

The U. S. Educated Among the Korean Politico—Bureaucratic Elite: An Aspect of American Socio—Cultural Influence

Kim, Kyong-Dong

Dept. of Sociology, Seoul Nat'l Univ.

Lee, On-Jook

Dept. of National Ethics Education, Seoul Nat'l Univ.

I. Introduction

Acculturation, or cultural change through the contact of two or more cultures, in principle, may be bilateral and symmetrical. The historical reality, however, tells us that the actual process of acculturation usually is asymmetrical and "tilted" to the disadvantage of one culture *vis-a-vis* another. In pre-modern eras, the military might alone could not subjugate the conquered culturally; rather tilted acculturation often took place in favor of the physically weaker. In modern times, it has become almost inevitable that stronger nations in terms of economic, technological, military, and political power also can and do exert one-sided influence in the cultural sphere, as well. As a matter of fact, cultural influence may be the most crucial aspect of the cross-national effect of culture contact. Yet, it is the most difficult one to identify empirically, too (Chirot, 1977; Ember and Ember, 1977; Kim, 1977; 1980; Moore, 1974).

Since our chief interest does not lie in explication of the theoretical background and framework of the notion of tilted acculturation, it should suffice to assume that the process of acculturation between Korea and the United States, historically and currently, has been tilted in nature, various culture contents flowing "down," so to say, from the latter to the former, and America exerting rather one-sided influence in the process. In order to examine this very general assumption, we have set out to analyze some basically limited quantitative data. What we are attempting in this work is to identify the relative importance of the experience of training and education in the United States in the attainment of an elite position in the politico-bureaucratic arena in Korea. This is considered a short-cut, as far as available material is concerned, that is, to an understanding of a wider question of the socio-cultural impact of the Korea —U.S. relationship which dates

back to a century ago. Operationally, we will examine the relative size and background of those individuals who have obtained some training or higher education in America, among those who have served in the government as ministers or vice-ministers, or in politics as national assemblymen in the Republic of Korea, since 1948.

Because the data are limited in depth, one may dare not put forth any strong argument relative to the significance of education in the United States as a factor in the tilted acculturation between the two societies. Nevertheless, the implications of such material may be much graver than meet the eyes. To begin with, very little systematic presentation of this type of data has yet been attempted in the field of social sciences. This is quite strange in view of the relatively widespread belief among the Korean populace, in general, and the frequent claim made by the academicians and intellectuals, in particular, pertaining to the significance of American education in the sphere of attaining social status from the individual's perspective, and in the broader context of national development from the societal purview. Thus far, what we can see is not so much of empirically grounded statements and conclusions as a lot of thoughts laid out on the basis of impressionistic observations of individual scholars. It seems to be about time we did some empirical inquiry into this subject.

It does not necessarily mean, however, that these previous studies are useless, because they are very helpful indeed, especially in formulating our hypothetical thoughts. In fact, we are going to draw upon these other observers' opinions and suggestions to look into the implications of our data. But before we present our own data analysis, it would be useful to summarize some of the ideas about the effect of U.S. education in Korean society. This, we shall approach from two angles or on two different planes, namely, the individual and the society as a whole. Of course, we shall confine our discussion to the last generation since 1945.

From the individual's standpoint, American education has been believed to be a very important and even valuable asset or advantage point in status attainment and upward mobility. For example, a U.S. degree, a doctorate if possible, can be a definite advantage in the marriage market, through which one could accomplish upward social mobility. If we could analyze the entire population of the U.S. educated in Korea, we would find a disproportionately larger majority of them somewhere in the elite position in various sectors, notably in the political, bureaucratic, economic or business, educational or academic, and military spheres. Thus far, some observations to this effect have been

made in the politico-bureaucratic and academic areas (Chung, 1967; Kim, 1971; Han, 1975; Lim, 1977; 1982; Bark, 1978; 1983). None of these previous works, however, have enumerated the entire population of those educated in America.

To turn the table around a bit and try to locate studies on the Korean elite, one still finds no single such study presenting systematic or comprehensive data on education in the United States as a major factor in the context of recruitment into the elite status. Only very few refer to it in passing while mentioning their educational background (Hahn and Kim, 1963; Yu, 1966; Kim, 1971; Han, 1975). Thus, the effect of U.S. education for individual mobility has been more talked about than seriously studied with data.

There is another aspect to this subject matter which has almost completely been neglected in the Korean social science studies. This has to do with the question of international return migration of professionals or brain-drain in reverse. Scholars and even the federal government of the United States have not only shown keen interest in this matter but also have supported or conducted research on foreign students in America and their behavior of return migration (Glaser and Habers, 1974; Hekmati and Glaser, 1973). Staying on the individual level, inquiries into the background and motivation of those who decided to return to Korea after a certain period of study in the United States should be worthwhile, both academically and policy wise.

Of course, this question could have much greater ramifications from the societal point of view. Study abroad takes a great deal of investment in human capital (Becker, 1962; Schultz, 1959). But if the individuals for whom so much has been spent decide to forsake the home country and stay for good in the country of destination, then there is the problem of brain-drain. Although one could argue that from the international perspective there is no such thing as brain-drain, one still is concerned about this problem, especially in the less advantaged society (Adams, 1968). Turning our attention to those who return home after education overseas, the most often tackled issue has to do with whether or not they make due contributions to the development of their home country. Even in the field of migration studies, this has not been too effectively analyzed yet (Cerese, 1974; Fortney, 1972; Merriam, 1970; The Committee on the International Migration of Talent, 1970).

It is from this angle that we approach our subject matter. But our data are not sufficiently rich to lead us to any substantive conclusions regarding whether or not, and in what way the U.S. educated would have made contributions in Korea after their return home. All we can do at the moment within the limit of data available is to show how

many of them have served for the country in the position of cabinet minister or vice-minister or national assemblyman. Suggestions, however, have been made thus far as to the nature of the role of the returned professionals in the process of Korean development. To stay within the confine of our own immediate interest, we will only refer to the political and bureaucratic spheres in the following summary.

First, on a more general level, the Korean elite with American training or education are assumed to have performed a "filtering function" in transmitting culture from the United States(American Studies Association of Korea, 1976; Lim, 1982: 35), or they are assessed to have been most effective in playing the role of "technocrats" (Bark, 1983: 417).

Second, in substance, their main contributions could be most starkly identified in various institutional forms. According to some expert opinion, four major areas of institutional contributions include the following: 1) introduction and transplation of universal compulsory education on the primary level; 2) importation and application of administrative-managerial know-how and techniques in the government; 3) utilization of technocratic expertise in the sphere of economic development planning and implementation; and 4) progress in the science and technology administration(Bark, 1983:418-19; Kim, Z., 1971).

Third, in the political arena, their possible service may be debated. In general, the American cultural influence in boosting the democratic ideals in the society may not be denied (Lim, 1982). Yet, in reality, if it was political leaders with American education who have endeavored for democratization in Korea, it was also those with such education who have taken part or sometimes played active roles in arresting the process, one should note (Bark, 1983). Other more complicated factors must have been in operation in this respect and this issue is way beyond our concern.

No doubt, other relevant implications could have been delineated were it our primary interest to discuss such substantive issues. For the immediate purpose, however, the above background may be sufficient. We now shall concentrate on our findings.

II. Data and Findings

The data we have used for our analysis are drawn from various source materials containing basic personal and career information of leading figures in diverse walks of life, mostly directories of celebrities or Who's Who in Korea, plus biographical files in the archives of the National Assembly. We have selected only those individuals who have

served as cabinet ministers, including premiers and deputy prime ministers, vice-ministers, and those who have been elected as national assemblymen. For each individual, a data sheet was prepared to record the background information available in the sources. This information then was coded and transferred to the key punch cards for computer processing. About forty different variables were encoded, but we use only a few relevant ones in this analysis.

Counting each subject only once either in the ministerial or parliamentary role of the most recent date, we have enumerated 1,219 persons, of which 858 (70.4%) are congressmen, 304(24.9%) ministers, and 285(23.4%) vice-ministers. The reason why the three subcategories added up go over the total is that one person may be counted in more than one category because of overlapping career across the categories. In fact, quite a few individuals even served in more than one capacity over the years. Thus, depending on the nature of substance we want to deal with, we may use the absolute total of the overlapping figures which add up to 1,447.

The Extent of U. S. Education. Of the total individuals analyzed, 177 persons or 14.5 percent have been to the United States for some purpose of education or training. This proportion is only next to 18.4 percent with Japanese training, although in terms of real persons these two may overlap to some extent. The relative magnitude of the U.S. educated is the largest among the ministers taking up about a quarter of the total, followed by 19.3 percent among the vice-ministers, and the smallest and below average (9.6%) among the national assemblymen. In each case, the Japan-educated outnumber the U.S. educated (Table 1).

We will come back to the significance of the Japanese education shortly, but shall dwell on the relative size of the U.S. educated among the elite under study, at the moment.

Table 1. The Relative Size of the U.S. Educated among the Elite

Country	Total	Assemblymen	Ministers	Vice-Ministers
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Japan	244(18.4)	116(13.5)	110(36.2)	79(27.7)
U.S.A.	177(14.5)	82(9.6)	77(25.3)	55(19.3)
China	22(1.8)	7(0.8)	14(4.6)	11(3.9)
Europe & other	22(1.8)	9(1.0)	9(2.9)	9(3.2)
Total(Basis of %)	1,219 ^{a)}	858	304	285

Notes: a) The reason why the totals do not add up to 1,219 is given in the text, but it is primarily due to overlapping career.

Table 2. Ratio of the U.S. Educated Elite

	Elite (A)	General Population (B)	Ratio (%) (A/B)
U.S. Educated (C)	177	18,531 ^{a)}	.955
Total (D)	1,219	38,723,000 ^{b)}	.0031
Ratio (%) (C/D)	14.5	.048	(304 times)

	Elite (E)	# Students in Higher Ed. Inst. (F)	Ratio (%) (E/F)
U.S. Educated (G)	177	18,531 ^{a)}	.955
Total (H)	1,219	797,207 ^{c)}	.153
Ratio (%) (G/H)	14.5	2.32	(6.25 times)

Notes: a) # students with permission to study in U. S. (1953~81).

b) total population est. for 1981.

c) # students enrolled in institutions of higher education in 1981.

Since there is no relevant statistics which could show us the relative position of those who have been educated abroad in the total population over the time period we are currently considering, we are going to have to use some indirect measures. Just for the sake of some comparative picture, we have prepared Table 2.

These figures are, of course, very crude indirect indices, but they still suggest strongly that the U. S. educated elite happen to be an extremely small minority whether the comparison criterion is the general population, or those who have been given permission to study abroad, or the size of student enrollment in the institutions of higher education as of 1981 when our data were gathered.

Now, let us go back for a moment to the comparison between the U. S. and Japan educated elite. In order to understand this, we may not have to recall the historical experience of Japanese colonialism between 1910 and 1945. Due to this history, however, the relative influence of Japanese education in attaining the politico-bureaucratic elite position has been so important even after independence. For the sake of comparative analysis, we have computed the percentages of those who have been educated in the United States, in other foreign countries of which Japan is the most outstanding case, and those who have had no overseas educational background, for each major political period, by the elite status category. The results are shown in Table 3.

Because some of the numbers are too small for percentage calculation, we have simply presented the real numbers in these cases. Discounting some of variations caused by

Table 3. Major Period of Service by Status & Country of Education (%)

Period	Status/Country											
	Assemblyman				Minister				Vice-Minister			
	US	Other	Kor.	Tot.	US	Other	Kor.	Tot.	US	Other	Kor.	Tot.
1st Republic(1948~60)	9.6	30.8	59.6	100.0	21.8	48.7	29.5	100.0	13.9	41.7	44.4	100.0
Interim(1960)	(2)	(6)	(8)		(2)	(5)	(4)	(11)	(1)	(3)	(3)	(7)
2nd Republic(1960~61)	5.9	38.2	55.9	100.0	(3)	(9)	(5)	(17)	(4)	(7)	(12)	(23)
Junta(1961~63)	(7)	(6)	(13)		32.3	38.7	29.0	100.0	(4)	(8)	(6)	(18)
3rd Republic(1963~72)	7.5	15.9	76.6	100.0	19.5	43.7	36.8	100.0	18.5	40.7	40.7	100.0
4th Republic(1972~79)	10.0	10.4	79.7	100.0	27.1	31.2	41.7	100.0	14.3	21.4	64.3	100.0
Interim(1979~80)	(3)	(3)			(7)	(5)	(4)	(16)	(7)	(2)	(11)	(20)
5th Republic(1980~)	11.9	7.8	80.3	100.0	26.7	23.3	50.0	100.0	21.9	15.6	62.5	100.0

this and other factors, still a clear trend is visible that as time goes on, or particularly since the seventies with the advent of the Fourth Republic after the October Revitalization, the proportion of the U.S. educated increases beyond the average whereas that of those who have been educated in other foreign countries including Japan drops rather significantly. In other words, up to the sixties, the Japan educated have been more prominent in the politico-bureaucratic arena. But as they have generally grown older, this generation has begun to be replaced by those with U.S. education, whose number incidentally has grown larger over time, ever since.

The Nature of U. S. Education. Between 64 and 83 percent of the elite members who have been to the United States have earned some college degree, the percentage being the largest among the national assemblymen and the lowest among the ministers. The rest have been through some military courses and/or short-term training programs. Of those with a degree, almost seven out of ten assemblymen have a doctorate,

Table 4. U.S. Degrees Obtained

Degrees	Status					
	National Assemblyman		Minister		Vice-Minister	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bachelor's only	10	14.7	19	38.0	20	51.3
Up to Master's	11	16.2	9	18.0	12	30.8
Up to Ph. D's	47	69.1	22	44.0	7	17.9
Total	68	100.0	50	100.0	39	100.0

Table 5. Major Field at U.S. Universities

Field	Status					
	National Assemblyman		Minister		Vice-Minister	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Political Science	17	24.3	1	2.0		
Law	5	7.1	2	4.0		
Economics	4	5.7	7	14.0	6	15.4
Management	1	1.4			2	5.1
Other Social Science	4	5.7			2	5.1
Humanities	7	10.0	7	14.0	1	2.6
Natural Sciences	1	1.4	1	2.0	1	2.6
Engineering	4	5.7	4	8.0	1	2.6
Medicine	2	2.9	1	2.0	1	2.6
Theology	1	1.4	1	2.0		
Other	2	2.9				
Unidentified	22	31.4	26	52.0	25	64.1
Total	70	99.9	50	100	39	100.1

while 44% ministers and 18% vice-ministers are Ph. D. holders. There are more persons with a bachelor's degree only among the vice-ministers than any other categories, but almost four out of ten ministers also have bachelor's only, although the proportion of those with graduate training is generally higher than those with undergraduate education alone (See Table 4).

Table 5 contains information on the major field of study in the American schools, even though we were not able to identify it for quite a few cases. Concentrating only on those whose major is identified, we find some interesting contrast between the politicians and administrators. The most outstanding cases are political science among the former and economics among the latter. Humanities is as popular among the ministers as among the congressmen, in fact slightly more so, while social science still is the most well represented among the vice-ministers. If we take this finding seriously, the contrast seems quite interesting. Although social science background definitely plays a most significant part in the recruitment into the politico-bureaucratic elite echelon, vice-ministers tend to be recruited as technocrats as far as their educational background is concerned, whereas the politicians are more non-technocratic in this regard. The ministers seem to stand somewhere in-between these two poles.

Another set of data which partially corroborates the same argument and may be of

interest on its own can also be introduced here. We have identified the individuals who have undergone some type of military training and education among the elite subjects under study. This time the proportion of those who have such training is the largest among the ministers(29.9%), followed by 12.7% vice-ministers, and 12.2% congressmen. Military background in a way stands for technocratic orientation, on the one hand, but it also can mean the relative weight given to the military connection in the political appointment of cabinet ministers, on the other.

Some Socioeconomic Characteristics. To help understand the significance of American education in the status mobility, we have analyzed some socioeconomic background data of those who have been to the United States in comparison with those without such experience. Table 6 summarizes these findings. It is rather enlightening to notice that clearly the U. S. educated come from an urban background and have much favorable educational background. This is true across the categories of elite status. There are, no

Table 6. Summary of Socioeconomic Background by Country of Education(%)

SES Variables	Status								
	National Assemblymen			Ministers			Vice-Ministers		
	US	Other	Korea	US	Other	Korea	US	Other	Korea
(1) Birth Place									
Urban	39.0	35.7	28.0	31.2	30.8	30.1	52.7	39.2	31.0
Rural	61.0	64.3	71.4	68.8	68.5	69.0	47.3	60.8	67.6
Other, Don't Know			.7		.8	.9			1.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(2) Education									
High school or below		1.6	1.8		3.1	8.8		1.0	9.0
College	24.4	85.2	66.9	48.1	79.2	66.4	41.8	84.5	74.5
Graduate school	75.6	12.4	26.0	51.9	17.7	21.2	58.2	13.4	15.9
Unidentified		.8	5.2			3.5		1.0	.7
Total	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	99.9	100.1
(3) Age at Current Recruitment									
Below 40 years	17.1	7.0	20.4	6.5	5.4	6.2	10.9	9.3	11.0
40~44 years	19.5	10.1	24.7	16.9	10.8	22.1	29.1	27.8	21.4
45~49 "	29.3	25.6	26.0	24.7	24.6	25.7	27.3	25.8	37.2
50~54 "	19.5	25.6	16.5	20.8	26.2	21.2	14.5	22.7	20.7
55~59 "	8.5	14.7	8.4	24.7	18.5	22.1	10.8	10.3	9.0
60 and over	6.1	17.1	3.2	6.5	14.6	2.7	7.3	4.1	—
Unidentified			.8						.7
Total	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.1	100.1	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.0

doubt, some variations. For instance, the urban background is the most stark among the vice-ministers, followed by the parliamentarians, and the least so among the cabinet members. While there are no individuals without college education among the U.S. educated, about one in ten of those without any foreign training has only high school background. When it comes to the proportion of persons with graduate education, there is no comparison with the U.S. educated coming forth quite strong in this respect.

Age may be another selectivity factor and it is found in our data that the U.S. educated elite tend to be recruited into the politico-bureaucratic sphere in their forties, and that their age at recruitment happens to be intermediate between those educated in Korea and in other countries. The cabinet members are generally the oldest and the vice-ministers the youngest of the three groups. The same holds even within the category of the U.S. educated.

Career Background. In addition to the above socioeconomic background factor, we have also analyzed the career background data, for the same reason. The findings are summarized in Table 7. We have examined their career background in the field of public service, military, university teaching, business, other socio-cultural spheres, and political activity. With the exception of business career as company president, we find some significant differences between the U.S. educated and the others.

As can be expected, the vice-ministers have had most extensive public service career behind, followed by the ministers and national assemblymen. Among those who have had some administrative experience as a high ranking official, say, above the third grade, the proportion of the U.S. educated is the highest, with the exception of the parliamentarians. In other words, politicians do not require bureaucratic background as much as the cabinet ministers or vice-ministers. But for the latter two categories, the U.S. educated tend to be better equipped with such a background.

The extent of military background is rather limited, in general. Nevertheless, some significant pattern seems to emerge depending on the elite position and educational background. Of the three elite categories, the proportion of those with military career as generals behind them is the highest among the cabinet members, followed by the congressmen and vice-ministers. When their educational background is considered, the U.S. educated again appear to have advantages in terms of their military career, for both the cases of national assembly and ministerial jobs. Of course, the relative importance of military career as generals in the politico-bureaucratic elite recruitment has become much

Table 7. Career Background by Country of Education (%)

Career Background	National Assemblmen			Ministers			Vice-Minister		
	US	Other	Korea	US	Other	Korea	US	Other	Korea
1. Public Service as High									
Banking Official									
Yes	26.8	34.9	29.3	62.3	55.4	58.4	81.8	68.0	71.7
No	73.2	65.1	72.7	37.7	44.6	41.6	18.2	32.0	28.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2. Military Service as General									
Yes	14.6	5.4	8.2	26.0	16.9	12.4	7.3	8.2	4.1
No	85.4	94.6	91.8	74.0	83.1	87.6	92.7	91.8	95.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
3. College Professor									
Associate professor & above									
	30.5	17.9	7.2	19.5	16.2	11.5	20.0	13.4	7.6
Assistant professor & below									
	4.8	3.1	3.8		1.6	.9		3.1	1.4
None	64.6	79.1	89.0	80.5	82.3	87.6	80.0	83.5	91.0
Total	99.9	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
4. Business as Company									
President									
Yes	12.2	13.2	22.2	10.4	9.2	11.5	7.3	7.2	6.2
No	87.8	86.8	77.8	89.6	90.8	88.5	92.7	92.8	93.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
5. Socio-Cultural Sphere									
Press	17.1	8.5	12.3	1.3	3.1	1.8		3.1	1.4
Law	1.2	7.0	3.5		1.5	.9		1.0	1.4
Other	11.0	4.7	7.2	3.9	6.2	2.6	5.5	4.1	2.7
None	70.7	79.8	77.0	64.8	89.2	94.7	94.5	91.8	94.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
6. Politician									
Ruling party member	69.5	55.8	57.1	16.9	13.8	22.1		8.2	9.7
Opposition party member	13.4	24.0	28.5	2.6	10.8	8.0		5.2	4.1
Both	8.5	3.9	4.9	3.9	2.3	1.8	1.8		2.1
None	8.5	16.3	8.9	76.6	73.0	68.2	98.2	86.6	84.2
Total	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.1

prominent after the May 1961 coup. But it is also to be noted that quite a few military men have been exposed to foreign education, especially in the United States, not only in their military training but also in their civilian education, especially in the more recent

times. These two factors combined, it can readily be assumed, the military career plus U.S. education, that is, could play a very significant part in the elite recruitment.

Another area where American education becomes very prominent is college teaching. For all three elite categories, the proportion of the U.S. educated with some university teaching experience particularly in the rank of associate or full professorship is the highest compared with those who have had no such training background. That proportion is the largest among the national assemblymen. Recall that quite a few American educated elites have a doctoral degree or at least a master's, which qualifies them as professorial candidates. It has also become a rather widespread practice that university professors are recruited directly into the politico-bureaucratic elite circle, especially since the 1961 coup. And a majority of those who have been selected for such jobs happen to have American education, mostly advanced degrees. Thus, education in the United States has become a definite asset in this process.

A related career experience has been tapped in this analysis. Some socio-cultural activities have helped individuals proceed into the politico-bureaucratic arena. Most outstanding case in this regard, especially in politics, has been a career in the press sector or as journalists. And to a lesser extent, legal experience also has been of use. In our data, it was the press career where the U.S. educated have been most successful in seeking the elite status. But other experiences in the socio-cultural sector, too, have not been useless in the case of the U.S. educated, when compared with the others.

As has been indicated earlier, business career in itself does not seem to have any differential impact on the process of being recruited into the politico-administrative elite status, regardless of their educational background. One final dimension of interest is the political stance of the U.S. educated in the political sphere itself. In this respect, of course, the ministers and vice-ministers are less directly involved than the national assemblymen. But one very clear tendency we can detect is that the U.S. educated are found much more frequently in the ruling party than in the opposition party. This is quite distinctly so among the congressional members, while it is true in the case of administrative elite, as well. This seems to support the general assumption that the U.S. educated thus far tended to have played the role of "technocrats" in the government.

In short, we could conclude that the U.S. educated have been favored already in their socioeconomic background and have fared better in their career mobility to move into the elite status under study. Of the career background, public service, military prominence,

and university teaching appear to be relatively more advantageous in their upward mobility.

III. Discussion

With inherently limited data, we have endeavored to shed some light on the possible impact of educational experience in the United States upon some aspects of career mobility in the politico-bureaucratic sphere of Korean society. The basic idea behind this sort of analysis is that the relationship between Korea and the United States, having been the way it has, can best be understood in terms of what we have termed "tilted" acculturation. In this process, we assumed, the cultural influence would flow "down" from the United States to Korea. One very crucial channel through which such influence may be exerted could be education. Thus, we have decided to look into the place of those who have had some educational or training experience in the United States among the political and administrative elite. National assemblymen for the former class, and the cabinet ministers and their vice-ministers for the latter have been selected for analysis.

Using whatever available biographical data of those who have served in the above positions since 1948 up to 1981, we have tapped on some basic socioeconomic and career background of them. The analysis has provided evidence to generally support the basic argument that Korea has been under very strong influence of American culture through education during the last generation. Of course, this is only indirectly supported because our data did not deal with cultural influence in substance. Rather, they have shown us how such educational experience in the United States might be advantageous to the individual's career mobility, primarily. From such findings we could now make inferences regarding the nature of tilted acculturation.

Sticking to the findings, we have noticed that presence of the U.S. educated among the politico-bureaucratic elite is unusually outstanding. It is still a privilege to be able to go abroad for advanced education, and it can be a very useful asset in career mobility in every walk of life, if one could return with some advanced degree, preferably a doctorate. This means that these individuals who can enjoy such a privilege happen to be a very small minority of the general population. Considering this, the high proportion of the U.S. educated among the elite certainly reveals the importance of such background in career mobility.

As a matter of fact, the level and quality of education is rather excellent and many

hold some advanced degree in their respective fields, in the case of the U. S. educated, when compared with those elite members without such background. This, in itself, could be of some positive value for the career. Examining the major field of study, however, we have come across a very interesting tendency. Political science seems to be most popular among the U.S. educated congressmen, while economics happens to be the queen of science for the administrative elite. The latter tend to be more technocratic in their educational background.

But technocratic orientation is not confined to the administrative elite, if we examine their career background. Public and military service plus college teaching being the most prominent career background, and a majority of the U.S. educated politicians belonging to the ruling party of their time, both political and bureaucratic elites with U.S. education must be characterized as technocratic in their role. They must have been recruited into the elite echelon on account of their expertise obtained through education in America.

Assuming that the above conclusion is true, we now may have to qualify our statement regarding the possibly great cultural influence exerted through U.S. education. While it no doubt is evident that education in the United States has definitely played a significant role in boosting the chance for an individual to attain upward status mobility to join the elite class, its societal impact may not be as neat and clean as the case of individuals. Because of their disproportionate advancement into the elite status, their influence in the society at large must be enormous. Nevertheless, while due to the fact that their primary role has been one of technocrat, they may have had some hand in the process of decision-making affecting the life of the whole populace, we should also remember that it has not been these technocrats who have actually held the crucial key in the process of decision-making. In other words, their relatively subordinate status and role as technocrats must inherently restrict scope and depth of their influence in our society. It is in this sense that we should regard the influence of U.S. education as something less than straightforwardly strong and direct, at least on the societal plane. Future research with more substantial data should be able to provide better understanding of the phenomena.

One final issue we would like to touch upon in this concluding section has to do with international return migration of high-talent manpower. If this issue has been the central concern in our study, we would have treated the data in a different manner drawing different conclusions. But since it has been only tangentially mentioned in our introductory remark, and since the issue itself is of great interest, we should like to have an

opportunity to make some general observations. To begin with, our data have shown us that the U.S. educated elite have already been "selected" out of the general populace in their early background. Urban residence and better educational career have been noticed among them. The mere fact that they were able to go to the United States for some advanced training and education stands for a privilege, as has been indicated. But many still do not return home after completion of their education. Considering this, it is only the kind of incentive which seems rather clear to anybody that will become the pulling force instigating those who remain to return. And relatively easy access to career mobility which promises the elite status should be one of such clear incentives.

Acknowledgements

This study was possible through the support from the Institute of American Studies of Seoul National University, which the principal author was privileged to have obtained. Our gratitude goes to the Director of the Institute, professor Youngnok Koo. The data were collected and compiled by the help of Mr. Suk Ryul Huh and analyzed by the help of Mr. Tae Ryong Choe, both of the Department of Sociology of Seoul National University. Our appreciation is also due to them.

Notes on the Source Materials

The primary source materials of data we used in our analysis are as follows:

Directory of the Prominent Individuals in the Three Branches of the Government of the Republic of Korea (in Korean). 1981: Seoul: Naewe Shinso.

The Dong-A Yearbook. Appendix: Who's Who in Korea (in Korean). 1982. Seoul: The Dong-A Daily News.

Korea Yearbook. Appendix: Directory of Names in Korea (in Korean). 1982. Seoul: The Yonhap Press.

References

Adams, Walter. 1968. *The Brain Drain*. New York: The Macmillan Co.,

Bark, Dong Suh. 1978. "Current state and evaluation of the social sciences in Korea." *Korean Public Administration* 16: 17~28 (in Korean).

Bark, Dong Suh. 1983. "Korean elites with American education." Youngnok Koo, ed. *Korea and the U.S.* Seoul: Bakyong-Sa: 401~424.

Becker, Gray. 1962. "The investment in human capital: A theoretical analysis." *The Journal of*

- Political Economy. 70.
- Cerese, Francesco P. 1974. "Expectations and reality: A case study of return migration from the United States to Southern Italy." *International Migration Review* 8, No.2 (Summer): 245~262.
- Chirot, D. 1977. *Social Change in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Chung, Bum-mo. 1967. "American influence through educational exchange programs." *The Journal of Asiatic Studies* 10 : 109~119.
- Ember, C. R. and M. Ember. 1977. *Cultural Anthropology* 2nd. ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Fortney, Judith. 1972. "Immigrant professionals: A brief history survey." *International Migration Review* 6 (Spring): 50~62.
- Glaser, W. A. and G. C. Habers. 1974. "The migration and return of professionals." *International Migration Review* 8 : 227~244.
- Hahn, Bae-Ho and Kyu-taik Kim. 1963. "Korean political leaders (1952~1962): Their social origins and skills." *Asian Survey* 16.
- Han, Sung-jo. 1975. "Patterns of recruitment of Korean political elites," *The Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 18 : 1~44.
- Hekmati, Mehri and William A. Glaser. 1973. "The brain drain and UNITAR's multinational research project on the subject." *Social Science Information* 12, No.2 (April): 123~138.
- Kim, Kyong-Dong. 1977. "The international dynamics of modernization: Some theoretical issues and humanistic concerns," *Journal of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Korea, Humanities and Social Sciences Series* 16 : 277~306.
- Kim, Kyong-Dong. 1980. "Cultural dimensions in creating a new international order in Asia: Some conceptual and empirical observations on 'tilted' acculturation between Korea and Japan." *Korea-Japan Relations-Issues and Future Prospects*. Seoul: Asiatic Research Center, Korea University: 223~250.
- Kim, Zong-chul. 1971. "American influence on Korean educational system and educational administration." *The Journal of Asiatic Studies* 15 : 161~186.
- Kim, Kyu-taik. 1971. *Dynamics of Korean Politics*. Seoul: Iljogak.
- Lim, Hy-sop. 1977. "A study of Korean-American cultural relations," *The Journal of Asiatic Studies* 20.
- Lim, Hy-Sop. 1982. "Acceptance of American culture in Korea: Pattern of cultural contact and Korean perception of American culture." Sung-Joo Han, ed. *After One Hundred Years: Continuity and Change in Korean-American Relations*. Asiatic Research Center : 28~40.
- Merriam, M. F. 1970. "Reversing brain drain: A case study from India." *International Development*

Review 3 : 16~22.

Moore, W. E. 1974. *Social Change*, 2nd. ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall: 90.

Schultz, T. W. 1959. "Investment in man: An economist's view." *Social Service Review* I-XXX-LLI (June).

The Committee on the International Migration of Talent. 1970. *The International Migration of High-Level Manpower, Its Impact on the Development Process*. New York: Praeger Publisher.

Yu, Hoon. 1966. "The social background of high-ranking government officials in Korea." *Korean Public Administration* 4 : 243~266.