 Jayang-dong, Dong-gu, Taejon 300–100, R.O.K.
Telephone: (042)630–9600 FAX: (042)631–2346

AIR AND CORRESPONDENCE UNIVERSITY

Korean Air and Correspondence University
1) National 2) 1972 3) 16 4) 250,000 5) 0
Address: 169 Dongsung-Dong, Chongro-gu, Seoul 110–791, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)740–4114 FAX: (02)744–5882

JUNIOR COLLEGES

Agricultural Cooperative Junior College
1) Private 2) 1962 3) 4 4) 200
Address: San 38–27, Wondang-eup, Koyang, Kyonggi 411–707, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0344)60–4133 FAX: (0344)60–4136

Andong Junior College
1) Private 2) 1967 3) 15 4) 3,290
Address: San 89 Kyo-ri, Seohu-myon, Andong, Kyungbuk 762–820, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0571)52–9901 FAX: (0571)52–9907

Andong Technical Junior College
1) Private 2) 1993 3) 12 4) 2,320
Ansan Junior College
1) Private 2) 1973 3) 11 4) 2,760
Address: 225 Il-dong, Ansan, Kyonggi 425–150, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0345)400–6900 FAX: (0345)419–8390

Ansan Technical Junior College
1) Private 2) 1995 3) 12 4) 2,000
Address: 170 Choji-dong, Ansan, Kyuggi 425–080, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0345)490–6014 FAX: (0345)495–7828

Anyang Technical College
1) Private 2) 1976 3) 14 4) 6,000
Address: San 39–1 Anyang-dong, Manan-gu, Anyang, Kyunggi 430–749, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0343)41–1100 FAX: (0343)42–4400

Baehwa Women’s Junior College
1) Private 2) 1977 3) 14 4) 2,480
Address: 12 Pilun-dong, Chongno-gu, Seoul 110–735, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)399–0700 FAX: (02)737–8431

Bucheon Technical College
1) Private 2) 1978 3) 17 4) 5,360
Address: 424 Shimgok-dong, Wonani-gu, Pucheon, Kyonggi 421–735, R.O.K.
Telephone: (032)610–3200 FAX: (032)612–5016

Chang-An Junior College
1) Private 2) 1978 3) 18 4) 6,000
Address: 460 Sang-ri, Pongdam-myon, Hwaseong-gun, Kyonggi 445–756, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0331)292–5680 FAX: (0331)292–8276

Changshin Junior College
1) Private 2) 1991 3) 14 4) 2,720
Address: 541 Pongam-dong, Hoewon-gu, Masan, Kungnam 630–764, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0551)51–3001 FAX: (0551)97–5181

Changwon Junior College
1) Private 2) 1978 3) 20 4) 4,160
Address: 196 Tudae-dong, Changwon Kyungnam, 641–771, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0551)79–5114 FAX: (0551)81–7386
Cheju Junior College
1) Private 2) 1973 3) 25 4) 4,480
Address: 2235 Youngpyoung-dong, Cheju 690–140, R.O.K.
Telephone: (064)56–4001 FAX: (064)55–8330

Cheju Tourism Junior College
1) Private 2) 1993 3) 16 4) 2,560
Address: 2535 Kwangmyong-z-ri, Aewal-eup, Pukcheju-gun, Cheju 695–905, R.O.K.
Telephone: (064)47–9111 FAX: (064)48–2829

Cheonan College of Foreign Languages
1) Private 2) 1994 3) 13 4) 2,480
Address: San 89–1, Anseo-dong, Cheonam, Chungnam 330–800, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0417)550–0700 FAX: (0417)550–0559

Cheonan National Junior Technical College
1) National 2) 1972 3) 14 4) 2,240
Address: 275–1 Pudae-dong, Cheonan, Chungnam 330–240, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0417)550–0204 FAX: (0417)62–8080

Cheongju National Junior College
1) National 2) 1948 3) 11 4) 1,320
Address: 213–1 Sachang-dong, Cheongju 361–280, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0431)279–4000 FAX: (0431)279–4199

Chinju Nursing and Health Junior College
1) Private 2) 1971 3) 8 4) 2,200
Address: 1142 Sangbong Seo-dong, Chinju Kyungnam 660–757, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0591)40–1806 FAX: (0591)43–3010

Chinju Technical College
1) Private 2) 1977 3) 16 4) 2,960
Address: San 270 Sangmun-ri, Munsan-eup, Chinju, Kyungnam 660–759, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0591)57–1780 FAX: (0591)57–1787

Choonhae College of Nursing
1) Private 2) 1967 3) 1 4) 960
Telephone: (051)805–2211 FAX: (051)805–4811

Chosun University Junior College of Nursing
1) Private 2) 1971 3) 1 4) 600
Address: 280 Seoseok-dong, Tong-gu, Kwangju 501–140, R.O.K.
Telephone: (062)232–9033 FAX: (062)232–9036

Chosun University Technical Junior College
1) Private 2) 1963 3) 14 4) 5,360
Christian Hospital College of Nursing
1) Private 2) 1966 3) 1 4) 360
Address: 67 Yangnim-dong, Nam-gu, Kwangju 502–040, R.O.K.
Telephone: (062)675–1681 FAX: (062)675–5806

Chung Kang College of Cultural Industries
1) Private 2) 1996 3) 9 4) 1,440
Address: 37 Haewol-ri, Majang-myon, Icheon-kun, Kyunggi 467–810, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0336)637–2143 FAX: (0336)637–2147

Chungbuk Junior College
1) Private 2) 1994 3) 13 4) 2,400
Address: San 38, Dampyong-ri, Kamkok-myon, Zunsung-kun, Chungbuk 369–850, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0336)643–3311 FAX: (0336)643–3310

Chungcheong College
1) Private 2) 1982 3) 30 4) 4,400
Address: 330 Wolgok-ri, Kangnae-myon, Cheongwon-gun, Chungbuk 363–890, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0431)230–2114 FAX: (0431)232–1881

Chungnam Junior College
1) Private 2) 1980 3) 21 4) 4,480
Address: 48 Chang-dong, Youseong-gu, Taejeon 305–343, R.O.K.
Telephone: (042)866–0211 FAX: (042)861–5110

Chunnam Junior College
1) Private 2) 1991 3) 16 4) 3,120
Address: San 85 Okgwa-ri, Okgwa-myon, Kokseong-gun, Chonnam 543–910, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0688)60–5000 FAX: (0688)63–5020

Daecheon College
1) Private 2) 1995 3) 2 4) 1,360
Address: San 6–7 Kwansan-ri, Jupo-myon, Boryung, Chungnam 353–830, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0452)939–3000 FAX: (0452)32–6173

Daedong Junior College of Nursing
1) Private 2) 1970 3) 1 4) 520
Address: 60–1 Pugok-dong, Keumjeong-gu, Pusan 609–322, R.O.K.
Telephone: (051)518–5444 FAX: (051)514–5847
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>FAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daejeon Junior College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Address: 226–2 Jayang-dong, Tong-gu, Taejeon 300–100, R.O.K.</td>
<td>(042)629–6114 FAX: (042)625–5831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Address: San 119 Jiheung-dong, Donghae, Kangwon 240–150, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0394)521–9900 FAX: (0394)521–9907

Dongju Women’s Junior College
1) Private 2) 1978 3) 21 4) 5,200
Address: San 15–1 Koejeong-dong, Saha-gu, Pusan 604–080, R.O.K.
Telephone: (051)208–2611 FAX: (051)201–5420

Dongnam Health Junior College
1) Private 2) 1973 3) 18 4) 4,040
Address: 695–1 Cheongja-dong, ChangAn-gu, Suwon, Kyonggi 440–714, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0331)44–3511 FAX: (0331)48–6577

Dongshin Junior College
1) Private 2) 1975 3) 21 4) 5,200
Address: 771 Tuam-dong, Puk-gu Kwangju 500–714, R.O.K.
Telephone: (062)520–2221 FAX: (062)520–2222

Dong-U College
1) Private 2) 1980 3) 14 4) 4,880
Address: 244 Nohak-dong, Sokcho, Kangwon 217–070, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0392)32–6551 FAX: (0392)32–6556

Doowon Technical College
1) Private 2) 1994 3) 9 4) 2,560
Address: 678 Jangwon-ri, Juksan-myon, Anseong-kun, Kyonggi 456–890, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0334)676–7690 FAX: (0334)676–7689

Geoje Junior College
1) Private 2) 1989 3) 7 4) 880
Address: San 42–3 Okrim-ri, Ilun-myong, Geoje, Kyungnam 656–890, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0558)680–1504 FAX: (0558)681–3993

Halla Institute of Technology
1) Private 2) 1995 3) 8 4) 2,080
Address: San 66, Heungup-myon, Wonji, Kangwon 220–840, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0371)760–1114 FAX: (0371)762–6705

Halla Junior College
1) Private 2) 1969 3) 16 4) 3,080
Address: 1534 Nohyong-dong, Cheju 690–180, R.O.K.
Telephone: (064)47–3981 FAX: (064)47–3989

Hallym Junior College
1) Private 2) 1939 3) 14 4) 2,360
Address: 790 Changhak-ri, Dong-myon, Chuncheon 206–850, R.O.K.
Institutional Information

Telephone: (0361)52–7721 FAX: (0361)52–9462

Hanyang Women’s Junior College
1) Private 2) 1974 3) 18 4) 6,000
Address: 17Haengdang-dong,Seongdong-gu,Seoul 133–793, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)290–2114 FAX: (02)291–6111

Hanyeong Technical Junior College
1) Private 2) 1993 3) 13 4) 2,640
Address: San 19 Yeoseo-dong, Yeosu, Chonnam 550–260, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0662)650–4000 FAX: (0662)650–4020

Health Junior College Attached to Korea University
1) Private 2) 1963 3) 7 4) 1,800
Address: San 1 Jungneung-dong, Seongbuk-gu, Seoul 136–703, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)914–4971 FAX: (02)916–5943

Holy Spirit Junior College of Nursing
1) Private 2) 1966 3) 1 4) 360
Address: 97 Sanjeon-dong, Mokpo, Chonnam 762–820, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0631)72–6336 FAX: (0631)72–5123

Hyejeon Junior College
1) Private 2) 1982 3) 24 4) 3,520
Address: San 16 Namjung-ri, Hongseong-eup, Hongseong-gun, Chungnam
430–749, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0451)30–5114 FAX: (0451)34–5154

Induk Junior College
1) Private 2) 1971 3) 14 4) 4,400
Address: San 76 Wolgye-dong, Nowon-gu, Seoul 139–749, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)901–7500 FAX: (02)906–5340

Inha Technical Junior College
1) Private 2) 1958 3) 22 4) 6,000
Address: 253 Yonghyon-dong, Nam-gu, Incheon 402–752, R.O.K.
Telephone: (032)870–2114 FAX: (032)868–3408

International College of Hotel Administration, Kyunghee University
1) Private 2) 1975 3) 6 4) 1,440
Address: 1 Hoegi-dong, Tongdaemun-gu, Seoul 130–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)962–1823 FAX: (02)962–9134

Iri National College of Agriculture and Technology
1) National 2) 1922 3) 13 4) 1,600
Address: 194–5 Ma-dong, Iksan, Chonbuk 570–110, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0653)840–6505 FAX: (0653)842–1382

Jeonju Technical College
1) Private 2) 1976 3) 11 4) 3,440
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Address: 72 Namnosong-dong, Wansan-gu Cheonju, Chonbuk 560–760, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0652) 80–6114 FAX: (0652) 80–6250

Jesus Junior Nursing College
1) Private 2) 1950 3) 1 4) 600
Address: 168–1 Chungwhasan-dong, Wansan-gu, Cheonju, Chonbuk 560–250, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0652) 84–4024 FAX: (0652) 83–2390

Jisan Junior College
1) Private 2) 1963 3) 11 4) 2,640
Address: 9 Pugok-dong, Keumjeong-gu, Pusan 609–757, R.O.K.
Telephone: (051) 515–5811 FAX: (051) 514–1576

Joongkyong Technical Junior College
1) Private 2) 1963 3) 19 4) 5,200
Address: 155–3 Chayang-dong, Tong-gu, Taejeon 300–100, R.O.K.
Telephone: (042) 629–6308 FAX: (042) 634–8003

Jung Up Technical College
1) Private 2) 1995 3) 10 4) 1,840
Address: San 9–28 Siki-dong, Jungeup, Chonbuk 580–060, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0681) 30–9114 FAX: (0681) 32–3768

Junior College Attached to Korea Samyook University
1) Private 2) 1973 3) 9 4) 1,160
Address: San 133, Hwajeop-ri, Byolnae-myon, Namyangju, Kyonggi 742–810, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02) 3399–3636 FAX: (02) 979–5318

Junior College of Incheon
1) Private 2) 1969 3) 25 4) 5,200
Address: 235 Tohwa-dong, Nam-gu, Incheon 402–750, R.O.K.
Telephone: (032) 760–8625 FAX: (032) 764–6770

Juseong College
1) Private 2) 1992 3) 15 4) 3,120
Address: San 4 Deokam-ri, Pukil-myon, Cheongwon-gun, Chungbuk 363–930, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0431) 220–8111 FAX: (0431) 221–9039

Kaejong Junior College of Nursing
Address: 413 Kaejeong-dong, Kunsan 573–440, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0654) 450–3801 FAX: (0654) 452–9673

Keimyung Junior College
1) Private 2) 1970 3) 21 4) 5,840
Institutional Information

Address: 2139 Taemyong-dong, Nam-gu, Taegu 705–037, R.O.K.
Telephone: (053)620–2604 FAX: (053)621–3268

Keochang Junior College
1) Public 2) 1996 3) 4 4) 640
Address: 1396 Daepyong-ri, Keochang-eup, Keochang-kun, Kyungnam 670–800, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0598)945–1101 FAX: (0598)945–1106

Kijeon Women’s Junior College
1) Private 2) 1973 3) 16 4) 3,120
Telephone: (0652)80–5201 FAX: (0652)86–9995

Kimchun College
1) Private 2) 1978 3) 22 4) 4,240
Address: 754 Samnack-dong, Kimcheon 740–200, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0547)420–4000 FAX: (0547)420–4003

Kimpo College
1) Private 2) 1996 3) 8 4) 1,440
Address: San 14–1 Masong-ri, Tongjin-myon, Kimpo-kun, Kyonggi 415–860, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0341)987–0123 FAX: (0341)987–0222

Kimsan Junior College
1) Private 2) 1956 3) 4 4) 1,320
Address: 480 Samnack-dong, Kimcheon, Kyungbuk 740–200, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0547)434–2787 FAX: (0547)30–4477

Kongju National Junior College
1) National 2) 1963 3) 10 4) 1,480
Address: 326 Ongnyong-dong, Kongju, Chungnam 314–040, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0416)52–1986 FAX: (0416)856–0740

Korean National Railroad Junior College
1) National 2) 1905 3) 6 4) 390
Address: San 1–4 Wolam-dong, Uiwang 437–736, Kyunggi, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0343)61–4010 FAX: (0343)61–4011

Kumi Junior College
1) Private 2) 1991 3) 14 4) 2,640
Address: 407 Pukkok-dong, Kumi, Kyungpuk 730–170, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0546)456–0740 FAX: (0546)455–8953

Kumsung Environment College
1) Private 2) 1995 3) 13 4) 2,000
Address: San 1–1, Bokam-ri, Dasi-myon, Naju, Chonnam 523–930, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0613)35–4391 FAX: (0613)35–8497
Kunjang Technical Junior College
1) Private 2) 1994 3) 8 4) 2,000
Address: San 3–3 Doam-ri, Sungsan-myon, Kunsan, Chonbuk 573–840, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0654)61–9302 FAX: (0654)61–9091
Kunsan Junior College
1) Private 2) 1973 3) 16 4) 3,680
Address: 832–1 Oryong-dong, Kunsan, Chonbuk 573–110, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0654)60–9121 FAX: (0654)60–9191
Kwang Yang College
1) Private 2) 1994 3) 15 4) 2,600
Address: 223–1 Dukrye-ri, Kwangyang-eup, Kwangyang, Chonnam 545–800, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0667)763–9001 FAX: (0667)763–9009
Kwangju Health Junior College
1) Private 2) 1971 3) 19 4) 3,800
Address: 683–3 Shinchang-dong, Kwangsan-gu, Kwangju 506–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (062)950–7503 FAX: (062)953–4946
Kwangju Women’s Junior College
1) Private 2) 1991 3) 17 4) 2,720
Address: 165 Sanjeong-dong, Kwangsan-gu, Kwangju 506–255, R.O.K.
Telephone: (062)953–2211 FAX: (062)953–2218
Kyewon Junior College of Arts
1) Private 2) 1993 3) 5 4) 1,920
Address: San 125, Naeson-dong, Euiwang, Kyonggi 437–081, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0343)20–1700 FAX: (0343)24–7509
Kyongbuk Junior College
1) Private 2) 1980 3) 18 4) 4,240
Address: 270 Pyoungsan-dong, Kyoungsan, Kyungbuk 712–250, R.O.K.
Telephone: (053)810–9200 FAX: (053)813–3162
Kyonggi Junior College
1) Private 2) 1939 3) 16 4) 3,040
Address: San 27–1 Kanseok-dong, Namdong-gu, Incheon 405–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (032)428–3932 FAX: (032)421–3971
Kyongju Junior College
1) Private 2) 1981 3) 21 4) 3,840
Address: 165 Chunghyo-dong, Kyongju 780–250, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0561)749–5555 FAX: (0561)41–5429
Kyung In Women’s Junior College
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>FAX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyunghee School of Nursing</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Hoigi-dong, Tongdaemun-gu, Seoul 130–701, R.O.K.</td>
<td>(02)966–4196</td>
<td>(02)958–4830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>FAX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Medical Center Junior College of Nursing</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>18–79 Ulchro–6–St., Chung-gu, Seoul 100–196, R.O.K.</td>
<td>(02)260–7436</td>
<td>(02)265–6339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Information

Telephone: (0562)47–8000 FAX: (0562)46–5005

Pohang Shullin Junior College
1) Private 2) 1969 3) 12 4) 2,960
Address: 146–1 Chogok-dong, Heunghae-eup, Puk-gu Pohang, Kyungbuk 791–940, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0562)61–2381 FAX: (0562)61–9455

Pusan Junior College
1) Private 2) 1976 3) 16 4) 5,120
Address: San 48–6 Kupo-dong, Puk-gu, Pusan 616–737, R.O.K.
Telephone: (051)334–6666 FAX: (051)334–7780

Pusan Kyungsang Junior College
1) Private 2) 1979 3) 17 4) 3,320
Address: 277–4 Yonsan–8–dong, Tongnae-gu, Pusan 611–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (051)850–1000 FAX: (051)862–7577

Pusan Women’s Junior College
1) Private 2) 1968 3) 17 4) 4,800
Address: 74 Yangjeong-dong, Pusanjin-gu, Pusan 614–734, R.O.K.
Telephone: (051)852–0081 FAX: (051)867–4705

Pyungsung Junior College
1) Private 2) 1935 3) 10 4) 1,600
Address: 51–52 Kongduk-ri, Kongduk-myon, Kimje, Chonbuk 576–920, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0658)540–2300 FAX: (0658)540–2354

Red Cross Junior College of Nursing
1) Private 2) 1945 3) 1 4) 480
Address: 85–15 Pyoung-dong, Chongno-gu, Seoul 110–102, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)735–2956 FAX: (02)735–4399

Samyuk Junior Nursing College
1) Private 2) 1936 3) 2 4) 300
Address: 29–1 Hwigyong–2–dong, Tongdaemun-gu, Seoul 130–092, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)212–2527 FAX: (02)215–2380

Sangji Junior College
1) Private 2) 1969 3) 15 4) 3,360
Address: 393 Yulse-dong, Andong, Kyungbuk 760–070, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0571)851–3021 FAX: (0571)57–9590

Sangji Junior College Attached to Sangji University
1) Private 2) 1973 3) 17 4) 3,440
Address: San 41 Usan-dong, Wonju, Kangwon 220–702, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0371)730–0708 FAX: (0371)44–1333
Seo II Junior College
1) Private 2) 1974 3) 26 4) 5,040
Address: 49–3 Myonmok–8–dong, Chungnang-gu, Seoul 131–206, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)433–0015 FAX: (02)493–2576

Seokang College
1) Private 2) 1978 3) 21 4) 5,520
Address: 789–1 Unam-dong, Puk-gu, Kwangju 500–170, R.O.K.
Telephone: (062)520–5011 FAX: (062)523–1603

Seoul Health Junior College
1) Private 2) 1967 3) 19 4) 4,760
Address: 212 Yangji-dong, Sujeong-gu, Seongnam, Kyonggi 461–250, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0342)40–7191 FAX: (0342)40–7195

Seoul Institute of the Arts
1) Private 2) 1962 3) 12 4) 2,000
Address: 8–19 Yejang-dong, Chung-gu, Seoul 100–750, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)778–0261 FAX: (02)778–9650

Seoul Nursing Junior College
1) Private 2) 1954 3) 1 4) 720
Address: 287 Hongje-dong, Seodaemun-gu, Seoul 120–742, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)395–8011 FAX: (02)395–8018

Shingu Junior College
1) Private 2) 1973 3) 23 4) 6,320
Address: 2685 Keumgwang-dong, Chungwon-gu, Seongnam, Kyonggi 462–743, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0342)43–5761 FAX: (0342)734–0905

Shinheung Junior College
1) Private 2) 1971 3) 24 4) 5,280
Address: 117 Howon-dong, Uijeongbu, Kyonggi 480–701, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0351)870–3341 FAX: (0351)870–3349

Shinil Christian College
1) Private 2) 1966 3) 22 4) 4,620
Address: Sab 395 Manchon-dong, Suseong-gu, Taegu 706–025, R.O.K.
Telephone: (053)754–0361 FAX: (053)753–8705

Sinsung Junior College
1) Private 2) 1995 3) 12 4) 1,840
Address: San 49 Dukma-ri, Chungmi-myon, Dangjin-kun, Chungnam 343–860, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0457)50–1114 FAX: (0457)50–1145
Songwon Junior College
  1) Private 2) 1973 3) 18 4) 5,040
  Address: 199–1 Kwangcheon-dong, Seo-gu, Kwangju 502–742, R.O.K.
  Telephone: (062)365–0035 FAX: (062)365–5524

Soonchon Junior College
  1) Private 2) 1954 3) 8 4) 2,520
  Address: 224–9 Teokwol-dong, Suncheon, Channam 540–743, R.O.K.
  Telephone: (0661)740–7111 FAX: (0661)743–6414

Soong-eui Women’s Junior College
  1) Private 2) 1903 3) 12 4) 2,960
  Address: 8–3 Yejang-dong, Chung-gu, Seoul 100–751, R.O.K.
  Telephone: (02)773–2600 FAX: (02)773–2625

Sunchon Technical Junior College
  1) Private 2) 1978 3) 15 4) 4,080
  Address: 9–3 Teokwol-dong, Suncheon, Chonnam 540–744, R.O.K.
  Telephone: (0661)740–1203 FAX: (0661)743–5106

Sungsim Junior College of Foreign Languages
  1) Private 2) 1982 3) 20 4) 4,160
  Address: 249 Pansong-dong, Haeundae-gu, Pusan 612–083, R.O.K.
  Telephone: (051)532–7000 FAX: (051)532–9347

Suwon Industrial College
  1) Private 2) 1977 3) 23 4) 5,600
  Address: San 9–10 Botang-ri, Jungnam-myon, Hwaseong-gun, Kyonggi 445–960, R.O.K.
  Telephone: (0339)52–8980 FAX: (0339)52–6506

Suwon Women’s College
  1) Private 2) 1969 3) 15 4) 3,320
  Address: San 1–6 Omokcheon-dong, Kwonsun-gu, Suwon, Kyonggi 441–748, R.O.K.
  Telephone: (0331)292–6251 FAX: (0331)292–6250

Taegu Health Junior College
  1) Private 2) 1971 3) 16 4) 5,760
  Address: San 7 Taejeon-dong, Puk-gu, Taegu 702–260, R.O.K.
  Telephone: (053)324–6001 FAX: (053)311–6022

Taegu Technical Junior College
  1) Private 2) 1975 3) 14 4) 3,920
  Address: 831 Pon-dong, Talseo-gu, Taegu 704–350, R.O.K.
  Telephone: (053)625–0501 FAX: (053)625–0506

Taejon Junior College
  1) Private 2) 1940 3) 17 4) 3,600
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Address: San 15–3 Poksu-dong, Seo-gu, Taejeon 302–210, R.O.K.
Telephone: (042)580–6114 FAX: (042)580–6129

Taejon Medical Junior College
1) Private 2) 1977 3) 25 4) 5,400
Address: 77–3 Kayang–2–dong, Dong-gu, Taejeon 300–092, R.O.K.
Telephone: (042)630–5700 FAX: (042)628–1423

Taekyung Junior College
1) Private 2) 1993 3) 16 4) 2,560
Address: San 24 Danbuk-ri, Jain-myon, Kyongsan, Jyungbuk 713–850, R.O.K.
Telephone: (053)850–1000 FAX: (053)851–0770

Taesung Junior College
1) Private 2) 1995 3) 9 4) 1,600
Address: 439 Hwangji-dong, Taebaek, Kangwon 235–010, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0395)52–9005 FAX: (0395)53–7622

Tongkuk Junior College
1) Private 2) 1993 3) 14 4) 2,320
Address: San 159 Bongsan-ri, Kisan-myong, Chilkok-gun, Kyungbuk 718–850, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0545)971–9001 FAX: (0545)971–9010

Tongnae Women’s Junior College
1) Private 2) 1979 3) 16 4) 3,920
Address: 640 Pansong-dong, Haeundae-gu, Pusan 612–080, R.O.K.
Telephone: (051)521–8891 FAX: (051)521–7188

Tongwon College of Technology
1) Private 2) 1996 3) 8 4) 1,440
Address: San 1–1 Shimchon-ri, Silchon-muon, Kwangju-gun, Kyonggi 464–870, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0347)63–8541 FAX: (0347)63–8549

Ulsan Junior College
1) Private 2) 1973 3) 17 4) 4,160
Address: San 29 Mugeo-dong, Nam-gu, Ulsan 680–749, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0522)47–6301 FAX: (0522)77–1538

Wonju National Junior College
1) National 2) 1967 3) 14 4) 2,040
Address: San 2–1 Heungup-ri, Heungup-myong, Wonju, Kangwon 220–840, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0371)763–8677 FAX: (0371)763–8680

Wonkwang Public Health Junior College
1) Private 2) 1976 3) 17 4) 4,360
Institutional Information

Address: 344–2 Sinryong-dong, Iksan, Chonbuk 570–750, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0653)840–1114 FAX: (0653)840–1566

Woogjin Junior College
1) Private 2) 1993 3) 12 4) 1,760
Address: 180–1 Keumam-ri, Janggi-myon, Kongju, Chungnam 315–910, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0416)856–6100 FAX: (0416)856–6104

Yangsan Junior College
1) Private 2) 1989 3) 15 4) 3,120
Address: San 105–1 Myonggok-ri, Yangsan-eup, Yangsan, Kyongnam 626–800, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0523)370–8100 FAX: (0523)386–2000

Yeojoo Technical College
1) Private 2) 1993 3) 16 4) 2,800
Address: San 6–16 Kyo-ri, Yeojoo-eup, Yeojoo-kun, Kyonggi 469–800, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0337)85–7050 FAX: (0337)83–5113

Yeong Dong College
1) Private 2) 1963 3) 17 4) 3,320
Address: San 11 Keumsan-ri, Sungsa-myon, Kangmeung, Kangwon 210–840, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0391)610–0146 FAX: (0391)44–8809

Yeungjin Junior College
1) Private 2) 1977 3) 16 4) 6,080
Address: 218 Pokhyon-dong, Puk-gu, Taegu 702–022, R.O.K.
Telephone: (053)940–514 FAX: (053)939–1050

Yeungnam Junior College
1) Private 2) 1968 3) 18 4) 6,080
Address: 1737 Taemyong-dong, Nam-gu, Taegu 705–037, R.O.K.
Telephone: (053)620–9114 FAX: (053)627–8491

Yonam Junior College of Engineering
1) Private 2) 1981 3) 5 4) 1,280
Address: San 100 Kajwa-dong, Chinju, Kyungnam 660–300, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0591)751–2000 FAX: (0591)751–2004

Yonam Junior College of Livestock and Horticulture
1) Private 2) 1973 3) 5 4) 720
Address: San 3–1 Suhyang-ri, Seongwhan-eup, Cheonan, Chungnam 333–800, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0417)580–1114 FAX: (0417)581–0401

Yong In Technical College
1) Private 2) 1995 3) 95 4) 1,840
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Address: San 77–1 Mapyong-ri, Yongin-eup, Yongin-kun, Kyonggi 449–800, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0335)37–1981 FAX: (0335)36–9535

Yongwol Technical College
1) Private 2) 1994 3) 10 4) 1,760
Address: San 57 Hasong-ri, Youngwol-eup, Youngwol-kun, Kangwon 230–800, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0373)73–6210 FAX: (0373)73–6219

Yuhan Junior College
1) Private 2) 1978 3) 17 4) 5,120
Address: 185–34 Keoan-dong, Sosa-gu, Pucheon, Kyonggi 422–749, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)610–0600 FAX: (02)610–0777

MISCELLANEOUS SCHOOLS (FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS)

Capital Baptist Theological Seminary
1) Private 2) 1980 3) 1 4) 192
Address: 717–3 Yongdu-ri, Kongdo-myon, Anseong-gun, Kyonggi 456–820, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0333)51–2835 FAX: (0333)53–9679

Chugye School of Arts
1) Private 2) 1974 3) 9 4) 1,050
Address: 190–1 Pukahyeon-dong, Seodaemun-gu, Seoul 120–763, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)362–4515 FAX: (02)365–3066

Daegu Theological College and Seminary
1) Private 2) 1952 3) 4 4) 617
Address: 137 Paekcheon-dong, Kyongsan, Kyungbuk 712–100, R.O.K.
Telephone: (053)811–1181 FAX: (053)811–4178

Don Bosco College of Arts
1) Private 2) 1993 3) 3 4) 600
Address: San 117–6, Dabu-ri, Kasan-myon, Chilkok-gun, Kyungbuk 718–910, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0545)973–5311 FAX: (0545)973–5319

Han Sung Theological Seminary
1) Private 2) 1959 3) 4 4) 720
Address: San 73–1 Shinyang-ri, Yonsan-myon, Nonsan, Chungnam 320–870, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0461)33–6565 FAX: (0461)33–6560

Hapdong Presbyterian Theological Seminary
Institutional Information

1) Private 2) 1980 3) 2 4) 200
Address: San 42–3 Woncheon-dong, Paldal-gu, Suwon 442–791, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0331)212–3694 FAX: (0331)212–6204

Jung Ang SamGha College
1) Private 2) 1979 3) 2 4) 480
Address: 156–5 Ga Anam-dong, Seongbuk-gu, Seoul 136–075, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)925–5508 FAX: (02)928–4302

Korea Christian College
1) Private 2) 1937 3) 1 4) 237
Address: 1–19 Shinsa-dong, Eunpyong-gu, Seoul 122–080, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)356–5181 FAX: (02)354–3162

Korea Church of God Bible College
1) Private 2) 1970 3) 2 4) 326
Address: San 22–1 Kaebong-dong, Kuro-gu, Seoul 152–091, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)616–4091 FAX: (02)616–4102

Korean Bible College Theological Seminary
1) Private 2) 1952 3) 5 4) 640
Address: 205 Sanggye-dong, Nowon-gu, Seoul 139–791, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)952–6321 FAX: (02)936–0444

Kwangju Presbyterian Theological Seminary
1) Private 2) 1960 3) 2 4) 400
Address: San 70 Ponchon-dong, Puk-gu, Kwangju 500–210, R.O.K.
Telephone: (062)571–7251 FAX: (062)571–7255

Luther Seminary
1) Private 2) 1966 3) 1 4) 192
Address: 17 Sanggal-ri, Kiheung-eup, YongIn, Kyonggi 449–900, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0331)288–3593 FAX: (0331)288–1505

Pusan Union Theological Seminary
1) Private 2) 1962 3) 2 4) 352
Address: 316–3 Daeyon-dong, Nam-gu, Pusan 608–025, R.O.K.
Telephone: (051)628–0115 FAX: (051)628–0848

Reformative Theological Seminary
1) Private 2) 1960 3) 2 4) 400
Address: San 72 Shinyang-ri, Saengguk-myon, Eumsung-gun, Chungbuk 369–840, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0446)78–0761 FAX: (0446)78–3351

Seoul Presbyterian Theological Seminary
1) Private 2) 1954 3) 3 4) 468
Address: San 20–5 KyungAn-ri, Kwangju-eup, Kwangju-kun, Kyonggi 464–742, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0347)61–6453 FAX: (0347)65–1232
Taejon Presbyterian Theological Seminary
1) Private 2) 1960 3) 2 4) 400
Address: 226–22 Ojung-dong, Daeduck-gu, Taejon 306–010, R.O.K.
Telephone: (042)623–3620 FAX: (042)621–0821
Yongsan Won Buddhist College
1) Private 2) 1927 3) 1 4) 50
Address: 20–2 Kilyong-ri, Paeksu-eup, Youngkwang, Chonnam 513–900, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0686)52–6346 FAX: (0686)53–5642

MISCELLANEOUS SCHOOLS (TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS)

Kwangju School of Arts
1) Private 2) 1993 3) 3 4) 600
Address: 45 Kyochon-ri, Nampyong-eup, Naju, Chonnam 523–840, R.O.K.
Telephone: (0613)31–9824 FAX: (0613)31–9829

Officer Training College of the Salvation Army
1) Private 2) 1910 3) 1 4) 61
Address: 83–2 Chungang-dong, Kwachon 427–010, R.O.K.
Telephone: (02)502–9505 FAX: (02)502–7160

Pusan School of Arts
1) Private 2) 1993 3) 3 4) 600
Address: 1552 Daeyon–5-dong, Nam-gu, Pusan 608–025, R.O.K.
Telephone: (051)628–3990 FAX: (051)628–2719
This appendix contains detailed statistical information on trends in Korean higher education since 1965. It shows the unparalleled growth between 1965 and 1996 in the numbers of institutions (from 162 to 336: Table A) and students (from 141,636 to 2,541,659: Table B-2). Among all the Korean higher education institutions in 1996, there were 134 colleges and universities; 11 teachers colleges; 152 junior colleges; 20 miscellaneous schools; 18 open universities; and 1 Air and Correspondence University (Table A). Korean higher education students in 1996 were distributed across institutional type as follows: 1,266,876 in colleges and universities; 127,808 in graduate schools; 20,439 in teachers colleges; 642,697 in junior colleges; 14,828 in miscellaneous schools; 141,826 in open universities; and 327,185 in the Air and Correspondence University (Table B-2). In 1995, 44 percent of college and university students majored in natural sciences and engineering, and 26 percent majored in social sciences (Table B-3). In junior colleges, 52 percent of the students majored in natural sciences, with 42 percent of these majoring in engineering (Table B-5). Half of the students were concentrated in the metropolitan Seoul, Pusan, and Kyonggi areas.

Opportunities for higher education are limited, despite the very strong demand for higher education. Secondary education has been virtually universal since the early 1970s. Almost all elementary school graduates go to middle school, and 97 percent of middle school graduates enter high schools. The enrollment ratio in high school is about 90 percent of the age-cohort. In recent years, about 75 percent of high school graduates
have taken national entrance examinations for college and university admission. Unfortunately, there have been places for about half of the applicants, and only 30 percent of all applicants could be accepted into four-year colleges and universities.

Korean higher education institutions had 63,809 full-time teachers in 1996: 49,582 in colleges and universities; 786 in teachers colleges; 11,515 in junior colleges; 403 in miscellaneous schools; and 2,523 in open universities (Table C-1). In 1995, 59 percent of college and university faculty had Ph.D. degrees, and 22 percent had master’s degrees; in junior colleges, about 23 percent of faculty had Ph.D. degrees, and 57 percent had master’s degrees (Table C-2). Also in 1995, 22 percent of faculty were in engineering, 16 percent were in social sciences, 13 percent were in medicine and dentistry, and 12 percent were in natural sciences (Table C-3).
# A. Korean Higher Education Institutions

## A-I. Number of Institutions by Type and Institutional Founder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; University</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Schools</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Universities</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air &amp; Correspondence</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. STUDENTS IN KOREAN HIGHER EDUCATION

#### B-1. Number of Higher Education Students per 10,000 Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Population (in 1000's)</td>
<td>28,794</td>
<td>31,466</td>
<td>34,707</td>
<td>37,436</td>
<td>40,448</td>
<td>43,411</td>
<td>45,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. # H. E. Studs. (in 1000's)</td>
<td>141.6</td>
<td>201.4</td>
<td>318.7</td>
<td>647.5</td>
<td>1,455.8</td>
<td>1,691.4</td>
<td>2,541.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/A × 10,000</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>173.0</td>
<td>360.0</td>
<td>389.6</td>
<td>558.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


#### B-2. Number of Students by Type and Institutional Founder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>141,636</td>
<td>201,436</td>
<td>297,219</td>
<td>647,505</td>
<td>1,451,297</td>
<td>1,691,429</td>
<td>2,541,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>39,181</td>
<td>65,208</td>
<td>88,568</td>
<td>194,178</td>
<td>470,538</td>
<td>496,812</td>
<td>800,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>102,455</td>
<td>136,228</td>
<td>208,651</td>
<td>453,327</td>
<td>980,759</td>
<td>1,194,617</td>
<td>1,744,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; Universities</td>
<td>105,643</td>
<td>146,414</td>
<td>208,986</td>
<td>402,979</td>
<td>931,884</td>
<td>1,040,166</td>
<td>1,266,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>25,964</td>
<td>36,038</td>
<td>56,830</td>
<td>114,686</td>
<td>243,378</td>
<td>254,748</td>
<td>308,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>79,679</td>
<td>110,376</td>
<td>152,156</td>
<td>288,293</td>
<td>688,506</td>
<td>785,418</td>
<td>958,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>3,842</td>
<td>6,640</td>
<td>13,870</td>
<td>33,939</td>
<td>68,178</td>
<td>86,911</td>
<td>127,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>2,597</td>
<td>4,236</td>
<td>11,133</td>
<td>19,362</td>
<td>25,426</td>
<td>40,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>2,194</td>
<td>4,043</td>
<td>9,634</td>
<td>22,806</td>
<td>48,816</td>
<td>61,485</td>
<td>87,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College</td>
<td>5,920</td>
<td>12,190</td>
<td>8,504</td>
<td>9,425</td>
<td>18,174</td>
<td>15,960</td>
<td>20,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>5,920</td>
<td>12,190</td>
<td>8,504</td>
<td>9,425</td>
<td>18,174</td>
<td>15,960</td>
<td>20,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>23,159</td>
<td>33,483</td>
<td>62,866</td>
<td>165,051</td>
<td>242,117</td>
<td>323,825</td>
<td>642,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>4,699</td>
<td>14,383</td>
<td>18,998</td>
<td>26,881</td>
<td>22,956</td>
<td>26,959</td>
<td>22,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>18,460</td>
<td>19,100</td>
<td>43,868</td>
<td>138,170</td>
<td>219,161</td>
<td>296,866</td>
<td>620,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Schools</td>
<td>3,072</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>4,058</td>
<td>17,475</td>
<td>23,947</td>
<td>14,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>2,122</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>2,993</td>
<td>4,058</td>
<td>17,475</td>
<td>23,947</td>
<td>14,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Universities</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20,254</td>
<td>51,970</td>
<td>141,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>13,453</td>
<td>25,069</td>
<td>81,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,801</td>
<td>26,901</td>
<td>60,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B-3. Percentage of Students by Major (Colleges and Universities/Undergraduate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities¹</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts²</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences/Engineering³</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine⁴</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Linguistics and Literature are included.
²Music, Fine Arts, and Physical Education are included.
³Agriculture, Forestry, Fishery and Marine, and Home Economics are included.
⁴Dentistry, Oriental Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy are included.

### B-4. Number of Students by Major and Sex (Colleges and Universities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>105,643</td>
<td>146,414</td>
<td>208,986</td>
<td>406,979</td>
<td>931,884</td>
<td>1,040,166</td>
<td>1,187,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>23,761</td>
<td>32,641</td>
<td>55,439</td>
<td>90,634</td>
<td>250,088</td>
<td>296,129</td>
<td>378,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities¹</td>
<td>19,227</td>
<td>17,786</td>
<td>36,611</td>
<td>54,252</td>
<td>150,141</td>
<td>156,164</td>
<td>166,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>7,697</td>
<td>6,067</td>
<td>11,488</td>
<td>16,979</td>
<td>64,033</td>
<td>72,624</td>
<td>86,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>29,037</td>
<td>35,734</td>
<td>37,343</td>
<td>85,197</td>
<td>257,738</td>
<td>286,814</td>
<td>306,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1,933</td>
<td>3,322</td>
<td>3,308</td>
<td>6,596</td>
<td>36,489</td>
<td>50,815</td>
<td>78,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts²</td>
<td>6,512</td>
<td>7,782</td>
<td>12,621</td>
<td>21,871</td>
<td>53,177</td>
<td>69,029</td>
<td>84,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3,940</td>
<td>5,115</td>
<td>8,739</td>
<td>15,578</td>
<td>32,970</td>
<td>39,206</td>
<td>47,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp;</td>
<td>37,099</td>
<td>59,264</td>
<td>74,410</td>
<td>166,137</td>
<td>337,624</td>
<td>419,891</td>
<td>523,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering³</td>
<td>4,603</td>
<td>7,024</td>
<td>9,247</td>
<td>19,121</td>
<td>49,796</td>
<td>80,087</td>
<td>108,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>9,382</td>
<td>12,845</td>
<td>16,813</td>
<td>22,111</td>
<td>39,408</td>
<td>40,430</td>
<td>44,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine⁴</td>
<td>3,172</td>
<td>4,416</td>
<td>6,143</td>
<td>7,004</td>
<td>13,934</td>
<td>14,299</td>
<td>17,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>4,386</td>
<td>13,003</td>
<td>31,188</td>
<td>53,411</td>
<td>94,796</td>
<td>67,838</td>
<td>62,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>2,416</td>
<td>6,697</td>
<td>16,514</td>
<td>25,356</td>
<td>53,866</td>
<td>39,098</td>
<td>40,818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Linguistics and Literature are included.
²Music, Fine Arts, and Physical Education are included.
³Agriculture, Forestry, Fishery and Marine, and Home Economics are included.
⁴Dentistry, Oriental Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy are included.

### B-5. Percentage of Students by Major (Junior Colleges)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities(^1)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts(^2)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences/</td>
<td>[66.4]</td>
<td>[76.3]</td>
<td>[79.6]</td>
<td>[76.6]</td>
<td>[52.9]</td>
<td>[54.0]</td>
<td>[51.7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering(^3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine(^4)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Linguistics and Literature are included.
\(^2\)Music, Fine Arts, and Physical Education are included.
\(^3\)Agriculture, Forestry, Fishery and Marine, and Home Economics are included.
\(^4\)Dentistry, Oriental Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy are included.

B-6. Number of Students by Major and Sex (Junior Colleges)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>23,159</td>
<td>33,483</td>
<td>62,866</td>
<td>165,051</td>
<td>242,117</td>
<td>323,825</td>
<td>569,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>8,316</td>
<td>17,761</td>
<td>42,724</td>
<td>87,123</td>
<td>119,345</td>
<td>214,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities¹</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4,799</td>
<td>10,419</td>
<td>25,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,114</td>
<td>5,467</td>
<td>13,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>3,258</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>16,314</td>
<td>44,165</td>
<td>58,441</td>
<td>118,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>5,215</td>
<td>15,454</td>
<td>25,739</td>
<td>56,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts²</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>6,907</td>
<td>18,707</td>
<td>28,759</td>
<td>58,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>3,920</td>
<td>11,137</td>
<td>19,127</td>
<td>33,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp; Engineering³</td>
<td>15,389</td>
<td>25,557</td>
<td>50,052</td>
<td>126,382</td>
<td>128,033</td>
<td>174,815</td>
<td>294,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2,713</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>7,867</td>
<td>22,415</td>
<td>21,213</td>
<td>30,208</td>
<td>57,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine⁴</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>5,448</td>
<td>10,738</td>
<td>15,448</td>
<td>31,975</td>
<td>37,532</td>
<td>56,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>5,204</td>
<td>8,597</td>
<td>11,174</td>
<td>22,774</td>
<td>25,998</td>
<td>35,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>14,438</td>
<td>13,859</td>
<td>16,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>14,431</td>
<td>13,806</td>
<td>16,775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Linguistics and Literature are included.
²Music, Fine Arts, and Physical Education are included.
³Agriculture, Forestry, Fishery and Marine, and Home Economics are included.
⁴Dentistry, Oriental Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy are included.

## B-7. Number of Students per Full-Time Faculty by Type

|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| All                       | 19.8 | 19.2 | 20.9 | 28.8 | 37.7 | 33.6 | 34.5
| National & Public         | 14.5 | 15.5 | 16.1 | 24.4 | 30.7 | 24.8 | 28.6
| Private                   | 27.3 | 21.4 | 23.8 | 30.8 | 40.6 | 37.1 | 36.6 |
| College & University      | 22.6 | 18.8 | 20.7 | 27.9 | 35.8 | 31.2 | 26.3 |
| National & Public         | 12.6 | 13.6 | 16.4 | 25.3 | 29.7 | 24.6 | 23.3 |
| Private                   | 28.1 | 21.5 | 23.0 | 29.2 | 38.6 | 34.2 | 27.5 |
| Teachers College          | 20.3 | 18.5 | 10.8 | 16.7 | 29.2 | 23.0 | 27.5 |
| National & Public         | 20.3 | 18.5 | 10.8 | 16.7 | 29.2 | 23.0 | 27.5 |
| Private                   | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    |
| Junior College            | 26.0 | 20.5 | 22.9 | 30.1 | 37.8 | 49.3 | 54.9 |
| National & Public         | 14.6 | 18.7 | 18.6 | 21.8 | 37.8 | 28.1 | 35.7 |
| Private                   | 32.4 | 22.0 | 25.4 | 32.1 | 40.2 | 46.2 | 56.1 |
| Miscellaneous Schools     | 12.9 | 14.0 | 15.0 | 26.7 | 42.9 | 58.6 | 36.8 |
| National & Public         | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    | —    |
| Private                   | 12.0 | 14.0 | 15.0 | 26.7 | 42.9 | 58.6 | 36.8 |

1 Air and Correspondence University is excluded.

C. FACULTY IN KOREAN HIGHER EDUCATION

C-1. Number of Full-Time Faculty by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>6,801</td>
<td>10,270</td>
<td>13,981</td>
<td>20,900</td>
<td>33,483</td>
<td>41,920</td>
<td>63,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>4,079</td>
<td>5,326</td>
<td>6,476</td>
<td>9,786</td>
<td>12,025</td>
<td>16,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4,210</td>
<td>6,191</td>
<td>8,655</td>
<td>14,424</td>
<td>23,697</td>
<td>29,895</td>
<td>47,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; University¹</td>
<td>5,305</td>
<td>7,779</td>
<td>10,080</td>
<td>14,458</td>
<td>26,047</td>
<td>33,340</td>
<td>49,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>2,649</td>
<td>3,514</td>
<td>4,578</td>
<td>8,204</td>
<td>10,373</td>
<td>13,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td>5,130</td>
<td>6,728</td>
<td>9,880</td>
<td>17,843</td>
<td>22,967</td>
<td>35,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>5,488</td>
<td>6,406</td>
<td>7,382</td>
<td>11,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>4,229</td>
<td>5,447</td>
<td>6,424</td>
<td>10,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Schools</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Universities²</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>2,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>1,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Faculty of graduate schools are included.
²Faculty of Air and Correspondence University are included; for 1996 data only, teaching assistants are included in the numbers for National and Public Open Universities.

C-2. Percentage of Faculty by Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>College &amp; University</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junior College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C-3. Percentage of Faculty by Major (All Institutions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics &amp; Literature</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music &amp; Fine Arts</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine, Dentistry, &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Forestry</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishery &amp; Marine</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


C-4. Number of Faculty by Major (Colleges and Universities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>5,305</td>
<td>7,779</td>
<td>10,080</td>
<td>14,458</td>
<td>26,047</td>
<td>33,340</td>
<td>45,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>2,824</td>
<td>5,501</td>
<td>5,692</td>
<td>7,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>1,522</td>
<td>2,249</td>
<td>4,359</td>
<td>5,513</td>
<td>7,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>2,742</td>
<td>3,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>3,547</td>
<td>5,357</td>
<td>8,973</td>
<td>11,660</td>
<td>17,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1,338</td>
<td>1,719</td>
<td>2,166</td>
<td>3,577</td>
<td>5,095</td>
<td>6,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>2,638</td>
<td>3,062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>Linguistics and Literature are included.

<sup>2</sup>Music, Fine Arts, and Physical Education are included.

<sup>3</sup>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishery and Marine, and Home Economics are included.

<sup>4</sup>Dentistry, Oriental Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy are included.

C-5. Number of Faculty by Major (Junior Colleges)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>5,488</td>
<td>6,406</td>
<td>7,382</td>
<td>10,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities(^1)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>1,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts(^2)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>1,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp; Engineering(^3)</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>3,148</td>
<td>3,283</td>
<td>3,716</td>
<td>5,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine(^4)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Linguistics and Literature are included.
\(^2\)Music, Fine Arts, and Physical Education are included.
\(^3\)Agriculture, Forestry, Fishery and Marine, and Home Economics are included.
\(^4\)Dentistry, Oriental Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy are included.

C-6. Number of Faculty by Major (Teachers Colleges)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities(^1)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts(^2)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp; Engineering(^3)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine(^4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Linguistics and Literature are included.
\(^2\)Music, Fine Arts, and Physical Education are included.
\(^3\)Agriculture, Forestry, Fishery and Marine, and Home Economics are included.
\(^4\)Dentistry, Oriental Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy are included.
C-7. Number of Faculty by Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>1965&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1970&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1975&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>6,365</td>
<td>9,265</td>
<td>11,416</td>
<td>20,900</td>
<td>33,895</td>
<td>41,920</td>
<td>58,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>1,318</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>5,967</td>
<td>8,034</td>
<td>13,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>2,336</td>
<td>2,985</td>
<td>4,195</td>
<td>5,986</td>
<td>9,414</td>
<td>16,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>1,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>4,857</td>
<td>9,939</td>
<td>10,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>1,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>1,918</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>4,351</td>
<td>9,138</td>
<td>8,733</td>
<td>10,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>1,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>5,304</td>
<td>5,621</td>
<td>4,195</td>
<td>7,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>1,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>1,673</td>
<td>3,293</td>
<td>7,092</td>
<td>9,379</td>
<td>13,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>3,557</td>
<td>6,861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>Teachers in Junior Vocational and Technical Colleges are excluded.

D. EXPENDITURES IN KOREAN HIGHER EDUCATION

D-I. Total Expenditure Budget by Type of Higher Education Institution (Unit: Million Won)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>18,257</td>
<td>69,683</td>
<td>436,825</td>
<td>1,290,207</td>
<td>2,407,934</td>
<td>6,450,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>6,566</td>
<td>25,177</td>
<td>155,567</td>
<td>350,515</td>
<td>636,580</td>
<td>1,315,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>11,691</td>
<td>44,506</td>
<td>281,258</td>
<td>939,692</td>
<td>1,771,354</td>
<td>5,135,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>2,031</td>
<td>11,231</td>
<td>80,899</td>
<td>181,663</td>
<td>348,139</td>
<td>1,317,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>3,884</td>
<td>18,840</td>
<td>29,963</td>
<td>49,770</td>
<td>38,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>7,347</td>
<td>62,059</td>
<td>151,700</td>
<td>298,369</td>
<td>1,278,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>3,508</td>
<td>10,144</td>
<td>28,117</td>
<td>48,130</td>
<td>83,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>3,508</td>
<td>10,144</td>
<td>28,117</td>
<td>48,130</td>
<td>83,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; University</td>
<td>14,957</td>
<td>54,646</td>
<td>344,080</td>
<td>1,065,213</td>
<td>1,984,528</td>
<td>5,020,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>4,403</td>
<td>17,784</td>
<td>126,582</td>
<td>292,435</td>
<td>538,679</td>
<td>1,193,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>10,554</td>
<td>36,862</td>
<td>217,498</td>
<td>772,778</td>
<td>1,445,849</td>
<td>3,827,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Schools</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>15,214</td>
<td>27,137</td>
<td>29,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>15,214</td>
<td>27,137</td>
<td>29,104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D-2. Total Expenditure per Student by Type of Higher Education Institution (Unit: Thousand Won)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>109.6</td>
<td>308.5</td>
<td>727.7</td>
<td>1,011.6</td>
<td>1,503.1</td>
<td>3,629.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>128.8</td>
<td>376.2</td>
<td>985.8</td>
<td>1,153.5</td>
<td>1,453.0</td>
<td>3,903.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>101.2</td>
<td>280.0</td>
<td>635.2</td>
<td>966.5</td>
<td>1,516.9</td>
<td>3,565.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>183.3</td>
<td>490.1</td>
<td>750.3</td>
<td>1,075.1</td>
<td>2,312.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>203.6</td>
<td>700.9</td>
<td>1,305.2</td>
<td>1,846.1</td>
<td>1,810.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>174.5</td>
<td>449.2</td>
<td>692.2</td>
<td>1,005.1</td>
<td>2,332.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>423.7</td>
<td>1,076.3</td>
<td>1,547.1</td>
<td>3,015.7</td>
<td>4,225.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>423.7</td>
<td>1,076.3</td>
<td>1,547.1</td>
<td>3,015.7</td>
<td>4,225.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; University</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>103.7</td>
<td>258.4</td>
<td>785.7</td>
<td>1,065.2</td>
<td>1,760.8</td>
<td>4,227.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>119.7</td>
<td>307.9</td>
<td>998.1</td>
<td>1,113.0</td>
<td>1,922.7</td>
<td>4,033.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>239.7</td>
<td>699.1</td>
<td>1,048.1</td>
<td>1,707.2</td>
<td>4,291.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Air and Correspondence University is excluded.*

### Allocation of Total Expenditures by Type of Higher Education Institution (in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; University</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National &amp; Public</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D-4. Educational Expenditures of National College and Universities
(Unit: Million Won)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>5,514</td>
<td>17,812</td>
<td>120,014</td>
<td>223,088</td>
<td>449,272</td>
<td>896,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Expenses</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>11,062</td>
<td>45,328</td>
<td>120,232</td>
<td>251,796</td>
<td>483,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Expenses</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>3,875</td>
<td>21,477</td>
<td>49,832</td>
<td>112,207</td>
<td>235,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Expenses</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>2,875</td>
<td>53,209</td>
<td>53,024</td>
<td>85,269</td>
<td>176,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>2,214</td>
<td>13,107</td>
<td>22,722</td>
<td>39,717</td>
<td>24,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Expenses</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>5,768</td>
<td>10,377</td>
<td>18,706</td>
<td>10,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Expenses</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>5,659</td>
<td>10,145</td>
<td>5,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Expenses</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>4,644</td>
<td>6,686</td>
<td>10,865</td>
<td>8,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>8,418</td>
<td>20,695</td>
<td>37,872</td>
<td>61,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Expenses</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>5,031</td>
<td>11,250</td>
<td>21,257</td>
<td>36,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Expenses</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>2,242</td>
<td>5,156</td>
<td>9,423</td>
<td>15,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Expenses</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>4,290</td>
<td>7,191</td>
<td>9,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; University</td>
<td>2,128</td>
<td>4,092</td>
<td>12,738</td>
<td>98,489</td>
<td>179,671</td>
<td>371,684</td>
<td>810,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Expenses</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>8,038</td>
<td>34,529</td>
<td>98,605</td>
<td>211,833</td>
<td>436,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Expenses</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>2,889</td>
<td>16,540</td>
<td>39,018</td>
<td>92,639</td>
<td>214,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Expenses</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>47,421</td>
<td>42,049</td>
<td>67,212</td>
<td>158,818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Expenditure of school support is excluded.

Table D-5. Allocation of Educational Expenditures in National Colleges and Universities (in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Expenses</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Expenses</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Expenses</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Expenses</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Expenses</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Expenses</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Expenses</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Expenses</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Expenses</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; University</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Expenses</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Expenses</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Expenses</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Expenditure of school support is excluded.

D-6. Ratio of Tuition to Per Capita GNP in Private Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition per Student (A)(^1)</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>649 (738)</td>
<td>1,078 (1,175)</td>
<td>1,791 (1,911)</td>
<td>3,398 (3,723)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita GNP (B)(^2)</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>3,942</td>
<td>7,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A/B \times 100) (%)</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>67.0 (76.2)</td>
<td>56.4 (61.5)</td>
<td>45.4 (48.5)</td>
<td>43.7 (47.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)The unit of tuition is ten thousand won. The tuition per student indicates the average tuition of private universities in the field of natural science. Figures in parentheses are for freshmen.
\(^2\)Unit of Per Capita GNP is ten thousand won.


D-7. Ratio of Tuition to Urban Workers’ Gross Incomes\(^2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition per Student (A)(^1)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>1,791</td>
<td>3,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita GNP (B)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>2,809</td>
<td>5,174</td>
<td>11,319</td>
<td>22,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A/B \times 100) (%)</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)The unit of tuition is ten thousand won. Tuition per student indicates tuition in the field of natural science.
\(^2\)Urban workers’ gross incomes mean family income per urban worker household. The unit is ten thousand won.
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