Asian Journal of Education 2003, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 255-274. - 80 (姜榮惠)* 80 가 가 가 가? I. 가 80

*

256

4 2

1995 . 20 가 가 가 (Braithwaite, 1992: 44). () 가 (Walford, 2001: 23). (LEA) 가 (voucher)' (Chitty, 1997: 49-50). 가) 가 가 가 (open enrollment)' (formula fund)' 가)

가 1988 (National 가 1992 Curriculum) (SAT: Standard Assessment Tests) (School League Table) (OFSTED:Office for Standards in Education) 가 가 1995 가 가 가가 가 가 가 가 2002 10 (Grant Maintained School) , (City Technology College) 가 20 가 가 가 가 가 가 가

·

1.

가

가 가 (Hayek, 1944) 가 , 가,

, '가

,

·
,
,
,

7} (Brighouse, 1998: 149; Brighouse, 1997: 505). ,

,

가 가 (Peters, 1966). 가 가 가 (Tooley, 1997) 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가

260

가

4 2

가

가

가

2.

.1)

2001: 29).

1)

가

가

(formulae fund)

가 가

1988 (open enrollment)

, 가

가

가

1/3가

. A

, B

가

가

(Walford,

. 가 가 S 가 가 가 가 가 가)가 가 가 (Braithwaite, 1992: 51). 가 . 가 가 가 가 가 가가 (Walford, 2001: 29). 가 가 가 가 가 (School League Table)

262	4	2		
 가		가 .		
			(Grammar School), . フト	
	,			
			(intake)	가
	(,		(Braithwaite, 1992: 44).	,
	가 '	, 가, ,		
			,	
		٠	. 가	,
	가	가	가 .	
		가	. ,	
	()가		. ,

) 1. ' 가 (Braithwaite, 1992: 49) 가 가 가 가 가

가가 가

.

264

2)

가 2. 가 () 가 가 가 가 가 ,2) 가

. 가 . 가 가

가 . , , , ,

. , ,

(P. H. Hirst) '

•

.

```
(School League Table)
       가
                                          (West & Pennell, 2000: 425).
                                                               가?
               가
                                   가
                                                   가
(SAT)
                                                가
                                                                          가
                      (
                                   SAT
                              가
                                               , SAT
                            가
                                                                가
                   가
                           가
                                                                   가
   가
                                                                       (West &
                                           가
Pennell, 2000: 428).
                            가
           가
                               가
                                                  가
                                             가
                                                                            가
  3.
           가
```

가 1988 80 가 , 가 (Coldron & Boulton, 1991: 174). 가 1/3 (Walford, 2001: 26). , 가 가 가 가 가 1. 가 가 (Coldron & Boulton: 178). 가 가 가

가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 (Harris, 2000: 7). 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 (Coldron & Boulton, 1991:

173).

가 10 .3) 가 가 2. 가 가 가 가 가 가 (Gorard & Fitz, 1998: 373). 가 3) 2001 2 가 2002 가 (Comprehensive School) (specialist school) 가 가 가 10%

가 가 가 가 , 가 가 가 가 가 가 (Walford. 2001: 24). 가 가 가 50 가

80 가 가 가 (Jeynes, 2000). 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 . 2

가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가가 가 가 가 가 가

- Braithwaite, R. J.(1992), "School Choice as a Means of Attaining Excellence in Education", *Cambridge Journal of Education*, Vol 22, No 1. 43-53.
- Brighouse, H.(1997), "The Philosophical Errors Concerning School Choice", Oxford Review of Education, Vol 23, No 4, 503-510.
- Brighouse, H.(1998), "Why should States fund Schools?", *British Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol 46, No 2. 138-152.
- Chitty, C.(1997), "Privatization and Marketization", Oxford Review of Education, Vol 23, No 1. 45-62.
- Coldron, J. & Boulton, P.(1991), "Happiness' as a Criterion of Parents' Choice", *Journal of Educational Policy*, Vol 6, No 2. 169-178.
- Gorard, S. & Fitz, J. C.(1998), 'The More Things Change....The Missing Impact of Marketization?', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Vol 19, No 3. 365-376.
- Harris, A.(2000), "What works in school improvements? Lessons from the field and future directions", *Educational Research*, Vol 42, No 1. 1-11.
- Hayek, F. A.(1944), The Road to Seffdom, London: RKP.
- Jeynes, W.(2000), "Assessing School Choice: a balanced perspective", *Cambridge Journal of Education*, Vol 30, No 4. 223-241.
- Peters, R. S.(1966), Ethics and Education, London: George Allen & Unwin
- Tooley, J.(1997), "Choice and Diversity in Education: a defence", Oxford Review of Education, Vol 23, no 1. 103-116.
- Walford, J.(2001), "Does the Market Ensure Quality?", Westminster Studies in Education, Vol 24, No I. 23-33.
- West, A. & Pennell, H.(2000), "Publishing School Examination Results in England: incentives and consequences", *Educational Studies*, Vol 26, No 4, 423-436.

Abstract

Consumerism, Parent Choice and Educational Reform

Kang, Young-Heh*

Since the 1980's, consumerism and parent choice have been main principle of educational reform world-widely. In particular, British educational reform is reported radica and market-oriented, so many other countries have made a bench-marking on the implementation of that idea in order to innovate their public educational systems. The British Government expected that the parent choice and competition between educational institutions would make a quality assurance, but the relation between school choice and improving school standard has not been confirmed objectively.

The purpose of this study is: to clarify the meaning of market principle as a educational ideology and the possibility of application of the market principle to educational arena; to clarify if the parental choice is able to make sure the quality of education logically and empirically; to find how the parent choice and participant have brought about school change.

To some extent, parental choice has influenced many schools to concentrate on making better school image, impressive school discipline and children's welfare inside school place. In addition, it encourages some parents to participate and co-operate with school management. In spite of this merit, parental choice is not concerned with improving school standard or quality of education logically. Because the choice of parent as a consumer is pursuing the subjective satisfaction which is related to individual taste, value-orientation, socio-economic status etc. Therefore, parents are not responsible for the school improvement directly. Instead, responsibility for the quality assurance belongs to the State basically because modern public educational system has aimed for implementing the equal opportunity of education and universal human right.

^{*} Research Fellow, Korean Educational Development Institute

■ Key Words: parent choice, education reform, school league table, school improvement, quality of education, consumerism