

Participation and Its Restriction in Policy Making Process in Korea*

—Under the third Republic (1963~1972)—

Hae-Kyun Ahn

Professor, Graduate School of Public Administration
Seoul National University

The purposes of this paper are to review the social scientists' participation in governmental policy-making processes in the 3rd Republic of Korea (1963~1972) after the end of military coup d'etat government (1961~1963) and to find a desirable future relationship between the government and social scientists.

In this article, the social scientists' participation is analyzed by focusing on the modes of participation by social scientists (e.g., public administration, political science, economics, sociology, etc.). The modes are classified into two types: direct and indirect. The major institutions analyzed are numerous governmental advisory committees and academic associations for social scientists.

The major finding is that the social scientists' participation under the 3rd Republic was very limited, and if any, participation was made mostly by the economists. The participation by other social scientists was merely a means for legitimation of governmental policies, rather than for improvement of the quality of the policies. This was due to the centralized and authoritarian politico-administrative culture and policymaking structure which was dominated by the group of higher bureaucrats equipped with highly sophisticated modern managerial techniques.

The mode of other social scientists' participation was mostly indirect. It was very difficult for them to access to policy information due to the severe "task security regulations" harshly enforced by the government.

I. Research Focus and Analytical Premises

1. Research Focus

This paper focuses on rediscovering the future problems by examining, through limited data, problems raised but not empirically investigated in Professor Suk-Joon Cho's research paper, "Report on the Seminar on Utilization of Social Science Researches in the Policy

* This paper is a translated version of my paper which was published in Korean Public Administration Review (Korean Association for Public Administration, 1972, Vol. 6), pp.24-46.

Formulation in Government of Republic of Korea"¹⁾ sponsored by Korean Public Administration Association in 1970. Otherwise, collecting and analyzing factual data is beyond the scope of my capability. Moreover, research without such preparation will lead not to new ideas but to the repetitive study already being studied by other scholars.

2. Analytical Premises

As analytical bases for the relationship between policy formulation and social sciences, I focused on some of the following points that Professor Cho already pointed out.

(1) If policy formulation is based on democratic values, policy making process becomes open and its openness promotes increased volume of policy alternatives generated by increased participants. The increased volume, in return, may require more time for decision making and decrease prudence in comparing and evaluating the consequences of each alternative. On the other hand, increased participation under open system can lead to more fact-based policy alternatives.

(2) Under open decision making system, related policy issues may become easily disseminated to individuals and social groups other than to policy agents.

(3) Under closed system, on the other hands, the number of participants and the number of possible alternatives may be limited, the decision speed be fast but search effort for sound alternatives be treated lightly. As a result of this, the decision is likely to become the outcome of personalized decision.

(4) Under closed system, factual bases for policy decisions tend to be rumour, and, as a result of that, the decision is being subjectively judged and misinterpreted.

(5) Empirical researches become important under a system that considers fact as the most important policy decision bases. In this environment, researchers can have real impact on policy decisions.

Considering these five hypothetical policy environment in Korea, it is hypothesized that, participation of scholars and professional groups in policy making processes would be relatively limited and the decision speed would be faster. And then, these two phenomena might lead to limited search for policy alternatives and subjective judgement in policy makings

Under these circumstances, policy makers would lack recognition of and desire to utilizing the scientific studies, thus, many empirical studies conducted by Korean scholars would be used in areas other than being utilized in decision making bases. If there is a case that scholars' empirical studies aren't being fully reflected in policy making by those policy agents who are fact-oriented and ready to accept policy inputs from scholars, then there

should be other reasons. Difficulty to accessing necessary data or lack of sufficient time for studying thoroughly may be one of such reason. Lack of capability to produce excellent research outputs that satisfy policy makers' expectations may be another such reason.

Usually the latter reason is caused either by the lack of scholaristic ability or desire or lack of sufficient time for implementable policy studies. In Korea those variables that affects policy formulation and participation of scholars are the orientation of administrative system as a whole, the basic orientation and capabilities of policy makers, policy practitioners, and scholars, and other constraining factors, etc.

Therefore, I will discuss the relationship between policy formulation and participation focusing on the above variables.

II. Administrative System, Policy Agents and Disciplinary Orientation

Participation of scholars in administrative decision system largely depends on the doctrines of power elites. For example, policy makers' orientation (status-quo orientation vs. development orientation) in policy formulation, and scholars' orientation, etc, are major variables which will decide the participation of scholars. If power elites are only interested in social order or enforcement of their political regime, then, policy formulation for societal problem solving by indusing development, and by reflecting economy, effectiveness, and democratic value into policy making becomes very hard. In this case, policy agents are more interested in knowledge of reinforcing political regime and status quo than that of policy formulation or policy science. Thus, when scholars' participation in policy making process is severely limited, various policy studies by scholars can not have life or cannot be used in real policy making. Bearing this situation in mind, let's examine Korean case.

1. Administrative System and Policy Bureaucrats

(1) The basic doctrine of the Liberal Party regime was maintenance of law and order. Their policy orientation was also status quo. Accordingly, policy bureaucrats emphasized conformity with strong closedness. And they felt strong pride as policy bureaucrats. In this period, only few economists could influence indirectly to policy making processes through public opinion formation, criticism, and suggestions in economic policies. Other social scientists' role was protesting against system reinforcing policy to enhance civil rights through public opinion formation²⁾.

Table 1. The Doctrines of Each Regime and the Change of Administrative Functions

Regime	Regime's Doctrines	Policy Orientation	Administrative Mechanisms	Administrative Functions
Liberal Party (1955~60)	Nation building & Law and order	Status-quo by dependence on foreign power	Simplification Unification Law and order	Maintenance of regime and order
Democratic Party (1960~61)	Economic development	Economic development	Goal-orientation Differentiation & institutional increase Transforming period of economic agencies orientation	Attempt in economic development functions
Republican Party (1961~67)	Economic development	Economic self-sustaining by development	Strong goal-orientation Large differentiation & increase Superiority of economic agencies	Enlargement of economic and social development

(2) The first and second priorities of the Democratic Party regime were economic development and changing policy orientation from law and order to development, respectively. The change of basic orientation, in return, opened opportunity for economists' participation in economic policy formulation. However, participation of other social scientists were yet to be opened except few from public administration field by the generosity of policy bureaucrats. Most of the high level policy bureaucrats (specifically above class 2 level public officials), who had basic background of classical public administration, lacked knowledge in policy sciences.³⁾

(3) Republican Party regime: The first doctrine of Republican Party and military power elites was also economic development and the salient characteristic of its basic policy was goal attainment of economic development.⁴⁾ As a result of this doctrine, in 1960s, there had been dramatic increase in number of policy studies and practical decision makings for the purposes of meeting various administration demands arising from education, society, culture, city, rural problems, housing, transportation and other sectors of people's life, etc. And various administrative reforms had been occurred and new public institutions had been established to accommodate increasing policy demands.

After military coup d'etat during early 1960s, the above listed activities, i.e., the increase of goal attainment oriented economic development, establishment of new public institutions, and accommodation of new administrative demands were mainly handled by high-level policy bureaucrats who had educational background of public administration, business administration, and military administration, and by economists who participated in policymakings directly or indirectly.

Without policy oriented or military management oriented policy bureaucrats and the direct

or indirect participation of economists and policy scientists, one could not have expected 1960s' high economic progress and dramatic changes in every aspect of people's life.⁵⁾ However, in 1960s, policy bureaucrats, I suspect that, had not allowed practical participation on scholars, except some economists, for rational and scientific based policy makings.

Two main reasons for these exclusion of scholars from the policy making processes are: (1) The decision making system under strong president became closed and most of scholars were more equipped with traditional administration theories than those theories of change and normative methodologies (quantitative methods) or positive methodologies. Of course, the latter theories and methodologies are more appropriate application tools for practical decision makings. (2) Lack of policy sciences of similar fields among other public administration curricula at graduate schools and at high official courses of training center for public officials resulted in lack of policy science knowledge. There are several scholars who suggested similar suggestions with mine. First of them are Professor Yun-ho Park's view. He suggested in his article titled "Evaluation of Trainings of Public Officials in the 1960s" that "It is desirable to try to look into all related factors of policy decisions by focusing on the continuous processes of policy formulation and policy execution."⁶⁾ Mr. Hong-uk Dong's view of "public officials' attitude and behavioral change and institutional change from reigning to service to the people" is another example.⁷⁾ Another similar view is that "Government's valuable administrative data should be well organized and preserved so that it can be provided to the necessary researchers and others on time."⁸⁾

2. Disciplinary Orientation - In Case of Public Administration

It is already pointed out that scholars' participation in the administrative decision making depends upon the orientations of three key elements, that is, the orientation of administrative system, policy bureaucrats, and that of scholars.

As I already examined in the previous section of administrative system and policy changes, limited participation or exclusion of participation in the policy making processes during Liberal Party regime was partly due to its regime's status-quo and system maintenance orientation. However, those scholars who were studying public administration could also be blamed for their exclusion. That was because the basic subjects of public administration were composed of Public Law, History of Political Ideology, Comparative Government Theory, and Economics, etc. Except Economics, these subjects provided knowledge bases only for the critics of the government policy decisions. However, studying these subjects

alone could not provide, I suspect that, proper knowledge bases for practical policy studies of which bases are the scientific search for alternatives and proposals for solutions.

Therefore, in this circumstances, it was almost inevitable that not only policy making processes became muddling through or subjective ones but also scholars' major activities in policy making processes were limited to mere public opinion formation based not on concrete scientifically-based alternatives but on subjective value judgement.

At the end of Liberal Party regime, some scholars involved in administrative innovation movements with and by the introduction of the principles of efficiency and effectiveness.

During Democratic Party regime, Graduate School of Public Administration, Seoul National University became enclave for introducing new administrative management to Korea. Scholars of public Administration could start to lay foundation and contribute to the practical public administration, even if it was an indirect ones, by transmitting the knowledge of Organization Theory, Personnel Administration, and Public Finance as core subjects, and Administrative Survey and Analysis as elective course to high-ranking officials.

Since 5.16 military coup d'etat, those military power elites and polity agents (newblood), who were well acquainted with management sciences, mobilized administrative scholars in large scale for the government's important policy formulations. This mobilization, in my judgement, became a great burden for those scholars whose academic interests were limited to theoretical aspects of administrative efficiency and principles. Therefore, in actuality, most of the scholars' activities in policy making processes, except some scholars specializing in Personnel Administration and Financial Administration, were limited to the following ones:

- (1) Finding administrative management principles for efficient implementation of already decided government policies;
- (2) Studying administrative demands and administrative effectiveness;
- (3) Data gathering activities for administrative procedural changes and institutional changes;
- (4) Empirical research for the purpose of systematic classification;
- (5) Acting as policy advisors as an advisory board member or as an expert
- (6) Coordinating policy data or policy alternatives based on subjective judgement by the request of policy bureaucrats, etc.

As management-oriented administrative demands increased around 5.16 military coup

d'etat, several university authorities established Department of Public Administration and started teaching those basic subjects of GSPA, SNU as their undergraduate subjects. In the mid 1960's, the key subjects have been dramatically transformed from traditional management theories to so-called interdisciplinary sciences by reinforcing policy formulation, policy decision making theories, governmental policy analyses, and related analytical methodologies. These changes of basic curricula were being made to meet the demand of governmental agencies of which needs were scientific methods and quantitative analyses for efficient policy formulation and effective implementation of the policies.⁹⁾

These series of changes, i.e., cognitive change of policy agents and policy bureaucrats, their knowledge enhancement of administrative science and policy sciences, their increased capacity for real application, social scientists' increased interests in policy sciences, their capacity increase in these fields, and their desire to participation in policy formulation processes, etc., brought different dynamics than 1950s and 1960s.

III. Participation and Contribution in Policy Making Process

1. Problems

To understand present situation and also to explore future problems, I am going to discuss the contribution of public administration scholars and other social scientists by linking the way they participated in the governmental decision processes.

2. Participation Modes

(1) Direct Modes

- i) Participation as a member of various governmental review boards, decision committees, advisory boards, consulting bodies, and research groups, etc.
- ii) Participation by way of submitting research papers or by policy recommendations which were usually requested by university-attached research institutes or legal entity-type research institutes
- iii) Policy recommendations based on the results of individual research activities done by the support of research funds

(2) Indirect Modes

- i) Participation by publishing books and/or articles
- ii) Acting as an opinion leader by writing or discussing contemporary issues in the media,

〈Table 2〉 Summary of Activities of Governmental Committees

division	class	decision	advice	discussion	research	other	total	
							'71	'61
OAC	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	—
EPB	2	11	—	—	—	—	13	—
MOGA	5	3	1	—	—	—	9	—
MOST	1	5	2	—	—	—	8	1
OAPA	—	4	—	—	—	—	4	—
NUB	—	1	—	—	2	—	3	—
GLA	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	—
PVAA	4	5	1	1	1	1	11	—
MOFA	—	3	2	—	—	—	5	—
MOHA	6(4)	7	—	—	—	—	13	—
MOF	4	10	1	1	1	1	17	4
OMA	2	—	1	—	—	—	3	1
OSA	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	—
OCA	1	3	—	—	—	—	4	—
MOJ	3	3	1	—	—	—	7	1
MOND	9	7	1	1	1	1	19	2
OMMA	—	4	—	—	1	—	5	—
MOE	1	17	1	—	—	1	20	9
MOAF	1	15	5	—	—	—	21	2
OFA	—	5	—	—	—	—	5	—
FA	—	5	—	—	—	—	5	—
MOTI	3	39	—	—	—	3	45	3
MOCT	4	13	—	—	—	3	20	—
MHSA	1	24	—	—	—	—	25	1
OLA	2	6	—	—	—	—	8	—
MOT	4	5	—	—	—	—	9	—
ONRA	4	—	—	—	—	—	4	1
MOC	1	—	—	—	—	2	3	2
MOCI	—	15	—	—	—	—	15	—
total		58	214	16	6	12	303	27

iii) Educating students and policy bureaucrats who may participate in policy making processes in the near future.

The typical roles and backgrounds of those social scientists who participated in various committees differed from committee to committee. For example, those committees of which main issues were legal matters were usually composed of legal (juris) scholars. The major functions of various review committees were centered on reviewing the effectiveness of governmental plans or policy alternatives. The main function of consulting bodies, on the other hand, were mere suggestion of complementary rationalization of government-initia

ted projects and operation plans. The member of these consulting bodies were usually economists, management scientists, and scholars from the fields of sociology and public administration, etc.

As we see in Table 2, when we compare the number of various governmental committees we find that the number increased dramatically from 27 in 1961 to 303 in 1971.¹⁰⁾

The dramatic increase of governmental agencies were, in return, resulted in the increase of governmental projects and policies or in the power elites' motivation of careful review and evaluation of governmental decisions. However, I have great doubt that how much prudence those is, participating scholars in various governmental committees could exercise in reviewing government-initiated project plans and policies or in examining policy alternatives and preferences, especially under the circumstances that they did not have enough time for even their own jobs - teaching and researches. If this is true, I can say that the main functions of those various governmental committees could be characterized by their sheer formality of expert screen procedures and extreme subjectivity of policy evaluation rather than objective evaluation or prudence in reviewing them. It would have been more desirable, in my judgement, if each ministry or government agency could establish its own policy research institute and select research fellows on the merit base. With these institutes, they not only could get more effective and real policy advices but also could enhance their rationality in policy decision making.

In the early part and mid-part of 1960s, scholars' participation in the administrative policy making processes, of which modes were policy recommendations or various policy researches by the request of governmental research institutes, were relatively wide and open. And the main issues or contents reviewed by the participating scholars were also various and substantive ones such as finding better policy directions for the effective implementation of each governmental branches' policies, studying the policy directions, evaluation of personnel, structural problems and budget problems, and other governmental service issues, etc. Moreover, in the latter part of the 1960s, the dramatic changes have been occurred in the field of policy making and policy formulation. Firstly, various social scientists' interests in policy studies have been increased by the increased demand of new administrative tasks. Some examples of those new tasks were the formulation of basic plans and policy formulation for economic development, designs of detailed project plans and implementation plans for supporting the above basic plans, various policies being aimed at changing policy environment to support new policies, new administrative opera-

<Table 3> Research Institutes of Social Science

(Year of 1970)

Speciality	Institutes					
	Academic Society		Corporate		Univ. Attached	
	1970	1966	1970	1966	1970	1966
1. Law	5	4	1	0	9	—
2. Public Adm.	1	1	1	0	4	4
3. Industry, Economics, Management, Trade	3	1	1	2	33	13
4. Social Affairs & Labor	1	2	0	0	9	2
5. Rural Community, Agriculture	1	1	0	3	8	3
6. Local Plans & Development	0	0	0	0	7	1
7. Education	1	3	0	0	3	4
8. News & Broadcasting	1	1	0	0	4	1
9. Population	0	0	1	1	5	1
10. Politics	2	3	1	0	5	2
11. Health	0	0	0	0	1	0
12. Fishing Village	1	0	0	0	4	0
13. Statistics & Computer	0	0	0	0	2	2
14. Psychology & Human Science	1	1	1	1	5	1
15. Social Science	0	0	1	1	5	3
total	17	17	7	8	102	37

tion techniques for adapting to changed policy environment, and resolving inevitable by products of economic development, etc. Secondly, these dramatic increase of scholars' interests resulted in behavioral and institutional changes. It increased the number of new research institutes whether they were university-attached or independent legal entities. It also changed scholars attitudes toward policy researches specifically from passive research activities to active project seeking behaviors. It even revealed active project soliciting behavior. These changes resulted in fierce competition and conflict between and among government economic ministries and bureaus.¹¹⁾

There were several reasons for these increase of policy research institutes. Those reasons are: 1) Many Korean policy problems at that time raised social scientists' interests on policy sciences; 2) Real policy issues could be effectively dealt with interdisciplinary approach rather than individual disciplinary approach; 3) Sadly enough some scholars were interested in policy researches as means of either getting research funds or their supplementary income; and 4) Other scholars were interested in pure research activities and education, etc. Table 3 shows the number of various social and policy research institutes in 1966 and in 1970, respectively.

I have to say that this table is more or less incomplete in the sense that the classific-

〈Table 4〉 Research Projects By ARIC

Year	Research Field		Research Institutes		Speciality				Results			# of Resear- chers	Notes
	Policy Directi- on	Adm. Diagn- osis	Univ. Attached	Private	Adm.	Mgt.	Eco.	Others	Reflec- tion	Ref.	Others		
1965	○	○		CERI				○	○	○			Education Adm.
1965		○		KPC		○				○			Railroad & Communication
1965		○	KU FMI			○			○				Supply Adm.
1965		○	SU MI			○				○			Gov't-run Bank Rationalization
1965		○	KU FMI			○			○				Tax Adm.
1965	○	○	FMI			○				○			Grain Mgt.
1965		○	FMI			○				○			Budget Acc. Sys
1965		○		KRIPA			○			○			Local Adm.
1965		○		KPC		○				○			Rationalization of Gov't Managing Firms (Service)
1965		○	YU MPI					○		○			Rationalization of Gov't Managing Firms under MOTI
1966	○	○	SNU G.S.P.A.						○	○			Chief Mgt. Improvement
1966	○	○	SNU G.S.P.A.						○	○			Public Official System
1967	○	○	SNU G.S.H.	KIEC			○		○	○			Health Adm.
1967	○	○		KLAA					○	○			Post Service Project
1967	○	○									○		Optimal Adm. District

Year	Research Field		Research Institutes		Speciality				Results			# of Resear- chers	Notes
	Policy Directi- on	Adm. Diagn- osis	Univ. Attached	Private	Adm.	Mgt.	Eco.	Others	Reflec- tion	Ref.	Others		
1967		○		KRIPA	○					○			Metropolitan Adm.
1967		○		AKED	○					○			Metropolitan Finance
1968		○		KSA				○		○			Gov't Statistical Adm.
1968		○		CERI				○		○			Juveniles Adm.
1968		○		KIEC			○		○	○			Public Route & Transportation
1969		○							○	○	○		Labor Adm. (Man-Power Export)
1969		○							○	○			Insurance Adm.
1969		○							○	○			Relief Adm.
1969		○							○	○			Textbook Adm.
1972		○								○			Public Official Behavior
TOTAL	13	25	12	13	5	9	2	9	10	24	1		

ation of reserach institutes were based on my own judgement and because some legal entity-type research institutes were not fully counted in the source material, that is, Don-A Yearly Book.

As we can see from Table 3, the number of research institutes increased more than twice. Specifically, while the number of research institutes for general administration remained the same, those for industry, economics, management, and trade increased from 13 to 33, those for social and labor areas increased from 2 to 9, and those for psychology and human sciences also dramatically increased. The rapid increase of those institutes for regional development and economic development also indirectly reflect the increase of policy demands.

However, the degree of scholars' contribution to the governmental policy decision makings should be measured in view of quality not in view of the quantitative increase of research institutes. In the Administrative Reform Committee's research paper, we can find the following facts. (See Table 4) During seven years between 1965~1972, total 25 research projects were given to 25 different research institutes. Among them 7 were contracted by university-attached research institutes, and 8 were contracted by individual ones. Among the above 25 research projects, 5 were given to research institutes for public administration and related fields, 9 to business administration field, 2 to economics, and the remaining 9 were given to other institutions. Among the 25 presented research outcomes, only 10 were reflected in real policy recommendations. Specifically, 7 out of 10 researches from university-attached institutes were reflected in, while 3 out of 5 from individual institutes were reflected in.

In conclusion, we as public administration scholars should note the following two things: One is that 15 out of 25 reports were used as policy data, and the other thing is that among 25 research projects 5 were given to public administration field while 9 were given to business administration field. At this moment of time, we the scholars of public administration need to examine if current curricula and scholars' academic capability can meet the various demands of Korean government. And the active participation of management and other social scientists shows us the direction of and need for disciplinary change of public administration programs (whether they are graduate program or undergraduate program) to meet the government demand.

With basic change of programs, I am very much worried that we are at that point, that the core or sacred areas of public administration can neither be protected from business

administration or other related fields' invasion can nor produce able students who can effectively deal with real policy problems. Next, indirect participation and its modes should also be discussed here, but that will be omitted in this paper since indirect ones are strongly correlated with the direct problems that we discussed already.

IV. Restrictions of Participation in Policy Making Process

Based on the above discussions, we will extract and discuss several problems of restrictions of scholars participation in the policy decisions.

First, since governmental policy faces more difficult problems due to the changes of internal context and its implementation requires scientific techniques based on fact and the accuracy of situation analysis, developing scholars' scholaristic capability is directly dependent upon their efficient participation and practical contributions. In order to achieve these capability, introducing new knowledge and new programs will be active from now on. Attempt of interdisciplinary approach and facilitation of mutual interaction between related fields will also be active. And rising scholars or newbloods at universities and research institutes should attempt to search for new scientific methodologies for policy studies.

Secondly, from here on, participation in policy formulation processes through individual activity will become very limited. It will be so not because the basic policy of current government funded researches is avoiding individual contracts. The fact of matter is that few public administration scholars' are participating in various government policy review or evaluation committees, and even there is none in the Planning Operation Committee. And since various subcommittees of Administrative Reform Committee are focusing on the effective operations, it is very difficult for existing scholars to, as discussed previously, give effective policy advises or feedbacks to the government without developing new disciplinary capability and techniques. If current trend of subjective and impromptuous approach continues, the role of public administration scholars in the government policy makings will be limited to merely conforming or endorsing government's one-sided decisions.

Thirdly, the decreasing tendency of both the research funds and project funds from Ministry of Education (MOE), Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST), and Administrative Reform Committee (ARC) to several social sciences is very worrisome.

Because it will eventually affect not only to the opportunity for scholars but also to the quality of policy reports. This gradual fund decrease in social sciences, even though total government fund is increasing, will result in fewer participation opportunities.¹²⁾

The decreasing share of social sciences funds vis-a-vis the increasing scholars' interests in policy studies. Therefore, we academicians should recommend to the government authorities to facilitate practical policy researches by increasing research funds.

Fourth, many small research institutes not only make each institute suboptimal in terms of its size, but also it brings fierce competition and conflict among scholars for research funds. Hence this should be stopped. Another thing to be stopped is scholars' playing politics to government authorities to secure more research funds. Therefore, it is necessary for policy bureaucrats to try to find some alternatives to improve the above situation from the representatives of various research institutes by confessing frankly and open their difficulties they are facing with. One way of improving this situation is encouraging mutual collaborative research activities among different but related research institutes.

Fifth, as shown in the Administrative Reform Committee's evaluation report, more than half of the government-funded research reports were not at all reflected or little used for government policy formulations. This undesirable phenomena was caused either by the difficulty in data gathering of government authorities to be studied or by the lack of researchers' research capabilities or lack of desire to retrieving, analyzing, evaluating, and finding policy alternatives.

Thus it is desirable for the government to relieve the secrecy and regulations for the effective research activities of those professors who are involving in government policy projects.

Specifically since Task Security Ordinance 60.2, which is the basic regulation that every government authority follows in case of releasing government data, is too restrictive, it is almost impossible for researchers to access to secretive but valuable data which are essential for their studies. This is one reason that oftentimes scholars' policy research papers and their recommendations are qualitatively inferior to those made by government-attached research institutes or policy bureaucrats who can easily access to these first- and second class secret data. Unfortunately, this, in turn, resulted in formation of underrating attitude toward policy formulation capability of academicians.¹³⁾

V. Conclusion - Characteristics and Restrictions of Participation in Policy Making Process

I realized that the following scholar's statements, which was presented on the Special Seminar on Researches on Policy Formulation and on Other Social Sciences (Korean Public Administration Review, 1970), amicably confirm the characteristics and limitations of scholars' participation in government policy making processes: (1) "We the sociologists only give indirect influence in policy making processes by systematically analyzing social phenomena." (Koh, Youngbok); (2) "Economics, with its operationality and quantification, influence directly to the processes." (Hwang, Injeong); (3) Public Administration scholars contribute to administrative procedures and operations which are largely related with efficiency and economy rather than with policy contents." (Kim, Younghoon); (4) Those scholars who are majoring in education contribute a great deal by providing valuable data to policy makers." (Baek, Hyunkee); (5) Professionals in city planning area has limited but some influence on enlightening the policy directions." (Roh, Yunghee); (6) Government shows a tendency to mobilize scholars for the purpose of prolonging its regime or mobilizing public support." (Park, Dongsuh); and (7) Participation of scholars is being used not for the reflection of true representation of people but for the political mobilization. This is more so because public opinion building and interest inputs by scholars are greater in number in Korea than other countries." (Cho, Sukjoon)

The point I want to make in this paper is that, in case of Korea, judging from the characteristics and modes of policy decisions, closed policy decision making practices are yet to be overcome.

In order to improve policy making environment toward more open one, the following measures have to be taken:

- (1) Relieving strict control of policy data;
- (2) Establishment of Center for Policy Research Data and systematic reclassification of various policy research papers and reports including individual faculty papers, masters' theses, Ph. D dissertations, and books and other articles;
- (3) Collaborative research effort between and among research institutes;
- (4) Public bureaucrats' perception change in accordance with the increasing policy problems and new analytical techniques and removal of their biases on scholaristic

capability of social scientists;

- (5) Institutionalizing practical policy studies through facilitating government-university collaboration;
- (6) Developing scholars capability in the areas of problem findings and problem solving techniques as well as government support for these efforts;
- (7) Substantial increase of government research and project funds;
- (8) Encouraging scholars' participation by improving the effectiveness of various government consulting bodies; and
- (9) Curricula change of undergraduate and graduate schools toward linking theories and practices.

These are the future tasks to be implemented for the effective participation of scholars in the government policy making processes.

〈Notes〉

- 1) The Korean Association for Public Administration, *Korean Public Administration Review* (KPAR), Vol. Ⅱ (1970) pp.85~99.
- 2) ① Hae-Kyun Ahn, "Role of Intellectual Elite in Development Process of Korean Public Administration" *Sungkok Nonchong* 1 (1970), Sungkok Haksul Moonhwa-Jaedan, p.103.
② Yun-Ho Park, "Education of Public Officials", KPAR, Vol. Ⅲ (1969) The Korean Association for Public Administration. p.83.
- 3) Before 5.16 military coup d'état, Curricula for 2 level, higher and middle class, bureaucrats of National Training Center for Public Officials consisted of 'management theories', 'personnel relations', 'organizations and planning', 'management of foreign aids'
- 4) ① See Table 1
② Hae-Kyun Ahn, op. cit., p.96.
③ Suk-Joon Cho, "Administrative Reforms under military Government", *Korean Journal of Public Administration*, Graduate School of Public Administration, Seoul National University, Vol. 6 (1968), pp.95-120.
④ In-Jung Hwang, "Impact of research activities of economists on the government economic policy" *Korean Public Administration Review*, Vol. Ⅱ (1970), pp.102-103.
- 5) Yun-Ho Park, op. cit., pp.81-110.
- 6) Ibid., p.123.
- 7) Hong-Uk Dong, "Past, Present and Future of Korean Public Administration", KPAR, Vol. Ⅲ (1969), p.45.
- 8) Loc, cit.
- 9) Woon-Tai Kim, "Scope and Method of Korean Public Administration" KPAR Vol. Ⅲ (1969), p.48.
- 10) See Table 2

11) ① Dong-Hyun Kim, "Statistical Analysis of the Involvement of Government and Academic Agencies in Social Science Research in Korea" *KPAR*, Vol. V, (1971) pp.71-89.

② In-Jung Hwang, op. cit., pp.109-112.

12) Ratio of the total research funds and social science research funds to the total budget of the government by year

year	total research funds	social science research funds	year	total research funds	social science research funds
1965	0.04	0.03	1968	0.11	0.02
1966	0.04	0.03	1969	0.11	0.01
1967	0.10	0.02			

Note) Data of Ministry of Education, Ministry of Science and Technology, USAID, Board of Administrative Reform cited in "Report on the seminar on Utilization of Social Science Researches in the Policy Formulation in Government of Republic of Korea", in *KPAR* Vol. IV (1970), p.90.

13) According to the Task Security Regulation, material and information for government policy were classified into three categories:

- 1) 1st class; the information endangering diplomatic relations, research and development of science and technology which was vital for national defense plan and information gathering activities
- 2) 2nd class; the information, in case of being released, endangering the possibility of national security
- 3) 3rd class; the secret material which may be harmful for national security in case of being released

Those who are authorized to deal with secret information and material were as follows;

1) classified the 1st class

- ① President
- ② Prime minister
- ③ Director of board of auditor
- ④ Ministers of central government
- ⑤ Director of C.I.A.
- ⑥ Director of secretary, council of national security
- ⑦ Secretary of general, council for economy and science
- ⑧ Attorney general
- ⑨ Chief of secretary and director of security office for president
- ⑩ Chief of staff, army, navy and airforce
- ⑪ Commander general authorized by Minister of Defense the consent of C.I.A.

2) classified the 2nd and 3rd class;

- ① Those who are authorized to deal with 1st class materials
- ② Chief administrators of the central government agencies
- ③ City mayors of Seoul and Pusan cities and governors of the regional Provinces.
- ④ Director of Board of education in Seoul, Pusan and Cities and regional Provinces
- ⑤ Administrative Chief of the sub-organizations authorized by those above mentioned