

**A History of Curriculum Thought in South Korea: 57BCE-1987**

BY

DAEYOUNG KIM

B.A., Korea University, 2005

M.A., Korea University, 2007

THESIS

Submitted as partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Curriculum and Instruction  
in the Graduate College of the  
University of Illinois at Chicago, 2013  
Chicago, Illinois

Defense Committee:

William H. Schubert, Chair and Advisor

Ward Weldon, Educational Policy Studies

David Stovall, Educational Policy Studies

Ming Fang He, Georgia Southern University

Patrick Roberts, National-Louis University

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to express my profound gratitude to Professor William H. Schubert who has steadfastly served as my major professor, my mentor, repository of knowledge, critic, and inspiration of my life. I greatly appreciate his guidance, encouragement, advice, and patience. I thank Professor Schubert for having inspired me to explore curriculum studies in South Korea.

I owe special thanks to my fiancée, Joungeun Park, who spent countless hours encouraging. And she made the greatest sacrifice because she was forced to listen to my complaints during my doctoral studies in the USA. The love and concern expressed by my father and mother, Jong Kim and Kyuja Suh, proved to be inspirational.

I would also like to thank other committee members. I especially thank Professor Ming Fang He for expanding my understanding of Confucius's thought in my study and for providing articles, comments and editorial suggestions, which was an enormous amount of work. I thank Professor Patrick Roberts for encouraging me to keep the focus of my study meanwhile releasing my cultural imagination for my future inquiries. I thank Professor David Stovall for awakening me with critical consciousness and encouraging me to learn to politicize the history of curriculum thought in South Korea, which helps describe the contextual reminders of each period in this study. I thank Professor Ward Weldon's tremendous understanding of the educational situations in South Korea which contributes to integrated historical and analytical approaches to a history of curriculum thought in South Korea.

To all the above, I offer my sincere thanks.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
1. The Purpose of this Study .....	1
2. Background of the Problem.....	2
1) Historical Curriculum Studies in the Republic of Korea.....	2
2) Curriculum Theory and Practice .....	4
3) Orientations in Curriculum Studies .....	6
3. Research Methodology .....	11
4. Organization of this study .....	15
1) Curriculum studies in the United States .....	16
2) Curriculum studies in the Republic of Korea .....	20
5. Significance of the Study .....	22
6. Limitations of the Study.....	24
II. A BRIEF HISTORY OF KOREAN EDUCATION AND CURRICULUM FROM THREE KINGDOMS THROUGH JAPANESE COLONIZATION: 57BCE-1945 .....	26
1. Three Kingdoms Period (57 BCE – 935 AD) .....	26
2. Koryo Period (918 – 1392).....	29
3. Choson Period (1392 – 1897).....	30
4. Early modernization (1897 – 1910).....	34
5. Japanese Colonization (1910 – 1945).....	37
III. CURRICULUM LITERATURE AND CONTEXT: 1945-1963 .....	40
1. Contextual Reminders.....	40
2. The characteristics of four schools of curriculum thought.....	44
3. Curriculum thought and literature .....	54
4. Bibliography of Curriculum Books 1945-1963.....	62
IV. CURRICULUM LITERATURE AND CONTEXT: 1964-1973.....	64
1. Contextual Reminders .....	64
2. Curriculum thought and literature .....	67
3. Bibliography of Curriculum Books 1964-1973.....	77

## TABLE OF CONTENTS(continued)

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
V. CURRICULUM LITERATURE AND CONTEXT: 1974-1981 .....	80
1. Contextual Reminders .....	80
2. Curriculum thought and literature .....	83
3. Bibliography of Curriculum Books 1974-1981.....	92
VI. CURRICULUM LITERATURE AND CONTEXT: 1982-1987 .....	95
1. Contextual Reminders .....	95
2. Curriculum thought and literature .....	99
3. Bibliography of Curriculum Books 1982-1987.....	108
VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	112
1. Understanding Derived from this Inquiry .....	114
2. Recommendations for Future Research .....	117
REFERENCES .....	121
VITA.....	136

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. APPROXIMATION OF THE NUMBER OF CURRICULUM BOOKS PRODUCED BY YEAR AND DECADE .....	13
II. THE PEIOD AND CHARACTER OF NATIONAL CURRICULUM IN SOUTH KOREA .....	14

## **SUMMARY**

This dissertation provides a chronology of curriculum books with commentaries which appeared in the Republic of Korea from 1945 to 1987. Specifically, the foci of the study are on the followings: 1) a history of curriculum studies in the Republic of Korea, 2) relationships between theory and practice of curriculum studies, and 3) schools of thought in curriculum studies.

The broad intent of the research is to help anyone whose interests and professional pursuits deal with education and curriculum studies in South Korea within the context of increased interest in South Korean education in the United States and for understanding curriculum studies in South Korea. The method of inquiry is the historical study. Approximately 150 curriculum books and articles that appeared from 1945 to 1987 are selected, analyzed, and discussed in the study.

The study begins by introducing a brief overview of Korean education as well as curriculum from earliest times to Japanese colonization because whatever the historical period or the particular setting, there is a timelessness in the questions that have pervaded the study of curriculum. In addition to this, the history is important not only to provide a more complete the picture of educational change but also to understand contemporary educational situations and curriculum studies. I regard curriculum studies as a formal area of inquiry in South Korea beginning in 1945. Since that time the urgent problems of education were to extirpate the remnants of the Japanese and to establish future directions of education. In particular the substitution of Japanese teachers and textbooks was the most exigent issue. Naturally the concerns about curriculum that are closely related to teacher education and selecting and organizing contents of textbooks were increased, and the demands for curriculum scholars occurred. Under these circumstances at least four dominant schools of curriculum thought were

## SUMMARY (continued)

competing against each other. I have called them the *curriculum experientialists*, *advocates of curriculum development*, *curriculum scholars of analytical philosophy*, and *curriculum sociologists*.

Chapters Three through Six, each consists of three parts: 1) contextual reminders, 2) curriculum literature and thought, and 3) bibliography. This builds on the theoretical framework established by Schubert and Lopez Schubert (1980) in *Curriculum Books: The First 80 Years* and amplified by Schubert, Lopez Schubert, Thomas, and Carroll (2002) in *Curriculum Books: The First Hundred Years*. In order to understand the what and why of that which is introduced, emphasized, and asked in curriculum books it is also necessary to comprehend the contextual situations because curriculum studies are closely related with backgrounds of politics, economy, society, and culture at that time. Curriculum literature and thought are described mainly according to each school of curriculum thought. I have attempted to search for origins of curriculum thought in South Korea and to portray the books produced by curriculum scholars from 1945 to 1987.

The contribution of the study is to provide the following relative to the history of South Korean curriculum: (1) a reasonably extensive coverage of issues and problems; (2) a bibliography of curriculum books used in South Korea from 1945 to 1987; and (3) commentaries on this curriculum literature to enhance historical understanding and perspectives. This study is a journey into the past in search of a deeper foundation for contemporary curriculum research, theory, policy and practice in South Korea.

## **CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION**

### **1. The Purpose of this Study**

This study provides a chronology of curriculum books with commentaries that appeared in the Republic of Korea from 1945 to 1987. Thus, the purpose of this study is to help provide historical and contextual perspectives for anyone whose interests and professional pursuits deal with education and curriculum studies in South Korea. It also speaks to increased interest in South Korean education in the United States. Curriculum that is ‘a’-contextual and ‘a’-historical cannot adequately meet needs of policy and practices in the space and time of South Korea today.

The perspectives that can be found in curriculum studies, however, situate curriculum within backgrounds of politics, economy, society, and culture at that time. Such consideration of South Korean curriculum studies from 1945 to 1987 could shed light on unique and distinctive features of curriculum studies and practices. Moreover, the key questions of what should be taught and why, have pervaded the field of curriculum studies as all humankind’s common interests, and contain universal attributes beyond generational and social distinctiveness. To know the universality is to expand a foundation of mutual understanding of curriculum studies. I hope that this study contributes to such international collaborative understanding in the curriculum field.



## 2. Background of the Problem

During my doctoral study I concentrated on three issues for my curriculum studies: 1) a history of curriculum studies in South Korea, 2) the relationship between theory and practice of curriculum studies, and 3) schools of thought in curriculum studies. My interests in these topics were enhanced as I translated *Curriculum Books: The First Hundred Years* by William H. Schubert, Ann Lynn Lopez Schubert, Thomas P. Thomas & Wayne M. Carroll (2002) into Korean during my Master's Degree study in South Korea. These research issues provide focus and organization to a study which has the considerable potential to become a history of South Korean curriculum studies. The following addresses the process of forming these three research topics: (1) historical curriculum studies in the Republic of Korea, (2) curriculum theory and practice, and (3) orientations in curriculum studies.

### 1) Historical Curriculum Studies in the Republic of Korea

For several years before publishing a Korean version (2009) of *Curriculum Books* (Schubert et al., 2002), scholars found it inconvenient not to have such a book in South Korea. This does not mean, however, that there are no books related to curriculum history about South Korea. Chongkyu Ham (2003, 1980, 1976, 1974), Gyeongseop Lee (1997), Bongho Yoo (1997) conducted researches about the changing history of the national curriculum.

All of them focused on the changes of statements in the national curriculum documents. Therefore, these books mainly describe changes of the national curriculum relative to the stated revisions of educational purposes and objectives, organization of subject matters, time allocation, and the system of contents. Without understating the existence and the worth of their efforts, it

seems safe to contend that their studies are kinds of histories of curriculum, not a history of curriculum studies.

Thus, it is necessary to distinguish between a history of curriculum studies and a history of curriculum. Byunghee Yoon (2001) illuminates this difference: “the former is a history of the academic study, and the latter is a history of research objects such as subjects or materials... because the reality of the latter is constructed by the former and the concept of the latter is regulated by the former, the conceptual confusion between the two is predictable” (p. 141).

The documented national curriculum, which is announced in the form of a decree or notification by the Minister of Education, could be easily and clearly recognized as subjects for curriculum scholars or guidelines for practitioners. Of course it is useful to identify the relevance of the national curriculum. However, discussions about how the national curriculum can be conceptualized and analyzed are also needed. These histories of extant curricula rarely address considerations of perspectives used to develop the curriculum, characteristics and limitations of the applied perspectives, and what are emphasized and omitted in the curriculum because of such perspectives.

A historical study of South Korean curriculum studies is first provided by Woongsun Hong in 1973. He introduces the curriculum books published from 1945 to 1972 and comments about the books. His analysis is valuable to know curriculum studies of the formative years in South Korea. Pahljoong Yoon (1975) also analyzed 49 curriculum books that appeared from 1945 to 1972 according to (1) general aspects (author, title, publisher, year of publication, and number of pages), (2) purposes of the books, (3) type of readers that the author expects, (4) contents, and (5) bibliography. In 1983, based on the previous study in 1975, Yoon delineates the progress of curriculum studies in South Korea through 18 synoptic texts and 12 articles from 1945 to 1975.

In an important study of synoptic texts, Pahljoong Yoon (1975, 1983) observed that *synoptic texts* (Schubert & Lopez Schubert, 1980) constitute an important indicator about the direction of curriculum studies. These are texts that provide a summarized conceptualization of salient knowledge in the field at the time. What he figures out in his study of synoptic texts is that the topics of the field are too extensive, and the concepts are too diverse, and there is insufficient distinction between curriculum and instruction (Yoon, 1983, pp. 53-57).

Discussion of history of curriculum studies existed since the 1950s; however, today it is difficult to find continuation of such a discussion. In addition, when the historical studies of curriculum studies are occasionally announced in South Korea, almost always the reference is to only these two researchers. There is little research about curriculum studies since 1970s. In this study, I built upon and reorganized the bibliography in papers of Woongsun Hong (1973a) and Pahljoong Yoon (1975, 1983), and selected new bibliographies from the 1970s to 1987.

## **2) Curriculum Theory and Practice**

There is a need to clarify the relationship of curriculum theory and practice. This topic is closely related to the general issue of theory and practice. After Aristotle, first classified the disciplines and specified an unique place in each discipline, categorized disciplines into three types such as the theoretical, the practical, and the productive, the debate about whether curriculum studies is the theoretical or the practical continues. Therefore, the research about this whole issue would be beyond of the intent of this study.

For this study, the relationship of theory and practice that is identified in Bummo Chung's *The Climate for Intellectual Inquiry* (2006) is germane. His premise through the whole of this book is that curriculum studies addresses the theoretical, and a reality of curriculum such as the

national curriculum is constructed by curriculum theory. First of all, he argues that more abstract theory is better. He defines theory as something that abandons the different individual particularities of several specific phenomena and picks out the general and universal properties from these phenomena. On the other hand, practice always retains “*thisness*” and distinctiveness. For him, theory is like a picture of X-rays which ignores clothes and flesh of several different people and detects the skeleton.

In addition, in order to apply theory into practice, practice has again to wear clothes and flesh suitable for the purpose of practice. In these mutually related processes, he noted that two creativities are needed. One is an “abstractive creativity” for generating theory and “constructive creativity” for applying theory into practice. Even though he did not proceed further with the issue of constructive creativity, the basic idea of it is closely related to *Arts of Eclectic* (1971) by Joseph Schwab.

In fact, curriculum studies of the United States was introduced to South Korea, and there were great efforts to understand and to apply them to reality. In this process some curriculum scholars argue that foreign theories do not fit to the reality of South Korea, so it is needed to generate our own curriculum theory. Before such claim, however, it is necessary to review sufficiently the following three cases: 1) whether the foreign theory is wrong, 2) whether the foreign is “narrow” theory, and 3) whether constructive creativity is well applied.

Without a close investigation I do not agree with nationalistic claims that the US theory is wrong and only South Korean theory is right, or with relativistic claims that the US theory is just right in the US and South Korean theory is merely right in South Korea. The fact that Korean curriculum scholars formed many of their perspectives on curricular phenomena through US curriculum studies and literature cannot be repudiated. But somewhat different educational

situations resulted due to variations among US curriculum studies; moreover, curriculum studies in South Korea also evolved its own way.

Ultimately these occurrences expand the scope and level of curriculum studies in both South Korea and the United States. Thus, I will describe similarities and differences between South Korean and the United States curriculum studies, and especially look for characteristics, strengths, and limitations of curriculum studies in South Korea.

### **3) Orientations in Curriculum Studies**

It is not possible to completely characterize the overall look of curriculum since the phenomena of curricula are too complex and are correlated with other phenomena of education. In addition to this, like other social phenomena curricular phenomena also cannot be separated from the researchers who illuminate them. A phenomenon, according to Immanuel Kant (1787), is sensed by a human being within a subjective movement that is triggered by an external object. Kant insisted that what we can see is not a thing-in-itself, i.e., there is some part of the thing that cannot be seen and apperceived by human sense because the human perspective is included our subjective movement.

However, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel criticized Kant's epistemology in that Kant's idea of thing-in-itself was a product of abstract thought that was formed when thinking that consciousness is only connected to any scene. Rather he maintains that we must examine actual knowing as it occurs in lived or experienced knowledge processes. According to Hegel (1807), the consciousness staying in this step cannot know the whole thing. However we change our consciousness because of contradictions of our experience and imagination about the behind of the thing.

This new consciousness changes the appearance of the thing before we knew. Hegel (1807) defined the state of knowledge appeared in these several levels as *knowledge of phenomenon*, and called the growing consciousness *natural consciousness*. Thus, the thing has been changed when consciousness altered his or her own knowledge. This change does not mean that just appearance of the thing is changed but the thing is essentially transformed since thing belongs to knowledge.

This discussion could be applied to curriculum studies. Curriculum scholars should acknowledge that it is hard to apprehend a whole picture of curriculum within their own perspective, and that their knowledge of curriculum studies is not absolute but provisional. Curriculum scholars, therefore, have to share a variety of thoughts of curriculum studies. Each perspective cannot be evolved in a vacuum. Rather thoughts influence one another. These processes deepen the depth of curriculum studies and extend the breadth of it. As Byeongseon Kwak (1983) notes, however, most of South Korean curriculum scholars make an error as if each of them sees the whole of curricular phenomena. One of the mechanisms for exploring this fallacy is to compare schools of curriculum thought.

Curriculum scholars have found that by cutting curriculum phenomenon up into hypothetical segments and looking at it theoretically, they can extract meaning from it. They also extract meaning by putting the pieces together again. This is analysis and synthesis. Thus, over time they have divided, subdivided, and classified their experience of reality into categories that they think are reasonable in order to come to terms with, and understand, the fantastic masses of data that impose themselves upon their senses. Roughly, this hypothesizing process has led to the development of these theories we call schools of curriculum thought. Seeing how one orientation

stands in relation to another provides us with some perspective on the current state of curriculum studies.

For example although William A. Reid (2006), William H. Schubert (1986), Herbert M. Kliebard (1986) and Elliot W. Eisner & Elizabeth Vallance (1974) divide schools of curriculum thought differently, their classifications have a lot in common. In addition, some scholars have characterized philosophy of social inquiry relative to categories of Jurgen Habermas as empirical-analytic, hermeneutic, and critical (Kim, 2001; Schubert, 1989, 1986; Giroux, 1980; Pinar, 1978; van Manen, 1977).

Although these scholars' categorizations help to elucidate basic premises of curriculum studies, Yonghwan Lee (1983) spelled out that none of them helps to grasp curriculum theories comprehensively and systematically that in South Korean curriculum studies. Thus, he suggested his own classifications of curriculum studies in South Korea: 1) Tyler-Rationale, 2) theory of analytical philosophy, 3) interpretative paradigm, and 4) autobiographical paradigm, and identified features of each school of curriculum thought. In the same context Byunghee Yoon (2001) also divided curriculum studies in South Korea into five categories: 1) development model approach, 2) logical philosophy approach, 3) policy research approach, 4) education-centered approach, and 5) reconceptualist/post-philosophy approach. Hoojo Hong (2004) describes a 50-years history of Korean curriculum studies with three categories: 1) curriculum development 2) curriculum philosophy, and 3) curriculum sociology, which might translate respectively to (1) empirical-analytic, (2) practical or hermeneutic, and (3) critical theory.

While the above have classified schools of curriculum thought by somewhat speculative inquiry, Hyeongtaek Lim (1992) used a statistical method to analyze the academic activities of South Korean curriculum scholars. He investigated the possibility of forming schools of

curriculum thought in South Korea by selecting 50 influential scholars and 355 books, articles and master's/doctoral theses that the 50 scholars wrote from 1970 to 1992, and by examining the frequency and relationship of mutual citation in their references. Lim concluded that academic activities of curriculum studies in South Korea are being led by two universities (Seoul National University and Kyungpook National University) and a school of curriculum thought known as *curriculum sociology*. In addition, he amplified that there is no paradigmatic difference such as research perspectives and methodological assumptions in these two universities' curriculum studies.

One of reasons why these conclusions are deduced is that he limited the periods from 1970s to 1980s in his study. The 1970s-1980s was an era of analytical philosophy, which is represented by Hongwoo Lee (Seoul National University) and Gyeongseop Lee (Kyungpook National University), and *curriculum sociologists*, and synoptic texts which exemplify eclecticism. It is difficult in the absence of historical perspective to figure out various schools of curriculum thought in this period. Thus, attention must turn back to curriculum studies that evolved prior to 1970s. On the other hand, Byunghye Yoon (1999) notes from a different angle that paradigms of curriculum studies in South Korea cannot be grasped simply:

...among us (curriculum scholars) the fragmental phenomenon of academic dialogue is easily witnessed. Under these circumstances, the contention of various paradigms is difficult to perceive. Only a variety of narrative or discourse is deployed in parallel to certain readers. A forum of debates with distinctively identified schools of curriculum thought is rare. We do not share epistemological structure that makes the difference of the voices different. (p.395)



Actually it is not easy work to differentiate schools of curriculum thought. As Byunghee Yoon pointed out, a lot of curricular discourses show up in the form of monologue not dialogue. In addition to uncritically accepting popular curriculum studies at that time, many curriculum scholars changed their stance, which is a nettlesome problem of deciding which categories are appropriate for them.

Given these points, it is necessary to stretch back to formative year of curriculum studies to identify schools of curriculum thought. A full-fledged discussion of curriculum studies in South Korea as a formal area of inquiry has been started with issues about shortage of teachers, teacher education, and development of textbooks for schooling in the process of liquidating the remnants of the Japanese occupation. Various schools of curriculum thought can be identified by dealing with these issues.

First of all, at that time the republic of Korea confronted a fierce ideological struggle between the politically left and right, and education was no exception. Of course, the U.S.A. Military Government in Korea (hereafter USAMGIK) and the subsequent regimes limited officially left-wing educational activities, however unofficially there were lots of activities and researches led by the left. Thus, it is hard to think that the spirit of the left has been disconnected throughout the history of South Korea. For example, as Hyeongtaek Lim (1992) figured out, *curriculum sociologists*, whose theoretical background is neo-Marxism or critical theory, were starting to emerge again in the 1970s.

The initial right-wings of curriculum studies as well as education have a tendency for pro-America, they strongly absorbed the ideas of the Progressive Movement in the United States, but without its politically radical dimension. Based on this, they formed a school of curriculum thought, which will be called as *curriculum experientialists*.

At a similar time another orientation to curriculum thought was introduced. It has been widely disseminated through the book *Curriculum* by Bummo Chung (1956b). This book as a first synoptic text provides encyclopedic background knowledge about Ralph Tyler's four principles (purposes, learning experience, organization, and evaluation), and represents the position that curriculum should be developed by scientific methods. One group of curriculum scholars to take this position is *advocates of curriculum development*. Finally after the introduction of Jerome Bruner's *The process of Education* (1960), there emerged *curriculum scholars of analytical philosophy*, who have tried to derive purposes and meanings of education from disciplines.

At least four dominant schools of curriculum thought vied for supremacy, even though these occurred at different times. These are convenient categories for studying early curriculum thought as well as for many of the variations that evolved during forty-two years after 1945. More will be described about each in Chapter Three.

### **3. Research Methodology**

This study is intended to contribute to an understanding of the curriculum thought in South Korea. It is historical, because I am convinced that one cannot comprehend nature of educational thought in general and curriculum thought in particular without seeing it in its historical context. "Yet historical awareness cannot be achieved by desire alone. The centralization of literature about curriculum is a necessary prerequisite to knowledge and analysis of its origins" (Schubert, et al., 2002; in the Preface).

The first issue to be considered in this process is to establish criteria for which books are included or excluded. Fundamentally, this study is limited to curriculum books which are

published in South Korea and in Korean language. Reports and books in English as exceptional instances, which devoted entire contents to curriculum matters in South Korea, are included. Master/doctoral theses and research reports are not a part of this study for the difficulty of accessing these materials and the limitation of distribution. In addition, influential curriculum thesis and reports eventually make their way into books. Journal articles of *The Journal of Curriculum Studies* (Korean), which is only entirely dealing with curriculum issues in South Korea, are occasionally included. And some articles of *The Journal of Educational Research* (Korean), which are written about curriculum issues before publishing the first issue of *The Journal of Curriculum Studies* (Korean) in 1974, are also a part of this study. Since many curriculum books are in the form of synoptic texts after Bummo Chung (1956b), it is worthwhile to identify authors' key ideas presented in the synoptic texts from the articles where they were originally published.

Even though the most basic criterion of selecting the citations is determination of which books contributed directly or indirectly to curriculum thought, there is enough room for diverse interpretation. In other words, the curriculum literatures are likely to vary according to researchers. Therefore, more specific sub-criteria are required.

First, "does *curriculum* appear in the title?" If *curriculum* appears in the title, the book is included. However, books with *curriculum* in the title are excluded if they primarily deal with a specialized subject area such as English curriculum, mathematics curriculum, early childhood curriculum, or special education curriculum.

Second, "does the book participate in the discussion of curriculum studies even if it does not have *curriculum* in the title?" In particular, this sub-criterion is necessary to include the Korean version of curriculum books that are originally published in foreign countries. Almost all

curriculum books in South Korea have *curriculum* in the title, but *curriculum* usually does not appear in the translations. Since the impact of the translations to curriculum studies in South Korea cannot be ignored, this specialized criterion was set.

The number of curriculum books and articles selected in accordance with these criteria are shown in the following TABLE I. A feature that vaguely appears in the TABLE I is that a large number of books and articles are produced in the particular year. The character is revealed better when compared to the year of the national curriculum revision. That is, curriculum books and articles, which criticize the old national curricula and introduce the new national curricula, were published intensively around the years of the national curriculum revision. The years of the revision of the national curriculum are as presented in TABLE II.

TABLE I  
APPROXIMATION OF THE NUMBER OF CURRICULIM BOOKS  
PRODUCED BY YEAR AND DECADE

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
1940s							1	3	1	2	7
1950s	-	-	1	3	2	-	4	1	-	-	11
1960s	1	1	1	3	-	-	2	3	6	6	23
1970s	4	2	4	8	7	6	3	7	2	3	46
1980s	6	2	12	14	3	8	3	15			63
Total = 150											

As mentioned earlier, curriculum studies reflect, to some extent, various phases of the times. In particular, one of the most noticeable features in history of curricular reforms in South Korea is that the reforms always followed major changes in the political situation (Lee Yonghwan,

2003). Nevertheless, there are not always direct relationships between a revised national curriculum and curriculum studies. However, curriculum studies in South Korea is not free from the reality of the national curriculum, since the national curriculum is one of major objects of curriculum studies.

TABLE II  
THE PERIOD AND CHARACTER OF NATIONAL CURRICULUM IN SOUTH KOREA

National Curriculum	Period	Character
Transitional Curriculum	1945-1946	Subject-Centered
The Course of Study	1946-1954	Subject-Centered
The First National Curriculum	1954-1963	Subject-Centered
The Second National Curriculum	1963-1973	Student-Centered
The Third National Curriculum	1973-1981	Discipline-centered
The Fourth National Curriculum	1981-1987	Eclectic

[derived from Gyeongseop Lee (1997)]

Therefore, the periods of the national curriculum disclose features of curriculum studies as well as practices in the Republic of Korea. In the period of this study each national curriculum is used as a basic unit for analyzing and interpreting curriculum literature. Based on this, the body of this study is consisted of three parts for each time period designated: 1) general influences of political situations in South Korea to schooling, 2) trends of curriculum studies at that time and discussions of curriculum books and authors, and 3) a bibliography of curriculum literature.

#### **4. Organization of this study**

The issue of universality and particularity in curriculum studies could be connected with globalization and localization that currently are sweeping the world. The trend of globalization must be accompanied with the trend of localization because globalization is related to the degree of universality, whereas localization is involved in distinctiveness. Of course globalization analyzed by the view of curriculum sociology emphasizes perspectives or interests served in globalization, and which is well worth considering.

In this study, however, globalization is restricted to trends of curriculum studies. It does not mean that globalization is equal to Americanization. The fact that curriculum studies as a formal area of inquiry that began in the United States has led to trends of curriculum studies in many parts of the world. Formation of a variety of perspectives derived from scholars in the United States cannot be denied. However it is also acknowledged that curriculum studies in the United States cannot delineate a whole picture of curricular phenomena.

The initial curriculum studies in South Korea were directly and indirectly affected by that of the United States. Directly by several educational missions and indirectly by South Korean curriculum scholars who studied in the United States, curriculum studies and practices are introduced. However contents and directions of curriculum studies in South Korea have gradually diverged from the origins of the United States and Korean scholars have cultivated capabilities to inspect alternative research views, assumptions, concepts, and research methodology in curriculum studies.

Thus, central contents of this study are comprised of the description of which curriculum thought of the eminent scholars in the United States are introduced, how they were developed or

criticized by whom in South Korea, and how South Korean scholars developed new and modified old curriculum ideas.

The following presents a brief history and central contributors to curriculum studies in the United States as well as South Korea. These statements are provided for those who are not familiar with curriculum studies in South Korea and to compare trends of curriculum studies in South Korea with those in the United States.

### **1) Curriculum studies in the United States**

Humans have performed a wide range of activities in order to introduce the young to life. These activities began to be analyzed over time relative to political, economic, social, educational and cultural concepts and activities. Therefore, the same activity could be analyzed in many different ways according to perspectives of researchers or observers.

In particular, educational activities have been a part of human history as ways to deliver the accumulated heritage to posterity. In addition to this, thinking about curriculum is as old as thinking about education. It is hard to imagine any inquiry into the nature of education without paying deliberate attention to the question of what should be taught. For example, Aristotle recognized in his *Politics* the complexity of deciding what to teach:

At present, opinion is divided about the subjects of education. All do not take the same view about what should be learned by the young, either with a view to plain goodness or with a view to the best life possible; nor is opinion clear whether education should be directed mainly to the understanding, or mainly to moral character. If we look at actual practice, the result is sadly confusing; it throws no light on the problem of whether the proper studies to be followed are those which are useful in life, or those which make for

goodness, or those which advance the bounds of knowledge. Each sort of study receives some votes in its favor (Aristotle, 1945, Ernest Barker, Trans. p. 244)

Whatever the historical period or the particular setting, one can see something of the timelessness of Aristotle's questions that have pervaded the study of curriculum. The educational activities or issues, however, were not treated, addressed and analyzed in a formal area of educational inquiry since one did not exist until recently. These questions and educational activities were mainly dealt with in a part of philosophy. That is, Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Locke, Rousseau, Kant, and a host of others offered educational and curricular recommendations as minor parts of their own philosophical systems (see Ulich, 1954). Since their discourses were treated in comprehensive views of life as well as education, they are useful reference works to curriculum studies as well as other sub-fields within the study of education. One of the characters in their philosophical discourses is that concepts of education and curriculum have been extended to whole of life rather than treated as a specialized topic of study. Therefore, in such discourse curriculum is not necessarily related to schooling. Thus, it is difficult to argue that these philosophical works legitimized curriculum studies as a formal area of inquiry. They did, however, identify matters about what is worthwhile to learn as valuable for human beings to address thoughtfully.

Educational considerations began to be perceived as a specialized area of study by scholars such as Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi and Johann Friedrich Herbart, who issued in the era of modern pedagogy has arrived. One of the historical backgrounds of the advent of modern pedagogy in Europe at that time was universal schooling. The introduction of universal schooling changed the scope of education, so education is no longer the exclusive property of the privileged or aristocratic class. As a result, the educational interests, concerns and studies have



expended to all humans and have needed to embrace dramatically increased numbers of students. In addition, the rapid increase of students sparked a whole series of issues of schooling that had gone unforeseen.

First of all, it was becoming problematic as to whether the curriculum that had seemed to serve so successfully in the 19th century would be suitable for the new population of students then marching through the schoolhouse doors. In the older curriculum, it was deemed necessary to ensure the legitimacy of existing educational purposes and contents, and to see curriculum and instruction as mental disciplines conveyed through faculty psychology, wherein the mind was seen as made up of faculties (e.g. reason, intuition) to be improved by exercise.

The criticisms of these theories emerged in earnest in the United States in the early twentieth century. More specifically, the critiques by William James and Edward L. Thorndike through “transfer experiments” and John Dewey’s philosophical criticism opened new horizons of curriculum studies. Since then a history of curriculum studies in the United States unfolded with more criticisms on the existing studies and by presenting new perspectives with more concerns about schooling. In this context, David Hamilton (1990) pointed out the nature of curriculum studies: “curriculum is a central concept in Anglo-Saxon educational studies; and ...curriculum practice is integral to the modern institution of schooling” (p. 3).

During the history of curriculum studies scholars have asked: how to conceptualize the three sources of curriculum: learner, society, and subject matter (discipline)? Different definitions and concepts of each source and the priority of each source in developing curriculum eventually evolved into different patterns of curriculum thought. For instance, what sources should be emphasized in curriculum development? How should education select and organize the educational contents from highlighted sources? What and how should be evaluated? These

considerations lasted until the late 1950s, when an incident occurred that caused curriculum scholars to be excluded in curriculum development. From the Woods Hole Conference in 1959, curriculum specialists rather than curriculum generalists began to develop curriculum. In these situations, there were two paths that curriculum scholars in the United States could take up.

The more recent answer...calls for the university-based specialist to be doing something different, something other than serving the practitioner's need for technical help...One possibility is for them to begin working even more closely with practitioners than they have in the past. Another possibility is for them to bring to bear on educational matters in general the outlooks of scholarly disciplines and political perspectives that heretofore have been overlooked or largely ignored (Jackson, 1992: 21).

Many curriculum scholars in the United States attempted to change the concept of curriculum, and sought to expand it into the journey of life's education. By the 1970s curriculum scholars in the United States, e.g., James B. Macdonald, Dwayne Huebner, Maxine Greene, Lawrence Cremin, and Herbert Kliebard, had criticized curriculum development and reconceptualized various forms of curriculum inquiry (He, 2010). Followed by these predecessors, young scholars such as William Pinar, Madeleine Grumet, Michael Apple, Henry Giroux, and Jean Anyon precipitated a shift from curriculum development to understanding curriculum as historical, political, racial, gender, phenomenological, postmodern, autobiographical, aesthetic, theological, institutionalized, and international texts (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1995). Pinar (1975a) called these trends of curriculum studies "reconceptualization"; they tried to find the curricular meanings in the expanded concept of *currere*, or the lived experience of curriculum.

## **2) Curriculum studies in the Republic of Korea**

Whatever the historical period or the particular setting, as mentioned above, there was always curriculum studies as an informal area of inquiry. The Korean peninsula is no exception. Especially from the period of Three Kingdoms (57BCE – 935 AD) educational institutions existed, and there were discussions about what should be taught and why in the institutions. Even though curriculum was slightly different in each era, the core contents of curriculum consisted of the recitation and interpretation of Confucian classics.

The seven liberal arts composed of the trivium (grammar, logic, and rhetoric) and the quadrivium (geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, and music) since ancient Greece greatly influenced the reality of modern western curriculum and influenced intellectual dimension of Korean education more than the Confucian classics. Confucian classics, however, continued to provide great perspective on philosophical, historical, and ethical education. Confucian educational tradition has provided Koreans indirectly with a reasonable way of thinking, a strong moral sense, and zeal of education by stressing that human being can be fully human only through education (Park Sunyoung, 1991). These traditions can shed light on new aspects of curriculum studies. Actually Sungmo Chang, Hangu Yoo, and Hongwoo Lee (2003), based on neo-Confucianism, attempt to understand curriculum greenly, i.e., through new forms of growth. The educational institutions and the contents taught in the institutions from Three Kingdoms period to Choson period (1392-1897) is depicted in more detail at Chapter Two.

Toward the end of the nineteenth century as a result of the sweeping changes brought about by the intrusion of foreign powers into Korea, the peninsula began to implement the beginnings of a Western-style educational system. After the opening of Korea to international trade and diplomacy in the years following Japan's gunboat-style port opening in 1876, new types of

schools appeared. Starting with the *Wonsan Academy* (Wonsan Haksa) in 1883, wealthy Koreans established privately organized schools offering non-traditional instruction, especially in the major ports. In addition, the Korean government experimented with a number of educational institutions from 1881, attempting to introduce foreign knowledge and technical skill from Japan, United States, and Western Europe.

These educational experiments, however, were overwhelmed by the efforts of the Japanese to organize Korean society to serve their own needs. Of course modern national systems of schooling and curriculum were established during the Japanese colonization, so the curriculum at that time was definitely affiliated to Japan. This period is also a part of Chapter Two.

Curriculum studies in South Korea as a formal area of inquiry appeared after independence in 1945. Since that time the urgent problems of education were to extirpate the remnants of the Japanese and to establish future directions of education. In particular the substitution of Japanese teachers and textbooks was the most exigent issue. Naturally the concerns about curriculum that are closely related to teacher education and selecting and organizing contents of textbooks were increased, and the demands for curriculum scholars occurred. Under these circumstances at least four dominant schools of curriculum thought were competing against each other. I will call them the *curriculum experientialists*, *advocates of curriculum development*, *curriculum scholars of analytical philosophy*, and *curriculum sociologists*. More is said about each in Chapter Three.

Chapter Four introduces and examines the thirty-five books that appeared from 1964 to 1973, and Chapter Five depicts thirty-six books issued in the period of the second national curriculum known as *discipline-centered curriculum*. The books published during the third national curriculum known as the *eclectic curriculum* are examined in Chapter Six.

In the conclusion of this study, I reiterate that South Korea maintains a system of national curriculum. National curriculum development plays a dominant role in curriculum studies as well as practices. Since 1945, the scholars who participated in the development were extremely limited as compared with the government's Ministry of Education. Schools and teachers had little discretion to develop their own curriculum. The authorized and approved textbooks were used in the instruction as the only teaching material. Thus, the concerns of curriculum scholars in South Korea were relegated to understanding and theorizing curricular phenomena, not to developing them. In addition, most of teachers were not interested in curriculum itself. These situations have increased the separation of curriculum theory and practice in South Korea. Finally, after Bummo Chung (1956b) published the synoptic text *Curriculum*, most subsequent curriculum books followed its format. While synoptic texts are useful to mass-produce knowledge and disseminate it, they tend toward uncritical synthesis and simplification of theories and practices in curriculum studies.

## **5. Significance of the Study**

This study depicts the flow of curriculum books published in the Republic of Korea from 1945 to 1987. It is, however, not simply to introduce a chronology of curriculum books by year. Rather this thesis is research about curriculum studies developed in South Korea, the contexts from which it developed, and characteristics within curriculum studies, and categories of different orientations. It is an attempt to map curriculum studies in South Korea.

Therefore, this study is a direct alternative to the problem of ahistoricism. All disciplines should be aware of their histories, including curriculum studies. To critique a history of

formation, change, and development of the field has to be carried out in macroscopic and microscopic views. That is, it is difficult to expect a legitimate criticism by either a position of adherence to specific academic traditions and epistemologies or by merely accepting uncritically mainstream fashion of the present. Educators should not overlook temporality in their critique.

No act or work of human beings is possible with reference only to the past or only to the future, but is always dependent on their interaction. For instance, the future may be considered as the horizon against which plans are made, the past provides the means for their realization, while the present mediates and actualizes both. This interrelation of reciprocal conditions is not a historical process in which the past never assumes a final form nor does the future close its possibility to alternatives of any era.

Within this perspective, a study of a retreat into the past in search of a deeper foundation is one which merits attention. Curriculum studies in Korea has been created not only within a context of educational thought, it also creates a context. More can be understood about the curriculum if the context within which it was constructed is analyzed. Views advanced in this study, thus, could contribute to a fresh perspective regarding curriculum thought in South Korea.

It also allows the Western readers to grasp the Eastern *Weltanschauung*, even though this study cannot totally represent the Eastern perspective, in such a way as to open up a new possibility of interpreting curriculum studies with other systems of thought in other cultures and religious traditions. For instance, Youngchun Kim (2010) described a history of reconceptualization in South Korean curriculum studies from the late 1980s to present in terms of local and regional perspectives. Especially his non-Western narratives of curriculum reconceptualization go beyond the simple narration of intellectual history rather it ushers in a future era of post-Western curriculum studies as bring diverse ethnic and indigenous perspectives

to understanding curriculum internationally. This study also enables curricularists to understand how curriculum studies circulated globally and is re-contextualized locally; i.e., how curriculum studies is reformulated according to local traditions, needs, and aspirations rather than simply applied.

Accordingly, a positive aspect of this study is that it provides the context of interaction between an Eastern writer and Western readers. This is what Hans-Georg Gadamer (1975) calls the “fusion of horizons”. It means that the writer’s horizon and the reader’s horizon are met, fused and expanded. In this way, previous curricular perspectives could be more abundant and deeper than currently realized or proposed for the future.

## **6. Limitations of the Study**

The title of this study sheds light on its own limitations. That is, the dissertation is limited by dealing with curriculum books that are published in South Korea and in Korean language, and by examining those that appeared only from 1945 to 1987. First of all, this study stems from a commitment to describe curriculum studies from new perspective drawn from the Eastern educational history, even though it does not yet represent the widespread view of the Eastern, and because much of the practice of curriculum history in the East (South Korea) is geared to the Western traditions. Thus, the thesis is an attempt to introduce new contexts and variations of curriculum studies that are usually generated in the Western tradition.

Second, curriculum studies in the Republic of Korea are not finished in 1987. Actually after 1987 there have been more curriculum books than introduced in this study. Moreover since 2000 young curriculum scholars who are affected by reconceptualization of curriculum scholarship

have drawn upon an array of sources neglected in curriculum studies, such as: radical psychoanalysis, neo-Marxism, critical theory, phenomenological and hermeneutical studies, and deconstruction. Although they offer new perspectives and orientations, these new forms of curriculum inquiry face strong resistance from mainstream researchers in South Korea who support more positivistic research orientations and mandates of the Ministry of Education. Therefore the depiction of the struggles for curriculum is a desirable basis for understanding recent curriculum studies of South Korea.

While the larger scope of this project will analyze and synthesize curriculum books from 1987 to present, this thesis achieves closure at 1987, when curriculum has become even more fully function of the national government. I think that the curriculum thought introduced in the thesis provides a useful perspective that might increase the vision and range of possibilities of curriculum studies in South Korea.

Finally, this study is an attempt to search for origins of each school of curriculum scholars. The origins run much deeper than the beginning of curriculum studies as a formal inquiry. Indeed, some attention is given to historical and philosophical sources or roots of curriculum studies as an informal inquiry. Such efforts should be continued; thus, my ongoing and future researches will pay more attention to both historical and philosophical sources published before 1945 and to curriculum books from 1987 to present.



**CHAPTER TWO:**  
**A BRIEF HISTORY OF KOREAN EDUCATION AND CURRICULUM**  
**FROM THREE KINGDOMS THROUGH JAPANESE COLONIZATION: 57BCE-1945**

This chapter offers a brief overview of Korean education as well as curriculum from earliest times to Japanese colonization. This history is important not only to complete the picture of educational change but also to understand contemporary educational situations and curriculum studies. Korea's educational past is part of the context of contemporary debates and decisions.

**1. Three Kingdoms Period (57 BCE – 935 AD)**

The religious, cultural, and ideological influences of ancient Korea are dominated by the cosmology of shamanism, present since ancient times, and interactions with China of Buddhism and Confucianism. Shamanism, its mythology and rituals, appears to have given little attention to life hereafter or to previous life, but rather concentrated on the needs and interests of the ongoing life of the people. The gradual introduction of Confucianism and the later introduction of Buddhism in the 4th century brought two powerful and lasting influences on Korean culture. Buddhism and Confucianism have exerted profound impact on social, political and educational institutions throughout ancient and contemporary Korean history.

Confucius, a Chinese sage, is assumed to have lived during the 6th century BC. He and his followers left for posterity several books which came to be regarded as Confucian Classics and over the years volumes of commentary have been added by scholars (see Chan, 1963). Over two thousand years, the purpose of education in Korea was clearly expressed in *The Doctrine of Mean*: “What Heaven imparts to man [sic] is called human nature. To follow our nature is called *The Way*. Cultivation of *The Way* is called education” (Chan, 1963: 98). Education was means of achieving the essential oneness of human being and Heaven. The idea of Confucian cultivation does not stop on an individual level but necessarily involves the individual’s relationship with other human beings and with Heaven (Tu & Ikeda, 2011). That is, self-cultivation is not a set of isolated moral codes; rather it is a continuous process in which no step can be separated from the other.

Thus, Confucian education in Korea was not only an intellectual process; it was also moral cultivation. The interrelationship of the intellectual process and the moral process was an orientation of the Confucian tradition in that the intellectual process of understanding cannot be completed without moral cultivation. The term moral cultivation, however, does not mean simply a certain type of human conduct or behavior. Moral cultivation concerns the inner quality of human being which enables a human to understand oneself and the world around her or him.

Formal education in Korea is usually traced to the Three Kingdoms period when the geographical area roughly encompassing contemporary North Korea and South Korea was controlled by Koguryo (37 BCE-668 AD) in the north, Paekche (18 BCE-661 AD) in the southwest, and Silla (57 BCE-935 AD) in the southeast of the Korean peninsula. The first public educational institute, modeled after Chinese institutions, was created in 372 AD in the Koguryo

period. Sometimes referred to as the National Confucian Academy(태학)<sup>1</sup>, this institution fostered core Confucian ethics.

Although little is known about education undertaking in the Paekche period, several educational institutions developed and prospered under the Silla Kingdom. A training system for young aristocrats was initiated early in Silla's history and eventually developed into *Hwarangdo* (화랑도) a "public semi-official social educational system" (Park Sunyoung, 1991: 13). The teaching of *Hwarando* was grounded in Shamanism, Buddhism, Confucianism, and Taoism, and at various times emphasized such virtues as patriotism, loyalty, filial piety, and martial arts. In *Samguk Sagi* (A history of Three Kingdoms, 1145) Pusik Kim called these characters of Silla as *Pungnyu*(풍류):

The country (Silla) has a way of mystery, *Pungnyu*.... In fact, *Pungnyu* includes the three teachings of Confucianism, Buddhism, and Daoism and transforms peoples in touch with them. Thus, filial piety at home and doing one's utmost for the country are teachings of the Justice Minister in Lu; non verbal teachings with non-coercive action are the essential tenets of libertarians in Zhou; and practicing what is good without committing wrongdoing is a precept of princes in India. (Kim Pusik, 1145; part IV).

The elaboration of the bureaucracy and increased power of the sovereign led to the establishment of the National Confucian College (*Kukhak*: 국학) in 682, an institution modelled after Chinese institutes of higher education. Sunyoung Park(1991) describes the Confucian domination of the curriculum of the *Kukhak* (국학):

---

<sup>1</sup> I will use parenthetical terms from Korean language (한글), especially when the translated equivalent is less than accurate, as exemplified by Ming Fang He (2003) in *A River Forever Flowing: Cross-Cultural Lives and Identities in the Multicultural Landscape*.

Its curriculum, which focused on subjects keyed to the inculcation of loyalty to the monarch and filial piety to parents, was divided into three different courses of study based on elective subjects that varied from philosophy to history and literature. Upon graduation from the college, students underwent a state examination in the Confucian classics and were appointed to public posts according to their grades. It was the first of a long tradition of state examinations for civil service recruits which later came to be known as *Kwago* (과거) (p. 14).

Although in theory the purpose of education in Confucian thought was self-cultivation and for achieving the aim the teaching of Confucian thought emphasized creative, harmonious, associated, joyful, and worthwhile living (He, 2012; Zhao, 2011), however the reality of the Confucian curriculum was characterized by “the inculcation of loyalty to the monarch and filial piety to parents” as Park (1991) indicates above.

## **2. Koryo Period (918 – 1392)**

The Kingdom of Silla was eventually absorbed into Koryo (918-1392), from whose name derives the Western term “Korea”, which further developed many of its institutional structures. Although Confucianism continued to exert strong influence on education, Koryo accepted Buddhism as its official religion. The central teaching of Buddhism was that the misery and frustration of existence are due to attachment and desire, and that release comes from understanding this basic cause of suffering and from taking the necessary measures to become free (Chang, 1991; Phenix, 1961). Therefore the way to emancipation is through detachment, compassion, and love. This is very similar to the topic that the proper goal of education is

conversion from the life of self-serving to the life of devotion (see Buber, 1958 and Fromm, 1976).

On the other hand, an important intellectual development during this period was the evolution of a sophisticated interpretation of Confucianism which stemmed from the thought of the Chinese sage, Chu Hsi (see Chan, 1963). This Neo-Confucianism(성리학) now emerged as the intellectual basis of an opposition movement to Buddhism, for the privileges enjoyed by Buddhist monks were generating resentment throughout Koryo society.

The educational system slowly evolved with several *Hyanggyo*(향교) located in the countryside teaching Chinese classics and history, and private village schools, *Sudang*(서당), which introduced the reading and writing of Chinese ideograph. The *Kukjagam*(국자감), somewhat similar in function to the earlier *Kukhak*(국학), provided advanced education. The *Kukjagam*, however, developed a curriculum which included in addition to Confucian classics such practical studies as calligraphy, accounting, law, and military tactics.

### 3. Choson Period (1392 – 1897)

Choson in 1392 replaced Koryo as General Yi declared himself king initiating the Yi Dynasty (1392-1910). Perhaps the most important intellectual development under the latter stages of the Koryo had been the introduction of Neo-Confucianism(성리학). Historically, Buddhism and Confucianism had existed in relative harmony; however, corruption of some Buddhism monks and subsequent blame placed on Buddhists for their influence in weakening the Koryo courts, led to a military defeat by the Mongols, and generated anti-Buddhist outcries among Confucian officials. Neo-Confucianism professed to have added to the philosophical

depth of Confucianism by further explanation of the good (righteousness, wisdom, and empathy) and the bad (material and ego-centered desires) sides of human nature (see Tu, 1976 and Chan, 1963).

The overall Confucian educational goal was to extend learning and self-cultivation (Tu, & Ikeda, 2011). The ideal man was "saga" (군자) whose wisdom contributed to the guidance of the state; the state itself had a responsibility to educate the people, that is, to lead them in the right direction. Good education was assumed to lead to good government and good government was assumed to guarantee a good society (see Kalton, 1988).

The selection of Confucian scholars was limited to the *Yangban* (양반) or nobility class and the key to acceptance as a scholar was a set of national examinations which were created in the Koryo period and functioned until the latter part of the 19th century. Success in a number of examination hurdles could take a scholar to the final test in the presence of the king. The level of civil service appointment or social status depended ranking on the examinations.

The royal examination system played an important role in the life of Korea from the tenth century until the latter part of the nineteenth century. Achievement in these examinations became the highest individual educational goal for such achievement was not only practically a guarantee for a lifetime official position and a promise of coveted social prestige but also a devout expression of filial piety. The immediate purpose of these literary examinations was to select government officials on the assumed unprejudiced basis of knowledge and scholastic ability. Another purpose for filling vacancies to official positions by means of free competition was to create a continued stimulus to cultural advancement. However neither purposes were fully achieved in Korea. This system had been originally developed to serve the peculiar needs of the Chinese power structure where little nobility existed between the monarch and the people. In

Korea, however, a numerically and politically strong landed gentry which jealously sought to maintain its privileges obstructed the usefulness of these examinations.

The educational system undergirding the examination system was a combination of public and private institutions of various qualities and levels of curriculum. At the top of this loose configuration was *Sunggyungwan*(성균관), the national university. *Sunggyungwan* could trace its origin to 1288 and from this date until Japanese annexation it was considered the highest educational institution in the nation. In 1398 this school settled at its present site in Seoul. More than merely an advanced school, the *Sunggyungwan* was long the educational center of Korea. On its faculty were some of the most distinguished scholars of the nation and in its library was a priceless collection of the finest works of Chinese scholars. Its grounds served as the location for the royal examination. The original purpose of the *Sunggyungwan* was that of "...reorganizing the people's life demoralized by the preponderance of Buddhism in the former dynasty and of training able officials for the administration" (Korean Overseas Information Service, 1979: 659). To accomplish this goal "...it gathered here the best gifted youth of the Chinese classics so that they might acquaint themselves with Confucian moralism and philosophy as a guide for politics and economy" (Korean Overseas Information Service, 1979: 659).

Thus from *Hyanggyo* (향교) or private institute to *Sunggyungwan*(성균관) the scholars traveled along an extremely narrow scholastic path. They studied to understand the ancient Confucian cannon. The epitome of scholarship was the polished essay which typically reflected an attempt to produce a balanced mosaic of classic wisdoms. This process of emulation of a near sacred body of knowledge eventually was to prove inadequate preparation for the changed stirring in the late 19th century when Korea confronted Western institutions and learning.

The 500-years history of Choson was a period in which Confucian roles and precepts were incorporated into the life and institutions of Korean society. Confucian principles became deeply infused into the structure of government, community, family and education. Each person, (i.e., mother, father, daughter, son, teacher, student, official, ruler or subject) had a prescribed role definition in social relationship. The purpose of education was to impart the rules, ceremonies, and moralistic principles associated with each status or rank.

The legacy of pre-modern education was more than just an emphasis on formal learning. In many ways Choson education resembled that of modern South Korea education. Perhaps the most striking point of resemblance is the degree to which both focused on preparing students for competitive examinations. While education was recognized as an end in itself, in practice it was generally seen as a means of social mobility and status selection. As W. H. Schubert (1986) pointed out, “there is an important sense in which the mode of education of any time period caters to the paths that bring success in that era” (p. 58), an idea Schubert drew from Harry Broudy and John Palmer (1965).

Another legacy was the exalted position held by the scholar-teacher. Organized religion was peripheral to Choson society; rather than the temple and the priest, it was the school and the teacher that served as the principal source of ethical counsel. Consequently, the scholar attained an almost sacred status. The learned man was more than a scholar or teacher; he was the moral arbiter of society and source of guidance at the village as well as the state level. Thus, the value placed on learning was extremely high. This is because the central teaching of Confucius in *The Great Learning* was that self-cultivation (or learning) is unending process of self-transcendence and expands the self by integrating family, community, nation, and all humanity (He, 2012; Tu, 2010).



Several other attributes were to remain characteristic of South Korean schooling. The master-disciple relationship of *Suwon*(서원) echoed an ancient cultural pattern that has appeared in modern higher education. The emphasis on rote memorization, moral training, and the notion of schooling as basically a male activity all have continued to shape Korean education. Education in the pre-modern era was also characterized by a disdain for the specialist and for technical training that has prevailed in modern South Korea. Although specialized technical exams existed for certifying doctors, astronomers, interpreters, and other needed professionals, they remained far less prestigious; education was basically of a non-specialized literary nature that has remained the preference of most South Koreans.

#### **4. Early modernization (1897 – 1910)**

The latter part of the 19th century was a period of turmoil and change in the Korean peninsula with strong advocates emerging for the introduction of Western culture and institutions and other Koreans committed to maintaining Korea's isolation and preserving traditional ways. The struggle between the traditionalists and the modernizers was reflected in the mix of Western and Eastern educational philosophic and institutions which competed for attention well into the 20th century. At that time, Confucianism interpreted education as a process of preparing privileged males through study of the approved classics in order to serve an aristocratic society. However, in contrast the impact of Western culture:

...was manifested in the development of the *silhak* (실학) or pragmatic school of learning. Literally *silhak* means a pragmatic learning of politics, economics, history, and natural

sciences, with greater concern for real problems than theoretical metaphysics. By advocating a realistic approach, *silhak* provoked a fresh look at the world and facilitated the shaping of a new national outlook (Korean Overseas Information Service, 1979: 669).

The impact of *Silhak* was largely propagated by a small number of Korean scholars. A few *Yangban*, referred to as the *Kaehwadang* (Enlightenment Party: 개화당), were willing to explore Western studies and even embrace Western institutions. Efforts to reform education, however, were fitful and unsystematic before 1894. New patterns of thought and learning were mainly the result of the activities of the few Koreans who had traveled abroad, especially to Japan, and the efforts of foreign agents, mostly American missionaries, who, starting with the *Paejae* Academy in 1886, began to open schools (Son Insu, 1980).

The two main foreign influences, the Japanese and the American, made their impact felt from the inauguration of Korea's modern era. The Japanese influences during this period were more important. Indeed, most of the reformers in Korean education, as well as in other areas, shared the experience of having spent some time in Japan. Japan became a model for a younger generation of Koreans. Furthermore, by 1894 large numbers of Japanese merchants and adventurers appeared in Korean cities and towns, and in some cases they came with their families and established Japanese schools. Consequently, the Japanese model was not a remote concept but a visible demonstration of what a neighboring society with a partially shared cultural tradition was doing to modernize its educational institutions.

The American influences, while less penetrating, were nonetheless substantial. At first, American missionaries had great difficulties in attracting students to their schools. *Ewha* Academy, which Mary Scranton established in 1886 as a school for girls, for example, initially was able to enroll only a single student, a young prostitute (Son Insu, 1980: 130). Gradually a

few Koreans were attracted to mission schools, many becoming Christians and acting as major agents for educational reform in twentieth-century Korea. A trickle of Koreans also began to make their way to the United States, forming a small intelligentsia with first-hand experience in the American educational system. Among these pioneering students was Syngman Rhee, the future first South Korea president. But before 1945 the U.S. influence on a modern Korean education was modest compared to that of Japan.

There was also a modern Korean educational reform movement, which is different from the influences of Japan and the United States. One of the largest organizations for promoting education was the Korean Self-Strengthening Society (대한자강회), formed in 1905 [renamed the Korean Association (대한협회)]. This and other groups established a number of private schools that attempted to incorporate a modern curriculum. Drawn principally from elements of the *Yangban* class, along with some non-aristocratic members of the business, professional, and religious communities, these individuals displayed considerable eagerness to modernize Korean education.

It is also worth noting that traditional values and attitudes about education remained strong. An examination of textbooks reveals that to some extent which education during this early modernizing period was still rooted in inherited values. Textbook lessons were largely Confucian and ethical in tone and, except for some modern geographical information, were not radically different from traditional didactic works. The quality of paper and illustrations was high, reflecting a customary Korean respect for books and paper making (Hyojae Elementary School, 1987). The *Sudang* also continued to function in villages and urban neighborhoods. One interesting development was the use of mixed script. The indigenous *Hangul* (Korean alphabet:

한글), which had long been held in low esteem, was used along with Chinese characters. The use of the easily mastered Korean alphabet would make acquiring basic literacy easier in the future.

The early experiment in modern education foreshadowed later attempts to find a unique educational system suitable for Korea. The government's modest attempts at modernizing education reflected the weakened condition of the Korean peninsula. These contrasted with the efforts of progress private groups and individuals, who were opening up hundreds of schools that introduced modern science and Western geography, history, culture, and language. Both state and private educational reform programs, however, were overwhelmed by the efforts of the Japanese to colonize Korean society to serve their own needs.

## **5. Japanese Colonization (1910 – 1945)**

Korea's forty-year occupation by Japan, first as a protectorate (1905-1910) and then as a colony under direct rule (1910-1945), is important for understanding Korea's educational development because it was during Japanese rule that a comprehensive, modern national system of education was established.

The Japanese administration influenced South Korea's educational development in a number of ways. Colonial education was well disciplined. Class instruction was based on rote memorization and choral recitation, methods not unfamiliar to Koreans, who had always equated scholarship with strict reference to and quotation from classical texts. New element forced on Koreans were the Japanese concern for ritual performance, neat uniforms, lining up smartly at the morning assembly, and performing student duties, such as maintaining of discipline,

orderliness, and cleanliness. These practices would continue in South Korea, contributing to the regimented and disciplined nature of the nation's schooling.

From the start the Japanese administration of Korean education was characterized by a high degree of centralization, careful planning, and professionalism among teachers and other educational personnel. Educational development was also sequential, which included concentration on basic education followed by a slow growth in the secondary and tertiary levels of schooling.

But the Japanese came as conquerors, outsiders who ruled over an often hostile Korean population in order to carry out policies that they thought beneficial to Japan. To secure their control, they created an elaborate bureaucratic apparatus staffed by tens of thousands of Japanese, a national gendarmerie with substations in almost every village and neighborhood, and a substantial military garrison. The educational system that the colonial authorities created became part of the strong, coercive, and exploitative state structure, and its primary purpose was to serve all the needs of Japan. These often were not the perceived needs of the people they ruled. As a result, a pattern of tension over educational policies evolved between the Korean public and the state controlled by Japanese. Educational politics contributed to a legacy of bitterness from Koreans toward their colonial rulers that remained strong over a half century after it ended.

Two features of colonial educational policy contributed greatly to the anger and frustration that the Korean people felt toward the colonial state and would greatly influence South Korea's educational system. First, under the Japanese, access to education beyond the elementary level was restricted as part of Korea's subordinate status to the Japanese. Colonial planners did not see the need for the most of their peninsular subjects to obtain more than basic literacy and numeracy especially due to the high respect of Koreans for higher education. This restriction on higher

education led to a pent-up demand for educational access that would burst into the open in south of Korea when the Japanese empire collapsed. Second was the use of education to indoctrinate Koreans into being loyal subjects of the Japanese empire and later to assimilate them into Japanese culture. Forced assimilation left a nationalist anger, while the use of education as a political instrument by a powerful centralized state set a pattern that was followed by the future governments of both North Korea and South Korea.

## **CHAPTER THREE:**

### **CURRICULUM LITERATURE AND CONTEXT: 1945-1963**

#### **1. Contextual Reminders**

The intense drive for educational attainment that has characterized South Korean society burst forth in the years immediately after the collapse of the Japanese. The colonial restraints on access were removed, new ideas on education were introduced mainly by Americans and American-educated Koreans, and the basic framework of the educational system was debated. The educational reforms carried out under the three-year American military occupation, 1945-1948, following World War II would help set in motion and shape the course of South Korea's mass drive for educational attainment.

The 1945-1948 periods were also a time of turmoil and rapid change. The surrender of Japan on 15 August 1945 was accompanied by the partition of the Korean nation along the thirty-eight parallel into American and Soviet occupational zones. US forces arrived in the southern zone in September and set up the U.S.A. Military Government in Korea (USAMGIK). Under the supervision of the USAMGIK a separate government in the south organized on 15 August 1948 became the independent Republic of Korea. A rival Democratic People's Republic of Korea was proclaimed in the north on 9 September of that year.

The USAMGIK took over the Japanese Government-General's Bureau of Education, reorganized as the Ministry of Education, and established a seven (later ten) person education committee on 16 September 1945. It then ordered the opening of elementary schools on 19 September and secondary schools on 24 September. In November 1945, the USAMGIK established an educational council, chaired by Chaehong An and made up of ten subcommittees. The educational ideal selected at that time was to foster well-rounded and patriotic citizens of a democratic state based on the Korean national foundation principle of *Hongikingan* (widely benefiting humanity: 홍익인간). At that time, there were those who criticized the use of the mythical “widely benefiting humanity” as something that could not be proven scientifically.

The educational council abolished the various rudimentary and temporary schools set up by the Japanese in rural areas and revised the school system to provide for six years of elementary schooling, six years of secondary schooling, and four years of college education. It also divided middle school into lower and higher middle school of 3 years each, thus following the US 6-3-3-4 system. Near its end, the USAMGIK in December 1948 promulgated a law for the establishment of educational district assemblies intended to promote local educational autonomy. Efforts were also made to cast off the colonial educational methods of repression, uniformity, and instructor and textbook-centered instruction and replaced them with more democratic methods. This achieved only limited success because of difficulties in finding qualified teachers and appropriate educational materials.

Although a new education law was passed on 31 December 1949, its educational principles perpetuated the “widely benefiting humanity”(홍익인간) of the USAMGIK, to which it added the first president Syngman Rhee's, “one people-ism”(한민족주의) as an “ideal of democratic national education”. The USAMGIK also organized the Student National Protection Corps



through which it implemented military training for students at the middle school and higher levels. Although the Rhee regime paid lip service to the ideal of democratic education, concerns were raised by educational scholars that its “one people-ism” was strongly fascist, that it was forcing its ideology on the students and that it was pursuing a centralized educational policy.

At the time of its establishment, the Rhee regime's educational policy was set as “democratic and nationalist education”, “unification of the people's thought”, “anti-Communist spirit” and “a skill for everyone” as it sought to unify the people behind its anti-Communist doctrine. After the outbreak of the Korean War (1950-1953), the regime intensified its anti-Communist education under the name of national defense education. In February 1951, the Rhee regime announced its “special principles for wartime education”, proclaiming its pursuit of moral, technical and national defense education and calling for fostering the belief of certain victory over Communism, clarifying perceptions of the wartime situation and of international collective security, and providing guidance for living in wartime.

The Rhee regime also revised the school system, abolishing the six year middle school and replacing it with a three year middle school and a three year high school in March 1951. This was implemented despite opposition saying that the change would introduce another round of entrance examinations as students sought to advance from middle to high school, that it would cause schools to focus on preparing their students for examinations, and that it would double the financial burden on parents.

In addition, although the education law provided the legal basis for a system of educational autonomy, its implementation was delayed due to the Korean War and it was not until June 1952 that city and district educational committees were established in the area south of the Han River. The district educational committees were established at the county level and were under the

control of provincial governors, the Minister of Education and the Minister of Internal Affairs, and were composed of country chiefs and members selected from the country seat and each township. The superintendents of education, who were district administrations, had to be approved by the provincial governor and the Minister of Education, with final appointments being made by the president. The city educational committees were also made up ten persons chosen by the mayors and the city councils and also had superintendents of education. The provincial educational committees were made up of one person from each district and city educational committee along with three persons appointed by the governor, but real educational authority was in the hands of provincial educational and social bureau chiefs and the educational committees only acted as advisory boards.

Free compulsory elementary school education was called for by the constitution, the 16<sup>th</sup> article of which says “all citizens have equal rights to education and the state shall provide, at a minimum, free compulsory elementary school education”. This, however, was not thoroughly implemented and continuing policy efforts were made to achieve that goal. Budgets for education in South Korea soared to 15.2% of the total and the share of the Ministry of Education budget allocated to free compulsory education had reached 80.9% (Son Insu, 1980).

The school population had also increased greatly. The number of elementary schools expanded by 62.3% from 2,834 in 1945 to 4,602 in 1960, whereas the number of students increased 260% from 1,366,024 to 3,597,627. During the same period, the number of schools increased eleven-fold from 97 to 1,053. The number of high schools, including both liberal arts and vocational schools, nearly tripled from 224 in 1945 to 640 in 1960, while the number of high school students grew 310% from 84,363 to 263,563. The number of colleges and universities

expanded 330% from 19 to 63 and the number of college students increased twelve-fold from 7,819 to 97,819 (Son Insu, 1980).

The factors behind the rapid growth in the school population include the explosion of pent-up demand from the colonial period, the post liberation implementation of open educational policies to meet the demand, the growth in the school-age population, the demise of the old colonial era view that college education was only for the ruling class and the bourgeoisie, deferment of military service for students during and after the Korean War, and difficulty in finding employment, especially for those with only elementary, middle school and high school educations. However, the rate of growth in the number of students far exceeded the rate of growth in the number of schools. The consequence was a decline in the quality of education, particularly in higher education.

## **2. The characteristics of four schools of curriculum thought.**

The most striking feature at this period was the enormous expansion of schooling. The portal of learning opened wide at all levels. The percentage of children attending primary school may have doubled, from less than 40 percent to more than 70 percent. Secondary education expanded at an even more explosive rate. Only a privileged few received a secondary education before 1945. Within two years, the number of secondary schools grew from 62 to over 250, and total enrollment increased six times. The literacy rate rose from an estimated 20 percent for women and 25 percent for men to an official combined rate of 71 percent by the end of 1947 (Adams, 1960).

This achievement is even more striking since there was a severe shortage of teachers and textbooks. Providing enough teachers to cope with an enlarged education system on this scale would have been an enormous problem in any case, but the shortage of teachers was further aggravated by the fact that almost 40 percent of the 13,782 elementary teachers in Korea before 1945 were Japanese and had to be replaced (Son Insu, 1980). In addition to this, most of the existing books were in Japanese, so they had to be replaced. Textbooks had to be translated, a suitable national history had to be determined, and texts that would teach democratic values had to be written.

These pervasive problems coupled with the great increase in a number of students created huge challenges for schooling. Thus, debates directly related to curriculum about purposes for South Korean education, principles for developing learning experiences that enable attainment of the purposes, and disputes over provision of sources and procedures for teacher education were very active and heated. Even though these considerations were dealt with in the somewhat comprehensive view of education, they prepared paths for the emergence of a specialized area within education, known as curriculum studies.

As was noted in the Introduction, these initial debates about education were differentiated into distinct schools of curriculum thought advocating distinct educational positions. At least four distinctive schools of curriculum thought appeared from 1945 to 1987 in South Korea; *curriculum experientialists*, *advocates of curriculum development*, *curriculum scholars of analytical philosophy*, and *curriculum sociologists*.

First of all, there were two groups who were leading education reformation after independence in 1945. One was left-wing and the other right-wing in political ideology. With the surrender of Japan on 15 August 1945, a network of popular committees sprang up. Within a few

weeks People's Committees (인민위원회) were formed in every province and in over half of South Korea's 115 counties, and even a Korean People's Republic (한국인민공화국) had been declared in Seoul. Though these self-proclaimed organs of government contained people of diverse backgrounds, Communists and leftists who were suspected of being pro-Communist played a major, if not a leading, role in them. Therefore, the USAMGIK and Rhee's administration excluded and oppressed the leftists, and they were left with no powerful chance at influencing Korean education.

However, just when the Japanese colonization was defeated, the leftist educational movement became very active. They criticized the education of the Japanese for being the typical model of distorted capitalist education. They insisted on a new kind of education capable of overcoming the inconsistencies of capitalist education. They called it “labor education for the new intelligentsia”. “New intelligentsia” meant people who were both laborers and capitalists. Labor education for the new intelligentsia was believed to have the potential to allow people to participate in the productive processes with knowledge by which people could acquire insight into the society. It was a form which connected mental labor with the physical. It meant not just a career education but one which could develop ability to be adapted to society with free speculation. However, though their assertion was very ideal, they were not able to put it into practice continually because the USAMGIK considered them as an enemy to be defeated. Thus the ideas and practices in education as well as curriculum studies soon diminished and nearly disappeared. Their thought, however, was not discontinued completely. Their thought was resurrected with a discussion about “*hidden curriculum*” in 1970s. Scholars who shared premises that schools reproduce the structure of society by providing knowledge and experience differently (hidden curriculum) to students of different social-economic classes, eventually

formed a school of thought known as *curriculum sociology*. More detailed features of them will be explained in Chapter Five.

Another leading group was right wing and it consisted of *liberalists* which later developed into the aforementioned *curriculum experientialists*. The liberalists started a movement for reforming “old education”, which was called as “New Education Movement” (hereafter NEM). Among its leaders were Chunsuk O and Chaecheon Yoon, who had actively promoted progressive educational reforms during the USAMGIK. In *An introduction of New Education* (1946) Chaecheon Yoon, the headmaster of Hyojae elementary school, introduced the concept democracy and emphasized democratic education that is closely related to progressive movement in the United States. Also he attempted to explain the “Project Method” derived from William H. Kilpatrick (1918), protégé of John Dewey for writing a teaching plan. Chunsuk O also tried to introduce John Dewey’s democratic educational theory at the “Summer Vacation Educational Leader Institute” sponsored by the Ministry of Education, and published the book *The Construction of Democratic Education* (1947) based on the contents of the lecture. This was the first book explaining the theoretical aspects of the NEM. The next year, he (1947) translated the John Dewey’s book *Democratic and Education* (1916).

In addition, the views of the NEM were disseminated in several ways through *Saekyoyuk* (*New Education*), the main journal of education in 1948; in workshops for teachers; and in pamphlets, textbooks, and newspaper articles. The leaders of the NEM felt that they were introducing a truly new education with its ideas of child-centered instruction and individualistic learning. They were concerned with both classroom instruction and democratizing society, and thought that there was a direct link between the structure of school and society. In virtually all

articles published in *Saekyoyuk* about education linked the principles or methods that were being discussed with the construction of a democratic society.

There were a few fundamental conditions that made their endeavors possible. First, the primary schools that led the NEM possessed almost an unlimited power when it came to deciding the curriculum. In other words, the national control over education as well as curriculum was very weak at this time because national power was held by USAMGIK. Second, the teachers in those schools embraced democratic thoughts of education allowing them strong discretion to develop their own curriculum. Third, there were leaders who owned strong leadership abilities providing them competence when leading the other teachers within these schools because at that time many teachers did not have enough educational theories and practices. They were the masters of the schools who were firmly influenced by the belief that the schools should only be reformed by the NEM. Owing to these prior conditions, they were able to make progress in the curriculum within the primary schools. The teachers in these primary schools reformed various projects of schooling for their children and developed new curricula that could best serve the children's interests and activities.

In these processes the NEM introduced and promoted the activities that encouraged the active participation of the children during class thereby acquiring learning through experience and interest. Such activities differed markedly from the method of instruction exercised during the Japanese colonial period. This reform, while influenced by the United States, was neither an invention nor a complete acceptance of a system originating from the United States, because it also was a result of endeavors of Korean teachers to reform methods of education which remained as result of the Japanese colonial rule.

While it is clear that the American ideas of progressive education had taken firm root in South Korean pedagogical thought, there was a significant difference in educational philosophy between the Korean advocates of progressive education and their American counterparts. South Korean educators were almost uniformly concerned with the moral component of education. Kiyong Chu (1949) wrote that "child-centered" education was only one of the two basic principles of the NEM; the other was "moral-centered" education. Education must teach democratic values and pragmatic problem solving, but it must also have a moral or ethical basic. The teacher must be an exemplar of moral rectitude, and students must be encouraged to develop their ethical consciousness. A democratic education and a democratic society must be rooted in ethical principles. Chu's position is representative of many Korean educators; new and exciting ideas of education are juxtaposed to more traditional concepts of education as a process of moral cultivation. A progressive concern for the individual is paralleled by the Confucian's aim of personal ethical cultivation.

The initial NEM focused on elementary schools, and concentrated in improving teaching methods rather than developing curriculum. Naeun Sung, however, initially started the discussion about curriculum by publishing the article, *Subject Integration and New Teaching Methods* (1947), of how is the subject-integration developed with new teaching or instructional methods, for example, project method, problem-solving method, and Henry Morrison's (1926) unit method. Moreover, Naeun Sung referred to J. Minor Gwynn's (1943) *Curriculum Principles and Social Trends*. His article also introduced J. Murray Lee and Doris May Lee's (1940) *The Child and His Curriculum* that proposed curriculum for elementary education from perspectives of Morrison and Kilpatrick, which was translated in 1954, 1956, and 1957.



In his book *An Outline of New Education* (1949), Naeun Sung started to criticize the trends of the NEM at that time in that the NEM had a tendency to accept uncritically the ideas of progressive movement in the United States after independence in 1945. He pointed out features of the NEM as follows: 1) promotes work-oriented education, 2) emancipates students from teachers, 3) is overly child-centered education, 4) insists on the useless of curriculum, 5) perpetrates on a groundless argument, and 6) goes not prepare well for secondary education. In this book, he defined curriculum not as a course of study, which was common idea at that time, but as the process of reorganization of experience.

The NEM gradually formed a school of curriculum thought, which will be called as *curriculum experientialism*. The thought was strongly influenced by John Dewey and other experientialists in the United States. Some of features of experientialist in the United States are to encourage a curriculum that holds the child's nature to be the most basic foundation for developing curriculum, and then to emphasize the need for studying child scientifically (see Schubert, 1986, and Schubert, et al., 2002). Even though experientialists in South Korea share the conviction that the powerful source for developing curriculum is the child's nature, they use different methods, conducted more in philosophical inquiry than in science.

Another school of curriculum thought which appears in 1950's is *advocates of curriculum development* represented by Bummo Chung. He, as an advisee of Benjamin Bloom, majored in educational psychology at University of Chicago from 1950 to 1952. Chung published a series of books, *A Statistical Method* (1956a), *Curriculum* (1956b), and *Principles of Educational Evaluation* (1958). These books had a profound impact on the fields of curriculum and educational evaluation.

The framework of Chung's book, *Curriculum* (1956b), follows *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (1949) by Ralph Tyler. Perhaps, this was inevitable. Chung's mentor was Benjamin Bloom, and Bloom's mentor was Tyler, all studying at the University of Chicago for their Ph.D. degrees. The institution of doctoral study often has significant impact on and the directions of subsequent scholarship. Based on Tyler's book, referred to as the *Tyler Rationale*, he tried to embrace many of the central questions and categories of curriculum studies at once, so the book served as a compendium for curricular inquiry. He treated the followings as major topics: what is education, the sources for educational purposes (discipline, learner, and society), curriculum organization (purpose, selecting and organization of contents, guiding learning) and evaluation and touched on curricular theories (the subject-centered curriculum, the life-centered curriculum, and the core curriculum).

According to Pahljoong Yoon (1975), Chung's book provided South Korean curriculum scholars with many U.S. curriculum sources. The reference list in Chung's book included 102 books which were all published in the United States. Among the 102, Chung mainly referred to the following: *Fundamentals of Curriculum Development* by B. Othanel Smith, William O. Stanley, and J. Harlan Shores (1950); *Curriculum Development* by Hollis L. Caswell and Doak S. Campbell (1935); and *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* by Ralph Tyler (1949).

While books and articles, which is related to curriculum studies and appeared before this book, limited the distribution, it produced for college textbook had a great ripple effect. For a long time, Bummo Chung's definition of education was taught in colleges as the one and only definition: "education is deliberate change of human behavior" (p. 15). For him, education was regarded as the means to an end imposed externally, and nobody seriously raised questions about this. Moreover, Benjamin Bloom's *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* (1956) and Robert F.

Mager's (1962) concept of behavior objectives, along with behavior psychology were introduced and enjoyed general popularity among teachers and educators who favored an efficiency-based nature.

Two important elements which consist of this school of thought are the notions of identification of purposes and regulation of means for achieving the aims. That is, purposes and objectives of curriculum have to be stated in the form of measurable goals and outcomes. Thus, many educational purposes and objectives are selected based on whether they can be measured. Thus, the aims that cannot be measured are ruled out. This school of thought was widely adopted by administrative approach of the Ministry of Education.

The last school of curriculum thought which appears in 1970s is *curriculum of analytical philosophy*. Gyeongseop Lee, who studied at the University of Tokyo in Japan, introduced discipline-centered curriculum by referring to *The Process of Education* (1960) by Jerome Bruner in his article *Discipline in the Curriculum Theory: On the Structure of Discipline* (Lee, 1968). A series of curriculum scholars began to pay attention to this new theory. In these contexts, Hongwoo Lee (1974) criticized the Tyler Rationale in that it neglects the value of education from the perspective of the preeminent value of disciplines in the first issue of *The Journal of Curriculum Studies* (Korean).

For Lee, the aim of education is simple. It is to help development of student through learning. The development of student means the development of a rational mind. Developing a rational mind is not possible with only knowledge, but knowledge is essential. In addition for Lee, disciplines were correct because they sought to discover the essential character of human nature. Thus, the value of discipline does not exist on the outside, but it is intrinsic within the discipline. Lee supported the theory of mental disciplines, and insisted that the demise of mental

disciplines was caused by the argument that the value of discipline had to be relevant to contemporary social needs.

Even though this school of curriculum thought was triggered by the Bruner's book, its ideas were considerably influenced by *Ethics and Education* by Richard S. Peters (1966) and *The logic of Education* by Paul H. Hirst and R. S. Peters (1970). One of the reasons is that in contrast to the theory of Bruner, these two books in the United Kingdom were linked more with philosophy and less with institutional practice. In the United Kingdom the function of curriculum theory was the function of philosophy, and within philosophy the tradition known as concept analysis (Lawton, Gordon, Ing, Gibby, Pring & Moore, 1978). These trends are very similar to curriculum studies in South Korea because, as mentioned in Chapter Two, the legacy of Confucian thought, which emphasizes theory, philosophy and ethics, was already engrained strongly in curriculum studies.

Actually the impact of Peters' book on curriculum studies in South Korea is almost equal to Tyler's book. The initial discussions in curriculum of analytical philosophy were mainly based on *Ethics and Education*, which was finally translated by Hongwoo Lee in 1980. Curriculum scholars of analytic philosophy also refer to Harry Broudy's (1961) and Philip Phenix's (1964) theories that curriculum should be developed according to the essence of knowledge. Therefore, curriculum scholars of this school of thought called for one curriculum without electives for all students. They argued for the elimination of vocational education.

At least four distinctive schools of curriculum thought emerged before 1987, in the periods of 1945-1963 there were two schools of thought of curriculum studies: of course, in this period the foundation was laid for *curriculum sociologists*, although they could not do any activities officially. Changing versions of each orientation or school of thought are discussed through the remainder of this study.

### 3. Curriculum thought and literature

This period of curriculum studies in South Korea was directly or indirectly influenced by the progressive movement in the United States. First of all the USAMGIK established a Teacher Training Center for introducing democratic educational theory and practice, and educated about 560 teachers from August, 3 to September, 24, 1948 during fifty-three days. In addition five times educational missions were dispatched to South Korea, and a curriculum expert was invited.

More specifically, there was Educational Planning Mission to Korea by United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency in 1952. Its mission was to investigate the education of the whole country. The second to forth educational missions were first, second, and third American Education Teams. The first and second American Education Teams came in order to carry out pre-service and in-service teacher training programs.

The mission of the third American Education Team was to give advice on establishing a decree of the national curriculum and created the *Curriculum Handbook for the Schools of Korea for Korean educators* (1956a). In 1969 Harry S. Broudy, working as an advisor of the field of curriculum for the “Long-Range Educational Planning”, which was initiated by South Korean government, submitted the *Comments and Recommendations for Curriculum and Instruction* as an interim report (see Chapter Four). Perhaps, one of the reasons of inviting him from the Minister of Education was that his book, *Building a Philosophy of Education* (1961), was translated in 1963 and introduced widely his thought about education as well as curriculum. And finally in 1971, a research and development team from Florida State University was invited to South Korea to propose an innovative instructional system for South Korean schools.

With respect to the intents of this study, two reports related to curriculum studies in the Republic of Korea will be introduced and analyzed. First, the report, *Curriculum Handbook for the Schools of Korea for Korean educators* (1956a) by the third American Education Team was significant at that time however it was soon forgotten in the field of curriculum studies. This was the first book from the US that dealt with curriculum issues entirely related to the educational situations of South Korea. The contents of it are organized as follows: 1) the principles of curriculum, 2) the practices of establishing objectives, selecting contents, organizing teaching plan, and evaluation of curriculum, and 3) the recommendations for each subject curriculum of schools. Its basic ideas based on progressive movement appear clearly in the principles for developing curriculum. It explains the principles that should be pursued in democratic education of the Republic of Korea as follows: 1) learning to respect the dignity and worth of each individual, 2) the cultivation of personal fulfillment, 3) the cultivation of personal responsibility, 4) the cultivation of respecting labor, and 5) the cultivation of social function. Even though these basic principles of progressive movement are closely related to Confucian thought (He, 2012), in order to achieve these aims experience-centered curriculum was suggested along with the belief that it is more excellent means for curriculum than the subject-centered curriculum.

Later, Jongseo Kim and Hongwoo Lee (1980), however, judge the meaning of the report as follows: “it is true that the mission observed the reality of education in the South Korea and the results were well contained in it. But the observation is not for understanding the reality of South Korean education but for stressing the need for experience-centered curriculum” (p. 87).

Simultaneously, the Central Education Research Institute (CERI) also contributed largely to the introduction of curriculum studies in the United States. From 1954 to 1957 during 4 years,

the institute translated 14 books that deal with curriculum and other sub-fields within education.

The lists of books are;

1. Kilpatrick, W. H. (1940). *Group education for a democracy*. New York: Association Press
2. Olsen, E. G., Aldrich, J. C., Brunner, E. S., and Clark, L. M. (1945). *School and community: The philosophy, procedures, and problems of community study and service through schools and colleges*. New York: Prentice-Hall
3. Educational Policies Commission. (1946). *Policies for education in American democracy*. Washington, D. C.: NEA
4. Educational Policies Commission. (1948). *Education for all American children*. Washington, D. C.: NEA.
5. NEA/ASCD. (1949). *Toward better teaching*. Washington, D. C.: NEA
6. Association for Childhood Education International. (1950). *Helping children live and learn*. Washington, D. C.: ACEI
7. Lee, J. M., & Lee, D. M. (1950). *The Child and His Curriculum* (2ed.). New York: Applenton-Century-Crofts.
8. Wiles, K. (1950). *Supervision for better schools*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
9. Sandiago City Schools & NEA. (1951). *Moral and spiritual value in the public school*. Washington, D. C.: NEA.
10. Sheviakov, G. V., & Redl, F. (1951). *Discipline for today's children and youth*. Washington, D. C.: NEA
11. Association for Childhood Education International. (1952). *Helping children live and learn* (2ed.). Washington, D. C.: ACEI
12. Educational Policies Commission. (1954). *Strengthening community life: Schools can help*. Washington, D. C.: NEA
13. Benjamin, H. R. (1955). *Building a national system of education* (The contents consist of his speeches in South Korea)
14. American Education Team. (1956). *Curriculum handbook for the schools of Korea*. Seoul: CERI.

The publications of Korean translations at the CERI helped to introduce and improve curriculum and other issues of schooling because there were few translation projects among South Korean scholars at that time. At this time there were other efforts to introduce curriculum theory and practice from the books that appeared in Japan. *New Education Movement: The History and Construction of Curriculum* (1951) which dealt with the processes of historical development of curriculum studies in the United States, *New Curriculum Theory* (Hirooka, 1950) that introduced the theory and practice of experience-centered curriculum were also translated (Hong Woongsun, 1973a).

Along with these efforts that directly introduced curriculum studies of the United States and Japan, South Korean scholars began to diagnose progressive curriculum theory. Sungtae Kim broadcasted “*Curriculum Course*” at Radio School sponsored by the Ministry of Education in 1952. In this program, he explained that the domains of curriculum studies are comprised of 1) theoretical inquiry of curriculum, 2) historical inquiry of curriculum, 3) technical research of curriculum construction, and 4) comparative study of curriculum practices. Kim combined theory and practice into a series of steps to be followed by curriculum makers. Kim, just like Naeun Sung (1949), defined curriculum not as a course of study but as the process of reorganizing experience. For him, curriculum is the realms of experience thus curriculum as well as experience should be understood, developed, and synthesized. Even though Kim introduced core curriculum which was experimented in the Eight Year Study (1933-1941), he had recognized that there were a lot of difficult problems in applying core curriculum to South Korean educational situation, citing L. Thomas Hopkins’s (1929) view that most of the schools will adopt the intermediate type, when the subject-centered curriculum and the experience-centered curriculum are regarded as both poles of education.



Byoungchil Choi (1953) also published *The Constructive Method of Curriculum* at the Radio School. In the program he acknowledged the forms of traditional subject matters but argued that the contents of subject matters have to be determined and substituted by the thought of *curriculum experientialism*. He proposed four principles for constructing curriculum; 1) curriculum should be a reconstruction of the national society, 2) specific characteristics of the educated human and the way of bringing up the human should be displayed, 3) the process of personality development of students and the important features should be considered, and 4) the contents should be an appropriate and necessary minimum amount. These suggestions are exactly applied to the basic applications of the first national curriculum.

In 1956 an idea that opposed the thought of *curriculum experientialism* appeared, and was introduced, distributed and solidified by Bummo Chung. In *Curriculum* (1956b) Chung daringly appraised that the movement of curriculum until this time withered away and had no fruit as a result, because there was a mistake in our way of thinking about curriculum development. Thus, his book included reflection upon a mistake and attempts to revise curriculum thinking. For certain, most of curriculum literature written during this period was philosophical discussions. In other words the literature mainly focused on theorizing curricular phenomena, not on developing curriculum. Chung tried to take the philosophical inquiry down from curriculum studies as well as education. For him, curriculum has to be studied not by philosophical method but by scientific method. It does not, however, mean that he entirely ignored the value of philosophy. Chung just asserted that philosophy and science were different modes of thinking.

In this context, he defined education as a deliberate change of human behavior, and pointed out that the central concepts of education are behavior, change, and value. When thinking like

this, the basic factors of curriculum are 1) student, 2) community, 3) subject matter as social and cultural heritage, 4) philosophy for life, society and education, and 5) learning psychology.

For Chung, the purposes of education are to satisfy these five factors, and the fundamental mean for achieving the aims is curriculum examined by scientific inquiry. In addition to this, he thought that the purposes of education cannot be determined by educational or curriculum scholars, they are just given. Thus the roles of curriculum scholars are to control the means for achieving the given purposes.

With respect to perspectives of curriculum, he contended that “the way of thinking about curriculum will be different according to whether curriculum is regarded as a course of study or as experience” (p.61). He pointed out that curriculum is the whole experience of students under the guidance of schooling, and the perspectives of curriculum affect an approach to the issues of curriculum. His meaning of experience, however, is different from that of *curriculum experientialists*.

For him, experience was measurable “behavior” that should be examined by scientific research model. Before introducing the theories of B. S. Bloom (1956), R. F. Mager (1962), and R. G. Gagne (1967) by him and his disciples, and before his position was separated from *curriculum experientialists*, his book was widely quoted by *curriculum experientialists*.

Four years later, the second curriculum book appeared by Chongkyu Ham, Youngdeok Lee, Hokwon Kim, Nansu Kim, and Jungkyu Hwang (1960). Like the book of Bummo Chung, not only did this text provide an encyclopedic background on the curriculum studies, the authors added a new dimension that becomes mainstays of curriculum literature over the next forty years. This book examined the first national curriculum of elementary and secondary schools from the perspective of experientialism. National curriculum was to become the object of curriculum

studies and a part of texts that taught about curriculum studies. That is, the contents of most subsequent synoptic texts that appeared after two key books were composed by Chung (1956b) and Chongkyu Ham, et al., (1960). Chung (1956b) and Ham, et al., (1960) offered perspectives on national curriculum in their era by providing foundations of curriculum, principles of curriculum construction based on the Tyler Rationale, types of curriculum, and features and history of national curriculum.

Except for Bummo Chung's book, all books appeared in this period were affected by school of *curriculum experientialism*. For example, Chongkyu Ham, Youngdeok Lee, Hokwon Kim, Nansu Kim, and Jungkyu Hwang (1960), Kyuhwan Lee (1961), Chongkyu Ham (1962), Bongsoo Kim, Sikjoong Kim, Yongjin Cho, and Chungkyu Hwang (1963) defined curriculum as experience, and compared or contrasted experience-centered curriculum with subject-centered curriculum; experience-centered curriculum is more recent than subject-centered curriculum, and curriculum has been developed toward experience-centered curriculum.

Today, Dewey's idea of "education is life" becomes influential in the field of curriculum studies...Dewey contended that education is endless re-construction of experience, and this proposition suggests the inevitability of the experience-centered curriculum...Necessarily, in the new curriculum the shift from the subject-centered curriculum to the experience-centered curriculum is requested and actually it is (Ham Chongkyu, 1962: 94).

In addition, Chongkyu Ham (1962) insisted that "new curriculum should be the activities or the totality of experience that is pursued by the learner him/herself" (p. 37). He incisively criticized subject-centered curriculum from his experientialist perspective with ample citing of

*Reorganizing the High School Curriculum* by Harold Alberty (1947), and enumerated the features of experience-centered curriculum and a “resource unit”.

Yonggi Kim (1963) tried to explain the relationship of curriculum studies to the educational institutes, so he turned his attention back to the ancient world of the Eastern and Western. In this book he examined the curriculum of Three Kingdoms of Korea as well as ancient China. With respect to the Western, he traced curriculum thought back to ancient Greece, the Middle ages as well as Comenius, Locke, and Herbert Spencer. His description about the history of curriculum, however, is more similar to history of education. It was the first attempt in South Korea to understand curriculum from the historical perspective. He used the term “modern” in the title for distinguishing modern curriculum studies from pre-modern ones that he examined in the book.

The features of this period are that most curriculum books attempted to understand curriculum from the philosophy of John Dewey. Even though John Dewey combined the process of philosophy with that of science for the ways of deliberation of problem-solving, South Korean scholars’ concerns mainly focused on theoretical aspects of curriculum studies and disregarded the science. This is because at that time in education as well as in other academic fields the conditions for performing scientific experiments were insufficient, the legacy of Confucian that emphasizes theoretical inquiry has remained, and the control of government over curriculum has limited a variety of experiments about curriculum.

#### 4. Bibliography of Curriculum Books 1945-1963

##### 1946

Yoon Chaecheon (1946). *An introduction of new education*. Seoul: Chosonkyoyukyeonguhoe.

##### 1947

Lee Sangsun (1947). *Comprehensive education and unit instruction*. Seoul: Dongjisa.

O Chunsuk (1947). *Construction of democratic education*. Seoul: Gukjemunhwakonghoe.

Sung Naeun (1947). Subject integration and new teaching methods. *Choson Education*, 1(7), 23-25.

##### 1948

Dewey, J. (1948). *Democracy and Education* (O Chunsuk, Trans.) Seoul: Gukjemunhwakonghoe.

##### 1949

Chu Kiyong (1949). Educational reconstruction. *Saekyoyuk*, 2(2), 26-30.

Sung Naeun (1949). *An outline of new education*. Seoul: Hongjisa.

##### 1952

Kim Sungtae (1952). Curriculum course. *Radio School*, 2, 212-225.

##### 1953

Choi Byoungchil (1953). The Constructive Method of Curriculum. *Radio School*, 3, 231-237.

Educational Council (Ed., & Trans.). (1953). *New education movement: The history and construction of curriculum*. Seoul: Hakwoosa.

Hirooka, R. (1953). *New curriculum theory* (Kwangjoo Teacher's College, Trans.). Chonnam: Kwangjoo Teacher's College.

##### 1954

Kilpatrick, W. H. (1954). *Group education for a democracy* (Sung Naeun, Trans.). Seoul: CERI.

Lee, J. M., & Lee, D. M. (1954). *The child and his curriculum: I* (Seo Uidon, Trans.). Seoul: CERI.

**1956**

American Education Team (1956a). *Curriculum handbook for the schools of Korea*. Seoul: CERI.

American Education Team (1956b). *Curriculum handbook for the schools of Korea* (Seo Myeongwon, Trans.). Seoul: CERI.

Chung Bummo (1956). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Pungmanhakwon.

Lee, J. M., & Lee, D. M. (1956). *The child and his curriculum: II* (Seo Uidon, Trans.). Seoul: CERI.

**1957**

Lee, J. M., & Lee, D. M. (1957). *The child and his curriculum: III* (Seo Uidon, Trans.). Seoul: CERI.

**1960**

Ham Chongkyu, Lee Youngdeok, Kim Hokwon, Kim Nansu, & Hwang Jungkyu (1960). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Hyeondaekyoyukchongseo.

**1961**

Lee Kyuhwan (1961). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Saegwulsa.

**1962**

Ham Chongkyu (1962). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Changdongmunhwasa.

**1963**

Broudy, H. S. (1963). *Building a philosophy of education* (Lee Ingi & Seo Myeongwon, Trans.). Seoul: Eulseomunhwasa.

Kim Bongsoo, Kim Sikjoong, Cho Yongjin, & Hwang Chungkyu (1963). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Kyowoosa.

Kim Yonggi (1963). *Modern curriculum*. Seoul: Hapdong.

## **CHAPTER FOUR:**

### **CURRICULUM LITERATURE AND CONTEXT: 1964-1973**

#### **1. Contextual Reminders**

In 1960 the authoritative President S. Rhee, who had been in power from 1948, resigned and took refuge in Hawaii after a series of student protests against rigged elections. However, even before various democratic measures of the new government were implemented, the government was overthrown in 1961 by a military coup d'état. The educational principles and the national curriculum of the nearly twenty-year long Chunghee Park regime are authorized by the National Charter of Education(국민교육헌장, hereafter NCE) promulgated on 5 December 1968. The NCE is replete with such term as “pioneering spirits”, “co-operative spirit”, “shared prosperity of humankind”, “public profit and order”, “the future of the reunified fatherland”, and “development of capabilities”.

The NCE, which was drafted by Park, who had received a normal school education under the Japanese and other Japanese-trained scholars, was reminiscent of the Imperial Prescript on Education of militarist Japan and was criticized for its excessive emphasis on the nation. The NCE brought the intensification of Park's autonomy education, security system education, and

New Village Movement's(새마을운동) education for collaboration between industry and academia.

Park's autonomy education was based on two goals. One was the liquidation of the vestiges of Japanese colonial rule and the other was establishing the legitimacy of the Park regime in the confrontation between North Korea and South Korea. Thus, the regime pushed its idea of “history with nationality”, established a committee for strengthening education in Korean history in 1972, and required that all history textbooks be approved by the government in 1973. The regime also strengthened its national ethics education based on anti-Communism and morality, an aspect that it emphasized even more after the declaration of the *Yushin* system.

The Park regime reorganized the Student National Protection Corps that had been dissolved after April, 19, 1960 in order to implement military education. In the early 1970s the regime proclaimed a national emergency at the time of the south-north Red Cross talks in order to deal with the movement for academic democratization and strengthened its security educational system.

The 1 February 1962 “special temporary law on education” promulgated after May, 16 military coup incorporated the autonomous education system into the regular administrative system, thus bringing it to a temporary end until it was revived two years later. The revived system, however, was not implemented at the city and county level but only at the provincial level where the educational committee, which included the governor, were all appointees. The superintendents of education were appointed through the committees' recommendations. In short, the “autonomous education system” had very little autonomy.

One major change under the Park regime was the restructuring of entrance examinations at each level of schooling. Middle school entrance examinations were changed from the system



where each school had its own examination to a state-administered examination system and then in 1971 to a residential area school group system by which admissions were determined by a lottery instead of examinations. This change promised to do away with the excessive competition for middle school admissions and the abuses of extra-curricula education such as private tutoring and cram schools. On the other hand, there were concerns about the differences in school facilities and student preparation between more affluent and less affluent neighborhoods leading to general decline in the quality of education.

In the case of high school, the regime implemented a program of consolidated preliminary examination followed by a lottery system. This was implemented first in Seoul and Pusan, where the competition for admission to the best high schools was most severe and later expanded to some provincial cities. But the lack of appropriate policies to deal with differences in school facilities and students' abilities and differences in the quality of teaching meant that this effort to standardize high school education could not be implemented throughout the whole country.

With regard to colleges and universities, in 1961 the Park regime implemented a “special law for bachelor's degree qualifying examinations”, but it ended after two years. It then implemented in 1969 a preliminary examination system that limited the number of passers to double the number of students to be admitted according to the quota system and required that scores in the preliminary examinations be reflected in part in the final scores each college or university for admissions and to keep universities from admitting students beyond their assigned quotas, but at the same time it also reduced universities' autonomy in selecting their students.

In October 17, 1972, Park announced a presidential special declaration that suspended the constitution and declared a martial law. The Press, the speech, and the newscast were censored under a state of emergency. Under this *Yushin* system, great emphasis was put on *Yushin*

education, New Village education, and Confucian loyalty/filial piety education as the state sought unilaterally to force its ideology on the students.

## 2. Curriculum thought and literature

The curriculum books that appeared in the previous period were mainly written from the perspective of experientialism which played a leading role for progressive movement in the United States until 1940s. This trend of curriculum studies affected the reality of curriculum as reflected in the second national curriculum. The second national curriculum states the features of experientialism clearly:

Curriculum means the totality of learning activities that students experience under the guidance of schools. Thus according to the learning experience of students, it will be determined that what types of human beings they grow into (Elementary curriculum, 1963: 13)

At this period, however, curriculum studies of experientialists decreased gradually. On the other hand, *advocates of curriculum development* and *analytic philosophy proponents* increased. Initially, in this period, *curriculum experientialists* had a tendency to revise the previous publications. Kyuhwan Lee (1968) and Chongkyu Ham (1970) published a revised and enlarged editions. Hokwon Kim (1968) and Sikjoong Kim (1972), who coauthored curriculum books that emerged in 1960 and 1963, wrote curriculum books as single authors. Although each of them tried to introduced new and other literature from experientialism in the United States there was no big difference between previous books and their new editions. Chongkyu Ham (1966) wrote

the *Revised Curriculum*, which analyzed the theory and practice of the second national curriculum from the perspective of experientialism. Yangmo Yoon (1973) suggested curriculum theory for forming human being in terms of the experience-centered curriculum.

The concerns of curriculum studies in South Korea began to vary from the late 1960s. These changes were led by two representative researches. The first was Gyeongseop Lee's (1968) article, *Discipline in the Curriculum Theory: On the Structure of Discipline*, the other was *The Principles of Mastery Learning* by Hokwon Kim (1970).

Gyeongseop Lee's article emphasized the reasons why curriculum is developed from the perspective of the structure of discipline as follows: the first is that understanding structures makes a subject more comprehensible; second, learning structures is to ensure that memory loss will not mean total loss, that what remains will permit student to reconstruct the detail when needed; third, an understanding structures appears to be the main road to adequate transfer of training; and fourth, by constantly reexamining material taught in schools for its structure, teachers as well as students are able to narrow the gap between advanced knowledge and elementary knowledge.

With the introduction of these reasons, he cited the book *The Process of Education* (1960) by Jerome Bruner. After his article, curriculum books which introduced the Bruner's theory and the so-called discipline-centered curriculum began to emerge. Such publications are *The Principles of Modern Curriculum* (1968) by Sungkwon Kim, *Curriculum* (1971) by Chungkyu Kim and Daeyung Kim, *The School Curriculum* (1971) by Kyuhwan Lee, *The Principle and Practice of Curriculum* (1972) by Sikjoong Kim, and the Korean version of *The Process of Education* by Hongwoo Lee (1973). These curriculum books, however, just introduce the theory

of Bruner without establishing the system of curriculum, i.e., how to apply this theory through curriculum development.

Curriculum books that devoted their efforts to developing discipline-centered curriculum in earnest were Youngdeok Lee's *The Process of Education* (1969), Hoongsun Hong's *The Theoretical Foundation of New Curriculum* (1971), and Gyeongseop Lee's *The Theory of New Curriculum* (1972). The "New" or "modern" in their title of the curriculum books means discipline-centered curriculum. That is, the attention of curriculum scholars became to change from experience-centered curriculum to discipline-centered curriculum.

More specifically, Youngdeok Lee (1969) stated that the fundamental process of education consisted of planning and management of curriculum, and emphasized the roles of curriculum in the process of education. Within similar context, he defined curriculum as the whole learning experience that students have in the process of education. In other words, he put purpose, teaching contents, learning experience and evaluation on the continuous line of the process of education. For him, the main task of curriculum theory was to identify what educational situations are needed to give student a meaningful learning experience.

For Lee the educational situations that are required for students of South Korea were to improve retention and transfer of knowledge. He introduced the new concept of contents needed in such process of education by referring to Hilda Taba's the three levels of knowledge: facts, basic ideas and principles, and concepts. Hilda Taba (1957) pointed out that too much factual information is presented quickly, so students do not make connections between the new facts and the facts stored in students' brains. She explains how when facts are memorized and not connected to previously known facts, students forget the memorized facts within approximately two years. She notes that basic ideas and principles should be selected based on what information

children are able to learn at their ages and based on what information has scientific validity. The final level of knowledge, concepts, involves students using knowledge from all content areas to predict outcomes or effects. Based on her description of the levels of knowledge, Youngdeok Lee described the structure of knowledge and proposed new curriculum especially for high school.

Gyeongseop Lee (1972) categorized the types of curriculum into three: subject-centered curriculum, experience-centered curriculum, and discipline-centered curriculum. He explained the background, basic views, the types, merits and demerits, and the impacts of discipline-centered curriculum on curriculum studies. In addition to these, he pointed out the differences of selecting and organizing the contents between experience-centered curriculum and discipline-centered curriculum, and suggested the constructive method of curriculum along with the structure of knowledge.

Woongsun Hong (1973b) explained the features of the third national curriculum known as *discipline-centered curriculum* in order to meet the demands of teachers and educational policy-makers who did not have background knowledge about discipline-centered curriculum. He contrasted the third national curriculum with the previous two national curriculums to reveal the characteristics clearly. For him the theoretical backgrounds of discipline-centered curriculum were those of Jerome Bruner (1960), Philip Phenix (1964), and Harry Broudy (1961, 1964), thus each of these scholar's theories is depicted in detail in the book. Based on them, he explained how to determine the content, organization of the contents, and teaching methods from the perspective of discipline-centered curriculum. In the same year, as mentioned earlier, he (1973a) wrote about a history of curriculum books that appeared from 1945 to 1972.

Hongwoo Lee (1973) translated the book *The Process of Education* (1960) by Bruner, and in the Preface of the book he justified the view that educational aims are inherent in the structure of knowledge. His initial discussion about discipline-centered curriculum was based on the cognitive psychology and epistemology of natural science that are represented by Bruner, and he depicted the characteristics of knowledge as contents of subject matters and ways of teaching the knowledge. He continued in an effort to justify a priori value of knowledge based on analytic philosophy of Richard S. Peters and Paul H. Hirst.

Along with curriculum studies of the discipline-centered orientation, there were active discussions about curriculum development in this period. The *advocacy of curriculum development* from Tyler, through Bloom, Bummo Chung to Hokwon Kim was established in this period. Curriculum books that prescribe the procedures and methods of curriculum development increased. The revitalization of this thought was due mainly to the Tyler Rationale which looks like a self-evident theory, and was also caused by the social background of South Korea at that time that needed and emphasized scientific management in every field for economic development.

In this period the representative example of *advocates of curriculum development* was the book *The Principle of Mastery Learning* (1970) by Hokwon Kim, who, like Bummo Chung, studied in the University of Chicago. Even though the first discussion of mastery learning appeared in *A Model of School Learning* (1963) by John Carroll, his concept of mastery learning was directly influenced by Benjamin Bloom. Bloom (1976) hypothesized that a classroom with mastery learning would reduce the achievement gaps between varying groups of students. In fact mastery learning has little to do with specific content itself, but rather focused on a description of the process of mastering particular learning objectives.

Thus, For Hokwon Kim curriculum studies become a process of identifying relationship between the student's achievement and variables that affect the achievements, for example, learner, teacher, the readiness, and teaching methods, and finding a general law between them through a statistic method. After introducing his idea of learning for mastery, curriculum studies heavily depended on the experimental-statistical research. Such a tendency is still found in the recent curriculum studies.

The idea of mastery learning exerted a profound impact on the field of curriculum in South Korea as well as the development of learning materials. Its basic assumption was that if the factors that inhibit the achievement of student were removed, almost all students could reach the level of mastery learning. Therefore, there were a lot of experiments for achieving mastery learning. The programs of mastery learning that were developed by a lot of schools resulted in a variety of learning materials.

In the strict sense the book *Education and Educational Studies* (1968) by Bummo Chung is not only a curriculum book, it influenced several sub-fields within education including curriculum studies. In this book he distinguished education as practices from educational studies as theories. With reference to *The Logic of Scientific Discovery* by Karl R. Popper (1959) Chung categorized sentences into three types from the standpoint of truth-value: 1) synthetic statement, 2) analytic statement and 3) emotive statement, and asserted that educational studies should focus on synthetic and analytic statements, and he regarded emotive statements (for example, human dignity) as meaningless from the perspective of fact, truth, and science. He continually attempted to diminish philosophical inquiry in educational studies, except for concept analysis.

Even though the impact of critical theory on curriculum studies was feeble compared to books of Gyeongseop Lee and Hokwon Lee, a curriculum book that emphasized the reemergence

of *curriculum sociology* appeared in 1970: *The Analysis of the Forms of Instruction* (1970) by Jongseo Kim and Youngchan Kim. For analyzing instruction they focused on affective domain of interactions between teachers and students rather than cognitive domain of students with reference to the book *Analyzing Teaching Behavior* (1970) by Ned A. Flanders. Around this time in the United States the researches of describing the interaction between teachers and students from a variety of perspectives were active enough to form a distinct trend in curriculum studies. Under the influence of this trend they exemplified the analysis of language games, and social interactions between teachers and students, and non-verbal communication of teachers, all of which could be seen as dimensions of hidden curriculum. Moreover they criticized the conventional research paradigm which mainly focused on measurable behaviors of students or teachers. For them to examine, analyze, and develop the effective and efficient teaching methods was only a secondary interest. Their main concern was to describe instruction. They pointed out that instruction is more complicated than the assumption of the Tyler Rationale which held instruction to be merely means for achieving educational purposes. That is, in instruction there are a lot of aspects curriculum scholars do not really see or know. They called for descriptive inquiry of instruction that can reveal subtle forms of student understanding. This research placed increased importance on empirically derived theoretical understanding of curriculum and instruction. Later, based on this perspective, Jongseo Kim (1976) wrote *Hidden Curriculum*.

In this period unlike the above books that reveal the distinct research perspectives most of curriculum books were published in the form of synoptic texts. The features of synoptic texts are as follows. First of all, Woochul Kang (1966, 1971) explained the revision background and the development procedure of the second national curriculum, and suggested a guiding principle of how to manage curriculum in schools. From this period the curriculum books began with a



comprehensive overview of the field and then moved toward specialization in elementary, secondary, or higher curriculum. Joongjo Lee (1967) focused on the management techniques of high school curriculum. Sehwan Joo (1969) dealt with the issues of comprehensive high school for modernization. Opposed to the comprehensive high school, Hyungseok Gil and Shinwoong Kang (1969) introduced career-oriented curriculum in the secondary school. Kyuhwan Lee (1972) explained curriculum of each subject, for example, language, mathematics, sciences, social studies, art and other subjects of elementary and middle school. The Korean Education Association (1969) produced a book that described each feature of elementary, middle, and high school curriculum in a book. Finally, Youngdeok Lee, Yonggeol Lee, Sehwan Joo, Chungae Park, and Shinil Kim (1967) conducted the research about higher education curriculum.

Other variations on the synoptic texts that had considerable enduring influence added domain and content. Sungkwon Kim (1968) first expanded the research domains of curriculum by including educational evaluation. He, however, did not distinguish it from curriculum evaluation because he regarded just the measurement of student achievement as curriculum evaluation. Curriculum evaluation as an area of curriculum studies was justified by Hokwon Kim (1980). In addition after the introduction of Bruner, a new type of curriculum was attached to the synoptic texts. This was first done by Gyeongseop Lee (1972), who designated discipline-centered curriculum as a legitimate form of curriculum.

In addition the ideas that schooling should be connected to the *Saemaul* (New Village) Movement, the protection of nature, and the thought of loyalty and filial piety rather than the formal curriculum of schools was generated in 1970s. Until the late 1970s, the Ministry of Education installed research institutes of *Saemaul* in the universities, which drove the policy studies for spreading the spirit of the *Saemaul* Movement. At this time in parallel with the

education of *Saemaul*, a unique kind of curriculum inquiry with emphasis on these extrinsic goals of education appeared. That was education for the general populace. With respect to this issue, the board of education of Jeollabuk-do published the book *Citizen Curriculum* (1973) and Soogil Kim (1973, 1974) published a series of articles about citizenship education related to curriculum issues.

Finally, at this period a disparate report related to middle school curriculum emerged. As mentioned in Chapter Three, H. S. Broudy, who arrived in May 1969, worked with the staff and responded to their questions as an advisor to the South Korean curriculum field, helping the development of a “Long-Range Comprehensive Education Plan” which was pursued by the South Korean government. In the process, he submitted the interim report *Comments and Recommendations in Connection with Long-Range Planning for Curriculum and Instruction* (1969a) to the government. In the report he pointed out the gap between curriculum scholars and practitioners as the most prominent issues in the field of curriculum in South Korea. He stated that “the former focused on the long-term improvement of curriculum, the latter, on the other hand, was mainly interested in the practical issues such as lack of teachers, facilities, and educational finances” (p. 2). His observation of the situation of curriculum field was somewhat reasonable because at that time (as is the case today) curriculum scholars and teachers who could participate in national curriculum development were very limited, thus the concerns of curriculum scholars were to theorize curricula phenomena and those of practitioner actually were more about the lack of resources.

In addition, in Broudy’s report he contrasted the South Korean situations with the case of the United States, and recommended the organizations and procedures for the national curriculum development and revision. Especially he suggested the introduction of programmed

learning. This suggestion seems to be offered by considering the special circumstances of the South Korean middle school at that time where there existed huge differences among middle school students, who could benefit from material that met individual needs. The government had abolished middle school entrance exams and local educators needed help in reaching students with diverse needs and abilities. This was the most serious problem of middle schools at that time. For Broudy, discriminately automated teaching methods such as programmed learning or other standardized materials was a useful solution for this problem. In addition Broudy (1969b) announced his general idea about curriculum design at the conference of the Korean Education Research Association and his lectures published in the Journal.

### 3. Bibliography of Curriculum Books 1964-1973

#### 1966

Ham Chongkyu (1966). *The revised curriculum*. Seoul: Jaedongmunhwasasa.

Kang Woonchul (1966). *The planning and guiding principles of curriculum*. Seoul: Hyeon-daekyoyukchongseo.

#### 1967

Lee Joongjo (1967). *The management of high school curriculum*. Seoul: Sangmun.

Lee Youngdeok, Lee Yonggul, Joo Sehwan, Park Jungae, & Kim Shinil (1967). *A comprehensive study of the contents of higher education*. Seoul: Joongangkyoyukyeonguso.

Park Insik (1967). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyuk.

#### 1968

Chung Bummo (1968). *Education and educational studies*. Seoul: Baeyoungsa.

Kang Shinwoong & Wang Gihang (1968). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyuk.

Kim Hokwon (1968). *The theories of modern curriculum*. Seoul: Hyeondaekyoyuk.

Kim Sungkwon (1968). *The principles of modern curriculum*. Seoul: Hyeondaekyoyuksa.

Lee Gyeongseop (1968). Discipline in the curriculum theory: On the structure of discipline. *Article Collection of Kyungpook National University*. 12, 177-199

Lee Kyuhwan (1968). *Curriculum*. (second edition). Seoul: Saegulsa.

#### 1969

Broudy, H. S. (1969a). *Comments and Recommendations in Connection with Long-Range Planning for Curriculum and Instruction* (Interim Report). Seoul: The Ministry of Education.

Broudy, H. S. (1969b). Some principles of curriculum design. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 7(1), 66-69.

Joo Sehwan (1969). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Jiphyeonsa.

Korean Education Association (1969). *Curriculum of each level of school: The theory and practice*. Seoul: Daehakkyoyukeonhakhoe.

Lee Joongjo (1969). *The principles of curriculum*. Seoul: Sangmau.

Lee Youngdeok (1969). *The process of education*. Seoul: Baeyoungsa.

## 1970

Ham Chongkyu (1970). *Curriculum*. (second edition). Seoul: Ikmunsa.

Kim Hokwon (1970). *The principles of mastery learning*. Seoul: Baeyoungsa.

Kim Jongseo, & Kim Youngchan (1970). *The analysis of the forms of instruction*. Seoul: Kyoyuk.

Neagley, R. L., & Evan, N. D. (1970). *Handbook of effective curriculum development* (Son Kyubok & Lee Kyeongseop Trans). Seoul: Baeyoungsa.

## 1971

Hong Woongsun (1971). *The theoretical background of new curriculum*. Seoul: Baeyoungsa.

Kang Woonchul (1971). *The planning and guiding principles of curriculum*. (second edition). Seoul: Hyeondaekyoyukchongseo.

## 1972

Kim Daeyung, & Kim Jungkyu (1972). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Jaedongmunhwasa.

Kim Sikjoong (1972). *Curriculum*. Daegu: Hakmunsa.

Lee Gyeongseop (1972). *The theory of curriculum*. Seoul: Joongangcheoksungyeonguso.

Lee Kyuhwan (1972). *The school curriculum*. Seoul: Ewha Women's University Press.

## 1973

Bruner, J. (1973). *The process of education* (Lee Hongwoo, Trans.). Seoul: Baeyoungsa.

Hong Woongsun (1973a). Curriculum. In Korean Education Research Association (Ed.). *A history of educational studies in the Republic of Korea* (257-284). Seoul: Korean Education Research Association

Hong Woongsun (1973b). *The study of new curriculum*. Seoul: Yonsei University Press.

Kim Byeonghwa, Kim Jongseo & Lee Youngdeok (1973). *Curriculum and guideline of teaching*. Seoul: Seoul National Open University Press.

Kim Sooil (1973). Curriculum development study for demographic education. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 11(1), 5-25.

Lee Gyeongseop (1973). *The modern curriculum* (second edition). Daegu: Hyeongsul.

The Board of Education of Jeollabuk-do (1973). *Citizen curriculum*. Chunjoo: The Board of Education of Jeollabuk-do.

Yoon Yangmo (1973). *The modern curriculum: curriculum for forming human beings*. Seoul: Tamgudang.

## **CHAPTER FIVE:**

### **CURRICULUM AND CONTEXT: 1974-1981**

#### **1. Contextual Reminders**

Most times of this period was under the authority of the *Yushin* system (1972-1979) of Chunghee Park. After Park's regime took a more authoritarian turn in the early 1970s, it was less subject to public pressure due to public fear of punishment. It renewed his effort to promote more military training in education. Park announced that education would emphasize nationalism and thus include a greater awareness of duty and service to the nation, and above all to military preparedness of all kinds.

One of the most notorious measures of the Park regime was an education law passed in July 1975 that introduced a contract renewal system for college professors. The stated purpose was to weed out incompetent academics, but it was widely understood that this was a means of removing college instructors considered unfriendly to the regime. The contract renewal policy was a powerful weapon to pressure faculty, especially as the criteria for renewal were vague and therefore subject to political abuse. Six months after the measure was implemented, 376 professors were found incompetent and removed. Some universities resisted or attempted to delay the process, but the administration put pressure on them to deal with problem political professors.

In another change in education during this period, greater importance was given to physical education, considered important for creating disciplined as well as healthy young citizens. Park created a Council of National Physical Education and Sports Deliberation and established a bureau of Physical Education and Sports in the Ministry of Education. More time and money were given to athletic in the secondary schools. This stress on sports continued until the Seoul Olympics in 1988, when national greatness was measured in gold, silver and bronze medals. The Ministry of Education carried out physical examinations from the fifth grade, and from 1972 physical exams were necessary to enter middle and high school. Students were required to run 100 meters, throw objects, do chin-ups and sit-ups, and participate in relays. These physical exams were made stringent in 1973. Even under the harsh repression that characterized the mid and late 1970s, the public balked at too much stress on nonacademic education. Many educators and parents were unhappy with the attention to athletics. Physical education was not well received by the public, who feared that it took more time and energy away from exam preparation.

Moreover, Park and his military successors continued to require teachers to organize students for endless pro-government and anti-Communist political rallies and demonstrations, which often involved working late at night or on Sundays. Compulsory in-service training programs included frequent political seminars, sometimes referred to as spiritual education. The Park administration's practice of intense anti-Communist indoctrination and the bullying and political manipulation of teachers did little to win teacher loyalty and at times were counterproductive to promoting the regime's stability. Teachers, while seldom openly defying the regime, remained resentful of government interference. It is difficult to believe that their



cynicism, skepticism of government policies, and resentment were not, at times, conveyed to their students, limiting the effectiveness of state policies.

During the next several years, military drills expanded to include female students as well. Drill contests were held in *Yoido* Plaza, a huge square in the newly developed southern part of Seoul especially designed for massive rallies. One such rally in the summer of 1974 saw half a million high school students perform military drills. The following summer high school students were issued M1 rifles and paraded the streets of Seoul in military uniforms. They were accompanied by women students in white uniforms, many carrying first aid kits. On 20 May 1978, the Ministry of Education, before the deans of the nation's colleges and universities, revealed the Military Education Strengthening Plan to further intensify military training. But this new plan was delayed by unenthusiastic universities and education officials, and the Park regime ended before it could be implemented.

Among the most controversial changes in education during this period was the revival of the Students Defense Corps in the spring of 1976. All high school and college students were required to join, and by fall, most of students had been organized into twenty-five divisions under the motto 'Study while defending the nation'. Teachers, who were required to supervise the corps activities, were ordered to inspire a correct national defense spirit in students. The corps was composed of three major organizations: the Central Student Defense Corps, which oversaw the entire organization; the Collegial Defense Corps, also under central control; and the City and Provincial Defense Corps, which supervised high school units. The purpose of the revived organization, the Ministry of Education explained, was to inculcate patriotism and nationalism, and to eliminate subversive elements from the schools. In addition to marching and drilling, the corps sponsored seminars on anti-Communism and organized visits to national monuments and

military cemeteries. Yet much like its predecessor, the corps was disliked by parents, students, teachers, and the general public. Its unpopularity was reflected in the defensive edge to its own propaganda. The Ministry of Education contrasted the new Student Defense Corps with the earlier one under Rhee, claiming it was better run and more efficient and did not promote militarism. Rather its purpose was to teach students how to be good citizens. Furthermore the administration defended the corps as aiding students in their academic studies by making them more disciplined and directing them away from harmful extracurricular activities. All of these were arguments that the Rhee regime had used to answer the same parental complaints.

In Conclusion, *Yushin* system of the Park regime was challenged by activists from groups such as college students, artists, religious leaders, and the opposition. Park suppressed these protests by force. In the People's Revolutionary Party(인혁당) Incident, eight persons were executed for treason. The only evidence, their confessions, was extracted by torture, and the executed are now generally considered to have been innocent. Nevertheless, the resistance to *Yushin* system continued and caused serious social unrest. It was under such conditions that Naeun Sung and twelve other professors of Chonnam National University challenged the *Yushin* educational system, and called for true democratic education and true human education. All were dismissed from their positions and jailed.

## **2. Curriculum thought and literature**

Since the 1970s a variety of foundations for curriculum studies were established. For example, departments of education in undergraduate and Ph. D programs of curriculum in graduate school have been established. In addition to this, researches related to mastery learning

by the Korean Institute for Research in the Behavioral Sciences and the educational development researches on elementary and middle school by the Korea Educational Development Institute have had a huge impact on improving the interests of curriculum studies. In 1967 the *Society for Curriculum Studies* was organized in the Korean Education Research Association, various conferences related to curriculum studies were held, and finally, in 1974 *The Journal of Curriculum Studies* (Korean) was first published.

Despite these conditions for curriculum studies, in this period about thirty-one curriculum books appeared, most of which were responses to the *Yushin* system. In this period, it is necessary to pay attention to two articles, which attempt to criticize the Tyler Rationale, in the first issue of *The Journal of Curriculum Studies* (Korean). The article entitled *Curriculum from the Perspective of Decision-Making* (1974) by Sangjoo Lee extended the domains of curriculum studies by asking the following questions: 1) how was curriculum determined by what social structure through what social process? 2) what are the social factors affecting curriculum decision-making? 3) how are the decisions regarding curriculum put into practice and shape? 4) what are the social forces that constrain the rationality of curriculum decision-making? and 5) how are the conflicts that appear in curriculum decision-making settled? (p. 60). While many curriculum scholars agreed that curriculum studies should embrace the issues of “what” curriculum is pursued and “how to” develop it, for Lee curriculum may be varied according to “who” participates in curriculum decision-making.

Lee accepted the so-called perspective of the sociology of knowledge, and identified knowledge as a product of the social hierarchy. In accepting this claim, he saw that the regulations of “what” and the selective methods or “procedures” are often altered according to the background of the people involved in the process of determining curriculum. He called the

perspective of the Tyler Rationale “prescriptive curriculum”, and asserted that the “realistic model” of curriculum is necessary to describe the actual process of curriculum development. So, for Lee curriculum development is likely to be the result of choice of the values and interests of the people who participated in the process of curriculum making. Even if his ideas are not totally correct, the impact of these ideas upon curriculum studies was very large.

Under this context after *A Study on Hidden Curriculum* (1975) and *Hidden Curriculum* (1976) by Jongseo Kim the issue that the informal objectives and contents of schooling have an effect on the formation of student personality has been widely discussed. Jongseo Kim emphasized that the importance of hidden curriculum is more highlighted when curriculum scholars analyze what and how students learn in schools. In Kim’s book he did not deny the fact that students learn a large amount from the formal objectives and contents. However, he pointed out that there is a need for curriculum scholars to expand their views of curriculum studies to include the powerful impact of hidden curriculum. Kim introduced various examples of hidden curriculum such as life in classrooms by Philip Jackson (1968), the institutional messages of school by Everett Reimer (1971), Ivan Illich (1971), power relations in the school by Charles E. Silberman (1970), Robert Dreeben (1970) and moral implication by Lawrence Kohlberg (1970). Kim asserted that hidden curriculum is not limited to certain aspects of schooling rather it is related to whole situation of schooling.

This book, coupled with the social and political situation at that time brought a big splash. A series of scholars focused on the reality of schooling and analyzed the curricular reality from the perspective of curriculum sociology. Bukwon Park, Kiseok Kim, and Hoojo Hong each wrote their master’s theses based on the curriculum sociology, and Park and Kim continued to conduct researches related to curriculum sociology. In this period two books that are important but are

not quoted any more in curriculum studies in the South Korea appeared. Those are the books *Is this Education?* (1975) by Sanghun Lee and *How These Children Do?* (1977) by Odeok Lee. They argued that the contents of schooling reflect the unequal social structure, and criticized the contemporary schooling that is just assessed by the formal objectives and contents of the national curriculum. Especially these two books were written by the direct observation and records of schools, and depicted a vivid critique of schooling at that time. Moreover these two books first introduced the qualitative inquiry to curriculum studies.

Although little emphasis was placed on curriculum sociology from 1978 to 1987, however, since 2000s curriculum studies from the perspective of curriculum sociology become to increase again under the influence of reconceptualist thought. Many *curriculum sociologists*, however, accepted correspondence theory of Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis (1976), whose work is derived from Marx's theory. Marx differentiated between base and superstructure, with the base referring to the economic system, and superstructure, to the cultural and political system. Within these contexts they argued that unequal economic structure of society was mechanically reproduced through school curriculum.

On the other hand, some moved beyond the theory of Bowles and Gintis by accepting the theory of Basil Bernstein and Pierre Bourdieu whose theoretical backgrounds are partly derived from David Émile Durkheim. They regarded the whole society as the cultural unit rather than explain the society by the ownership of the means of production. Although they agreed with the claim that schooling is what takes place in the superstructure of society, and then it is affected by the base-structure, they argued that schooling has "relative autonomy" as a cultural category. For them, dominant social forces control curriculum in order to achieve their objective, and such control is difficult to resist. The external authority out of school, however, can be sometimes

refracted by the structure of the school. Thus, they indicated that the weak point of reproduction theory lies in perspectives of determinism and passivity of humans and in order to overcome the weakness they further study critical theory.

At that time there was a skeptical stance about the term and concept of hidden curriculum. Soontaek Kim (1982) claimed that what students learn from the unplanned aspects of schooling should be conceptualized as “incidental learning” or “simultaneous learning” while acknowledging the phenomena of education and learning could include the so-called hidden curriculum. In other words curriculum scholars should pay attention to the unplanned behavior and thought that are formed by the system of schools, school regulations, and the words and actions of the teachers. However, such scholars argued that there is no need to analyze such educational phenomena by using the term *curriculum*. If the so-called hidden curriculum is a kind of curriculum, in some cases curriculum becomes synonymous with education and furthermore life becomes curriculum. For curriculum to be equated with life the meaning of the term becomes empty. Soontaek Kim severely criticized such expansion of theoretical studies in the field of curriculum because of these problems of concepts and ideas. This shows the influence of the analytic philosophy curriculum orientation.

Continuing this view, Kim pointed out that curriculum scholars had a strong tendency to conduct their researches with the unified view of curriculum and instruction. He asserted that curriculum and instruction should be separated as a distinctive sub-field within education. To be sure, the unified view of curriculum and instruction in South Korea has been formed unconsciously since the first curriculum book by Bummo Chung (1956b). Bummo Chung, like Tyler, assumed that the same principles can apply to both and thus for him there was no actual

profit to distinguish them. However, the division of curriculum and instruction is clearly advocated in the argument of Suntaek Kim.

As noted earlier, Hongwoo Lee (1974) criticizes the Tyler Rationale from a different view in the first issue of *The Journal of Curriculum Studies* (Korean). He called Tyler's model an "objective model", and warned that such a goal-oriented model has a strong tendency to consider the content, method, and evaluation as a means for achieving the purpose, that the goal itself without normative premise is likely to be regarded as a means for other goals. In addition to this, he pointed out that the objective model is more suitable in curricular areas which emphasize information and skill; however, it cannot be applied to the intellectual, moral, and psychological field of education. For him, the objective model moves along with the formulation of objectives, and does not provide a method of defining such objectives. It is more concerned with efficiency rather than direction. It regards objectives as given.

Lee explored the possibilities offered by a strategy of curriculum design which attempts to arrive at a useful specification of curriculum and the educational process without starting with pre-specified the anticipated outcomes of that process in the form of objectives. Perhaps he asked, can there be principles for the selection of content other than the principle that it should contribute to the achievement of an objective? There seems no doubt that there can. He argues for the intrinsic justification of content. He starts from the position that education implies the transmission of what is worthwhile to those who become committed to it and that it must involve knowledge and understanding and some kind of cognitive perspectives that are not inert ideas (Whitehead, 1929). Believing that education involves taking part in worthwhile activities, he argues that such activities have their own built-in standards of excellence, and thus can be appraised because of the standards immanent in them rather than because of what they lead on to.

Within knowledge, it is possible to select content for curriculum without reference to student behaviors or indeed to ends of any kind other than that of representing the form of knowledge in curriculum. This is because a form of knowledge has structure, and it involves procedures, concepts and criteria. Content can be selected to exemplify the most important procedures, the key concepts, and aspects of the situation in which the criteria hold.

By contrast, he calls this approach of curriculum design the “content-model”. He elaborates the content model of curriculum design and development, arguing that, largely on logical grounds, and advocating that it is more appropriate than the objective model in the areas of curriculum which centre on knowledge and understanding.

Therefore, Lee’s major concerns are to identify the meaning of concepts related to the areas of curriculum by the sophisticated logical analysis, to justify the value of subject-matters and to raise objections against the stance that education and curriculum are regarded as a means for any extrinsic objectives. These features continue to appear in his books (1977, 1978, 1983, 1984) with ample reference to R. S. Peters and P. H. Hirst, foundational advocates of the analytic philosophy school of curriculum studies.

Critiques of curriculum of analytic philosophy represented by Hongwoo Lee also emerged in this period. Hokwon Kim (1980), from the perspective of behavioral psychology, advocates of curriculum development and criticizes the perspective of Hongwoo Lee as too speculative. In the book *The Inquiry of Learning in School* (1980) he stipulates the concepts of curriculum according to the stages of management and levels in the plan. He distinguished curriculum as 1) intended curriculum, 2) unfolded curriculum and 3) realized curriculum, and suggested features of the curriculum for each. In addition, he first separated curriculum evaluation from educational



evaluation and suggested the stages of curriculum development, the roles of each stage, and the evaluation of the roles.

In 1975, a book which emphasizes the role of teachers as curriculum developers was published by Bummo Chung, Wonsik Chung, Yonghun Park, and Yonghun Lee (1975). They acknowledged the importance of teachers in curriculum development, and attempted to empower teachers' discretion in planning their own curriculum at the instructional level. These ideas are mainly derived from *Modern Elementary Curriculum* (1953) by William B. Ragan. Ragan's book was translated in 1977.

In this period *curriculum sociologists*, *curriculum scholars of analytic philosophy*, and *advocates of curriculum development* developed a rich array of divergent theories from their own perspective; however, most of synoptic texts appeared in this period attempted to amalgamate all schools of curriculum thought rather than to advocate one position. Pahljoong Yoon and Chongkyu Ham were exceptions from this trend.

For Pahljoong Yoon (1980, 1981a, 1981b) education means human education. Thus he first analyzes the each concept of human education. He defines human as 1) an individual, 2) an organism and 3) an active being, and education as 1) learning of meaning, 2) holistic growth and 3) renovation of growth desire. After limiting the meaning of human education, he suggested three characteristics of curriculum for qualifying his meaning of human education: 1) self-realization as an individual, 2) balance and harmony as an organism and 3) investigation or inquiry as an active being. His humanist considerations for curriculum development can be cautiously traced to Confucian heritage. In addition to this, he regulated the contents and methods to help self-realization of students, and he emphasized that the contents are obtained by

the interaction of a variety of educational materials and by the psychological situation of the individual.

The Ministry of Education entrusted Chongkyu Ham with the project of investigating the changing history of national curriculum in the Republic of Korea, and in 1974 he announced the results. The report dealt with the national curriculum from 1894 to 1960, and then he, largely based on the report, published the book *The Study of Changing History in the Republic of Korea: I* (1976). He subsequently examined the national curriculum from 1961 to 1980 and published the book *The Study of Changing History in the Republic of Korea: II* (1980). In 2003 he again published the book with same title by refining and combining the previous two books and adding the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh national curricula to them.

### 3. Bibliography of Curriculum Books 1974-1981

#### 1974

- Chim Jaedong & Ko Younghee (1974). *The theory and practice of curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyuk.
- Ham Chongkyu (1974). *A study on changing history of curriculum*. Seoul: Sookmyong Women's University Press.
- Kang Shinwoong (1974). *Modern curriculum*. Seoul: Beopmunsa.
- Kim Sooil (1974). Selecting subject matters of population education. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 12(3), 98-101.
- Kim Sunae (1974). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Jaedongmunhwasa.
- Lee Hongwoo (1974). Classic model and its alternative of curriculum. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1, 11-33.
- Lee Sangjoo (1974). Curriculum from the perspective of decision-making. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1, 59-74.

#### 1975

- Chung Bummo, Chung Wonsik, Park Yonghun & Lee Yonghun (1975). *The principle of course of study*. Seoul: Neungryeokgaebal.
- Ham Chongkyu (1975). *The revised curriculum*. Seoul: Hyeongseol.
- Kim Jongseo (1975). *A study on hidden curriculum*. Seoul: Seoul National University Press.
- Kim Wonhee (1975). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Jaedongmunhwasa.
- Ko Younghee & Huh Hyung (1975). *The theory and practice of new curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyuk.
- Lee Sanghun (1975). *Is this education?* Seoul: Munmyeongsa.

#### 1976

- Ham Chongkyu (1976). *The Study of Changing History in the Republic of Korea: I*. Seoul: Sookmyong Women's University Press.
- Hong Woongsun (1976). *New elementary curriculum*. Seoul: Kyohaksa.

Kim Jongseo (1976). *Hidden curriculum*. Seoul: Ikmunsa.

### 1977

Gil Hyeongsuk, Lee Jinbun & Lee Chingchan (1977). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyuk.

Kim Hokwon, Lee Donhee & Lee Hongwoo (1977). *The theory of modern curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyuk.

Kim Sikjoong & Kim Yongsun (1977). *New theory of curriculum*. Seoul: Hakmunsa.

Korean Open Board of Education (Ed.). (1977). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Munjongseokwan.

Lee Hongwoo (1977). *Curriculum inquiry*. Seoul: Parkyoungsa.

Lee Odeok (1977). *How these children do?* Seoul: Chungnyeonsa.

Yoo Taeyoung & Kim Chungkyu (1977). *Curriculum and guidelines of teaching*. Seoul: Hyeongsul.

### 1978

A Society for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction of Education College (Ed.). (1978). *New curriculum and instruction*. Seoul: Kyoyuk.

Lee Hongwoo (1978). *The structure of knowledge and subject-matter*. Seoul: Kyoyukgwahaksa.

### 1979

Hong Woongsun (1979). *New introduction of curriculum*. Seoul: Muneumsa.

Kim Jongseo (1979). *Curriculum and instruction*. Seoul: Baeyoungsa.

Ragan, W. B. (1979). *Modern elementary curriculum* (Cho Yongjin, Trans.). Seoul: Hyeongsul.

### 1980

Ham Chongkyu (1980). *The Study of Changing History in the Republic of Korea: II*. Seoul: Sookmyong Women's University Press.

Kang Shinwoong (1980). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Seokwanggongsa.

Kim Hokwon (1980). *The inquiry of learning in school*. Seoul: Kyoyukgwahaksa.

Peters, R. S. (1980). *Ethics and Education* (Lee Hongwoo, Trans.). Seoul: Kyoyukgwahaksa.

Yoo Bongho (1980). *Modern curriculum*. Seoul: Kyohakyeongusa.

Yoon Pahljoong(1980). *The theory of human-centered curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyukgwahaksa.

**1981**

Yoon Pahljoong (1981a). *The theory of curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyukgwahaksa

Yoon Pahljoong (1981b). *Curriculum for all-round education*. Seoul: Baeyoungsa.

## **CHAPTER SIX:**

### **CURRICULUM LITERATURE AND CONTEXT: 1982-1987**

#### **1. Contextual Reminders**

The educational policy implemented during the Doohwan Chun regime (1980-1988) can be broken down into two periods before and after the establishment of the “educational reform council” on 7 March 1985. During these two periods, the fundamental basic goal of educational policy was the “strengthening of citizen spirit education”, but differences can be drawn between the two periods in terms of educational plans and measures. The educational policy of the first period was determined by the 1980 '30 July educational measures' taken by the committee for the establishment of legislation to protect the state. On the other hand, the educational policy of the second period, unlike that of the first five years of the Chun regime, focused on producing a national consciousness and labor force capable of dealing with rapidly changing economic conditions.

The Doohwan Chun regime, which came to power through the 12 December 1979 Coup d'état, the 17 May 1980 expansion of martial law, the suppression of the *Kwangju Minjung* (citizen: 민중) resistance and the establishment of the State Protection Emergency Measure Committee, faced two difficult problems. One was overcoming its lack of legitimacy and the other was overcoming the severe economic downturn of the late-1970s and early-1980s. Thus,

all policies focused on creating legitimacy for the regime. In educational policy, this took the form of Chun's citizen spirit education.

Citizen spirit education was declared to be education for forming and putting into practice the basic value system required in the lives of the citizens for the maintenance and prosperity of the national and state community. It was systematized as a concept that included education for reunification and security, economic education, New Village Movement education, and social purification education, which aimed at the elimination of social ills, such as violence, smuggling, drugs and deceptions and was implemented not only in schools but throughout society at large.

Economic education had the goals of easing the people's concerns over the economic inequality that had arisen during the rapid economic developing consciousness necessary to deal with rapidly changing economic conditions. Another purpose was to develop a systematic ideological critique of the workers' movement to gain their fair share.

Although citizen spirit education was supposed to be done on the basis of the voluntary participation of the people, in fact it was carried out with the strong backing of the government and was slanted toward promoting government policies. In case of education in schools, the Minister of Education Kyuho Yi oversaw the strengthening of ideological critique education by making citizens' ethics a required course at all four-year colleges and universities. At same time, a "nine-item citizen spirit education" program was implemented in all elementary, middle and high schools in an intensive effort to implant the regime's values in students' minds.

The content of the "30 July 1980 educational measures" can be summarized as revisions of the college entrance examination system and the so-called measure to normalize education. The revisions of the entrance examination system included abolishing the final examinations held by each university and requiring that consideration be given to high school work, and replacing the

entrance quota system with a graduation quota system. The abolition of university-based examinations meant that students were to be selected on the basis of their scores in the national standard college entrance qualifying examination and their high school work. This was done in hopes of reducing excessive private tutoring and of standardizing high school education which had increasingly focused on preparing students for college entrance examinations. The graduation quota system that was enforced beginning in 1981 was evaluated by the Ministry of Education as a measure to foster an atmosphere of diligent study and to cope with the chronic unrest on college campuses. It was also seen, however, as an attempt by the government to establish control over the college admissions process and ran into strong opposition.

At that time, 15% of South Korea's total 9,800,000 elementary, middle and high school students were getting extra-curricular private tutoring and 26% of arts high schools were being tutored privately in preparation for college entrance examinations. The total amount spent annually by parents on private tutoring was 327,500,000,000 won, an amount that was equal to 30% of the entire budget of the Ministry of Education. The so-called measures to standardize education included a harsh prohibition of extra-curricular classes at clam schools and private tutoring. This measure sought to win the support of the people for the regime by injecting state power to force the standardization of an extraordinarily inequitable educational situation. Without rectifying the root causes, such as the differences in pay according to levels of education and the monopolistic economic structure. These measures constituted nothing but a superficial reform that could not hope to resolve the educational irregularities and injustices that were part of the social pathology of South Korea.

At the heart of the Chun regime's educational policy of the early-1980s was an attempt to broaden the regime's base of support among the people by relieving to some degree the



accumulated social and economic equalities through theoretically egalitarian educational reforms. However, the regime soon found itself forced to abandon the graduation quota system and unable to enforce the prohibition of private tutoring because of dwindling support from the people who wanted special advantages for their children. This meant that regime had no choice but to search for a new direction in its educational policies.

The rapidly changing world situation in the late-1980s produced an educational reform movement along with demands from the economic sector to find solutions for South Korea's weakening international competitiveness. On top of that, there was a great deal of discontent with and mistrust of government policies among the people and rising demands for educational reform among teachers, led largely by the national Teachers' Labour Union. The educational policy of the early-1980s was focused primarily on the attainment of urgent political goals; while political goals remained important in the late-1980s, demands from the economic sector forced the regime to move in the direction of establishing concrete policies that embodied those demands.

The pursuit of diversity *and* excellence in education became the main thrust of educational policy in the late-1980s. In particular, the pursuit of excellence in education was a reflection of the shift from labour-intensive industries of the 1960s and 1970s to advanced technological industries that required highly trained personnel. This effort first got underway in the early-1980s with the October 1982 plan to develop science and technology that provided assistance for basic science education, established science high schools, and implemented a program of special training for gifted students. On the other hand, the pursuit of diversification and excellence meant the weakening of the government's uniform management of education and the introduction of discriminatory educational policies that went against the principle of equal access to education.

Strong control by the Chun regime which had come to power by suppressing the *Kwangju minjung* protest led to a period of relative quiet in the democratization movement during the early-1980s, and the educational sector was no exception. In the late-1980s, however, fervor for democratization began to rise again. This was reflected in the educational sector by the publication in 1985 of the magazine *Minjung Kyoyuk* (Citizen Education: 민중교육) by a group of committed teachers. Although Chingyong Kim and the other teachers who led the publication of this magazine were arrested and dismissed from their teaching posts, after the 10 June 1985 Democratization movement the National Association of Teachers for the Promotion of Democratic Education was formed and led the struggle for the reform of unjust and discriminatory education laws. This association carried out a petition movement for the reform of education law and held a 20 November 1988 national teachers' assembly in *Yoido* Square attended by over 13,000 teachers. On 19 February 1989, a meeting of association representatives adopted a resolution to form a teachers' labour union to press for guarantees of the three rights of labour: (1) the right of organization (2), the right of collective action, and (3) the right of collective negotiation.

## **2. Curriculum thought and literature**

In this period one striking feature of curriculum studies is that Korean versions of curriculum books become to increase. This phenomenon is due to the insufficiency or inaccuracy of curriculum theories that are introduced in the synoptic texts and increased concerns about curriculum studies. However, to make matters worse, this situation was exacerbated by the extreme limitation of purchasing the English language books in the original. There was no

convenient way in which to import the original books from the United States. Usually they were brought to South Korea by Korean students who studied in the United States.

In this period eleven books published in English were translated and these books indirectly captured the interests of South Korean scholars at that time. The lists of the books are as follows: Ralph Tyler's *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (1949), Hilda Taba's *Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice* (1962); Elliot Einsler's *The Educational Imagination* (1979); Denis Lawton, Peter Gordon, Maggie Ing, Bill Gibby, Richard Pring & Terry Moore's *Theory and Practice of Curriculum Studies* (1978); Michael Apple's *Ideology and Curriculum* (1979); Uwe Hameyer's *School Curriculum in the context of Lifelong Learning* (1979); David Pratt's *Curriculum, Design and Development* (1980); George A. Beauchamp's *Curriculum Theory* (1981); Gene D. Shepherd & William B. Ragan's *Modern Elementary Curriculum* (1982); Colin Griffin's *Curriculum Theory in adult and lifelong education* (1983); and John D. McNeil's *Curriculum: A Comprehensive Introduction* (1985).

There is another general trend of curriculum books in this period. After the book *Curriculum and Evaluation* (1983) by Jingu Shim and Chunghaeng Kim, *curriculum and evaluation* (or *educational evaluation*) appeared in the title of almost every book. It was considered a problem as to whether "curriculum and evaluation" can be treated as a formal area rather than two separate areas of educational studies. In principle "curriculum and evaluation" in the past was determined to be separated and therefore published as separate books. However even today "curriculum and evaluation" need to be rejoined because one of the courses in the compulsory teacher education set by the Ministry of Education is "curriculum and evaluation"; thus two different disciplines had to be weaved into one textbook. The authors who wrote books related to curriculum in the previous periods added the contents of educational evaluation, and

published new books with both *curriculum and evaluation* in the title. For example, such books are Pahljoong Yoon (1985), Bongho Yoo & Youngjoo Chung (1986), and Haemyeong Lee (1986).

Especially, the designation of “curriculum and evaluation” as a compulsory pre-service teacher education requirement had impact on the forms of curriculum books. While most of curriculum books published in the previous period were read by various kinds of readers, for example, scholars, school administrators, teachers, and prospective teachers, from this period 1982-1987 curriculum books were written mainly for prospective teachers who prepared for the teacher certification examination. Therefore officials believed that background necessary for the exams should be contained within one book. These trends have defined the contents of many subsequent curriculum books that simplified, stereotyped and solidified the amalgamation of schools of curriculum thought.

These tendencies of synoptic texts are also closely related to a feature of the fourth national curriculum. The central characteristics of the national curriculums before the fourth national curriculum were; subject-centered curriculum in the first national curriculum; child or experience-centered curriculum in the second national curriculum; and discipline-centered curriculum in the third national curriculum. The fourth national curriculum, however, attempted to compromise through synthesis or eclecticism. Now both practitioners and scholars have to know the features of each school of curriculum thought: subject-centered, experience-centered, discipline-centered and eclectic.

This period was the heyday of this type of synoptic texts which provided their synthetic or eclectic curriculum knowledge. Most of the synoptic texts do not stray far from the backbone of the Tyler Rationale. Further, there existed a variety of disagreements about the balance of

emphasis on subject matter, learner, and society. Too often these were presented superficially or messily, and emphasized procedures of curriculum development. In other words, the features of synoptic texts are arbitrary classifications of eclectic curriculum thought or perspectives, uncritical synthesis, oversimplification of guidance, and above all, adherence bandwagon trends. The synoptic texts which display these tendencies are Bongsoo Kim (1982, 1987), Chungkwon Kim (1982), Changgul Kim (1982, 1983, 1987), Bongho Yoo (1982), Sungho Lee (1982, 1985), Shinwoong Kang (1983), Hyeongseok Gil (1983), Sangwon Kim (1983), Wonhee Kim & Yongsun Kim (1983), Seungim Mun (1984), Hyeongseok Gil & Bongkyu Kang (1985), Insik Kim (1985), Youngsun Yoon (1985), Chunggi Cho (1986), Bongkyu Kang & Chongsung Lee (1987), Yongsun Kim & Bangcheol Kang (1987), and Chongbae Cheon & Sunae Kim (1987).

Some curriculum books in the midst of the flood of synoptic texts are popular as college textbooks. First, *Curriculum of Highly Industrialized Society* by Haemyeong Lee emerged in 1982. He translated the book *Educational Imagination* (1979) by Eisner in 1982 and later *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (1949) by Tyler in 1987. In Lee's text, he asserted that we must cultivate our cherished roots for the full bloom of our culture because to eat the fruit of the Western culture makes us more hunger. However the contents which contradict his insistence mainly consist of the introduction of Eisner (1979), Orlosky & Smith (1978), Alvin Toffler (1980), and Tyler (1949).

In this period the most popular Korean synoptic text was *Curriculum* by Byeongsun Kwak (1983). Not only did this text provide an encyclopedic background on the curriculum field, he first introduced a new trend of curriculum studies in the United States, known as *reconceptualization*. Kwak's synoptic text is oriented to the process of finding answers to the question of what is curriculum. More specifically Kwak raised other questions related to the

form of curriculum, the definitions of concepts of curriculum, persons who should develop curriculum, those for whom curriculum benefits or harms, roles of scholars and practitioners in curriculum field, topics the curriculum field should address, and research methodologies to use for study in the curriculum field. In the process of finding answers for these questions, Kwak diagnosed conventional curriculum theory as having narrow and a-contextual characteristics and advocated attempts to overcome them.

In more detail Kwak pointed out three fallacies which are apt to be found in definition of curriculum (pp. 18-21). The first is a fallacy of a singular view. Neither Tyler, who has a perspective of experience-centered curriculum, nor Bruner, who has a view of discipline-centered curriculum, can fully and completely explain curriculum. Psychological theory of cognitive development by Bruner ignored the cultural and social aspects of knowledge, which provided imbalance of the personal and socio-culture. Both, Kwak asserted, must be included in any complex depiction of understanding human beings. Moreover, Tyler's model conceptualizes curriculum as largely technical, and disregards ethical and political roles of curriculum studies. The second is a fallacy of an acontextual view. This considers the issues of curriculum only in schooling, and neglects powerful variables of social structure. An assumption underlying this fallacy is that without considering cultural, political, social, and structural differences, curriculum theories generated from Western developed countries could not be adequately applied in other countries. The last fallacy is an ahistorical view. This fallacy means that without accumulating knowledge by predecessors and sustaining academic traditions through intergenerational dialogue, new curriculum theory, especially from the United States, is accepted uncritically.

For Kwak, curriculum theory is not just about prescription of procedure for curriculum development but also and more importantly about inquiries for figuring out the structure of knowledge or meaning of experience. And such inquiries, he asserts, should be based on the observation and reflection of our educational situations. Thus, curriculum theory has to be understood from holistic and comprehensive perspective. Within this context, he first suggested the three distinctive foundations for curriculum studies in South Korea: humanity, knowledge and ideological conflict. Especially he pointed out that the contents which are related to communism or socialism have been thoroughly ruled out in schooling because of the ideological conflict between South Korea and North Korea. He explained this phenomenon by borrowing the concept of *null curriculum* from Eisner (1979). Finally he introduced the categorizations of curriculum studies (*traditionalists*, *conceptual-empiricists*, and *reconceptualists*) of Henry A. Giroux, Anthony N. Penna, and William F. Pinar (1981) and supported the perspective of reconceptualism, based on those introduced earlier by Pinar (1975b) in *Curriculum Theorizing: The reconceptualists*.

Curriculum books related to curriculum integration also gained popularity, because the integrated curriculum of first and second grades of elementary school was first established in the fourth national curriculum. Thus, the students have to study with integrated textbooks beginning in 1982. However no satisfactory explanation had been provided for teachers or even curriculum scholars for integrated curriculum. Jaebok Kim (1983, 1985) criticized this circumstance, and introduced the theoretical background of integrated curriculum by referring to the book *Curriculum Integration and Lifelong Education* (1979) by James B. Ingram.

Ingram (1979) divides the construction of integrated curriculum into two aspects; structural and functional. In curriculum integration structural aspects refer to reorganizing the structure of

knowledge related to subject matter within curriculum, and functional aspects refer to refurbishing the ideas and practices of integrated educational experience. Integrated curriculum provides structure to the nature of knowledge and the functional aspect is related to promotion of integrated learning. The former has a concern with epistemology, and the latter pays attention to psychology and sociology. Thus, the educational meaning of integrated curriculum consists of both aspects. Building on Ingram, Kim (1985) introduced a variety of models for integrated curriculum such as a fragmented model, connected model, nested model, sequence model, shared model, webbed model, threaded model, integrated model, immersed model, and network model. While Kim's book heavily focused on theory of curriculum integration, this did not give direct help to teachers.

In this period each school of curriculum thought continued to emerge. Hongwoo Lee (1983, 1984) continuously developed a highly sophisticated logic to justify intrinsic value of knowledge from the view of analytic philosophy. He expanded his theoretical background from Plato to Robert M. Hutchins, Philip Phenix, R. S. Peters, P. H. Hirst and Mortimer Adler, and attempted to understand the conceptual nature of curriculum. Especially he regarded the historical origin of mental disciplines in Plato's *Republic*, and tried to re-interpret the modern meaning of mental disciplines. He pointed out that the reason why mental disciplines declined is that it gave up on deriving educational purposes from intrinsic value of discipline and it began to exemplify the contemporary social relevance of disciplines. For him, the disciplines are more appropriate foci because they spoke to the essential character of human nature. Thus he denied any claims that educational aims have to be related to social relevance.

Jaemun Park (1983) approached the topic of structure of knowledge from somewhat different perspective. In *The Structure of Knowledge and Structuralism*, he attempted to explain



meaning of spiral curriculum by Bruner related to structure as identified by structuralists, for example, Jean Piaget, Claude Levi-Strauss, and Noam Chomsky.

Jongseo Kim (1982, 1987) also published some books related to hidden curriculum. Gradually the concept of the hidden curriculum became taken-for-granted curriculum knowledge, widely cited by those who insisted that curriculum preserved social stratification. In 1985, Bukwon Park and Hyeoyoung Lee translated the book *Ideology and Curriculum* (1979) by Michael Apple. After that book, new concepts of hegemony were employed in understanding curriculum in South Korea. In *Theory and Practice of Hidden Curriculum* (1987) Jongseo Kim interpreted hegemony in two senses by referring to Antonio Gramsci in Apple's book. First, hegemony referred to a process of domination whereby ruling class is said to exercise political control through its intellectual and moral leadership over allied classes. Second, it referred as a force through which ideology reproduced socioeconomic class relations. Thus, *curriculum sociologists*, re-emerged attempting to employ hegemony to refine reproduction theory that had been theorized during 1970s in the United States.

Related to policies that emphasized economic education, two books that dealt with higher education appeared. They are *Curriculum: The Approach on Industrial-Educational Cooperation* (1984) by Mukeun Lee and Chonghan Ham, and *The Theory of College Curriculum: Issues and Problems* (1987) by Sungho Lee. Both of them asserted that programs of industrial-educational cooperation and the needs of business should be more included in college curriculum because college graduates cannot meet the level demanded by highly industrialized occupations. This emphasis illustrates the rapid move in subsequent decades toward curriculum that enhances capitalistic competition in a globalized world. This orientation has dominated curriculum

scholarship, policy, and practice in South Korea and in many other nations of the world for the past 25 years.

### 3. Bibliography of Curriculum Books 1982-1987

#### 1982

- Eisner, E. W. (1982). *Educational imagination* (Lee Haemyeong, Trans.). Seoul: Dankook University Press.
- Hong Woongsun (1982). *New introduction of curriculum: Coordinates of Korean education*. Seoul: Muneumsa.
- Kim Bongsu (1982). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Hakmunsa.
- Kim Changgul (1982). *Curriculum and guidelines for teaching*. Seoul: Daebang.
- Kim Chungkwon (1982). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Jaedongmunhwasa.
- Kim Jongseo, Lee Youngdeok & Lee Hongwoo (1982). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Seoul National University Press.
- Lee Haemyeong (1982). *Curriculum of highly industrialized society*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.
- Lee Sungho (1982). *Curriculum: The strategy of development and procedure*. Seoul: Muneumsa.
- Lee Youngdeok, Lee Hongwoo & Kim Soontaek (1982). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.
- Taba, H. (1982). *Curriculum development* (Lee Gyeongseop, Kim Wonhee, Kim Minnam & Chung Hopyo, Trans.). Seoul: Hyeongsul.
- Tyler, R. W. (1982). *Basic principles of curriculum & instruction* (Kim Insik, Trans.). Seoul: Hyeongsul.
- Yoo Bongho (1982). *Modern curriculum*. Seoul: Daebang.

#### 1983

- Gil Hyeongseok (1983), *The theory of curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoeumsa.
- Ham Chongkyu (1983). *The study of changing history in the Republic of Korea: I*. Seoul: Sookmyong Women's University Press.
- Hameyer, U. (1983). *School curriculum in the context of lifelong learning* (Kwak Youngwoo, Trans.). Chunju: Chonpook National University Press.
- Kang Shinwoong (1983). *Modern curriculum*. Seoul: Chungminsa.

- Kim Changgul (1983). *Recent curriculum*. Seoul: Kyohakyeongusa.
- Kim Jangbok (1983). *The theory and practice of integrated curriculum*. Seoul: Kyohakyeongusa.
- Kim Sangwon (1983). *The theory of curriculum and instruction*. Seoul: Hakmunsa.
- Kim Wonhee & Kim Yongsun (1983). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Jaedongmunhwasa.
- Ko Younghee & Huh Hyoungh (1983). *Curriculum and guidelines for teaching*. Seoul: Kapeul.
- Kwak Byeongsun (1983). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Baeyoungsa.
- Lawton, D., Gordon, P., Ing, M., Gibby, B., Pring B., & Moore, T. (1978). *Theory and practice of curriculum studies* (Lee Gyeongseop, Shin Haewoo, Kim Wonhee, Kim Insik & Lee Wonhee, Trans.). Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.
- Park Jaemun (1983). *The structure of knowledge and structuralism*. Seoul: Hyeongsul.
- Shim Jingoo & Kim Chunghaeng (1983). *Curriculum and evaluation*. Seoul: Hakmunsa.
- Yoo Bongho (1983). *Modern curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyukyeongusa

#### 1984

- Lee Hongwoo (1984). *Purpose and difficulty of education*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.
- Lee Mukeun & Ham Chonghan (1984). *Curriculum: The approach on industrial-educational cooperation*. Seoul: Sangjosa.
- Mun Seungim (1984). *Curriculum and evaluation*. Seoul: Kyoyukmunhwasa.

#### 1985

- Apple, M. W. (1985). *Ideology and curriculum* (Park Bukwon & Lee hyeyoung, Trans.). Seoul: Hangilsa.
- Gil Hyeongseok & Kang Bongkyu (1985). *Curriculum and evaluation*. Seoul: Hakmunsa.
- Han Myeonhoe (1985). *Future-oriented curriculum*. Seoul: Muneumsa.
- Kim Insik (1985). *Curriculum and evaluation*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa
- Kim Jaebok (1985). *Integrated approach of curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa
- Lee Sungho (1985). *Curriculum and evaluation*. Seoul: Yangseowon.
- Yoon Pahljoong (1985a). *Curriculum and educational evaluation*. Seoul: Muneumsa.

Yoon Youngsun (1985b). *Curriculum and evaluation*. Seoul: Parkyoungsa.

## 1986

Cho Chunggi (1986). *Curriculum and educational evaluation*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.

Lee Heameyeong (1986). *Curriculum and evaluation*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.

Yoo Bongho & Chung Youngjoo (1986). *Curriculum and educational evaluation*. Seoul: Kyohak-yeongusa.

## 1987

Beauchamp, G. A. (1987). *Curriculum theory* (Kim Jongseok & KangYoung, Trans.). Seoul: Muneumsa.

Chun Jongbae & Kim Sunae (1987). *Curriculum and educational evaluation*. Seoul: Jaedongmunhwasa.

Griffin, C. (1987). *Curriculum theory in adult and lifelong education* (Kim Sooil, Trans.). Seoul: Dae-hankyokwaseo.

Kang Bongkyu & Lee Jongsung (1987). *New introduction of curriculum and educational evaluation*. Seoul: Hyeongsul.

Kim Bongsoo (1987). *The theory of modern curriculum*. Seoul: Hakmunsa.

Kim Changgul (1987). *Curriculum and educational evaluation*. Seoul: Kyohakyeongusa

Kim Jongseo (1987). *The theory and practice of hidden curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.

Kim Jongseo, Lee Youngdeok, Hwang Chungkyu & Lee Hongwoo (1987). *Curriculum and educational evaluation*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.

Kim Yongsun & Kang Bangchul (1987). *Curriculum and educational evaluation*. Seoul: Dongmunsa.

Lee Hongwoo (1984). *Purpose and difficulty of education*. (second edition). Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa

Lee Sungho (1987). *The theory of college curriculum: Issues and problems*. Seoul: Yonsei University Press.

McNeil, J. D. (1987). *Curriculum: A comprehensive introduction* (Lee Gyeongseop, Lee Jongwon, Park Youngboo, Chang Wonjo & Choi Hosung, Trans.). Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.

Shepherd, G. D., & Ragan, W. B. (1987). *Modern elementary curriculum* (Yongui Song, Trans.). Seoul: Sungwonsa.

Tyler, R. W. (1987). *Basic principles of curriculum & instruction* (Lee Haemyeong, Trans.). Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.

Yoon Pahljoong. (1987). *Issues of curriculum theory*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.

## **CHAPTER SEVEN:**

### **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION**

A major problem of curriculum studies in South Korea has been the lack of historical awareness that any disciplinary fields would require. Thus, I have attempted to portray the books published by curriculum scholars during forty-two years after independence in 1945, and to interpret and discuss salient contributions. I have portrayed the educational and political context in which curriculum books evolved. To some extent the relationship of social situations to curriculum thought is obvious. Indeed they contributed to the emergence of the distinctive schools of curriculum thought. On the other hand, whatever the historical period or the particular setting, there is something of the timelessness of the questions that have pervaded curriculum studies. Therefore, I have set this forty-two year history against the backdrop early influences and transformations from 57BCE to 1945 that shaped recent curriculum development and curriculum studies.

While curriculum studies have universality and particularity, curriculum studies in South Korea had a strong tendency to emphasize the nature of universality and curriculum scholars somewhat regarded United States curriculum ideas and orientations as the universal. Thus, many Korean curriculum scholars just attempted to introduce U.S. curriculum studies uncritically. Given these circumstances, curriculum studies in South Korea is embedded in economic globalization and in cultural, social, and international consequences that globalization brings.

Therefore, in this study I have tried not to fall into the trap which Edward W. Said (1979) indentified in his book *Orientalism* for interpreting or recognizing South Korean insights because these circumstances had an impact on my academic perspective unconsciously. I have attempted to maintain a balance of Eastern and Western thought, i.e., not only recognizing the West but also re-thinking Korean curriculum studies in terms of local and regional knowledge. Within similar context Youngchun Kim (2010) has attempted to create a Korean curriculum language opposed to traditional Western-influenced curriculum studies, and to produce indexical and indigenous languages that are not imitations of those created by curriculum scholars in the West.

However it cannot be denied that U.S. curriculum studies have exerted a huge impact on forming diverse perspectives on South Korean curriculum thought. U.S. curriculum studies also have evolved within particular social contexts. Curriculum studies should be understood in their social, political, cultural, geographical and economic contexts; this applies, of course, to the United States, South Korea, and other countries.

Furthermore, one cannot comprehend the nature of curriculum thought without seeing it in its historical context. In order to analyze the influences of U.S. curriculum studies upon curriculum studies in South Korea requires one who is able to combine U.S. curriculum studies and South Korean curriculum studies with an extensive knowledge both of the literature and of history of each as well as the larger history of influences between these countries. No one is fully able to accomplish this task, and the extent of reading or knowledge it requires about both countries. Thus, this thesis is beginning of such a project that will hopefully grow through efforts of many scholars.

Accordingly, I have conducted this study in the hope that it will serve until a more adequate historical inquiry can be written. A good historical inquiry should take into account a wider range



of works than I have been able to master in this study. This is a project I hope to strive to do in future years.

My accomplishment in this study has been to provide three attributes which are necessary in historical inquiry: (1) a relatively extensive coverage of historical issues and problems; (2) a bibliography of curriculum books that appeared in South Korea from 1945 to 1987; and (3) commentaries on the literature that address its historical meaning if it is to be adequately understood.

I hope that it will be of use both to those who wish to understand curriculum studies in South Korea and to anyone who is interested in becoming introduced to this important area of curriculum history.

## **1. Understanding Derived from this Inquiry**

Curriculum studies in South Korea as a formal area of inquiry appeared after independence in 1945. Since that time approximately 150 curriculum books in South Korea appeared from 1945 to 1987. During forty-two years at least four dominant schools of curriculum thought have competed against each other. They are *curriculum experientialists*, *advocates of curriculum development*, *curriculum scholars of analytical philosophy*, and *curriculum sociologists*.

In addition, curriculum studies since 1945 is portrayed as having grown from a long history beginning around 57BCE and moving through several historical transformations: Three Kingdoms Period (57BCE-935), Koroy Period (918-1392), Choson Period (1392-1897), Early Modernization (1897-1910), and Japanese Colonization (1910-1945).

After independence in 1945, the urgent problems of education were to extirpate the remnants of the Japanese and to establish future directions of education. There was a dominant group who was leading education reformation at this time. They started a movement for reforming “old education”, which was called as “New Education Movement”. The NEM gradually formed a school of curriculum thought, which will be called as *curriculum experientialism*. This school of thought was strongly influenced by John Dewey and other experientialists in the United States. Some of features of experientialists in the United States are to encourage curriculum based on the child’s nature, and then to continuously study the child scientifically. Even though experientialists in South Korea agree with the idea of developing curriculum based on the child’s nature, they use a different method. They revealed the nature of the child with philosophical inquiry. While Dewey was highly philosophical, his call for scientific inquiry was given little emphasis by South Korean experientialists. It is a telling commentary on neo-colonial influence of the U.S. on South Korea that John Dewey is cast as a major contributor to right-wing curriculum efforts when the usual interpretation is that his radical democratic theory makes him left-wing. This may be due to the fact that the USAMGIK emphasized Dewey’s advocacy of the child without his radical participatory democracy.

Another school of curriculum thought which appears in 1950s is *advocates of curriculum development* represented by Bummo Chung. He published the book *Curriculum* in 1956 and this book, based on the Tyler Rationale, had a profound impact on the fields of curriculum. For a long time, Bummo Chung's definition of education was taught in colleges as the one and only definition. When Benjamin Bloom's *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* (1956) and Robert F. Mager's (1962) concept of behavioral objectives along with behavioral psychology were introduced, this school of thought solidified its alliance and enjoyed general popularity among

teachers and educators who favored an efficiency-based nature. Two important elements of this orientation are the notions of identification of purposes and regulation of means for achieving the aims. That is, purposes and objectives of curriculum are best when stated in the form of measurable goals and outcomes. Thus, many educational purposes and objectives are selected based on whether they can be measured. Thus, the aims that cannot be measured are ruled out. This school of thought was widely adopted by administrative approach of the Ministry of Education.

The third school of curriculum thought which appears in the 1970s is *curriculum of analytical philosophy*. Gyeongseop Lee (1968) first introduced discipline-centered curriculum with reference to Jerome Bruner. This school of curriculum thought was triggered by Bruner; however, its ideas were considerably influenced by Richard S. Peters and Paul H. Hirst. A series of curriculum scholars began to pay attention to this new theory. This school of curriculum thought explored possibilities offered by a strategy of curriculum design which attempts to arrive at a useful specification of curriculum and the educational process without starting with pre-specified the anticipated outcomes of that process in the form of objectives. This starts from the position that education implies the transmission of what is worthwhile to those who become committed to it and that it must involve knowledge and understanding through cognitive processes perspective that are not inert ideas (Whitehead, 1929). This school of thought held that within a discipline of knowledge, it is possible to select content for curriculum without reference to student behaviors or indeed to ends of any kind other than that of representing the form of knowledge in curriculum.

The last school of curriculum thought was *curriculum sociologists*. In *The Analysis of the Forms of Instruction* (1970) Jongseo Kim and Youngchan Kim focused on affective domain of

interactions between teachers and students rather than on cognitive domain of students. In addition they pointed out that instruction is more complicated than the assumption of the Tyler Rationale which is apt to simplify instruction as a means for achieving educational purposes. Sangjoo Lee (1974) called the perspective of the Tyler Rationale “prescriptive curriculum”, and asserted that a “realistic model” of curriculum is necessary to describe the actual processes of curriculum development. Under this context after *A Study on Hidden Curriculum* (1975) and *Hidden Curriculum* (1976) by Jongseo Kim the issue that the informal objectives and structures of schooling have significant effects on the formation of students’ image of personalities has been widely discussed. This school of thought shares the basic premise that schools reproduce the structure of society by providing knowledge and experience differently to students of different social-economic classes, and which perpetuates class structure through hidden curriculum.

## **2. Recommendations for Future Research**

Finally inasmuch as questions are at least as important as answers, this thesis raises central questions for further investigation. The questions that follow are possible projects of future study that evolve from reflection on this study. They are what I want to pursue and what I encourage other curriculum scholars to pursue in the future. They can move in many directions.

1. To what extent does the curriculum field in South Korea suffer from lack of historical awareness? What insights have curriculum scholars ignored from their own past or from historical perpetuation in other parts of the world? For instance, might they find it

worthwhile to cultivate their Confucian or Buddhist heritage in order to address ethics, spirituality, and unity for today's educational issues and for curriculum?

2. What is the nature of curriculum studies, is or should it be more theoretical or practical? Can the theoretic and practical orientations in curriculum (see Joseph Schwab, 1970, 1971) both offer contributions to curriculum studies in South Korea?
3. How fundamental are the differences between schools of curriculum thought: the *curriculum experientialists*, *advocates of curriculum development*, *curriculum scholars of analytical philosophy*, and *curriculum sociologists*? Further, are they wholly separate and incompatible, or taken together do they complement one another, providing broader and deeper perspectives on the complex phenomenon known as curriculum studies?
4. Are these schools of thought suitable categories for analyzing and interpreting curriculum books produced from 1987 to present? As young curriculum scholars in South Korea in the 2000s have drawn upon an array of sources neglected in curriculum studies (such as: radical psychoanalysis, neo-Marxism, critical theory, phenomenological studies, and deconstruction since 2000s), is a new paradigm or school(s) of thought needed to the categories I have delineated?
5. Does the paradigm of curriculum studies in South Korea shift from curriculum development to curriculum understanding, as Pinar (1978) indicates? Further, is conflict among schools of thought or perspectives of inquiry a sign of the immaturity of curriculum studies, or signs of conceptual richness, diversity, and complexity of inquiry?

6. Should the paradigm of curriculum studies in South Korea shift to curriculum understanding? If it does, will it reach policy and practice as much as curriculum development did in the past?
7. Can the same phenomena of curricula be studied from a variety of research perspectives? How should each result be interpreted and judged? Is or does selection of form of inquiry redefine curriculum and the nature of problems perceived?
8. What are the fundamental differences and similarities between curriculum studies in South Korea and the United States, especially in an increasingly globalized society?
9. If curriculum studies in South Korea were strongly influenced by curriculum scholars of the United States, is curriculum studies in South Korea merely an imitation of the United States, or are there any indigenous curriculum studies in South Korea? Should curriculum scholars try to figure out the indigenous attributes of curriculum studies in South Korea?
10. How can Korean curriculum scholars re-think, re-interpret and re-formulate curriculum studies in terms of local and regional knowledge? That is, for those who work in Western Knowledge traditions, how can Korean curricularists represent and perform their distinctive approaches to curriculum inquiry in ways that authentically demonstrate their own localness?
11. Are there pockets of resistance to national curriculum policy? If so, do they offer precedent for cultivating greater capacities for student lives and contributions in the world?

12. Does this study offer new insight for curriculum studies in South Korea as well as in the United States?

## REFERENCES

- A Society for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction of Education College (Ed.). (1978). *New curriculum and instruction*. Seoul: Kyoyuk.
- Adams, D. (1960). Problems of reconstruction in Korean education. *Comparative Education Review*, 13(3), 27-32.
- Alberty, H. (1947). *Reorganizing the high school curriculum*. New York: Macmillan.
- American Education Team (1956a). *Curriculum handbook for the schools of Korea*. Seoul: CERI.
- American Education Team (1956b). *Curriculum handbook for the schools of Korea* (Seo Myeongwon, Trans). Seoul: CERI.
- Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. London: Routledge.
- Apple, M. (1985). *Ideology and curriculum* (Park Bukwon, & Lee hyeyoung, Trans.). Seoul: Hangilsa.
- Aristotle. (1945). *The politics*, (Ernest Barker, Trans.). London: Oxford at the Clarendon Press.
- Beauchamp, G. A. (1981). *Curriculum theory* (fourth edition). Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock Publishers.
- Beauchamp, G. A. (1987). *Curriculum theory* (Kim Jongseok, & KangYoung, Trans.). Seoul: Muneumsa.
- Bloom, B. (1976). *Human characteristics and school learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bloom, B. (Ed.). (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: D. McKay Co. Inc.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Broudy, H. S. (1961). *Building a philosophy of education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Broudy, H. S. (1963). *Building a philosophy of education* (Lee Ingi & Seo Myeongwon, Trans.). Seoul: Eulseomunhwasa.
- Broudy, H. S. (1969a). *Comments and Recommendations in Connection with Long-Range Planning for Curriculum and Instruction* (Interim Report). Seoul: The Ministry of Education.



- Broudy, H. S. (1969b). Some principles of curriculum design. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 7(1), 66-69.
- Broudy, H. S., & Palmer, J. R. (1965). *Exemplars of teaching method*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Broudy, H. S., Smith, B. O., & Burnett, J. (1964). *Democracy and excellence in American secondary education: A study in curriculum theory*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Bruner, J. (1960). *The process of education*. New York: Vantage.
- Bruner, J. (1973). *The process of education* (Lee Hongwoo, Trans.). Seoul: Baeyoungsa.
- Buber, M. (1958). *I and thou* (second edition). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Carroll, J. B. (1967). *A study of "a model of school learning"*. Cambridge : Center for Research and Development on Educational Differences, Harvard University.
- Caswell, H., & Campbell, D. (1935). *Curriculum development*. New York: American Book Company.
- Chan, W. T. (1963). *A source book in Chinese philosophy*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Chang, Sangho (1997). *Disciplines and education*. Seoul: Seoul National University Press.
- Chang, Sungmo, Yoo, Hangu, & Lee, Hongwoo (2003). *Curriculum theory*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwahaksa.
- Chim, Jaedong & Ko, Younghee (1974). *The theory and practice of curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyuk.
- Cho, Chunggi (1986). *Curriculum and educational evaluation*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwahaksa.
- Choi, Byoungchil (1953). The Constructive Method of Curriculum. *Radio School*, 3, 231-237.
- Chu, Kiyong (1949). Educational reconstruction. *Saekyoyuk*, 2(2), 26-30.
- Chun, Jongbae & Kim, Sunae (1987). *Curriculum and educational evaluation*. Seoul: Jaedongmunhwasa.
- Chung, Bummo (1956a). *A Statistical Method*. Seoul: Punggukhakwon.
- Chung, Bummo (1956b). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Punggukhakwon.
- Chung, Bummo (1958). *Principles of Educational Evaluation*. Seoul: Punggukhakwon.

- Chung, Bummo (1968). *Education and educational studies*. Seoul: Baeyoungsa.
- Chung, Bummo (2006). *The climate for intellectual inquiry*. Gyeonggi-do: Nanam.
- Chung, Bummo, Chung, Wonsik, Park, Yonghun & Lee, Yonghun (1975). *The principle of course of study*. Seoul: Neungryeokgaebal.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1948). *Democracy and education* (O Chunsuk, Trans.) Seoul: Gukjemunhwakonghoe.
- Dreeben, R. (1970). Curriculum as educational process: The middle class against itself. In N. Overly (Ed.), *The unstudied curriculum* (16-26). Washington, DC: ASCD, NEA.
- Educational Council (Ed., & Trans.). (1953). *New education movement: The history and construction of curriculum*. Seoul: Hakwoosa.
- Eisner, E. (1979). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school program*. New York: Macmillan.
- Eisner, E. (1982). *Educational imagination* (Lee Haemyeong, Trans.). Seoul: Dankook University Press.
- Eisner, E. W., & Vallance, E. (Eds.). (1974). *Conflicting conceptions of curriculum*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Flanders, N. A. (1970). *Analyzing teaching behavior*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
- Fromm, E. (1976). *To have or to be*. New York: Continuum.
- Gadamer, H. G. (1975). *Truth and method*. New York: Continuum.
- Gagne, R. M. M. (1967). *The conditions of learning*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Gil, Hyeongseok (1983). *The theory of curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoemussa.
- Gil, Hyeongseok & Kang, Bongkyu (1985). *Curriculum and evaluation*. Seoul: Hakmunsa.
- Gil, Hyeongsuk, Lee, Jinbun & Lee, Chingchan (1977). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyuk.
- Giroux, H. A. (1980). Critical theory and rationality in citizenship education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 10(4), 329-366.
- Giroux, H. A., Penna, A. N., & Pinar, W. F. (Eds.). (1981). *Curriculum and instruction: Alternatives in education*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

- Griffin, C. (1983). *Curriculum theory in adult and lifelong education*. Beckenham, England: Croom Helm.
- Griffin, C. (1987). *Curriculum theory in adult and lifelong education* (Kim Sooil, Trans.). Seoul: Daehankyokwaseo.
- Gwynn, J. M. (1943). *Curriculum principles and social trends*. New York: Macmillan.
- Ham, Chongkyu (1962). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Changdongmunhwasa.
- Ham, Chongkyu (1966). *The revised curriculum*. Seoul: Jaedongmunhwasa.
- Ham, Chongkyu (1970). *Curriculum*. (second edition). Seoul: Ikmunsa.
- Ham, Chongkyu (1974). *A study on changing history of curriculum*. Seoul: Sookmyong Women's University Press.
- Ham, Chongkyu (1975). *The revised curriculum* (second edition). Seoul: Hyeongseol.
- Ham, Chongkyu (1976). *The Study of Changing History in the Republic of Korea: I*. Seoul: Sookmyong Women's University Press.
- Ham, Chongkyu (1980). *The Study of Changing History in the Republic of Korea: II*. Seoul: Sookmyong Women's University Press.
- Ham, Chongkyu (2003). *A study of the changing history of the national curriculum in South Korea*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwahaksa.
- Ham, Chongkyu, Lee, Youngdeok, Kim, Hokwon, Kim, Nansu, & Hwang, Jungkyu (1960). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Hyeondaekyoyukchongseo.
- Hameyer, U. (1979). *School curriculum in the context of lifelong learning*. Hamburg : UNESCO Institute for Education.
- Hameyer, U. (1983). *School curriculum in the context of lifelong learning* (Kwak Youngwoo, Trans.). Chunju: Chonpook National University Press.
- Hamilton, D. (1990). *Curriculum history*. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Han, Myeonhoe (1985). *Future-oriented curriculum*. Seoul: Muneumsa.
- He, M. F. (2003). *A river forever flowing: Cross-cultural lives and identities in the multicultural landscape*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

- He, M. F. (2010). Curriculum inquiry. In Craig Kridel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of curriculum studies* (213-127). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- He, M. F. (2012). East~west epistemological convergence of humanism in language, culture, identity, and education: Confucius~Makiguchi~Dewey. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 10(1), 1-21.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1807). *Phenomenology of mind*. (several editions are available)
- Hirooka, R. (1953). *New curriculum theory* (Kwangjoo Teacher's College, Trans.). Chonnam: Kwangjoo Teacher's College.
- Hirst, P. H., & Peters, R. S. (1970). *The logic of education*. New York: Humanities Press.
- Hong, Hoojo (2004). 50-year history of curriculum studies in South Korea. In Korea Culture Research Institute of Ehwa Woman's University (Ed.), *50 year history of education in the Republic of Korea*. Seoul: Korea Culture Research Institute of Ehwa Woman's University.
- Hong, Woongsun (1971). *The theoretical background of new curriculum*. Seoul: Baeyoungsa.
- Hong, Woongsun (1973a). Curriculum. In Korean Education Research Association (Ed.). *A history of educational studies in the Republic of Korea* (257-284). Seoul: Korean Education Research Association.
- Hong, Woongsun (1973b). *The study of new curriculum*. Seoul: Yonsei University Press.
- Hong, Woongsun (1976). *New elementary curriculum*. Seoul: Kyohaksa.
- Hong, Woongsun (1979). *New introduction of curriculum*. Seoul: Muneumsa.
- Hong, Woongsun (1982). *New introduction of curriculum: Coordinates of Korean education*. Seoul: Muneumsa.
- Hopkins, L. T. (1929). *Curriculum principles and practices*. New York: Benjamin H. Sanborn & Company.
- Hyojae Elementary School (1987). *Ninety two year history of Hyojae elementary school*. Seoul: Hyojae elementary school.
- Illich, I. (1971). *Deschooling society*. New York: Harper& Row.
- Ingram, J. B. (1979). *Curriculum integration and lifelong education: A contribution to the improvement of school curricula*. Paris: UNESCO Division of Structures, Contents, and Methods of Education.

- Jackson, P. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Jackson, P. (1992). Conceptions of curriculum and curriculum specialists. In P. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (3-40). New York: Macmillan.
- Joo, Sehwan (1969). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Jiphyeonsa.
- Kalton, M. C. (1988). *To become a sage: The ten diagrams on sage learning*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kang, Bongkyu & Lee, Jongsung (1987). *New introduction of curriculum and educational evaluation*. Seoul: Hyeongsul.
- Kang, Shinwoong (1974). *Modern curriculum*. Seoul: Beopmunsa.
- Kang, Shinwoong (1980). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Seokwanggongsa.
- Kang, Shinwoong (1983). *Modern curriculum* (second edition). Seoul: Chungminsa.
- Kang, Shinwoong & Wang Gihang (1968). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyuk.
- Kang, Woochul (1966). *The planning and guiding principles of curriculum*. Seoul: Hyeondae-kyoyukchongseo.
- Kang, Woochul (1971). *The planning and guiding principles of curriculum*. (second edition). Seoul: Hyeondaekyoyukchongseo.
- Kant, I. (1787). *Critique of pure reason*. (several editions are available).
- Kilpatrick, W. H. (1918). The project method. *Teachers College Record*, 19(4), 319-335.
- Kilpatrick, W. H. (1954). *Group education for a democracy* (Sung Naeun, Trans.). Seoul: CERI.
- Kim, Bongsoo (1982). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Hakmunsa.
- Kim, Bongsoo (1987). *The theory of modern curriculum*. Seoul: Hakmunsa.
- Kim, Bongsoo, Kim, Sikjoong, Cho, Yongjin, & Hwang, Chungkyu (1963). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Kyowoosa.
- Kim, Byeonghwa, Kim, Jongseo & Lee, Youngdeok (1973). *Curriculum and guideline of teaching*. Seoul: Seoul National Open University Press.
- Kim, Chaechun (2001). A study on the tripartite nature of curriculum inquiry. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19(2), 1-18.

- Kim, Changgul (1982). *Curriculum and guidelines for teaching*. Seoul: Daebang.
- Kim, Changgul (1983). *Recent curriculum*. Seoul: Kyohakyeongusa.
- Kim, Changgul (1987). *Curriculum and educational evaluation*. Seoul: Kyohakyeongusa.
- Kim, Chungkwon (1982). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Jaedongmunhwasa.
- Kim, Daeyung, & Kim, Jungkyu (1972). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Jaedongmunhwasa.
- Kim, Hokwon (1968). *The theories of modern curriculum*. Seoul: Hyeondaekyoyuk.
- Kim, Hokwon (1970). *The principles of mastery learning*. Seoul: Baeyoungsa.
- Kim, Hokwon (1980). *The inquiry of learning in school*. Seoul: Kyoyukgwahaksa.
- Kim, Hokwon, Lee, Donhee & Lee, Hongwoo (1977). *The theory of modern curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyuk.
- Kim, Insik (1985). *Curriculum and evaluation*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.
- Kim, Jaebok (1983). *The theory and practice of integrated curriculum*. Seoul: Kyohakyeongusa.
- Kim, Jaebok (1985). *Integrated approach of curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.
- Kim, Jongseo (1975). *A study on hidden curriculum*. Seoul: Seoul National University Press.
- Kim, Jongseo (1976). *Hidden curriculum*. Seoul: Ikmunsa.
- Kim, Jongseo (1979). *Curriculum and instruction*. Seoul: Baeyoungsa.
- Kim, Jongseo (1987). *The theory and practice of hidden curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.
- Kim, Jongseo, & Kim, Youngchan (1970). *The analysis of the forms of instruction*. Seoul: Kyoyuk.
- Kim, Jongseo, & Lee, Hongwoo (1980). Curriculum and instruction in Korean schools as observed by foreign specialists. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 18(1), 82-99.
- Kim, Jongseo, Lee, Youngdeok & Lee, Hongwoo (1982). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Seoul National University Press.
- Kim, Jongseo, Lee, Youngdeok, Hwang, Chungkyu & Lee, Hongwoo (1987). *Curriculum and educational evaluation*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.

- Kim, Pusik (1145). *A history of Three Kingdoms* (Lee Jaeho, Trans.). Seoul: Sol.
- Kim, Sangwon (1983). *The theory of curriculum and instruction*. Seoul: Hakmunsa.
- Kim, Sikjoong (1972). *Curriculum*. Daegu: Hakmunsa.
- Kim, Sikjoong & Kim, Yongsun (1977). *New theory of curriculum*. Seoul: Hakmunsa.
- Kim, Sooil (1973). Curriculum development study for demographic education. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 11(1), 5-25.
- Kim, Sooil (1974). Selecting subject matters of population education. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 12(3), 98-101.
- Kim, Sunae (1974). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Jaedongmunhwasa.
- Kim, Sungkwon (1968). *The principles of modern curriculum*. Seoul: Hyeondaekyoyuksa.
- Kim, Sungtae (1952). Curriculum course. *Radio School*, 2, 212-225.
- Kim, Wonhee (1975). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Jaedongmunhwasa.
- Kim, Wonhee & Kim, Yongsun (1983). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Jaedongmunhwasa.
- Kim, Yonggi (1963). *Modern curriculum*. Seoul: Hapdong.
- Kim, Yongsun & Kang, Bangchul (1987). *Curriculum and educational evaluation*. Seoul: Dongmunsa.
- Kim, Youngchun (2010). Transnational curriculum studies: Reconceptualization discourse in South Korea. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 40(4), 531-554.
- Kliebard, H. M. (1986). *The struggle for the American curriculum: 1893-1958*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Ko, Younghee & Huh, Hyung (1975). *The theory and practice of new curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyuk.
- Ko, Younghee & Huh, Hyung (1983). *Curriculum and guidelines for teaching*. Seoul: Kapeul.
- Kohlberg, L. (1970). The moral atmosphere of the school. In N. Overly (Ed.), *The unstudied curriculum* (104-127). Washington, DC: ASCD, NEA.
- Korean Education Association (1969). *Curriculum of each level of school: The theory and practice*. Seoul: Daehakkyoyukeonhakhoe.

- Korean Open Board of Education (Ed.). (1977). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Munjongseokwan.
- Korean Overseas Information Service (1979). *A handbook of Korea*. Seoul: Samhwas.
- Kwak, Byeongsun (1983). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Baeyoungsa.
- Lawton, D., Gordon, P., Ing, M., Gibby, B., Pring B., & Moore, T. (1978). *Theory and practice of curriculum studies*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Lawton, D., Gordon, P., Ing, M., Gibby, B., Pring B., & Moore, T. (1978). *Theory and practice of curriculum studies* (Lee Gyeongseop, Shin Haewoo, Kim Wonhee, Kim Insik & Lee Wonhee, Trans.). Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.
- Lee, Gyeongseop (1968). Discipline in the curriculum theory: On the structure of discipline. *Article Collection of Kyungpook National University*. 12, 177-199.
- Lee, Gyeongseop (1972). *The theory of curriculum*. Seoul: Joongangcheoksungyeonguso.
- Lee, Gyeongseop (1973). *The modern curriculum* (second edition). Daegu: Hyeongsul.
- Lee, Gyeongseop (1997). *A study of history of modern curriculum in South Korea*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwahaksa.
- Lee, Haemyeong (1982). *Curriculum of highly industrialized society*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.
- Lee, Haemyeong (1986). *Curriculum and evaluation*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.
- Lee, Hongwoo (1974). Classic model and its alternative of curriculum. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1, 11-33.
- Lee, Hongwoo (1977). *Curriculum inquiry*. Seoul: Parkyoungsa.
- Lee, Hongwoo (1978). *The structure of knowledge and subject-matter*. Seoul: Kyoyukgwahaksa.
- Lee, Hongwoo (1984). *Purpose and difficulty of education*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.
- Lee, J. M., & Lee, D. M. (1940). *The child and his curriculum*. New York: Applenton-Century Craofts.
- Lee, J. M., & Lee, D. M. (1954). The child and his curriculum: I (Seo Uidon, Trans.). Seoul: CERI.
- Lee, J. M., & Lee, D. M. (1956). The child and his curriculum: II (Seo Uidon, Trans.). Seoul: CERI.



- Lee, J. M., & Lee, D. M. (1957). *The child and his curriculum: III* (Seo Uidon, Trans.). Seoul: CERI.
- Lee, Joongjo (1967). *The management of high school curriculum*. Seoul: Sangmun.
- Lee, Joongjo (1969). *The principles of curriculum*. Seoul: Sangmau.
- Lee, Kyuhwan (1961). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Saegyeulsa.
- Lee, Kyuhwan (1968). *Curriculum*. (second edition). Seoul: Saegyeulsa.
- Lee, Kyuhwan (1972). *The school curriculum*. Seoul: Ewha Women's University Press.
- Lee, Mukeun & Ham, Chonghan (1984). *Curriculum: The approach on industrial-educational cooperation*. Seoul: Sangjosa.
- Lee, Odeok (1977). *How these children do?* Seoul: Chungnyeonsa.
- Lee, Sanghum (1975). *Is this education?* Seoul: Munmyeongsa.
- Lee, Sangjoo (1974). Curriculum from the perspective of decision-making. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1, 59-74.
- Lee, Sangsun (1947). *Comprehensive education and unit instruction*. Seoul: Dongjisa.
- Lee, Sungho (1982). *Curriculum: The strategy of development and procedure*. Seoul: Muneumsa.
- Lee, Sungho (1985). *Curriculum and evaluation*. Seoul: Yangseowon.
- Lee, Sungho (1987). *The theory of college curriculum: Issues and problems*. Seoul: Yeonsei University Press.
- Lee, Yonghwan (1983). *Four paradigms in curriculum research*. *Educational Research of Chonnam National University*, 9, 37-61.
- Lee, Yonghwan (2003). Politics and theories in the history of curricula reform in South Korea. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *International handbook of curriculum research* (pp. 541-552). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lee, Youngdeok (1969). *The process of education*. Seoul: Baeyoungsa.
- Lee, Youngdeok, Lee, Hongwoo & Kim, Soontaek (1982). *Curriculum: Theory, development, management*. Seoul: Kyoyuk-kwakhaksa.

- Lee, Youngdeok, Lee, Yonggul, Joo, Sehwan, Park, Jungae, & Kim, Shinil (1967). *A comprehensive study of the contents of higher education*. Seoul: Joongangkyoyukyeonguso.
- Lim, Hyeongtaek (1992). *An analysis of academic activities of Korean curriculum studies*. Seoul: Yeoni.
- Mager, R. F. (1962). *Preparing instructional objectives*. Palo Alto, CA: Fearon.
- McNeil, J. D. (1985). *Curriculum: A comprehensive introduction* (third edition). Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- McNeil, J. D. (1987). *Curriculum: A comprehensive introduction* (Lee Gyeongseop, Lee Jongwon, Park Youngboo, Chang Wonjo & Choi Hosung, Trans.). Seoul: Kyoyukkwak-haksa.
- Ministry of Education (1963). *Elementary curriculum*. Seoul: Samhwa.
- Morrison, H. C. (1926). *The practice of teaching in the secondary school*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mun, Seungim (1984). *Curriculum and evaluation*. Seoul: Kyoyukmunhwasa.
- Neagley, R. L., & Evan, N. D. (1970). *Handbook of effective curriculum development* (Son Kyubok & Lee Kyeongseop Trans). Seoul: Baeyoungsa.
- O, Chunsuk (1947). *Construction of democratic education*. Seoul: Gukjemunhwakonghoe.
- Orlosy, D. E., & Smith, B. O. (Eds.). (1978). *Curriculum development: Issues and insights*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Park, Insik (1967). *Curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyuk.
- Park, Jaemun (1983). *The structure of knowledge and structuralism*. Seoul: Hyeongsul.
- Park, Sunyoung (1991). *Confucianism molds core of the system: Its legacies cost deep influence*. *Koreana*, 5(2), 13-19.
- Peters, R. S. (1966). *Ethics and education*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Peters, R. S. (1980). *Ethics and Education* (Lee Hongwoo, Trans.). Seoul: Kyoyukgwahaksa.
- Phenix, P. H. (1961). *Education and the common good: A moral philosophy of the curriculum*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

- Phenix, P. H. (1964). *Realms of meaning: A philosophy of the curriculum for general education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pinar, W. F. (1975a). Currere: Toward reconceptualization. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists* (pp. 396-414). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Pinar, W. F. (Ed.). (1975b). *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Pinar, W. F. (1978). Notes on the curriculum field. *Educational Researcher*, 7(8), 5-12.
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (1995). *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Popper, K. R. (1959). *The logic of scientific discovery*. New York: Basic Books.
- Pratt, D. (1980). *Curriculum, design, and development*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Ragan, W. B. (1953). *Modern elementary curriculum*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Ragan, W. B. (1979). *Modern elementary curriculum* (Cho Yongjin, Trans.). Seoul: Hyeongsul.
- Reid, W. A. (2006). *The pursuit of curriculum: Schooling and the public interest*. Greenwich, Conn : Information Age.
- Reimer, E. W. (1971). *School is dead*. New York: Doubleday.
- Said, E. W. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Schubert, W. H. (1986). *Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm, and possibility*. New York: Macmillan.
- Schubert, W. H. (1989). Reconceptualization and the matter of paradigms. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(27), 27-32.
- Schubert, W. H., & Lopez Schubert, A. L. (1980). *Curriculum books: The first eighty years*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Schubert, W. H., Lopez Schubert, A. L., Thomas, T. P., & Carroll, W. M. (2002). *Curriculum books: The first hundred years*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Schubert, W. H., Lopez Schubert, A. L., Thomas, T. P., & Carroll, W. M. (2009). *Curriculum books: The first hundred years* (Kang Iksu, Min Buja, Kim Sangdon, Lee Seungmi, Suh Hana, & Kim Daeyoung, Trans.). Seoul: Hakjisa.

- Schwab, J. J. (1970). *The practical: A language curriculum*. Washington: National Education Association.
- Schwab, J. J. (1971). The practical: Arts of eclectic. *School Review*, 79, 493-542.
- Shepherd, G. D., & Ragan, W. B. (1982). *Modern elementary curriculum*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Shepherd, G. D., & Ragan, W. B. (1987). *Modern elementary curriculum* (Yongui Song, Trans.). Seoul: Sungwonsa.
- Shim, Jingoo & Kim, Chunghaeng (1983). *Curriculum and evaluation*. Seoul: Hakmunsa.
- Silberman, C. E. (1970). *Crisis in the classroom: the remaking American education*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Smith, B. O., Stanley, W. O., & Shores, J. H. (1957). *Fundamentals of curriculum development*. New York: World Book Co.
- Son, Insu (1980). *A study of Korean enlightenment education*. Seoul: Ilchogak.
- Sung, Naeun (1947). Subject integration and new teaching methods. *Choson Education*, 1(7), 23-25.
- Sung, Naeun (1949). *An outline of new education*. Seoul: Hongjisa.
- Taba, H. (1957). *Curriculum development: Theory and practice*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
- Taba, H. (1982). *Curriculum development* (Lee Gyeongseop, Kim Wonhee, Kim Minnam & Chung Hopyo, Trans.). Seoul: Hyeongsul.
- The Board of Education of Jeollabuk-do (1973). *Citizen curriculum*. Chunjoo: The Board of Education of Jeollabuk-do.
- Toffler, A. (1980). *The third wave*. New York: Morrow.
- Tu, W. (1976). *Neo-Confucian thought in action: Wang Yang-ming's youth (1942-1509)*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Tu, W. (2010). *The global significance of concrete humanity: Essays on the Confucian discourse in cultural China*. New Delhi, India: Center for Studies in Civilizations.
- Tu, W., & Ikeda, D. (2011). *New horizons in eastern humanism: Buddhism, Confucianism and the quest for global peace*. New York: I.B.Tauris.

- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tyler, R. W. (1982). *Basic principles of curriculum & instruction* (Kim Insik, Trans.). Seoul: Hyeongsul.
- Tyler, R. W. (1987). *Basic principles of curriculum & instruction* (Lee Haemyeong, Trans.). Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.
- Ulich, R. (Ed.). (1954). *Three thousand years of educational wisdom*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- van Manen, M. (1977). Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6(3), 205-228.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1929). *The aims of education and other essays*. New York: Macmillan.
- Yoo, Bongho (1980). *Modern curriculum*. Seoul: Kyohakyeongusa.
- Yoo, Bongho (1982). *Modern curriculum* (second edition). Seoul: Daebang.
- Yoo, Bongho (1997). *A study of history of curriculum in South Korea*. Seoul: Kyohakyeongusa.
- Yoo, Bongho & Chung Youngjoo (1986). *Curriculum and educational evaluation*. Seoul: Kyohakyeongusa.
- Yoo, Taeyoung & Kim, Chungkyu (1977). *Curriculum and guidelines of teaching*. Seoul: Hyeongsul.
- Yoon, Byunghee (1999). Towards a critical reconceptualization of the disciplinary status of curriculum inquiry. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 17(2), 393-413.
- Yoon, Byunghee (2001). A historical review of the curriculum studies in Korea. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19(1), 139-158.
- Yoon, Chaecheon (1946). *An introduction of new education*. Seoul: Chosonkyoyukyeonguhoe.
- Yoon, Pahljoong (1975). An aspect of curriculum research in Korea. *Essays in Seoul National University*, 8, 411-444.
- Yoon, Pahljoong (1980). *The theory of human-centered curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyukgwahaksa.
- Yoon, Pahljoong (1981a). *The theory of curriculum*. Seoul: Kyoyukgwahaksa.
- Yoon, Pahljoong (1981b). *Curriculum for all-round education*. Seoul: Baeyoungsa.

- Yoon, Pahljoong (1983). A task for development of curriculum theory. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 3, 33-58.
- Yoon, Pahljoong (1985). *Curriculum and educational evaluation*. Seoul: Muneumsa.
- Yoon, Pahljoong (1987). *Issues of curriculum theory*. Seoul: Kyoyukkwakhaksa.
- Yoon, Yangmo (1973). *The modern curriculum: curriculum for forming human beings*. Seoul: Tamgudang.
- Yoon, Youngsun (1985). *Curriculum and evaluation*. Seoul: Parkyoungsa.
- Zhao, Y., Lei, J., Li, G., He, M. F., Okano, K., Megahed, N., Gamage, D., & Ramanathan, H. (Eds.). (2011). *Handbook of Asian education: A cultural perspective*. New York: Routledge.

## VITA

**NAME**                      DAEYOUNG KIM

<b>EDUCATION</b>	2009-present	Ph.D	University of Illinois at Chicago	EDUCATION
	2005-2007	M.A.	Korea University	EDUCATION
	1997-2005	B.A.	Korea University	EDUCATION

**PUBLICATIONS**      Insoo Kang, Buja Min, Sangdon Kim, Seungmi Lee, Hana Suh, and **Daeyoung Kim** (Trans.). *Curriculum books: The first hundred years*. Seoul: Hakjisa. 2009.

Gyeongsun Baek, **Daeyoung Kim**, and Hoojo Hong. A study on the implementation of profit equal distribution by each government-authorized textbook. *The Korean Educational Review*, 13(2), 127-151, 2007.

Seungmi Lee, **Daeyoung Kim**, Hoojo Hong, Buja Min. A study on the improvement of after-school education's operating system. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 25(3), 289-314, 2007.