

The Impact of Foreign Societies on South Korean Education: Research Findings of Frame Analysis of Korean National Teachers' Union Movement 1989–1999.

John P. Synott, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane Australia

Abstract: Education has been recognised as a key value in Korean culture and regarded as a central feature of the post-Korean War development success. It is frequently maintained that this focus on education is a manifestation of the cultural tradition of Korean Confucianist values of learning and education; an analysis of the historical formation of Korean education actually exhibits a range of external influences, through different forms of incorporation of educational ideals & practices of foreign societies. In this paper I discuss some of the core foreign impacts on Korean education.

A Decade of Contests in Korean Education

The period from 1989 to 1999 will go down in Korean educational history as one of the most turbulent decades ever. The period was one of bitter struggles between the government and large numbers of disaffected school teachers who set out to form an industrial union, called *Chunkyojo*, or the Korean Teachers and Educational Workers Union, now known simply as the National Teachers Union.

This was not the first time such a movement had emerged in modern Korean history, for a similar movement had come to grief at the hands of Park Chung-Hee in 1962. However, despite significant similarities there were also differences between the two historical movements. Certainly the movement of the 1990's was able to mobilise much more public and media support than its forerunners. Clashes between teachers and government were frequently reported in the leading news pages of all Korean newspapers through the decade, particularly around the formation of the union on May 15, 1989, and in the years of public dramas that followed. For example both *Han Kyoreh Shinmun* (1996) and the *Korean Herald* conducted and published the results of surveys of public opinion on the teachers conflict, as well as featuring interviews on the educational crisis with both movement and government leaders, including then President Roh Tae-Woo.

The *Chunkyojo* teachers movement emerged on a platform of grievances with the education system and the treatment of teachers as employees within the system. The disaffection of teachers, like those of many workers during the late 1980's when, after all, record numbers of strikes and

industrial conflicts arose, were primarily directed at the immediate conditions of their professional workplaces such as class sizes, working conditions and industrial issues. However, the movement identified the causes of these conditions as a range of deeper historical formations and institutional structures in Korean society and education that had been negatively manifest in the contemporary schools.

In 1989 I began some years of ethnographic fieldwork amongst the teachers' movement, during which I documented the actions of the movement and its organisation *Chunkyojo* in their conflicts with the government, and also an analysis of the grievances of the movement that motivated ordinary Korean teachers, many of them married people with families, into becoming political activists (Synott, 2002; see endnote). The teachers who joined the movement undoubtedly suffered for doing so. Early in the period they were frequently singled out and publicly abused by principals in schools, given extra duties and otherwise censored. As the struggle developed, their rallies were attacked by riot police, some 1700 teachers were sacked from their jobs in the second half of 1989, and their union offices were raided. A number of leaders were imprisoned, with the founding President YunYoung Gyu spending one year in jail from 1989 to May, 1990.

The history of the teachers' union movement can usefully be divided into four phases:

- A pre-formation stage through most of the 1980s;
- A period from formation of the union on May 28, 1989 until the re-instatement of sacked teachers in January, 1994; The move towards legitimacy from 1994 to February 1998, when the government, under President Kim Dae-Jung, agreed to legalise *Chunkyojo*, effective in July 1999.
- A fourth and current phase of consolidation and negotiating with the government on a range of issues, such as promoting the workplace interests of teachers, and seeking for a greater participation in aspects of schooling such as curriculum and educational values.

In my research analysis I adopted the sociological theory of collective action frames as a way of making sense of the movement, its grievances and their underlying causes. An adequate discussion of this theoretical perspective requires more time and space than I have here (for a full

explanation see Synott, 2002), however a few explanatory comments are warranted. When applied to social movements, the framing concept is understood as the set of definitions of a social condition, with the understandings, beliefs, and meanings that form the 'collective action frame' of the movement. Gamson (1992) emphasised that collective action frames are 'injustice frames' generated by movement participants through their analysis of a social condition. Snow and Benford (1992, 137) wrote that collective action frames 'punctuate or single out some existing social condition or aspect of life and define it as unjust, intolerable and deserving of corrective action'. A central concern of collective action frames becomes the process of 'interpretation of events and experiences relevant to participation in social movement activities and campaigns' (Snow et al. 1986, 465). The grievances at the basis of social movement mobilisation are, thus, core elements in the collective action frame of a movement. Tarrow (1994, 123) expressed this feature thus: 'Inscribing grievances in overall frames that identify an injustice, attribute the responsibility for it to others and propose solutions to it is a central activity of social movements'. The process of frame analysis, thus, involves, identifying frames and the underlying conditions which produce them.

One of the results of this research into the collective action frames of the teachers union movement was to identify a complex set of foreign influences on Korean education that had been largely obscured in the focus on a national system and its identity in the broader world community. There is no doubt that leading world institutions such as the World Bank, and many academics, during the period of Korea's international 'coming out' around and after the 1988 Seoul Olympics when a lot of attention was focussed on Korea (e.g. TIME, 1988), were unanimous in their praise of the South Korean national education system; similarly the Korean government strongly identified the nation's success with its education (e.g. Republic of Korea, Ministry of Education, 1989).

However, my research into the grievances of the dissident teachers pointed towards some extraordinary violations of human rights and other distortions in the school system that were the process and enduring effects of a range of impacts from outside Korea. In the remainder of this paper I will discuss the way these foreign elements became embedded in the Korean educational system and identify some of their key impacts.

Forerunners

The first foreign educational intrusion into the Yi Dynasty 'hermit kingdom' of Korea, whose 400-year old Confucianist system of examinations for entry into the civil service had itself been adapted from China, was probably from 18th century Christian missionaries, who had the Bible translated into *Hangul* and used this to develop literacy amongst the vast rural peasantry. At this time Chinese was still the official language of government, literature, and the ruling *yangban* class. As the pressure increased from outside colonial powers in Europe and USA for Korea to open up trade with the West, a number of foreign language schools started up in some port cities, teaching French in particular. An increasing profile of American protestant missionaries, especially women such as Mary Scranton, the founder of Ewha Women's College, in the later 19th century produced Bible schools that gradually expanded their curriculum. Moreover at this time the Korean government scrambled to adapt to the pressures for change and sent delegates to the United States to learn the new systems of education. Thus modern education in Korea began partly as a result of the rise of Christianity and the pressures of Western expansionism. Certainly the ongoing influences of those missionary schools has been profound, for example in the achievements of Ewha Womens University. However it was only with the Japanese invasion that a national system of schooling was established.

Japanese Colonial Education

The period of Japan's colonial government in Korea was obviously one of major foreign impacts on the whole society. During this period of some 45 years the subordination of Korean society to the economic and political interests of Japan was virtually total, and the dominance of Japan's military government was enforced with a violent ruthlessness. While the process of economic colonisation developed after the Kanghai Treaty in 1876, it was really after formal annexation in 1910 that the social and cultural colonisation became institutionalised. Under the colonial government meetings were forbidden, Korean-language newspapers were banned, educators and other officials had to wear Japanese style uniforms and the military police enforced rule by fear, with one analyst (Song 1989) recording that some 53,000 people were tortured in 1916. An increasing resistance by the Korean people in these early years led to the Declaration of Korean Independence and the March 1 Independence Movement. The Declaration asserted Korea's independence and called the world to witness its illegal annexation by Japan. The announcement of the Declaration signalled mass demonstrations in Seoul and around the nation. Frederick

Mckenzie, a reporter from London's Daily Mail, described the demonstrations in this way:

It was soon seen that every class of the community was united. Men who had been ennobled by the Japanese stood with the coolies, shopkeepers closed their stores, policemen who had worked under the Japanese took off their uniforms and joined the crowds, porters and labourers, scholars and preachers, men and women all came together (McKenzie 1920, 251–252).

The vicious reprisals by the colonial government are well recorded in Korean history books. Han (1970) recorded the participation of some two million people in different demonstrations around the nation, with about seven thousand people killed and fifteen thousand people wounded by Japanese police and soldiers. Song (1989, 23) cited Japanese statistics showing that of 19,000 people arrested in the following nine months, 8% were teachers and students, 16.5% were urban workers and unemployed, and 57% were peasants. Teachers were, thus, recorded as involved in the anti-colonial movement, to which later teacher activists looked back with pride. The movement was, nevertheless, remembered for its wholesale support by all Koreans except for a few pro-Japanese officials and large landlords. Han (1970, 477) commented: 'Seldom in history has an entire nation so unanimously expressed its desire for freedom'.

After the March 1 uprising the Japanese government moved towards a more complete system of social domination and control. The extension of a centrally controlled school system was a key element in the strengthening of the regime. Byon (1990, 226) claimed that the colonial society was 'an imperial capitalist system, which allowed for maximum exploitation...teachers roles were as agents of imperialism, to oppress and control the students according to the militarised education policy', while Kim Yun-Young (1991) commented that the structures and processes of the modern system had their origins in the colonial model.

The education system for Koreans was established in two phases, firstly before 1920, when little attention was given to Korean education and few children attended. The discrimination in attendance against Koreans is represented by the fact that, whereas 1 in 8 Japanese attended school, only 1 in 222 Korean persons received even basic education. After 1920, the policy to exert firmer control on the resisting Koreans and the slowly growing demand for literate workers in the factories caused an expansion

of schooling and the numbers of primary and middle schools were extended and the curriculum was reformed (Han 1970)

Within this process, the Japan government attempted to deny the epistemological basis of Korean culture so as 'to create a distorted picture of Korean history and society so as to convince the world that Korea was unfit for self-government and in need of the guiding hand of Japan' (Han 1970, 490). In this way and in the school curriculum in Korea and Japan and universities in Japan, and Keijo Imperial University set up in Korea in 1926, Japan imposed a meaning on Korean history and culture that legitimated its right to rule.

Japanese colonial education served primarily a social control function so that, for the 40% of Koreans who participated in the basic levels of schooling by the end of the colonial period, schools operated to impress on the students and their teachers values of loyalty as subjects to the Japanese emperor and a rejection of Korean culture, history and distinct identity. To meet these ends, basic literacy in Japanese language, numeracy and the memorisation of official knowledge comprised the core curriculum (Jayasuriya 1983).

However, the period also brought an increasing focus in schools on the economic functions of colonial education. Following the unsuccessful March 1, 1919, rebellion, a new *Manual of Education* was produced by the Bureau of Education, Government-General of Chosen, which emphasised that greater attention be paid in school to training for labour and industry. The manual demanded that the three following articles be the foundation of all teachers' work:

- *the fostering of loyalty and filial piety as the central morality of society;*
- *knowledge will be of a practical nature, promoting industry and labour;*
- *physical health and fitness for work is a necessary requirement*

(Bureau of Education, Government General of Chosen 1920, 114).

Students were trained to work in rice mills, mines, construction, transport, and chemical and armament industries whose products were transported out of Korea, while the Korean people lived in near-starvation, eating

barley while the rice they grew was transported to Japan. Through the 1930s, stimulated by Japanese military invasions in Manchuria, Inner Mongolia and China, a rapid industrialisation took place as war industries were established in Korea, owned by Japanese *zaibutsu* entrepreneurs who employed Korean labour for low wages (McNamara 1990). By 1938, the principle of 'devotion to labour' was introduced in school policy and in April, 1938, the Ministry of Education distributed to all teachers a detailed indoctrination manual called *Kokutai no Hongi* (Principles of the National Policy) which required teachers to direct students to undertake 'labour service' (Lee 1958). Lee Sung-Hwa, who experienced this period as a student, recalled:

Under the leadership of teachers they were sent to the factories and air fields to work, digging soil and preparing roads under the supervision of Japanese soldiers. So poor were the facilities provided for eating and sleeping that many students were sacrificed, dying of exhaustion and tuberculosis (Lee 1958, 129).

Through the war years, the militarisation of schools dominated the educational program. Students were obliged to wear Japanese-style uniforms, regulation haircuts, black clothes and caps (Eckert et al. 1990). According to Lee Sung-Hwa,

Students were required to spend so many of their school hours at military drill, air-raid drill, labour service, in participating in the special events on national holidays, in visiting the shrines, in collecting refuse, in inspecting war films that their school work was completely neglected (1958, 129-130).

Along with the drills went a military indoctrination that proclaimed the great deeds of the Japanese past, honoured the heroes and idealised the contemporary soldiers (Lee 1958).

Girl students, whose education was instructed to be 'the upbringing of modest and faithful women of industrial and thrifty disposition' (Bureau of Education, Government General of Chosun 1912, 53) were set to sewing uniforms and make 'comfort bags' to be sent to the Japanese troops. In large numbers, young women were also sent away as slave prostitutes or 'comfort women' to army posts throughout Asia, where many died and the survivors suffered immensely, to later announce their experiences to the world and demand justice from the Japanese government.

Eventually, any pretence at normal schooling was abandoned; on July 22, 1943, a policy of 'Student Mobilisation' was announced and, within two months, all high school and college students were sent to war labour service or conscripted into the army. Teachers were forced to encourage students to sign up as volunteers into the army, resulting in some students fleeing abroad while others committed suicide (Lee 1958) while most students were organised through their teachers to collect 'patriotic monies' or materials such as gold, silver and scrap iron for the war effort (Nahm 1988). In these ways connections between the economy, militarisation and authoritarian control became established as core values in education, and were to remain so right into the modern period. The politicised classrooms were controlled by teachers who performed a key economic role during the colonial period in producing a literate labour force for the Japanese rulers to exploit, and thereby teachers became agents of the colonial state (Jayasuriya 1983; Lee 1958).

Through this time, certain ideological, administrative, and pedagogical practices were embedded in the school system that provided a platform, plus many of the personnel, for schooling practices that were established in the post-war NIC development program. Thus, in the process of subordinating the Korean people, the colonial power established the infrastructure of a school system which provided the base for the South Korean national system.

The Impact of the United States on Korean Education

With the defeat of Japan in 1945, the American Military Government in Korea (AMGIK) moved quickly to re-build education along with other social systems in the south of the country, for the north had been occupied by the Soviet Union and it was imperative that the south become a bulwark against communism. Lee (1958) observed that few South Korean educators had any administrative experience, for previous bureaucrats and school principals had been Japanese nationals who had been repatriated after World War II, so teachers who had been trained in the Japanese system were promoted to administrative positions. Without new training, they could only reproduce the system in which they had worked. Moreover, amongst the most senior of these were many people who had been Japanese collaborators who persisted with the aggressive authoritarianism of the previous system (Song 1989). Reflecting on the persistence of the militarised colonial education system, Lee (1958, 153) observed 'that the thinking ways of a people change slowly'.

The mass repatriation of Japanese teachers removed over one third of elementary, two thirds of secondary and almost all college and university teachers from Korea. According to Lee (1958), there were 13,782 Korean trained teachers in elementary schools in 1945, a ratio of just one teacher per 150 students. As a result untrained, inexperienced teachers were employed into the schools and by March, 1948, there were 34,757 teachers, representing a considerable increase. Lee (1958, 161) considered that 'it became a matter of securing anyone willing to teach the pupils'. The absence of text-books and materials reinforced the difficulties.

In the volatile social climate and with their own interests paramount, the American Military Government in Korea (AMGIK) acted in the ambiguous role of 'conquering liberators' (Lauterbach 1947, 185; quoted in Song 1989, 61) by establishing military control and shaping laws, institutions, and administration in South Korea to US, rather than honouring Korean ambitions. Song pointed out that the US established a military government in Korea while, by contrast, it maintained the existing government in Japan: 'According to the army manual, Korea was treated as a conquered enemy country, but Japan was treated as a liberated, friendly country' (Song 1989, 62).

The US command, under General William Hodge, reinstated many colonial functionaries to their previous roles and occupations (Lee and Sato 1982). Thus, the colonial administrative, police and financial regimes were re-established. From the beginning, the Americans met Korean resistance against these actions and they responded with repression, for example by increasing the numbers of policemen to control dissent (Song 1989). As a result 'US post-war policy with regard to the Korean peninsula was largely improvised, deflected by misconceptions, and filled with frustrations' (Lee and Sato 1982, 16). The American soldiers had no understanding of Korean language, people or culture, nor any idea of the suffering Koreans had experienced at the hands of the Japanese despots. Hardly any Koreans could speak English and this was their first contact with *miguks* or Americans, who had not come to free them from bondage, but to 'mop up' the remaining defeated Japanese army. During the years of colonial rule, the United States had not shown any support to rid Korea of the Japanese invasion.

Military, political and civil structures were put together to establish stability as quickly as possible and the economic sphere likewise received immediate attention. In the first period of occupation, the US imposed martial rule and reconstituted the key economic and social relations

existing prior to their arrival. Between 1946 and 1948, the US provided \$181 million in aid to South Korea (as compared with US\$980 million to Japan in the same period), representing 48 % of the nation's revenue (Song 1989). Much of this expenditure was used to train and equip the local police for maintaining internal order. The police attracted many persons who had served in the Imperial Japanese Army (Lee and Sato 1982), of whom it was said 'the pro-Japanese spirit and the Japanese method of thinking prevails in those men. Their thoughts are quite separated from those of the people' (a member of the police, quoted in Song 1989, 73).

Similarly, the AMGIK bureaucracy became staffed by many of the 'older', 'conservative', and 'better educated' South Koreans who had served with the Japanese (Benninghoff, one of Hodge's political advisers; quoted in Song 1989, 76-7); while the factories and land seized by workers after the Japanese defeat were redistributed by the AMGIK, predominantly to local entrepreneurs who had established their positions under the colonial government. This was facilitated by the formation of the Korean Democratic Party, consisting of former landlords and entrepreneurs, to act as an Advisory Council for the AMGIK (Sim Chi-Yon 1984, 26-32; cited in Song 1989, 75). This body opposed any general land reform and moved to perpetuate the colonial landlord system. Members of this group were placed at the head of key administrative organisations such as the Departments of Agriculture, Communications, Education, Justice and Public Health as well as the police department and provincial governance. The outcome was that the AMGIKs 'Advisory Council' was similar to the 'Central Advisory Council' during Japanese rule, which was composed of well-known Korean collaborators (Song 1989). Jacobs (1985, 171) summed up the transition from colonialism in this way:

A minority [of the former aristocracy] was able to survive the Korean colonial period by serving the Japanese as clerks and flunkies. At independence, they moved into the senior administrative and even decision-making positions once held by their Japanese superiors, commanding the national and local governments, the courts, the police and the new government corporations. The significance of this occupational metamorphosis is that these individuals' values and operational procedures survived to motivate and guide the succeeding generation of planners, decision-makers and managers.

Without considering the broader social implications of their actions, the US had the simple objective of turning Korea into a base of anti-communism.

As Lee and Sato (1982, 7) perceived, 'concern over the future internal evolution of Korea received lower priority' than the foreign policy interests of the United States. Moreover, US President Truman and the Joint Chiefs of Staff considered Korea a 'strategic liability' and had no plan to maintain troops and bases in Korea. Rather, their intent was to exert US dominance, establish the mechanisms for suppressing local independence movements, establish a strong anti-communist, pro-American political and civil structure in Korea and then move out of Korea. The resurrection of former pro-Japanese landlords, capitalists and bureaucrats, all now virulently anti-communist as they sought American patronage, served the American purpose well (Lee and Sato 1982). The United States used aid money to glue up the cracks in the society, expanded the police, and supported those who presented themselves as local managers.

After grabbing control of the school system from the community committees that had sprung up in the first months after Liberation, the AMGIK reopened schools in October, 1945 (Lee 1958). At the same time, a National Committee on Educational Planning was established with 81 members comprised of ten US Army Officers and 71 Korean educators, business people and civic officials. This group shaped the revised educational structure along the lines of the American model and pronounced a set of abstract aims for South Korean education which included such emphases as the 'formation of character', 'the cultivation of a spirit of persistent enterprise' and a 'spirit of faithful and practical service' (Lee 1958, 156). Lee quotes a US military adviser of the time, Richard Werth, as saying that 'this somewhat cryptic statement of purpose and objectives was quite in line with the mystical quality of some of the Oriental education which had been known prior to the Japanese' (Lee 1958, 156).

The principles certainly offered a lot of scope in interpretation, and the military agenda set the tone for the operations. Moreover, according to Lee and Sato (1982), US policy towards South Korea was improvised and characterised by ignorance of Korean culture, history and aspirations, along with sheer anti-Asian racism. The military commander, Lieutenant-General Hodge, had been directed to 'immediately place under control all existing political parties, organisations and societies' (Lee and Sato 1982, 7). So the initial impact of the AMGIK on education, as on the whole nation, was removal of local initiatives and establishing a militarised order (cf. Coleman 1965).

Strict government control and regulation was enforced over the teachers. The content of text-books was controlled and standardised. Parents paid for schooling and competition for places was fierce. Teaching practices in schools were based around memorisation and recall of strictly controlled knowledge. New areas of curriculum emphasised the new social realities: anti-communism, subservience to state authority, and a willingness to labour for the nation. Reviewing the period, Nahm (1988, 365) stated,

the American occupation left behind no particular imprints, or notable accomplishments. When the Americans ended their occupation, South Korea was politically unstable, socially chaotic and an economically bankrupt country.

The Cold War Impact on Educational Policy

Though South Korea was regarded as a strategic liability to the US (Lee and Sato 1982), it was felt necessary to establish there an anti-communist client-state of the US and education was incorporated as a key institution for implementing this policy.

The policies implemented by the US in Korean education during the early years of the Cold War were the first applications of an approach that, by the 1960s had spread to countries such as Pakistan, Iran, Peru and Vietnam. In a review of United States foreign aid policies since the end of World War II, Elliot (1966) advocated the continuing links between US foreign aid and education in developing countries and emphasised the crucial role of education in developing 'moral responsibility' in the Cold War. Similarly, Mason (1966) articulated explicitly that all US support for 'development' in post-colonial societies stemmed from US foreign policy interests and stated that 'I would suppose that in the underdeveloped parts of the world the major interests of the United States are essentially security and political interests' (Mason 1966, 28). Mason emphasised the importance of the relationship between education, economic growth and US security interests in post-colonial societies for maintaining the security of the 'free world'. In similar vein, Malik (1966, 46) insisted that both international economic policy and international cultural policy necessarily must be 'coloured and determined by the foreign policy of the United States'.

As a testing ground for these policies, the South Korean education system established by the AMGIK was the first attempt to link together values of economic growth, education, client-state aspirations towards the symbols and artefacts of US culture and an avid anti-communist ideology (Slater 1966). Thus, while Nahm could claim that 'perhaps it was in the educational and cultural fields that the Americans made their most significant contributions' (1988, 354), the links between these activities and security issues were clearly a priority of AMGIK.

Baker and Smith (1966, 161) claimed that internal security could be managed through the development of 'social capital', as obtained through education, for instance in developing literacy as a preparation for obligatory military service, and cited Korea as an example where military objectives and education had been integrated:

Efforts by the US military administration ICA and AID in Korea in building schools and providing equipment have resulted in higher educational standards and qualifications of young men within draft age, thus tending to alleviate the illiteracy problem (Baker and Smith 1966, 173).

Not only in literacy, but they regarded that 'this kind of quasi-military national service would seem to be particularly useful in helping to combat restlessness and discontent among students' (Baker and Smith 1966, 163).

Suppression of dissidents and national mobilisation against communism were the chief objectives of AMGIK educational policy in Korea and these programs neatly dovetailed into the building of social capital for economic growth. US policymakers believed that economic development of the poor post-colonial societies was the best way to prevent them from falling prey to the 'agents of Soviet imperialism' (Elliot 1966, 14) and that the Cold War was as much a cultural and economic war as a military confrontation.

While these authors were writing some two decades later (Elliot ed., 1966) they identified South Korea as a nation where the policies were initiated, tried and tested. The apparent success of the policies in South Korea was used as a rationale for their application in other frontlines of the Cold War such as Vietnam, Pakistan, Iran, and Peru. Slater (1966) emphasised that the central goals of US foreign education aid included 'increasing the supply of human economic resources, understanding that universal literacy is a prerequisite to the division of labour and its supervision' and, also, that education involved 'the conflict of ideas' (Slater, 1966, 340):

The education of which we are speaking here is clearly something more than reading, writing, and arithmetic, although it must be firmly built upon these foundations. We deal, rather, with the whole range of educational experience...we deal with the school, but we deal as well with the home, the community, the nation, and all the many frameworks within which the educational process takes place...We reach finally the point where the educational process leads specifically into the culture (Slater 1966, 342).

The Implementation of Cold War Education in South Korea

The goals stated above, which resonated with those of the 1945 Korean National Committee on Educational Planning, set up from the Advisory Council, established a framework for anti-communist ideology in the education systems of post-colonial and developing nations, controlled externally by the United States through foreign aid. As introduced previously, these anti-communist policies established during the AMGIK period in South Korea were not intended to be a temporary measure but to become embedded within the Korean education system.

Under these broad goals, the structure of the school system that was instituted from September 1946 was based on the US 6-3-3-4 model. Many new elementary schools were established and the numbers of primary school students doubled within three years (Nahm 1988). Due to the shortage of facilities, most primary schools had a two-shift system making great demands on the teachers. The number of secondary schools doubled while secondary school enrolments increased fourfold, from 62,136 students in 1945 to 277,447 students at the end of 1947 (Nahm 1988). As mentioned previously, at the time of liberation from the Japanese, as much as 90% of the adult population was illiterate. The introduction of thirty thousand 'sodang' ('folk schools') throughout the country increased the literacy rate to 60% of the population by 1948 (Nahm 1988). These schools also taught a general education in government affairs, history, geography, economy, and vocational subjects (Nahm 1988) and, thus, were instrumental in preparing the population, still largely rural-based, for the economic development that had been foreshadowed by the US strategists.

The sheer increase in school enrolments, tripling in three years from 1946, far outweighed the capacity of the system to cater for them. The scarcity of buildings and budgets for repairs, the shortage of books and paper, the absence of heating and other physical facilities resulted in extreme overcrowding and the total absence of those conditions that could

produce a progressive learning environment. Any spare buildings, such as warehouses, were turned into classrooms. Lee Sung-Hwa described the experience thus, cast against the imminent threat of invasion by North Korea:

The government had to make its choice between achieving the goal of universal elementary education and building a strong police force and military might. Of course, the government had to choose the latter course (Lee 1958, 203).

Implicit in the anti-communist policy was a promotion of national consciousness and pride. Within the schools, the most conspicuous and welcome curriculum development for the South Koreans was the introduction of Korean language and history and the teaching of all subjects in the vernacular. Lee (1958, 171) noted that 'a strange sight presented itself' in Korean schools after 1945 for, 'as one would go from class to class, pupils at all age levels seemed to be taking the same lessons'. The growth of *Hangul* (Korean) literacy was restricted, however, by the 'serious shortage of paper' that was 'the greatest obstacle to a complete success of the language reform in Korea' (Lee 1958, 172).

In the academic areas, emphasis was on scientific and technical training, mathematics and physical education. English became the preferred second language in schools, using American-published textbooks depicting American culture, with family life, food and other political symbols such as the Statue of Liberty and the White House prominently displayed. American English, with its idioms, spelling and pronunciation was the form of English taught in the schools.

However, the demands of the situation worked against one goal of the USA which sought to have 'the broadest impact abroad on education matters' (Slater 1966, 377). Slater recommended that 'we should make special efforts in our work with underdeveloped countries to reorient their educational systems from rote-memory teaching to a problem-solving approach' (1966, 376). Slater identified the association between these methods and the 'ideology and techniques of free societies' (Slater, 1966, 365). Lee (1958) noted that under Japan's colonial system, memorisation of set subject matter, rather than the development of independent thinking, was the goal of all teaching. Under the AMGIK, there was a move towards progressive educational methods such as 'group discussion, observation, field trips, audio-visual aids and forms of creative expression' (Lee 1958, 176). There had been a tradition of progressive education methods in

Korea through missionary schools that had operated since the late nineteenth century (Fisher 1970; Chon 1995) and the educational philosophy of John Dewey, as mentioned earlier, was introduced in training sessions to some administrators and principals under AMGIK (Park 1980). But the deteriorated state of affairs and the urgency of the need to reconstruct the system were higher priorities so, in spite of some workshops and short-term training, the established methods of teaching and learning were revived.

The most concerted effort to establish a western-style teacher education was the opening of the Teachers' Training Centre, in August 1948, in buildings of the Seoul National University Medical College. This scheme involved bringing twenty American educational specialists to Korea, to train key local personnel in the methods of democratic education. Dewey-style educational philosophy formed the core of the approach, even down to a local experimental school where group and individual work, problem-solving and interest-based learning replaced memorisation of set materials as the basis of education. At about this time, Dewey's books *Democracy and Education* (1916), *School and Society* (1899) and *Experience and Education* (1963; orig. 1938) were translated into Korean to facilitate the transition to new forms of pedagogy. The head of the Teachers' Training Centre was Dr. Marion L. Pittman, former head of Georgia State Teachers' College who with his faculty team developed a set of principles and goals for the centre, that reflected in detail the notions of democratic procedures and scientific methods of Dewey's educational philosophy.

Four hundred Korean leaders attended the first term of the Teachers' Training Centre on August 1, 1948. The session lasted two weeks during which the participants lived at the centre where they experienced the ideals and methods, field trips and functional learning style of progressive western education. The notion of children's individual differences and their right to think their own ideas, rather than reproduce the teacher's thoughts, were promoted. Although the Teachers Training Centre, which was really a short term 'aid' project, closed after less than a year, those who had taught and studied there were enthusiastic in their praise. Brigadier-General Hume, Chief of the Reorientation Branch, Department of Army, was one of the military leaders who had promoted the scheme and expressed a sense of satisfaction with the project in these words:

Officers of the United States Military Government in Korea were high in their praise for the conduct of the program and of the ultimate value of the ideas and practices in education, which developed democratic tendencies

quite opposed to the autocratic processes previously promulgated by Japanese educators (quoted in Lee 1958, 186).

The experience of the Teachers' Training Centre emphasised the central elements of education created under the US Military Government in Korea which were to become enshrined in the South Korean Constitution. However, between the lofty rhetoric of free, compulsory, equal and democratic education, and the actual conditions and practices in the 3,442 elementary schools and 423 middle schools around South Korea, there was a great gap and the Dewey-style notions of initiative and freedom were confined to certain elite circles in the capital. Many legacies from the Japanese colonial system remained, including strict government control and regulation over the teachers and standardised textbooks. Parents paid for their children's schooling and competition for places was fierce. Teaching practices once again were based around memorisation and recall of set materials while the curriculum emphasised the new social realities – anti-communism, nationalism (meaning obedience to national authorities), and a willingness to labour for the nation. A military adviser of the time, Richard Werth, stated that 'the Korean schools of today are naturally still similar to the Japanese schools' (quoted in Lee 1958, 165) while the UNESCO-UNKRA (United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency) mission to Korea stated:

Nearly 90 % of the Korean teachers or professors of today have been trained by the Japanese and have retained a part of the Japanese influence in general and a very large part of the Japanese educational methods (UNESCO-UNKRA 1954, 26).

From the AMGIK perspective, they had successfully revived and expanded the school system and given it a set of principles suitable for a democratic, capitalist, anti-communist society. They had even demonstrated, in the Teachers' Training Centre, the ideal model to be pursued and had inducted a few hundred Koreans into its methods and goals. As they helped to set up the First Republic under President Rhee Syngman in late 1948, they had high hopes for the future. The Americans continued to exercise a strong influence over the programs of the new government. However the maintenance of the Cold War posture was much more important than the development of progressive education, a view which resonated with the government of President Rhee that was preoccupied with securing its legitimacy and resisting pressure from the North. These approaches appeared to be justified when the Korean War erupted in 1950, and they

were placed at the centre of school curricula when once again the school education system was resurrected in the ruins of the war after 1953.

Foreign Influences on the Formation of Education in the Newly Industrialising Country.

The architect of the export-oriented industrialisation program, President Park Chung-Hee claimed that 'economic development and modernisation have been the single most important themes of the Korean government' (Park 1979, 7). In his many speeches, Park often focussed on the national effort that was required, for example in the following reflection:

This national awareness in the 1960s led to the beginning of the modernisation of our country. To re-awaken our people's consciousness from its long slumber was never easy. Even harder was the task of reconstructing our nation with our bare hands. After so many twists and turns, the determination to develop was ultimately fired, bringing waves of modernisation to our nation's politics, economy, society and culture (Park 1979, 13).

Though cast as a great national mission, these sentiments of Park's owed a lot to the impact of two different but parallel beliefs on the role of education that emerged outside Korea in the early 1960's. One of these was the influence of the German model for reconstruction in the post-war period, while the other was the promotion of the doctrine of education for national economic development which became a key concept in development thinking during the so called 'development decades' of the 1960's and 1970's. This was a period, indeed, when the key agencies of the Marshall Plan that set the agenda for European reconstruction, the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, otherwise known as the World Bank, switched their interests from Europe to the so called 'underdeveloped world', of which Korea was a typical aid-dependent member. I will discuss both these influences respectively.

The Inspiration of German Education for South Korea

President Park incorporated enduring features from the educational past – an on-going raising of literacy and general education standards; an anti-communist ethos; mechanisms for legitimating state authoritarianism – and organised them into a cross-referenced, centralised arm of the state. Moreover, he added significant new dimensions to Korean education, in

particular, the critical link between schooling and the economy, as Korea embarked on its industrial 'miracle' and, also, an increased intellectual dependency on the USA. These features were manifested within a stylised nationalism that Park Chung Hee implemented to enforce his projects and to punish all oppositions that were launched against him. The various education Ministers who served under Park were functionaries for his programs and had little impact in shaping policy. He replaced them as expedience required. In the eight year period, from June 1971–December 1979, for example, he replaced the Education Minister four times (Nahm 1988).

Following a visit to West Germany in December, 1964, President Park praised the 'miracle' of West German post-war reconstruction and noted:

Germans hate to use the word 'miracle' and claim that all this is a result of blood and sweat. We confirm this is true. I agree that this is a result of twenty years diligence, economy, patience and unity... I have felt keenly that all I have seen or heard during my visit is what our countrymen should bear in mind (Park Chung Hee 1970a, 20).

President Park adopted the German stance towards rapid modernisation and economic growth from that time onwards. Development was certainly to be no 'miracle'. On the same visit, Park noted that 'one of my supprises' was the extent of vocational education in Germany:

It may be safe to think that every German is a trained worker with one specific talent at least. This is the reason why German industry was rehabilitated. I felt strongly that I have to check the direction of our education (Park Chung Hee 1970a, 23–24)

.

Over the following decades, the single-minded focus on education as a tool for national economic development became the most common theme in modern Korean education. Park made the following statements to graduates from Seoul National University in February, 1967:

...a constant productive effort for 10 to 20 years will prove to be the shortest cut to success in society...

...Unless you clearly recognise your role in this rapidly changing society and in this progressive current of the times, you will incur failure and defeat...

...it must be borne in mind that your effort, be your job in the financial world or in the government, becomes valuable only if it is directly linked with production, and that your effort in agriculture or social service will become useful only if it is connected with production and construction...

...my dear young workers...join me in renewing our pledge to work harder for the modernisation of our fatherland (Park Chung Hee 1970b, 77–79).

Park made a major speech on the aims of Korean education at the conference of university presidents, college deans and educational superintendents on January 24, 1967. Particular statements made in this speech are worth repeating for their focus on the governing objectives and ideologies of Korean education in the modernisation period:

We are at the threshold of a new stage where we must solve problems affecting our education, and readjust and strengthen the content and structure of our education, so that it can truly support national development.

...The generating force behind our modernisation drive is, ultimately, national education... (Park Chung Hee 1970c, 88).

In the same speech, Park emphasised his other major goal of education, that of anti-communism, and voiced his abhorrence for Communist education that ‘degrades education into a political tool by enforcing standardisation and enslavement of human nature’ (Park Chung Hee 1970c, 90). With patriotism thus advocated as the ‘spiritual foundation’ of Korean education, modernisation and anti-communism were inextricably united. Henceforth, Korean students and teachers were expected to wholeheartedly pursue both missions and to criticise the government’s procedures in one area was assumed to oppose the other.

The most forceful and complete expression of the mission of education in Korea during the regime of Park Chung Hee and all subsequent Republics was the Charter of National Education, proclaimed on December 5, 1968. In this charter Park brought together the key elements of nationalism, economic growth and anti-communism, fusing them into a comprehensive nationalist philosophy of education for Korea. The Charter was placed at

the front of every school textbook and recited daily in schools, such that every child who went through schools in Korea over some thirty years knew the Charter by heart until it was finally abandoned as official creed in 1994.

As Germany's example inspired Park, the national charter was created to inspire teachers, students and parents to give an intense commitment to national development. Of course children had no perspective on this, so the lead had to come from teachers, particularly. The literacy, skills, discipline, competitiveness, loyalty and nationalism that were essential attributes of South Korean workers in the national pursuit of development were demanded through the education system. In the 'politics of mass psychological mobilisation' (Sohn 1989, 93) that became embedded in Korea through the development decades, education performed a crucial role, as these analysts observed:

The gradual change in availability and quality of education from World War II to the present has been vital to the successful implementation of many economic policy measures. The rapid economic growth of the nation in this period can thus be appreciated through an understanding of the dynamics of change in education that are responsible for the quality of the modern workforce (Cho and Breazeale 1991, 569).

However, it was only through the emergence of the teachers movement and the campaign for educational reform that the impacts of this system of authoritarian coercion on teachers and students became a focus of resistance and conflict.

Education and Development Theory

The place of education in the South Korean economic model did not develop idiosyncratically from Park's personal obsessions, but was founded on a general set of theories, emanating from the West, regarding the function of education in development, which, like the economic policies, were adapted to the South Korean conditions (Chon 1995). Arnove et al. (1997, 145) commented that 'as international definitions of development changed, so did conceptions of the role of education in society'. During Park's presidency Korean education incorporated these principles so thoroughly that they became identified with the Korean national education system. In this discussion I will focus on just a few key elements.

The fundamental principle underlying the broad function of education in the economic development process was expressed by Jayasuriya in his analysis of education in the Third World:

It was thought, and in fact is still being thought, that the industrialised countries reached their high level of technological development because of the kind of education that was provided in them, and that the Third World should follow the same model (Jayasuriya 1980, 23).

At the core of this notion was the view of mass, compulsory schooling as a vehicle to modernisation, called by Coleman (1965, 3) as the 'kingpin' of 'The Great Awakening' of former colonies and developing nations (cf. Harbison and Myers 1964; Anderson and Bowman eds. 1965; Adams ed. 1971). Dale (1982, 410) stated that 'education is, along with the military and police, the most prominent "modern" institution in most developing countries' while Carnoy (1974: 236) stated that 'schooling was seen by reformers and industrialists alike as promoting their common vision of an ordered, purposeful and progressive society'. The concepts of modernisation theory hold that human resource planning and policy will contribute to social change and economic growth. Such growth, it is proposed, will benefit all people through the so-called 'trickle-down' effect of the increased wealth acquired by the elites being re-distributed to the masses (cf. Webster 1990). In addition there has been a widely held notion that economic growth accompanying modernisation also results in the spread of political democracy.

The contribution of education towards economic growth, like modernisation theory itself, has been an issue of debate. From an initial enthusiasm throughout the 1960s, when spending on education in the developing world rose from 2.3% to 3.9% GNP (Harrison 1981), to an increasing scepticism during the 1970s about the benefits of education (Dore 1976), to a renewed optimism – bolstered by the surge of economic rationalist economics – through the 1980s and 1990s, the debates about the economic development value of education have been strident. The early commitments were fuelled by the work of economists like Schultz (1961) and Denison (1962) who maintained that education contributes to national income through improved skills and productive capacity, views which stimulated fifteen years of educational expansion in the Third World (Jayasuriya 1980). With the wisdom of hindsight, Harrison (1979, 306) concluded that 'if education has failed in most countries as a tool to aid development, it is not because governments did not expand it fast enough', but he noted that while a great proportion of the budgets of developing

nations were allocated to education, the return, in respect to improved income and living conditions, was minimal.

Psacharopoulos and Woodhall (1985, 16) noted a declining interest in the issue during the 1970s 'because of a lack of economic growth and a certain ambivalence about the role of education' but asserted a 'renewed interest' from the 1980s that has 'reaffirmed the importance of education in promoting economic growth'. The debates on this issue revolve very much around differing conceptions of education and what it is meant to achieve in a society. In the earlier development period of the 1960s, education was regarded very much as a human right (Nyerere 1985). It was represented as such in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and its expansion in the 1960s was seen as a vehicle for eliminating, or significantly reducing, poverty and social inequality worldwide (Coleman 1965). With its failure to achieve these objectives, education came to be regarded as a suspect feature of development, and perhaps as a contributing factor in continuing impoverishment of developing nations, for example through creating a 'diploma disease' (cf. Carnoy 1974; Dore 1976; Carnoy and Levin 1976; Hindson 1992).

A renewed upswing of support towards education and development through the 1980s and 1990s was driven by the rise of global economic pragmatism. In leading the way towards a renewed thrust for education, the World Bank, as a prime source of development funds, refocused its activities away from the provision of basic educational facilities towards the planning, administration and management of educational systems. Whereas, in the 1950s, education was regarded as a national 'consumption', an alternative view emerged based on the notion of education as a productive 'investment' in 'human capital' adhering to the principles of any other investment in physical or resource capital. The theory of human capital is generally attributed to Schultz (1961) and its application in education advocated that a substantial investment in education would result in substantial and long term economic benefits for a society. Morris (1996) proposed that there were two analytical traditions in human capital theory, one associated with human resource development (Harbison and Myers 1964) and the other with the rates of return notion described here. In a review of four 'Asian Tigers', Morris regarded the South Korean model to be of the investment/returns type, but concluded that there was significant variation in the application of the concept across his four case studies, a view supported by Baker and Holsinger (1997), in rejecting notions of an 'Asian' model of school expansion and human capital formation.

The initial proposals for education as a producer of human capital, which were meant to endorse the importance of education and to encourage governments to invest in education, gradually assumed a more central role in the model for economic development such that Psacharopoulos and Woodhall (1985, 30) claimed that 'the idea that education is a form of investment in human capital is one of the most important developments in economics in recent decades, and it has had substantial impact on educational planning in recent decades'. Evaluations of education came to be conducted in the terms of economic frameworks and measurements. Schools and the personnel who participated in them came to be regarded as economic units whose value could be assessed in such concepts as: 'the rate of return to investment in education'; manpower-output coefficients; and, most commonly – 'human capital' (Psacharopoulos and Woodhall 1985). Human capital theory defined education as an investment activity, where students represented potential economic resources and, like other 'investment options' human capital concepts were regarded favourably because their relative efficiency and success/failure outcomes apparently could be measured (Blaug 1973; Mehmet and Hoong 1984). Lulat (1982, 235) reflected that 'the dominant perspective was that of investment in education as *the* primary instrument for modernisation' while Fagerlind and Saha (1989, 19) summarised the key issues in this way:

For politicians and decision-makers, efforts to promote investment in human capital were seen to result in rapid economic growth for society. For individuals, such investment was seen to provide returns in the form of individual economic success and achievement.

As a further statement on the function of education in development, Jarvis (1986, 88), observing that 'such is the significance given to the process of industrialisation that it has been regarded as the answer to all the problems of the world', concluded that:

education is, they claimed, the handmaiden of industrialism. They view education as the perpetuator of the knowledge and values of industrialism, a means whereby social conformity may be maintained and the knowledge transmitted may be directed by those who control the process of industrialisation. Education is an instrument to mould people to perform a role within the wider social structure, but without disturbing that structure (Jarvis 1986, 89).

The close alignment of education and industrial development as a national strategy was, thus, strongly advocated in international development policy

and models at the same time as Korea was developing its export-oriented industrialisation program. The concept of human capital formation was regarded as producing a comparative advantage for a nation pursuing export-oriented industrialisation and South Korean education was to become known as a successful implementation of the model (e.g. IMF 1991; Chon 1995). Subsequently education was to become regarded as a central plank of NIC-style development, primarily as a result of Korea's apparent success.

Impacts of Regional Educational Planning

An additional contextual feature that contributes to understanding the formation of education in South Korea is a recognition of the regional contexts of the educational model set up in South Korea. While Baker and Holsinger (1997) argued that there was no evidence to support claims that there was a unique Asian, particularly East-Asian and Confucianist, model of schooling for human capital formation, a review of educational trends across different Asian nations over the past thirty years indicates that the South Korean school system was compatible with emerging frameworks for regional development (Morris and Sweeting eds. 1995). Certainly, it is useful to recognise the existence of regional educational orientations,

While the various nations and cultures of Asia have developed distinctive educational traditions through the centuries, in the more recent ex-colonial period, particularly since World War II, there has been a degree of congruence in the principles of educational policy and planning in Asia (Huq 1979; Blaug 1979; Thomas and Postlethwaite 1983). Roy-Singh (1990, 21) studied educational planning in Asia as a whole and suggested that 'economic planning in the developing countries of Asia was shaped and determined by the situation of their underdevelopment...This is equally true of educational planning (Roy-Singh 1990, 21).

It was, however, in 1959-60, at a meeting of 17 Asian Member States of UNESCO, in Karachi, that the first systematic plan for Asian education was proposed. This was 'The Needs of Asia in Primary Education' plan, more widely known as the 'Karachi Plan'. Realising that Asia accounted for nearly 60 % of the world's illiterate people, and linking this fact to the widespread conditions of poverty in the region, the Asian nations believed that, through educational expansion, 'they would catch up with the industrialised countries' (Jayasuriya 1980, 6). Roy-Singh noted however, that in creating an additional 395 million additional school places across Asia in the period of one generation, 'the cost per unit of enrolled pupil

was held in balance in Asia and is among the lowest in the world' (Roy-Singh 1990, 11). In other words, the expansion of education in Asia was pursued with little regard for such matters as teaching conditions or industrial rights, student numbers in classes or the social effects of excessive competition.

Roy-Singh noted that educational planning in the region emerged at the same time as systematic economic planning: 'with the emergence of five-year planning, overall economic development and educational development became more closely linked' (Roy-Singh 1990, 19). Thus, while various nations developed their own development models, there was a broad accord that education was to be a key factor in development. Following the Karachi meeting in 1960, a follow-up meeting of regional planners was held in Tokyo in April, 1962, to discuss ways of implementing the plan. In 1965, a more elaborate regional plan was formulated, covering all types of education and projecting over a long-range period. This model was called *The Asian Model of Educational Development for 1965-1980* (UNESCO 1966). These planning sessions not only served to set the framework for planning within Asia, but established UNESCO as a major presence with an integrating influence throughout the region and Jayasuriya (1980, 5) observed that these early efforts for educational planning in Asia became 'a beacon light for Third World Countries in other parts of the world'. Notably, it was in this period that UNESCO established a regional office in Seoul.

Common views by educational planners in the region as to their general condition of underdevelopment and a belief in the educational paradigm of modernisation and development resulted in a broad agreement on the objectives of educational planning throughout the region. These objectives for education in Asia were:

- the expansion of educational opportunities;
- meeting the human resource needs of economic growth;
- development of the national education systems;
- qualitative improvement of educational processes and outcomes.

There was variation within the region in respect to the emphases placed on these objectives. For example, Indonesia gave priority to the expansion of the educational system as a way of achieving national integration, due to

its fragmented political structure. Roy–Singh (1990, 22) noted that ‘in some countries, therefore, the promotion of national unity and the strengthening of the integrative forces in national life became the overarching goals of development policy’. In the Philippines, by comparison, educational emphasis was towards developing human capital for the massive agro–business operations that dominated the economy while in South Korea education became focussed towards human capital production for export–oriented industrialisation (Chon 1995; Morris 1996).

Education became a central element of the economic development program in Korea as teachers were incorporated into President Park’s campaign for *chunghyo sasang* – loyalty to the state and filial piety – a combination of Confucianist ethics and nationalism which were, according to Sohn (1989, 93), ‘carried out through intellectual mobilisation by means of symposia, lectures and education meetings at various levels, as well as through the provision of an ideological basis for school education’. Park’s genius was to successfully adapt his foreign influences into a distinctively Korean framework and to ‘invent’ a sense that he was always drawing on an ancient cultural repertoire in the creation of his nation state, rather than borrowing foreign influences. Education was one strand of the institutional networks he established to position himself as the father of the nation, through the frequent invocation of Confucianist ideology. His conception of the Samaeul community doctrine epitomised his absorption of notions of modernisation in all spheres of society into a stylised Confucianist nationalism.

Conclusion

In summary, the previous discussion has considered a range on foreign influences on the formation of the modern Korean education system. The legacies of Japanese colonial education, American post–WWII and Cold War education, and internationalist models of education for development, including regional approaches, combined to produce a Korean school system that was fraught with ambiguities and oppressive conditions for teachers and students. The teachers union movement that emerged in the late 1980’s began to challenge these conditions and proposed a new set of alternative approaches. The primary critiques of existing system by the teachers movement were that they experienced:

- *a mixture of oppressive roles which teachers were expected to perform:*

e.g. teachers as clergy; teacher as anti-communists; teachers as producers of human capital; teachers as subservient agents of government propaganda.

- *a range of violating school values and practices:*

e.g. 'examination hell' as the driving agenda in schooling; centralised control of knowledge; the imposition of political propaganda in schools; authoritarianism and violence (actual and symbolic) in schooling; financial corruption and exploitation; poor educational environment; oppressive working conditions; coercive ideologies and legislation.

- *oppressive social effects of schooling:*

e.g. the corrosive effect of educational pressure and demands on families; the financial drain to the community as a result of corruption and excessive competition in schooling; student suicides; the legitimisation of militaristic and externally influenced social controls; the production from schools of exploitable human capital for government, commerce and industry.

These grievances were experienced by teachers as impacts and processes in schools and classrooms. The definitions and interpretations of these grievances constituted the collective action frames of the *Chunkyojo* movement, which in my research I identified and deconstructed, with some results as I've shared in this paper.

The situation of Korean education has changed significantly over the past decade, largely as a result of international impacts. The end of the Cold War in Europe in 1989 gradually has produced a lessening of anti-communist fever in South Korea and as the policy of engagement with North Korea developed through the 1990's, the school system has adopted a more gradualist and peace-oriented approach to reunification education (Synott, 2002). Likewise, the gradual integration of the global economy has produced new pressures and demands on Korean education. For example as Korea was applying for membership of the OECD in 1995, one of the procedures for entry entailed a visit by an OECD review team to review Korean education, to ensure that it maintained similar standards and processes as other nations in the OECD. These visits resulted in a range of demands being placed before the Korean government to do such things as reduce class sizes, ease the pressure of university entrance exams through multiple assessment methods, and to legalise the teachers union of

Chunkyojo, to permit the same industrial rights for teachers in Korea as elsewhere among OECD member nations.

In more recent times the thrust for change in Korean education again has been coming from external influences. With globalisation the nation is keen to develop a new form of human capital, based on the marketable skills of the knowledge-based economy. Frequently those skills include problem-solving abilities, electronic technical skills, flexibility, lateral thinking, skills in cultural diversity and communication – skills that were not promoted in the previous coercive learning models. We find these qualities being promoted in recent statements on education by government and key agencies in Korea. Again in many ways the challenges and demands for priority policies in Korean education are being generated outside. However, in this respect Korea shares much with other nations of the world, including my own as they try to position themselves for successful futures in an integrated world economy and global society. As a final comment, I just wonder what will be the educational consequences if the war on terrorism escalates, as it seems poised to do. Will there be a new global ideological campaign, orchestrated by the US, for educational systems to promote, and if so how will this become manifest in Korea?

[This paper is based on material contained in a new book by John Synott, **Teacher Unions, Social Movements and the Politics of Education in Asia: South Korea, Taiwan and the Philippines**, published in 2002 by Ashgate Press. ISBN: 0 7546 1557 X. Copies can be ordered through: www.ashgate.com or email: orders@bookpoint.co.uk]

List of References:

Anderson, C. & Bowman, M.(eds.) (1965). *Education and Economic Development*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Adams, D. (ed.) (1971). *Education in National Development*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul

Arnove, R.F. (1980). Comparative education and world systems analysis. *Comparative Education Review* No. 24, 48–62.

Baker, D. & Holsinger, D. (1997). Human capital formation and school expansion in Asia. In Y. Bradshaw (ed.), *Education in Comparative Perspective*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 159–173.

Baker, M. E. & Smith, B. (1966). The military contribution to national development. In W. Y. Elliot (ed.), *Education and Training in the Developing Countries: The Role of U.S. Foreign Aid*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger Publishers, 158–183.

Blaug, M. (1973). *Education and the Employment Problem in Developing Countries*. Geneva: International Labour Office.

Bureau of Education, Government General of Chosun (1912). *The Chosun Educational Ordinance and Various Attendant Regulations*. Translated and published by the Bureau of Education. Seoul: Government General of Chosun.

Bureau of Education, Government General of Chosun. (1920). *Manual of Education in Chosun*. Translated and Published by the Bureau of Education. Seoul: Bureau of Education.

Byon, Myong-Hee. (1990). The critical study of the Korean teachers union movement. In Lee Mok (ed.), *History of the Korean Teachers' Union Movement*. Translated by Je-Eun Son. Seoul: Pureun Namu Publishing Co., 226–274.

Carnoy, M. (1974). *Education as Cultural Imperialism*. New York: McKay.

Carnoy, M. & Levin, H. (1976). *The Limits of Educational Reform*. New York: David McKay.

Cho, Lee-Jay and Breazeale, K. (1991). The education system. In Cho Lee-Jay & Kim

Yoon-Myung (eds.), *Economic Development in the Republic of Korea: A Policy Perspective*. Honolulu: East-West Center, 567–586.

Chon, Sun-Ihm (1995). South Korea. In P. Morris & A. Sweeting (eds.), *Education and Development in East Asia*. New York: Garland, 125–148.

Choo, Hak-Chung (1991). The educational basis of Korean economic development. In Chung Lee & I. Yamazawa (eds.), *The Economic Development of Japan and Korea*. New York: Praeger.

Coleman, J. S. (1965a). Introduction: education and political development. In J.S. Coleman (ed.), *Education and Political Development*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 3–50.

Coleman, J. S. (ed.) (1965). *Education and Political Development*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Dale, R. (1982). Learning to be...what? Shaping education in developing countries. In H. Alavi & T. Shanin (eds.), *Introduction to the Sociology of the Developing Societies*. Houndmills and Basingstoke: Macmillan Education Ltd., 408–421.

Dewey, J. (1899). *The School and Society*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. New York: Collier/Macmillan.

Dewey, J. (1963). *Experience and Education*. Kappa, Delta, Pi Lectures, Lafayette, Indiana, 1938. New York: Collier/Macmillan.

Dore, R. (1976). *The Diploma Disease*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Eckert, C. J.; Lee, Ki-Baik; Young, Ick-Lew; Robinson, M.; & Wagner, E. W. (1990). *Korea Old and New: A History*. Seoul: Ilchokak Publishers.

Elliot, W. Y. (ed.) (1966). *Education and Training in the Developing Countries: The role of U.S. Foreign Aid*. New York: Fredrick A. Praeger.

Fagerlind, I. & Saha, L. J. (1989). *Educational and National Development: A Comparative Perspective*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Fisher, J. E. (1970, original 1928). *Democracy and Mission Education in Korea*. Seoul: Yonsei University Press.

Gamson, W. (1992). The social psychology of collective action. In A.D. Morris & C.M. Mueller (eds.), *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 53–76.

Hankyoreh Shinmun (1996). Survey of teacher attitudes to legalisation of *Chunkyojo*. Translated by Je-Eun Son. August 27.

Hankyoreh Shinmun (1996). Public opinion supports legalisation of *Chunkyojo*. Translated by Je-Eun Son. September 12.

Han, Woo-Keun (1970). *The History of Korea*. Seoul: The Eul-Yoo Publishing Co..

Harbison, F. & Myers, C.A. (1964). *Education, Manpower and Economic Growth*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Harrison, P. (1981). *The Third World Tomorrow*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Huq, M. (1979). *Education, Manpower and Development in South and Southeast Asia*. New York: Praeger.

International Monetary Fund (IMF) (1991). *World Economic Outlook*. Washington, D.C.:IMF.

Jarvis, P. (1986). Notions of development and their implication for adult education. *International Review of Education* No. 32, 85-96.

Jayasuriya, J. E. (1983). *Education in Korea: A Third World Success Story*. Seoul: Korean National Commission for UNESCO.

Jayasuriya, J. E. (1980). *Education in the Third World: Some Reflections*. Bombay: Somaiya Publications Ltd. .

Jacobs, N. (1985). *The Korean Road to Modernization and Development*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Kim, Yun-Young (1991). The deep rooted authoritarianism and bureaucracy in Korean education. Translated by Je-Eun Son. In *Uri Gyoyuk* Vol. 18 June, 123-127

Lee, Chae-Jin & Sato Hideo (1982). *US Policy Toward Japan and Korea*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Lee, Sung-Hwa (1958). *The Social and Political Factors Affecting Korean Education 1885-1950*. Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International.

Lulat, Y. (1982). Political restraints on educational reform for development: lessons from an African experience. *Comparative Education Review* June , 235-253.

Malik, C. H. (1966). The world looks at the American program. In W. Y. Elliot (ed.), *Education and Training in the Developing Countries: The Role of U.S. Foreign Aid*. N.Y.: Frederick A. Praeger Publishers, 37-42.

Mason, E. S. (1966). Questions concerning the interests of the United States in the economic development of emerging nations: governmental interests related to private interests. In W. Y. Elliot (ed.), *Education and Training in the Developing Countries: The Role of U.S. Foreign Aid*. N.Y.: Frederick A. Praeger Publishers, 28-36.

McKenzie, F. A. (1920). *Korea's Fight for Freedom*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.

McNamara, D. L. (1990). *The Colonial Origins of Korea Enterprise 1910-1945*. Cambridge, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.

Mehmet, O. & Hoong, Y. Y. (1984). *Human Capital Formation in Malaysian Universities*. Occasional papers and reports. Institute of Advanced Studies, University of Malaya.

Morris, P. (1996). Asia's four little tigers: a comparison of the role of education in their development. *Comparative Education* Vol.32 No.1, 95-109.

Morris, P. & Sweeting, A. (eds.) (1995). *Education and Development in East Asia*. New York: Garland.

Nyerere, J. K. (1985). Education in Tanzania. *Harvard Educational Review* Vol. 55, No 1, 45-51.

Park, Chung-Hee (1970a). Result of efforts, not miracle- impressions of visit to West Germany on December 24, 1964. In Shin, Bum-Shik (ed.) (1970), *Major Speeches by Korea's Park Chung-Hee*. Seoul: Hollym Corporation, 19-27.

Park, Chung-Hee (1970b). Victory sides with those who live for the future. Speech made at commencement exercises of Seoul National University on February 27, 1967. In Shin, Bum-Shik (ed.), *Major Speeches by Korea's Park Chung-Hee*, 77-79.

Park, Chung-Hee (1970c). Character-building education. Speech at the conference of university presidents, college deans and educational superintendents on January 24, 1967. In Shin, Bum Shik (ed.), *Major Speeches by Korea's Park Chung-Hee*. Seoul: Hollym, 87-92.

Park, Chung-Hee (1979a). *Korea Reborn: A Model for Development*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Psacharopoulos, G. & Woodhall, M. (1985). *Education for Development: An Analysis of Investment Choices*. New York: Oxford University Press for the World Bank.

Republic of Korea, Ministry of Education (1989). *Educational Development in Korea: 1986-1988*. Report to the 41st Session of the International Conference on Education, Geneva, 9-17 January, 1989.

Roy-Singh, R. (1990). *Educational Planning in Asia*. Paris: UNESCO; International Institute for Educational Planning.

Schultz, T. W. (1961). *The Economic Value of Education*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Slater, J. E. (1966). International educational and cultural policies and programs for the 1960s: philosophy, objectives and illustrative programs. In W. Y. Elliot (ed.), *Education and Training in the Developing Countries: The Role of U.S. Foreign Aid*. N.Y.: Frederick A. Praeger Publishers, 335-393.

Snow, D. A.; Rochford Jr. E.; Worden, S. & Benford, R.D. (1986). Frame alignment processes, micromobilization and

movement participation. *American Sociological Review* Vol. 5, August, 464–481.

Synott, J.P. (1995). The German origins of the South Korean National Charter of Education. *The Journal of East and West Studies* Vol.24, No. 1, 35–47.

Synott, J. (2002). *Teacher Unions, Social Movements and the Politics of Education in Asia*. Aldershot: Ashgate

Tarrow, S. (1994). *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, R.M. & Postlethwaite, T. N. (1983). *Schooling in East Asia: Forces of Change*. Elmsford, N.Y.: Pergamon Press.

TIME (1988). Special report: South Korea and the olympic host takes a bow. Vol. 3 No. 36, Sept. 5, 34–39.

UNESCO–UNKRA Educational Planning Mission to Korea (1954). *Rebuilding Education in the Republic of Korea*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (1966). *An Asian Model of Educational Development*. Paris: United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Webster, A. (1990). *Introduction to the Sociology of Development*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan Education.

Dr. John Synott, School of Humanities, QUT Carseldine, Queensland 4034, Australia. Email: j.synott@qut.edu.au

