US Influence on the Formation of the Korean Knowledge System in Education

and Its Dysfunctional Conditions

Jong Gag Lee

Juhu Kim

I. INTRODUCTION

Korea is one of a number of countries which has experienced both increased use of Western knowledge and increased doubts about the utility of that knowledge. In particular, the use and doubts of Western knowledge in Korea were mainly related to the relationships with US. After the Korean war, many Korean scholars went to the US in order to study a modern system of education, and they returned to Korea with newly acquired knowledge. This new knowledge became one of the key components supporting Korea's education. However, despite the increased number of scholars who studied abroad, the possibility of using the knowledge gained in the US in Korea's social system has been questioned. Additionally, it is questionable whether the scholars' efforts to learn the knowledge from US contributed to the development of Korea's own knowledge system. This paper focuses on how Korean knowledge system in education has been structured, and functioned under the continued influence of US. An attempt was also made to understand international dimensions and origins of domestic issues concerning educational R&D and reform in Korea.

This study explores major aspects of formation and change in the Korean knowledge system under the influences of the US knowledge system. The influence of the US was explored through reviewing a range of national and institutional historical materials on US-Korea knowledge exchanges. For this exploration, a particular period (1945~mid 1970s) was chosen. This largely qualitative analysis of the Korean knowledge system is undertaken within a world system or dependency paradigm which assumes transnational transfer of knowledge from 'centre' to 'periphery' countries. In this study, we assumed that Korea and US reflect 'periphery' and 'centre' countries respectively. The peripheral status of Korea was particularly reflected in its knowledge relationships with the US.

II. THEORETICAL RATIONALE

Transnational knowledge transfer involves the exchange of theories, models and methods for academic or practical purposes among countries which often share little in terms of cultural heritage, historical experience, developmental stage, and economic and political conditions. Such transfer occurs 'within a global network of countries' (Briggs 1977) and has resulted, particularly in many less-developed countries, in Americanization of the social sciences; it has also resulted in a global knowledge system and the emerging view of 'social science as a transnational system' (Alger and Lyons 1974).

The predominant model of knowledge between industrialized nations and Third World nations exchange during the developmental decades of the 1950s and 1960s was an imitation/intervention strategy based on the assumption of the universal applicability of western knowledge (Kumar, 1979; Useem and Useem, 1980). This strategy widely adopted by international aid networks of developed countries represented an attempt to solve problems in non-western countries by applying western knowledge. As a result, contemporary social science in less developed countries is often both the child and the companion of modernization (Stifel, Davidson & Coleman, 1982).

However, in the 1970s, with the emergence of dependency theory and the rise of Third World consciousness, and the increasing cultural awareness of some western social scientists, many criticisms were raised about this approach (Kumar, 1979; UNESCO, 1977; Alatas, 1972; 1974; Gareau, 1983). Proponents of dependency theory argued that "transnational cultural interactions should be examined within contemporary relationships of domination and subordination among nations" (Kumar, 1979: 12). Scholars of various ideological bent attempted to account for the transnational aspects of the social sciences in non-western countries (e.g., Lamy, 1976; Spitzberg, 1980; Woodhouse, 1985; Holzner, Campbell & Shahidullah, 1985).

These scholars' notions can be better explained by the concept of 'knowledge system', that is the institutions, organizations, groups and social roles that form the social arrangement within which knowledge-related activities are carried out (Holzner and Marx 1979). The activities of concern here include the production or reproduction of knowledge, its dissemination and exchange of knowledge, and the application of knowledge. Three separate but overlapping knowledge systems may be identified: the world knowledge system, an internationally structured system which may be divided into a centre knowledge system and a periphery knowledge system; a centre knowledge system functioning in industrialized countries and influencing less-industrialized countries; and a periphery knowledge system located in a less-developed country and dependent upon a centre knowledge system.

The world knowledge system has been divided into a centre of knowledge and a periphery of that knowledge (Vanderpool, 1974; Gareau, 1983; Roy, 1977) in such a way that the international academic system thus links the academic professions of the center and the periphery in a web of inequality (Altbach, 1979). The particular relationships between the center knowledge system and the periphery knowledge system suggest that the world knowledge system has at least four functions:

? legitimization and supply of knowledge experts(Goodman, 1984).

? legitimization and supply of new knowledge(Goodman, 1984).

? allocation of status(Goodman, 1984): and

? maintenance and control of knowledge production, distribution and storage system (Altbach, 1978; Vanderpool, 1974).

The functions of the center knowledge system, vis a vis the periphery knowledge system, are supported by a number of transnational networks including: ? international aid

networks and their programs; ? higher education systems within a world context; ? international networks of knowledge production and dissemination (Arnove, 1980:51-59). In a supporting view, Goodman (1984) observes the university education of the center of knowledge effectively defines education for the rest of the world through the institutionalization of international higher education between the center and the periphery.

There are two keys understanding the roles of knowledge mediators: One is the study of the state of mind of social scientists in the periphery knowledge system and the other is the cognitive relationships between scholars in the center and those in the periphery. The state of mind of scientists in the periphery has elicited many descriptors: "servitude" (Altbach, 1977); "inferior complex" (Kumar, 1978); "imitative" (Karsten, 1980); "butterfly collector" (Cardoso, 1977); "captive mind" (Alatas, 1972 & 1974) and "mechanistic imitation" (J.C.Kim, 1985). Further, Alatas subjects the scientific thoughts and activities of Asian social scientists to "a sociology of social scientists in Asia" (1972).

Interactions between center scholars and periphery scholars generate "academic reference groups," or academics whose professional outlook and behavior constitute a frame of reference for others (Eisemon, 1974:56), which explains interpersonal networks. According to Eisemon (1974), there are two kinds of academic reference groups: a foreign reference group (donor group) which works through several academic communities between the center knowledge system and the periphery knowledge system (recipient group), and a foreign educated reference group which works within the academic community of the periphery knowledge system. Eisemon (1974 & 1977) identifies the nature of the reference relation as basically a deference relation. In short, the asymmetry of the world knowledge system, the unique functions of the center knowledge system, and the institutionalized networks of influence all make up the environment under which recipient knowledge mediators in the third world nations act to transfer knowledge from the center to the periphery.

III. FORMATION OF THE KOREAN KNOWLEDGE SYSTEM AS A US-TRANSNATIONAL SYSTEM

Given the theoretical rationale described above, we analyzed the educational knowledge system in Korea. After a brief historical introduction to Korean intercultural interactions, the description focuses on the formation of the Korean educational knowledge system as a US transnational system from the historical data of education in Korea.

1. Korean Intercultural Interactions: an Overview

"The history of Korean education has reflected the history of Korean politics" (Auh, 1964: 515). Broadly speaking, Korean culture today is the result of acculturation by three cultures: China, Japan, and the US. Each country has contributed to critical changes in Korean politics.

When Korea was a "hermit kingdom" and had foreign relationships exclusively with China, its education was exclusively Chinese-oriented. In the late Yi-Dynasty (1870-1910), she began to have relations with Western countries. The dominant frame of reference of

cultural exchanges in Korea at that time was "Don To Suh Ki" (oriental learning for substance, Western techniques for their utility).

The Korea-US relationship began in 1882, the late Yi-Dynasty. The US influence began with missionaries who focused on medical practices and Christian education. As far as the transfer of educational theory is concerned, missionary education didn't have an important effect. Missionary education greatly influenced the development of modern education in Korea and education for women, but had little influenced on the development of educational theory as a logico-deductive system.

During Japanese colonialism (1910-1945), US-Korea cultural relations were restricted. The Japanese played a major role in influencing the education system at this time. However, two important preparations for receiving US knowledge later were made under Japanese colonialism. First, the frame of reference, "Dong-To" (oriental learning) was almost completely destroyed because it turned out to be of no use to Korea. The destruction of "oriental learning" became a preparatory stage for the massive importation without great resistance of American knowledge after 1945 (Kang, 1983: 391). Second, some of the Koreans who later became leaders of liberal Korea were educated in the US during this period. Both of these factors contributed to the formation of the Korean knowledge system under US influence.

Following the collapse of the imperial social order in 1945, liberated Korea engaged in innovative cultural borrowing of societal scale under the influence of the democratic US civilization. The US played a crucial role in the process of the formation of the Korean educational knowledge system. For instance, during the 1945-48 period, the US Military Government in Korea (USMGIK) was the educational bridge between Japanese imperialism and the introduction of more democratic processes in Korea. During this period, new transnational networks between the US and Korea began to be formulated. These networks include US expatriates, US-educated Koreans, written materials (US books and translations), and other means such as radio broadcasts and motion pictures (D.K.Kim, 1984: 191-192). As time passed, international organizations and new research organizations were added as transnational networks or knowledge transfer mechanisms. With the institutionalization of those networks, the direct influences of American expatriates became gradually smaller. On the other hand those mechanisms became dominated by the US-educated Koreans.

2. Changes in the Construction Process of the Korean Knowledge System

This section reconstructs the institutionalization of transnational networks between US and Korea. The major changes after the initial networking (e.g., USMGIK) included:

? a change of leadership in academic activities and recruitment of US-educated Korean scholars into leadership positions;

? the development of a social and academic reward system organized to favor US-educated Korean scholars;

? the introduction of a new educational frame of reference based upon US ideology and technology;

? the creation of new research institutions and universities based upon US models, which created new social roles for scholars;

? the emergence of new social roles dominated by the US-educated Koreans.

1) Drastic Leadership Change in Education

The defeat of the Japanese armed forces in the Korean peninsula by the US Army in 1945 marked the drastic change from the Japanese leadership to the US leadership. The US political leadership resulted in the drastic change of educational leadership of Koreans. The new linkages between the US and Korea began to be formed from the top during the US Military Government in Korea (USMGIK). American personnel of USMGIK needed people who knew both Korea and America. They were the missionaries mostly from US and US-educated Koreans.

American leadership and American educational information flowed directly into the center of the decision-making structure, mainly through personnel of USMGIK and US advisors. Advisors played roles in program planning, program implementation, and financial administration as well as in contacting those members of the reaching profession whose work fell within their bureau (D.K.Kim, 1984:112-113). "In order to improve Korean educational objectives and to introduce American democratic education, American advisers established Korean educational programs based on American educational models during the USMGIK period." (D.K.Kim, 1984: 192). American leadership continued after USMGIK. Four teams of American Educational Missions to Korea (1952-1962) successively advised young scholars and teachers and influenced the development of educational institutions (e.g., Central Educational Research Center & Audio-visual Center). American leadership was represented in needs assessments which were conducted by foreign advisors such as the UNESCO-UNKRA (the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency) education commission (September 4, 1952-February 1953), the American education missions, and the Florida State University (FSU) study team (Morgan and Chadwick, 1971).

US-educated Korean leaders who participated in the Bureau (later Department) of Education had an effect on the adoption of American educational thought (D.K.Kim, 1984:134). From this time on, the American educated Koreans were getting power, prestige and more social roles in administrative positions and academic positions (Auh, 1964:394; Kim, 1984:123-4). Such leadership change was more rapid in the education field than in other fields of social sciences such as law.

2) Shape of Reward System Favoring the US-educated

Many factors contributed to the formation of the reward system of the new leadership to favor the US-educated Koreans. They included: ? three years of US military occupation and its cultural advertisements; ? the obtaining of leadership positions by the US-educated Korean; ? military assistance during the Korean War; and ? educational assistances after the War.

The most important channel of US culture was the knowledge elite (Lim, 1978). The “US-educated” meant being well educated and well equipped with useful knowledge. The

most visible US-educated were those who held a Ph. D. The Ph. D. earned from US universities was highly recognized culturally as well as bureaucratically. The reward of having a Ph.D. was more than enough incentive for young students to go abroad sacrificing almost everything, to return the "Ph.D. as cultural hero." As a result, the reward system created a "go to the US boom," producing "the US-educated generation." The status gap between the US-educated and the native educated emerged, replacing the status of Japanese colonialism between the Japanese educated and the native educated. The status gap between the US-educated and the native educated, as time passed, became wider and wider.

3) Change of the Frame of Reference

The construction of "Dong To Suh Ki" (oriental learning as the substance, Western techniques of their utility) as a frame of reference of Korea-West cultural exchange provided the basic internal readiness to import US knowledge (Kang, 1983). "Sweeping off the vestiges of Japanese imperialistic education," the first educational principle by USMGIK justified the displacement of Japanese things with American things (J.C. Kim, 1967). With the change of leadership and reward system, the new frame of reference, the change from the Chinese tradition and Japanese imperialism to the US worldview was emerging.

The new frame of reference focused mainly on democratic and scientific education, emerged through the efforts of four American Educational Missions to Korea and the US-educated Koreas. Democratic Education and Dewey as a Cultural Hero, the first characteristic of the new frame of reference, guided the direction of educational study and provided rationales for the "New Education Movement" during late 1940s and 1950s. Democracy was substituted for autocracy and imperialism, and John Dewey began to appear as a cultural hero. Dewey was so popular among Korean educators that only those people who knew Dewey were recognized as real educators and scholars in pedagogy (Auh, 1964). When the New Education movement was at its height, Auh states, "there would be no educators who did not try to revise their educational method" (As quoted in Kim, 1984: 127). However, the rapid change of the frame of reference caused an intellectual anomie. Practical applicability and feasibility, or cultural resistances and conflicts were not questioned seriously either by Americans or Koreans..

The dominant characteristic of the new frame of reference in educational research has been identified as the "scientific and technological paradigm of education," formed during the late 1950s and 1960s and exercised later on (D.H.Lee, 1983; J.H.Park, 1983). Along with the New Education Movement, a technological and methodological focus under the name of scientific education replaced the existing philosophical and ethical focus. The core value of technological revolution in education was ‘effectiveness and efficiency of the procedure.’ The technological frame of reference was practiced by the Central Education Research Institute (CERI: 1952-1973). CERI’s concerns revolved around methodological areas and focused mainly on curriculum study and related areas such as evaluation, teaching methods and testing (J.H.Park, 1983: 55-57). American Education Teams spent most of their efforts on these methodological areas while the young Korean students transmitted the American theories (J.H.Park, 1983:57).

The most important part of the frame of reference was the new language being used in education, under strong US influence. One of four items in the first educational principle

declared by USMGIK expressed the need "to define and set standards for the educational terminologies, curricula and teachers." New languages were formulated through which those frames could be maintained and communicated. Forty years later, almost all of the language in education, through which scholars think, describe, diagnose, analyse and evaluate Korean education, are terms translated from American English.

From the review of four reports by American teams from 1952 to 1971, Kim and Lee (1980, abstract) concluded:

> that they provided the Koreans with a language by means of which the Koreans could grasp their educational realities. The most important part of the language is that education should be relevant to everyday life and needs of the society. This language still has a strong hold on the way the Koreans look at and discuss the problems of education, possibly leading their eyes away from the intrinsic value that the school subjects might have.

And they pointed out the danger of language dependence: "If it is important for the Koreans to have 'their own eyes' to look at Korean education, as it is increasingly emphasized recently, the above point is interpreted to raise a problem of defining the 'Koreans' own eyes."

Similar worries about the domination of a US frame of reference have been expressed on various occasions. The academic background of professors is dominantly American oriented. The curriculum, textbooks, and even what they are saying in the classroom are organized and prepared based on American theories. In a situation so dominated by American values, it is nearly impossible to learn theories or conceptual frameworks than explain Korean political reality.

4) Creation of New Roles

At the time of Liberation (1945), social roles, which provide scholars of education with their jobs, status, and official roles, were quite few. Many new roles were opened, expanded or created for Koreans after 1945. These proceeded in two ways. One was by replacing Koreans in roles formerly played by Japanese, and the other was by creating new social roles. Those newly created roles included new committees , expansion of professorial roles, successive visitings of US advisors and missions, establishment of research organizations, and the formation of an academic community. One important aspect of the creation of social roles was the increasing number of professorial roles at colleges and universities. Without previous accumulation of educational knowledge, newly appointed education professors depended mostly on the educational knowledge imported from the US by Americans or by US-educated Koreans. (During the 1950s, some US knowledge was imported through Japanese books.) US educational theories filtered to a small group of leaders and spread to others.

The academic communities were also formulated by the US-educated scholars. At the end of USMGIK, an organization for the New Education Movement was established and the academic organization of education was created. Both organizations were highly influenced by US educational theories. The Korean Federation of Education Association (KFEA), established in 1947, continued to disseminate new educational thought by

conducting inservice teacher education, publishing the Journal of Education and assisting the Central Educational Research Institute.

The Korean academic community of education was growing rapidly and the quantitative growth was not backed up by quality. US expatriates and the US-educated returnees were a progressive and leading group in the change and innovations of Korean education. The US-educated participated more in policy-making and were more productive in publishing than the native educated.

One of the most important events for the development of the educational knowledge system during 1950s was the institutionalization of the new research institute. The Central Educational Research Institute (CERI), the first research center, was established in March 1952 by US assistance, mostly by the initiation of Mary Harbage of the first American Education Team. CERI was the main channel of directly importing US theory (CERI, 1972: 266). It was utilized and strengthened by the four successive American Education Teams from 1952-1962. "CERI itself played the role of channel through which many young students could go to the US to study and import American knowledge" (JH.Park, 1983:57).

Along with CERI, the Korean Institute of Research in Behavioral Sciences (KIRBS: 1968) and the Long Range Comprehensive Educational Planning (LRCEP: 1967), also provided channels through which US theory was introduced and applied. Both of them are the organizational expressions of the application of manpower development theory. KIRBS had a close relationship with US counterparts (KIRBS, 1979:13) and it was led by US trained leaders. LRCEP was led by the US-educated leaders and also many US scholars were invited as advisors.

Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI), a major educational research institute, was established in 1972 under strong US financial and technical supports. KEDI as a transnational system introduced educational theories and methods from US. In addition, senior researchers in the institute were sent to US for academic training. The researchers returned to Korea with American theories and educational system as well as their Ph.D.s. Based on their training in US, they introduced new curriculum, instructional methods, large-scale testing systems, and so forth. Eventually, the researchers played a key role in developing national curriculum, nation-wide achievement tests, and educational policies.

5) Domination of the US-educated

> The number of US? educated Koreans grew rapidly. More importantly, the initiatives for the new roles were always under hands of the US or US? educated scholars. As a result, the US? educated researchers became more dominant year by year, and many new positions were filled by the US? educated. In the area of education, the degree of US dominance was even higher. As of 1985, the department of education at Seoul National University has 17 US? educated Ph.D.s out of 19 faculty. Seven out of eight in the case of Yon Sei University, six out of nine in the case of Korean University, and all 20 professors in the case of Ewha Women's University. These professors deliver the knowledge from the US through classroom lectures as well as book writings. The professors' students also accept studying broad to the US as a proper consequence of their learning at the universities. However, after mid 1970s, voice of criticizing the US dominant

phenomenon in education became louder. It was also pointed out that educational theories were too much US-oriented to reflect Korean situations.

IV. DYSFUNCTIONAL CONDITIONS OF THE DEPENDENT KNOWLEDGE SYSTEM

What are real functions and results of such US-domination? From a case study of transnational transfer of US knowledge, Lee (1986) identified dysfunctional conditions under the US-dependent peripheral knowledge system. External forces from the center knowledge system reinforced by some characteristics of the Korean knowledge system together tend to create dysfunctional conditions for knowledge activities. These conditions represent an intellectual environment that inhibits the open flow of knowledge and the critical examination of new ideas.

The US knowledge system continues to influence Korean education through aid networks and US educated Korean scholars. By extension, the US knowledge system defines the latest acceptable knowledge, the experts in that knowledge, and the allocation of status among the membership who apply that knowledge. In terms of the internal forces, Korean forces constituting major social and cultural differences between the US and Korea may be mentioned: a society of multi theories, and a society of few theories; an explicit communication society, and an implicit communication society; a relatively equal society, and a relatively hierarchical society; and a decentralized society and a centralized society.

Three characteristics of the Koran context are most significant in restricting the growth and influencing the direction of knowledge activities: ? the determinants of the status of a theory; ? the patterns of communication; and ? the process of knowledge accumulation. The status of a theory in Korea tends to be determined by the status of the theorist and the lack of competing theories. For example, in the center knowledge system, the status of theorists becomes higher as their theories gain recognition. It is not uncommon that those who had studied in the US may become an automatically recognized authority, and consequently gain a high status. In Korea, the status of a theorist, especially a US-educated scholar, is usually legitimized through external forces, the attainment of US graduate degrees. Also, the status of a US-educated theorist is maintained through two strong internal forces, a Korean society of hierarchy and a Korean society of few theories. Thus, a theory, regardless of its value, may easily become dominant in the Korean knowledge system. The status of theorist of newly imported knowledge will be safe until another person has studied newer trends in that knowledge from graduate education in the center knowledge system. Prospective scholars can't take an initiative in the area of the imported knowledge without having gone abroad to study.

The status of a theory in Korea may also be determined by the lack of commensurate competing theorists. For example, ITM (Inquiry Teaching Method) in the US exists among many competing theories and it achieves meaning, prestige and recognition in a competing context. But when ITM was transferred to Korea, its prestige was determined in a notably different context. The lack of competing theories and its legitimization by US educated scholars allowed ITM to reach high status. This high status seems to be maintained and reinforced by its appeal as an innovation, and consequent uniform application nation-wide due to Korea's centralized society. In fact, informed ITM theorists, by mere association, gained status among their colleagues.

Another determinant of the status of a theory is the control of valued imported knowledge, an aspect of the knowledge transfer from the US knowledge system to the Korean knowledge system. Imported knowledge in Korea has the very possibility of being controlled unintentionally by the US-educated Koreans. Some factors contribute to the control of imported knowledge, including: a local scholar's inability to read English rapidly and the US-educated have more information sources. In addition, intentional control occurs when knowledge mediators release their valued imported knowledge peacemeal and keep their expertise.

The third determinant of the status of a theory is the tendency of the replacement of a previously imported theory by a newly imported one just because it is new in the US and because there are disciples who learned them in the US universities. With some time lag, US new theories eventually become new theories in Korea. The US education served as a conveyer belt, carrying new theories from the US to Korea. New returnees and US advisers were like an extension of the conveyer belt. Korean scholars have been continuously looking for new information from the US. This may be a characteristic behavior pattern in a society where scholars have their intellectual home overseas.

In the area of the patterns of communication, absence of interactions and criticisms as an integral part of the Korean knowledge system is peculiar. Even though the status of a theory tends to be determined by the status of a theorist and the lack of competing theories, it is also maintained by a strong internal force of a Korean pattern of little or no-criticism among Korean academics. The internal forces of no-criticism syndrome is partly related to hierarchical social relations, seniority system and implicit communication pattern in Korea. Age seniority interrupts scholarly interactions (Adhikarya, 1981). Koreans are not accustomed to Western types of argument and criticisms.

Further, the absence of criticism in the periphery is influenced by the external forces such as the knowledge-legitimating and status-allocating functions of the center knowledge system. Two points can be made. First, the imported knowledge is perceived as already legitimized internationally, and is well systematized and thus it attracts Korean scholars. In addition, the lack of relatedness of foreign theories with Korean reality adds the difficulty of criticism. Secondly, in a rigidly hierarchical society, high status scholars created by US education interact little with lower status persons. People do not want to engage in risky arguments with authorities (US-educated scholars) in a hierarchical society in which one is able to become an expert through a US education, but not a Korean education. In the absence of any serious challenge imported knowledge passes as truth.

In the area of the process of knowledge accumulation, mosaic of abridged knowledge from foreign books and little accumulation of local experiences are main characteristics of the Korean knowledge system. With such a mode of knowledge accumulation, little knowledge base will be made for the growth of educational theories relevant to local context. As Gareau (1983:384) observes, in Korea the US educated scholars' prestige and prosperity may be at the expense of the development of a dynamic and meaningful national educational theory and also to the disadvantage of the native educational theorists who are not tied to the center. In short, the dysfunctional conditions of the Korean knowledge system restricted to respond to Korean reality and to adapt the imported theory to Korean context. Rather the dependent nature of the dysfunctional conditions directs education to be influenced by superficial imitation of foreign theories.

V. CONCLUSION

Through this historical (1945~mid 1970s) review of the Korean knowledge system in education, the researchers find that the knowledge system has been constructed under strong US influences. Based upon a dependency paradigm assuming transnational transfer of knowledge from ‘centre’ to ‘periphery’ countries, Korea was found to be a periphery country importing knowledge from the centre (US) country. After “Dong? To” (oriental learning) was destroyed under Japanese colonialism, massive information without resistance of American knowledge was imported. In this process, US educated leaders and scholars played key roles in altering the Korean education system. Many Korean researchers were also sent to the US in order to study modern systems of education and returned to Korea with new knowledge. However, the newly acquired knowledge did not contribute to the development of Korea’s own knowledge system. Rather, as time passed on, US? based educational theories and methods became dominant in Korea. The US dominance resulted in critical changes in the construction process of the Korean knowledge system. The changes include ? a change of leadership in academic activities and recruitment of US-educated Korean scholars into leadership positions; ? the development of a social and academic reward system organized to favor US-educated Korean scholars; ? the introduction of a new educational frame of reference based upon US ideology and technology; ? the creation of new research institutions and universities based upon US models, which created new social roles for scholars; ? the emergence of new social roles dominated by the US-educated Koreans.

The results of analyses supported a conflict between increased use of Western knowledge and increased doubts about its utility. Although the relationship between the US and Korea in terms of knowledge transfer had begun a long time ago, the pattern of the knowledge transfer showed a unilateral style (i.e., from US to Korea), rather than mutual collaborations or exchanges. As a result of the unilateral interaction, the functions of the center (US) knowledge system (legitimating knowledge; legitimating experts; and status allocation) dominated the Korean (periphery) knowledge system through transnational networks. The dysfunctional conditions of the Korean knowledge system reflect the dependency of the Korean knowledge system upon the US knowledge system. The process of transnational transfer of US theory illustrates that imitative patterns of knowledge transfer result in spite of attempts of "reality testings" and in the face of persistent demands of locally relevant knowledge.

The results of this study provide very important insights for the future of knowledge system construction in Korea. That is, if the Korean knowledge system is going to successfully address local problems, then certain conditions need to be met: First, the development of critical academic communities should become a main task of the periphery knowledge system. In order to build Korea’s own knowledge system, academic communities should have knowledge screening abilities based upon critical analysis and reflection about knowledge exchange. Otherwise, knowledge exchange could mean knowledge transfer from ‘centre’ to ‘periphery’ countries. Academic communities should be reformed from knowledge mediators to knowledge constructors.

Second, the reward system, which supports the studies of the indigenous educational system and the reality testing of Western knowledge, needs to be developed. For instance,

national research institutes or Ministry of Education can support scholars' efforts to develop Korea's own educational theories and methods. Educational journals also can develop a special section addressing critical analysis of knowledge exchange in terms of indigenous knowledge construction. Through these processes, the Korean knowledge system can become more competitive among Korean scholars. A critical group of educational theories in Korea could be formed.

Third, the communication channels between the native educated scholars and foreign educated scholars need to be expanded. Although many Korean scholars went to the US and returned to Korea with newly acquired knowledge, the quality of communication between the foreign and native educated scholars has been very poor. The poor communication between the two groups limited construction of Korea's own knowledge system. For the critical construction of Korea's own knowledge system, it is necessary to develop communication channels making a link between newly acquired knowledge from foreign countries and educational dynamics in Korea. In particular, research collaborations between young scholars who got their degrees from foreign countries and Korea are strongly recommended.

Finally, the status disparity between knowledge producers (scholars) and knowledge users (teachers) needs to be reduced. Unlike 1945 ? 1970s, the status disparity between two groups is not big, and the gap has been smaller and smaller. Currently, the users seem to become a power group requesting construction of new knowledge for their teaching. Thus, in order to construct Korea's own knowledge system and meet the users' needs, the knowledge producers should develop new roles such as knowledge constructor, critical reviewer, and collaborator.

References

ADHIKARYA, R. (1981) The trans-national communication knowledge transfer and utilization process: the US-ASEAN case. Ph. D. dissertation, Stanford University.

ALATAS, S. H. (1972) The captive mind in development studies. *International Social Science Journal*, 24(1): 9-25.

ALATAS, L. H. (1974) The captive mid and creative development. *International Social Science Journal*, 26(4): 691-700.

ALGER, CHADWICK, F. and LYONS, G. M.(1974) Social science as a trans-national system. *International Social Science Journal*, 26(1): 138-149.

ALTBACH, P. G. (1977) 'Servitude of the Mind? Education, Dependency and Neocolonialism'. *Teachers College Record*, 79: 187-204.

ALTBACH, P. G. (1978)The university as centre and periphery. *Journal of Higher Education*(New Delhi), 4: 157-169.

ALTBACH, P. G. (1979) The academic profession: perspectives on an international crisis. Occasional Paper No. 5, State University of New York, Buffalo, ERIC ED 181-826.

ARNOVE, R. F. (1980) Comparative education and world system analysis. *Comparative Education Review*, 24(1): 48-62.

AUH, C. S. (1964) *Histoty of Korea New Education*(in Korean) (Seoul: Hyundeakyoyuk Chongsuh).

BARBER, E. G. ALTBACH, P. G. and MYERS, R, G. (eds.) (1984)*Bridges to Knowledge*(Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

BERQUE, J. (1976) Towards a better transfer of knowledge and values. *Prospects*, 6(3):328-248.

BRIGGS, A. (1977) The role of the international intellectual community. In Bailey, S. K. (ed.) *Higher Education in the World Community*(Washington, DC: American Council on Education): 183-191.

CARCOSO, F. H. (1977) The consumption of dependency theory in the Ynited States. *Latin American Research Review*, 12(3): 7-24.

CHASE-DUNN, C. and RUBINSON, R. (1977) Toward a structural perspective on the world system. *Politics and Society*, 7(4):453-476.

EISEMON, T. O. (1974) Educational transfer: the implications of foreign educational assistance. *Interchange*, 5(4): 53-61.

EISEMON, T. O. (1977) Educational transfer: the social ecology of educational change. *Teachers College Record*, 78(3): 359-389.

GAREAU, F. H. (1983) The multinational version of social science. *International Social Science Journal*, 35(2): 379-389.

GOODMAN, N. (1984) The institutionalization of overseas education. In Barber, E. G., Altbach, P. G. and Myers, R. G. (eds.) *Bridges to Knowledge*(Chicago: University of Chicago Press): 7-8.

HOLZNER, B. CAMPBELL, D. & SHAHIDULLAH, M. (1985*) Introduction: The Comparative Study of Science and the Sociology of Scientific Validity,* Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, Special Issue. 6(4): 307-328.

HOLZNER, B. and MARX, J. H. (1979) *Knowledge Application: The Knowledge System in Society*(Boston: Allyn and Bacon).

KANG, S. P. (1983) Cultural interchange between the US and Korea. In Koo, Y. R. *et al*.(eds.) *Korea and America: Past, Present and Future*(in Korean)(Seoul: Pakyongsa): 5-11.

KARSTEN, D. (1980) Some remarks on Transfer of Knowledge from industrialized to less developed countries. In *DAAD, Research and Exchange*(Proceedings of the German-American conference at th Wissenschaftszentrum, Bonn, 24-28 November): 100-104.

KIM, D. K. (1984) American influence on Korean educational thought during the period of US military government, 1945-1948. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Connecticut.

KIM, J. C. (1967) The influence of US culture on Korean educational system and administration(in Korean). *Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 10(2): 91-106.

KIM, C. S. and Lee, H. W. (1980) Curriculum and Instruction in Korean Schools as Observed by Foreign Specialists(in Korean) *Kyoyukhak Yanku*, 18(1): 82-99.

KUMAR, K. (1978) Some reflections on trans-national social science transactions. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 19(3/4): 219-234.

KUMAR, K. (1979) *Bonds without Bondage: Explorations in Transcultural Interactions* (Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii).

LAMY, P. (1976) *The Globalization of American Sociology: Excellence or Imperialism*, The American Sociologist. 11(2):104-114.

LEE, D.H. (1983) *In search of a New Paradigm for Educational Theory (in Korean)* Hankuk Kyoyukmunche Yonku. (Studies on Korean Educational Problems)1:15-23.

LEE, J. I. (1977) A short history of the Korean Social Studies Association(in Korean). *Journal of Social Studies Education*, 10: 98.

LEE, J. G. (1986) Trans-national knowledge transfer: the case of inquiry teaching method in Korea. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.

LIM, H. S. (1978) *A Study on the Adaptation of US Culture in Korea (in Korean)* Mikukhak (American Studies), pp. 135-151. Institute of American Studies, Seoul National University.

LIPPA-TENNEY, C. (1981) A comparison between the perceived needs of the Republic of Korea and graduate programs at United States institutions. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Connecticut.

McGINN, N. R. (1984) International social science or cultural imperialism? *Harvard Educational Review*, 52(2): 209-214.

MORAZE, C. with contributions of others (1979) *Science and the Factors of Inequality* (Paris: Unesco).

PARK, J. H. (1983) *On Educational Methods (in Korean)* Kyoyukyonku. 21(1): 14-21.

PETRAS, J. (1981) Dependency and world system theory: a critique and new directions. *Latin American Perspectives*, 7: 148-155.

PIERIS, R. (1969) The implantation of sociology in Asia. *International Social Science Journal*, 21(3): 433-444.

RESTIVO, S. and VANDERPOOL, C.(eds.)(1974) *Comparative Studies in Science and Society* (Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill).

ROY, R. (1977) Social science cooperation in Asia. In Unesco Interregional in the Social Sciences (Bangkok: Unesco): 13-24.

SPITZBERG, I. J. Jr. (1980) Universities and The International Distribution of Knowledge. New York: Praeger.

STIFEL, L., DAVIDSON, R. K. and COLEMAN, J. S.(eds.)(1982) *Social Sciences and Public Policy in the Developing Wor*d(Lexington, MA: Lexington Books).

UNESCO. (1977) Social Sciences in Asia I, II and III. Bangkok: Unesco.

USEEM, J. and USEEM, R. H. (1980) Generating fresh research perspectives and study designs for transnational exchange among the highly educated. In DAAD Research and Exchange(Proceedings of the German-American Conference at the Wissenschaftszentrum, Bonn, 24-28 November): 24-58.

VANDERPOOL,, C. K. (1974) Center-periphery in science: conceptions of a stratification of nations and its consequences. In Restivo, S. and Vanderpool, C. K. (eds.) *Comparative Studies in Science and Society*(Columbus OH: Charles E. Merrill).

WALLERSTEIN, I. (1974) *The World Capitalist System* (New York: Academic Press).

WIGGINS, T.(1983) The context of culture in education. Paper presented at a conference of the Nigerian Research Association, ERIC ED 240 669.

WOODHOUSE, H. R. (1985) *Knowledge and Educational Dependency*, Interchange (The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education) 16(2): 1-16.