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ABSTRACT

This study examines the influences of teacher organizations in the formation and reform of the Teacher Evaluation for Professional Development (TEPD) policy in Korea. The chances for successful policy implementation and reform can be improved through the involvement of key stakeholders in the policy process. Teacher evaluation policy is considered as one of the most sensitive issues for teachers and teacher organizations because the consequences of the evaluation can be threatening to teachers’ pay and job security. However, these major stakeholders (i.e., teachers and teacher organizations) have often been neglected when it comes to the forming and changing of policies. Moreover, there has been little discussion in regards to the roles of teacher organizations and the importance of their participation in the policy process. Therefore, this study can significantly contribute to the literature and expand the field of teacher organizations’ participation in the policy process. To account for the teacher organizations’ role in shaping and reforming TEPD policy, I conducted a search of the governmental documents, newsletters, and documents on TEPD published by two teacher organizations – Korean Federation of Teachers’ Associations (KFTA) and Korean Teachers and Education Workers Union (KTU) – between 2004 and 2016. By applying the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF), the study seeks to answer three research questions with sub-questions: a) How did teacher organizations attempt to influence TEPD policy processes? b) Does the case of TEPD align with the core postulates of advocacy coalitions from ACF? and c) What are external factors that led changes to the policy change?

Results suggest that two teacher organizations in the policy subsystem mobilized their resources and attempted to imprint their beliefs on policy formation and development of TEPD through different strategies. Results also indicate that the case of TEPD partially supports the assumptions of advocacy coalitions from ACF. For instance, advocacy coalitions of TEPD policy...
subsystem were stable over time, but there were some defection and changes in coalition composition. Moreover, the case of TEPD indicated mixed results for the ACF’s hypothesis pertaining to a belief system that the actors would show substantial consensus within the policy core belief. While KTU supported the hypothesis, KFTA presented an internal dissension within the organization on the policy core belief (i.e. implementation of TEPD). Third, the external factors – the problems attributed by previous teacher evaluation policies, a paradigm shift, the IMF bailout, changes in public opinion on teacher quality, changes of the regime every five years, and a higher degree of consensus needed within an open political system in Korea – influenced policy change of TEPD. Based on these results, the study discussed contributions to the literature, policy recommendations, and limitations and further directions for research.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

On October 27, 2005, over 800 teachers occupied the road and back gate of the Ministry of Education in South Korea (Korea hereafter). Almost a year later, on October 20, 2006, during a public hearing, over 200 officers were deployed to stop a group of teachers from protesting, which resulted in 25 teachers being taken into custody and detained against their will. Three teachers were actually criminally charged (Huh & Choi, 2006). The teachers from both incidents were members of a teacher organization that advocated and voiced their opinions against a new policy called Teacher Evaluation for Professional Development (TEPD) or Gyo-won-neung-lyeog-gae-bal-pyeong-ga.

Implemented nationwide in 2010, TEPD was a unique teacher evaluation policy in Korea that aimed to improve teacher quality and increase students’ and parents’ satisfaction in public education (Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology [MEST], 2010). In implementing TEPD, the government hoped to better reflect the opinions of different stakeholders (i.e. students, parents, and teachers). However, the policy often was criticized due to its failure to fulfill its stated purpose; the policy did not improve teacher quality (Kim & Joo, 2014). Both students and parents were dissatisfied with public education (Kim, Kim, & Park, 2012).

TEPD is a teacher policy that teacher organizations have hitherto fiercely criticized, but at the same time, this policy provided teachers the opportunity to actively participate in the formation and change process of the policy. This was a political strategy of the Roh administration to promote participation from multiple stakeholders. However, there are few studies on the role of teacher organizations in the policy formation process. As teacher organizations are core stakeholders, studies on their perspectives and strategies on how they deal
with the policy are critical to a policy’s success (Tuytens & Devos, 2009; Kim, 2009). In taking part of policy formation and change process, Teacher organizations make decisions according to their beliefs and resources (Sabatier & Weible, 2007). Accordingly, this study explores how teacher organizations influence the formation and change processes of TEPD, and more specifically, how TEPD was formed and changed over time as the beliefs, resources, and strategies of teacher organizations evolved.

Korea is well known globally for its students’ high academic achievement and high quality of teachers through a number of international survey results including the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) and Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS). Due to the global notion that teacher quality is accountable for student outcome (Akiba, LeTendre, & Scribner, 2007; Borman & Kimball, 2005; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005), Korean teachers and education system have gained constant worldwide attention. For instance, Barack Obama, former president of the United States, had praised the quality of Korean education system and teachers. Moreover, Arne Duncan, who was the former Minister of Education of the United States, also favored the education system of Korea (Hwang, March 14, 2011; Strauss, January 14, 2014). As global interest on improving teacher quality grew, the reform of the teacher evaluation policy in Korea particularly attracted a great amount of interest not only in Korea but also in other countries of the entire world. The importance of involving key stakeholders and the process of how teacher organizations in Korea actively engaged in the policy formation and change will be helpful for policymakers around the world to create teacher policies that can aid in teachers’ professional development.
Teacher Evaluation for Professional Development and Korean Teacher Quality

Although Korea is viewed as a teacher quality powerhouse, questions were raised both domestically and internationally, in which discussions to reform teacher evaluation policies as one of the systems of many to improve teacher quality. When a new teacher evaluation was suggested to Korea, there existed two teacher evaluation policies. Teacher Evaluation for Performance (TEP) or Geun-mu-seong-jeog-pyeong-jeong was implemented in 1964 and Performance-Based Incentive System (PBIS) or Seong-gwa-sang-yeo-geum-pyeong-ga started in 2001. However, none aimed to improve teacher quality. The purposes of these two policies were solely focused on promoting and providing incentives but, interestingly, not related to improving teacher quality (Kwon, 2012; Kim et al., 2010; Presidential Education Reform Advisory Committee [PERAC], 2008). Domestically, the need for a new teacher evaluation policy that aimed to improve teacher professionalism was first discussed in the mid-1990s. At the turn of the century, parents’ dissatisfaction and distrust in public education were reflected when parents searched for educational help outside of the school system, which is also known as shadow education (e.g. private tutoring and cram schools). In turn, fierce voices on the initiation of questioning teacher quality had risen. Internationally, the OECD’s suggestions on improving teacher evaluation policy in 2003 amplified the need for a new teacher evaluation policy that solely focuses on enhancing teacher professional capacity. An advisory committee from the OECD visited Korea and advised to make reforms on teacher evaluation policies, aiming to improve teacher quality. The suggestions derived from a global notion that teachers are accountable for their students’ outcome (Ellett, & Teddlie, 2003; Huber & Skedsmo, 2016; N. Kang, 2013; Steinberg & Donaldson, 2014). Consequently, TEPD was implemented nationwide in 2010 to satisfy domestic and international needs of enhancing teacher quality.
Prior to a nationwide implementation of TEPD, conflicts among the stakeholders (e.g. students, parents, teachers, and government) existed. Since the discussions on TEPD were initiated, not only was a new teacher evaluation policy introduced but implementing processes also created controversial issues among the stakeholders who possessed diverse interests and perspectives (Cho, 2009; N. Kang, 2013; N. Kang, 2017; Kim, Joo, & Park, 2009; Lee & Sung, 2013). Among the stakeholders, two teacher organizations – Korean Federation of Teachers’ Associations (KFTA) or Han-gug-gyo-won-dan-che-chong-yeon-hab-hoe and Korean Teachers and Education Workers Union (KTU) or Jeon-gug-gyo-jig-won-no-dong-jo-hab – were actively involved in the policy formation and change processes.

Teacher organizations in Korea are unique and interesting in three ways. First, the Korean government only recognized one teacher organization as a legal entity for more than half a century. It was not until 1999 that Korean government allowed a dualistic system for teachers’ organization and permitted a teacher union (i.e. KTU) to organize legally. Prior to 1999, there was only one teacher organization for more than 50 years¹ (Jeon, 2005; Kim, 2016). However, KTU was declared to be an illegal organization in 2016 for retaining displaced teacher members. Currently, the president of Korea pledged to legalize KTU in his presidential election pledge, and movements toward legalizing KTU are in process.

Second, ever since the two teacher organizations coexisted from 1999, the organizations had opposite standpoints, which often resulted in conflicts. As it will be further discussed in later chapters, KFTA and KTU disagreed on many policies, and the formation and process of making TEPD was not an exception. The organizations, based on their beliefs and resources, use different

¹ Joseon Education Association (JEA) was the first teacher organization that was founded in 1947 and on the following year JEA changed its name to Korean Education Association (KEA) then changed to KFTA in 1989.
strategies to influence their opinions on the policy (Jenkins-Smith & Sabatier, 2014; Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1993; Sabatier & Weible, 2007).

Third, leadership groups of teacher organizations tend to wield absolute power and make unilateral decisions. Thus, the decisions made by the organization can often neglect the opinions of members. In other words, decisions that were made by the teacher organizations did not necessarily represent the perspectives of all the members. While this problem existed in both organizations, it was more prominently seen in the members of KFTA than in KTU, which played a critical role in the decision-making process within the organization and significantly influenced the policy change in TEPD. These issues will further be discussed in the study.

Accordingly, TEPD is considered to be an especially interesting case because it dealt with a teacher policy, in which teacher organizations were actively engaged in the processes of policy formation and change. Among teacher policies, teacher evaluation policy was indeed considered as one of the most sensitive issues because it threatened teachers who were afraid of the consequences of the evaluation (Tornero & Taut 2010). Teacher policies, teacher evaluation policy, in particular, is critical because it directly affects teacher quality (Hanushek & Rivkin, 2006). Therefore, studying TEPD, which teacher organizations intensely participated in the policy processes, provides an opportunity to ponder over how future teacher evaluation policies should be formed to improve teacher quality.

Theories of Policy Change

The study of policy making and policy change processes is critical. Understanding the formation and process of making policy changes ultimately will allow policymakers to further comprehend the theories of governance and politics in a broader perspective. Understanding the processes provides the knowledge on how policies affected the composition and course of society
(Jenkins-Smith, et al., 2014, p. 183) and suggests guidance in many unpredictable situations. Although situations with the same type of scenario rarely occur in politics, analyzing previous cases will benefit and prepare government administrations from difficulties that may arise in future cases.

Nevertheless, studies on policy making and change processes of teacher evaluation policies are difficult to find. As it will be discussed in further chapters, previous studies on TEPD policy making and change processes by Kim, Park, and Joo (2009), Cho (2009), and N. Kang (2013) have certain limitations. The studies analyzed the periods prior to nationwide implementation, which limits the scope of the study only at the discussion stage. Moreover, these studies neglected the importance of teachers and teacher organizations in the policy processes. Indeed, teachers and teacher organizations are the major stakeholders that are directly related to teacher evaluation policy since they were the main subjects of the evaluation. Additionally, teachers’ beliefs and their roles of the educational policy is vital for the success of the policy’s implementation (Tuytens & Devos, 2009; Kim, 2009).

This study used ACF to explain how teacher organizations influence TEPD policy processes. Among theories that explain policy making and policy change, Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) is one of the strongest analytic tools of policies (Cairney, 2013) that specifically focuses on the influences of multiple policy actors to the policy processes. In the policy making and policy change processes, individual policy actors form advocacy coalitions by their shared beliefs and resources, advocacy coalitions perform strategies to successfully induce their standpoint (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1993; Sabatier & Weible, 2007). Therefore, by using ACF, I explore the changes in beliefs and resources of teacher organizations that affect strategies of the organizations and thus influence policy processes of TEPD.
In addition, since ACF was primarily developed to be used in a North American setting and, later on, European setting, studies on ACF applied to Asian cases are very few (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Scott, 2012). Therefore, this study contributes to the field by adding literature on ACF study that centers on Korean case. Additionally, this study contributes particularly on advocacy coalitions among ACF components to seek whether hypotheses cast by previous studies fit a Korean setting.

Furthermore, this study helps to broaden the understanding of the uniqueness of teacher organizations and their roles on the formation and changes of TEPD in Korea. Teacher organizations in Korea are comparatively new to international scholarly work. There has been little study related to Korean teacher organizations. The organizations, however, cast an interesting case since the government had not legalized teacher unions for almost half a century from the inception of teacher association. It is interesting to note that as the nation allows the existence of two types of teacher organization as a step forward to democratization, even though these two organizations coexisted while each had different beliefs and used different strategies to express the opinions of their organization.

In summary, this dissertation focuses on policy formation and change processes in TEPD with an emphasis on teacher and teacher organizations and, more specifically, how the changes in their beliefs, as well as resources and strategies, have influenced the policy processes of TEPD. Studying teacher policy is critical because teacher policies directly influence teacher quality and, in turn, student growth. Moreover, studying policy change in teacher policy by teacher organizations is important because teachers are the main agents, and without their consensus, it is difficult to construct successful policy. However, the coalitions amongst individual teachers can differ by beliefs, resources, and strategies. Therefore, this study focused on the roles of teacher organizations with the changes of the beliefs and resources that affect changes in strategies, which then eventually reflected the changes in TEPD policy. In addition, by questioning the
hypotheses of advocacy coalitions from ACF, this study can contribute to ACF literature of Asian cases that was often been questioned but rarely been studied.

**Research Questions**

The guiding question of this study is how teacher evaluation policy should be formed to best improve teacher quality. To answer the question, this study explores how teacher organizations have influenced TEPD policy processes by using ACF developed by Sabatier, Weible, Jenkin-Smiths, and their colleagues. ACF is one of the powerful tools that analyzes policy formation and policy change processes with an emphasis on a policy subsystem that explains policy processes by interactions among advocacy coalitions. The advocacy coalitions are formed by shared beliefs of individual policy actors and changes in the beliefs and resources generate proper strategies to influence policy processes (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1993; Sabatier & Weible, 2007).

In addition, ACF describes external features that influence changes in policy subsystem to advocacy coalitions. Although the study is focused more on the advocacy coalitions and the changes of their beliefs, these are not the only factors that are responsible for policy changes. The basic assumption of ACF is that external subsystem events are also an important factor that influences changes to a policy (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1999). Therefore, as this study analyzes policy making and policy changes processes of TEPD along with the belief changes of coalitions, external subsystem events is supplemented for an in-depth understanding of the process of TEPD policy change.

By applying the key concepts – beliefs, resources, and strategies – and hypotheses of advocacy coalitions (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014, p. 195) from ACF, the research questions driving this study are threefold (with sub-questions):
1. How did teacher organizations attempt to influence TEPD policy processes?
   1-1. What beliefs, resources, and strategies did teacher organizations have that influenced TEPD policy processes?
   1-2. Did beliefs change? If so, how did the change in beliefs affect TEPD policy processes?

2. Does the case of TEPD align with the core postulates of advocacy coalitions from ACF?
   2-1. When policy beliefs are in dispute, do the lineup of allies and opponents tend to be rather stable over periods of a decade or so?
   2-2. Do actors within an advocacy coalition show substantial consensus on issues pertaining to the policy core, although less so on secondary beliefs?

3. What are external factors that led changes to the policy change?

   The issues around teacher evaluation are not confined only to Korea; rather, as a global interest in teacher accountability increased, teacher evaluation reforms became a global trend. Thus, it is important to understand how the key stakeholders of the policy influenced the policy processes by analyzing belief systems, resources, and strategies of the stakeholders. Through this case study, key understandings will not only help administrators and/or policymakers in Korea but also other nations in acknowledging the importance of involving the major stakeholders for policy success.

**The Scope of the Study: The Case of Teacher Evaluation for Professional Development**

This study is focused on the policy making and change processes of TEPD for four reasons and confined the study from 2004 to 2016, the period when the discussion was initiated and major modifications were made. First, the formation and change process of TEPD was particularly unique in that it was one of the first policies that integrated the opinions and ideas from the teacher organizations. Moreover, it allowed active participation in making and revising the policy despite having a centralized government in South Korea (Jeong, 2010). Prior to the
inducement of discussions around TEPD, the centralistic Korean government tends to neglect the opinions of the teacher organizations even though they constantly strived to influence and make their contentions known among policymakers. However, as the new administration in 2004 aimed to engage participation from multiple stakeholders, the government opened discussions to teacher organizations on TEPD and made an effort to embrace input from teacher organizations. Therefore, this study seeks to analyze how teacher organizations utilized this golden opportunity to actively engage in TEPD policy processes.

Second, TEPD is the first teacher evaluation policy in Korea targeted to improve teacher quality by providing structural professional development. As mentioned, the discussion around TEPD was first induced with the need to improve teacher quality. TEP and PBIS, previously implemented teacher evaluation policies, did not focus on measuring teacher quality as a way to provide feedback to teachers in order to better provide quality teaching to students. TEP’s purpose was to evaluate teachers’ performance as a measuring tool to give promotions, whereas PBIS aimed to evaluate teachers’ performance and provide incentives at different levels. It was only until TEPD was implemented when the evaluation results were used as a measuring tool to help the professional development of teachers. Thus, the study explores the teacher organizations’ beliefs in regards to the purpose of TEPD and the effects of their beliefs on TEPD policy process.

Third, TEPD is the only teacher evaluation policy in Korea, in which students and parents are allowed to participate in the evaluation processes. The administrators (e.g. principals and vice-principals) evaluated teachers by using evaluation results from TEP and PBIS as a source of metric for promotional incentives. Unlike the two other teacher evaluation policies (i.e. TEP and PBIS), which merged as one called the Performance Evaluation (PE) later, TEPD aimed to improve teacher quality and gain students’ and parents’ trust and confidence in public education (N. Kang, 2013; N. Kang, 2017). TEPD, with such goals, appreciated students’ and parental opinions as the policy attempted to reflect the needs of the consumers. This study seeks to make
connections between students and parents as evaluators to belief systems in each teacher organization that influenced the policy process of TEPD.

Moreover, TEPD was an especially unusual and interesting case because it took a longer period of time for nationwide implementation in comparison to other teacher policies. Prior to TEPD, the Korean government was criticized for rushing the implementation of policies, which resulted in multiple modifications that burdened teachers due to its frequent alteration. However, TEPD discussions were ongoing for approximately five years to further elongate the timeframe for implementation. Thus, this study focused on how teacher organizations have positioned themselves within their belief systems to influence TEPD policy processes in such a long period.

Indeed, TEPD is one of the teacher policies that teachers and teacher organizations have supported and worked to leverage access to the policy formation and the change processes. Other teacher policies that have gained significant social attention were “school information disclosure system” (2008), “ordinance for students’ human rights” (2011), “national standardized examination policy” (2011), and establishment of international middle school, autonomous high school, and special-purpose high school (2013). In these particular cases, teacher organizations attempted to lead the policies in a certain direction without success. There was no other educational policy where teacher organizations had a significant influence on forming and developing teacher policy. Therefore, this study scrutinizes the influences that the teacher organizations had on the formation and change of TEPD policy with their belief systems, resources, and strategies.

**Definition of Teacher Organization**

The study uses the term “teacher organization” to refer to teacher associations and unions because they are not necessarily antithetical despite using different names (Hovekamp, 1997).
There are occupations that strictly separate associations and unions such as library professionals or blue-collar workers. However, professions, such as teachers and nurses are not necessarily differentiated and categorized. Organizations in various fields are often divided into two types – associations and unions – based on their purposes of foundation, functions, beliefs, and values (Jeong, Jung, & Youn, 2001; Lamb, 2012). Previous studies indicated that the roles of teacher organizations are categorized into two: a role as a political interest group and group of professionals (McDonell & Pascal, 1988). However, teacher associations and teacher unions in society today tend to share similar functions, which is a completely separate type of organization (Bascia, 2009; Hovekamp, 1997). Thus, this study uses the term “teacher organization,” which is terminology that refers to both teacher associations and teacher unions.

**Organization of the Following Chapters**

The goal of the dissertation is to identify the changes in beliefs, resources, and strategies of teacher organizations and how the changes affected TEPD policy formation and change in Korea. Thus, chapter 2 consists of four sections: teacher evaluation policy, teacher policy making and change processes, models that explain policy formation and policy change processes, and genealogy of ACF as a theoretical framework of this study. First, the section of teacher evaluation policy seeks to answer a series of questions such as how teacher evaluation policy has come to the forefront and capture the world’s attention, teachers are being evaluated, and teachers should be evaluated. Next, the section of teacher policy process explores to answer how teacher policies are formed and how teacher policies should be formed. Then the chapter moves on to the models that explain policy formation and change processes. The chapter presents the strengths and weaknesses of each model and finalizes the theoretical framework to ACF for this study. Finally, the chapter discusses the genealogy of research on ACF by describing studies that used ACF, in
particular, to analyze the TEPD policy process. The chapter ends by describing the gaps from the previous literature that justifies applying ACF to this study.

Chapter 3 provides a brief background on the administrative and legal structures, teacher evaluation policies, and teacher organizations in Korea prior to analyzing teacher evaluation policy in Korea. The chapter provides contexts on the implementation of the teacher evaluation policies by comparing three teacher evaluation policies – TEP, PBIS, and TEPD – that existed prior to the 2015 reform and detailing most recent version of the TEPD model. In doing so, a brief introduction on two teacher organizations (i.e. KFTA and KTU) are described in addition to their respective perspectives on policies in order to understand the ideology of each organization and their influences on policies.

The methodology of the study is depicted in chapter 4 with the analytic framework, data resources, and analytic strategies. The analytic framework section provides features of advocacy coalitions, belief systems, and resources and strategies in a relation to research questions as well as external parameters that additionally influenced policy processes of TEPD. In order to conduct research, the study used documents (e.g. statements, press releases, newsletters) from teacher organizations and the government as data. As this study draws upon qualitative methodology, more specifically content analysis, the chapter provides justification for using document analysis as the main analytical strategy. Specific analytic procedures, which include timelines for collecting data and coding, are presented. Moreover, specific coding themes and emerged themes are provided in tables.

The results are presented in chapter 5 by following the chronological history of TEPD policy process. The study aims to analyze the influences of teacher organizations to the policy process of TEPD. Accordingly, the results portray the changes in advocacy coalitions and their belief systems, resources, and strategies by period and discuss their influences to the policy process. Moreover, the policy formation and change processes are described in alliance with a
figure of a simplified form of ACF. Each part of the figure further explains the external factors and interactions between coalitions that influenced governmental decisions on the policy processes of TEPD. However, since the focus of the study is on advocacy coalitions, other components serve only as additional explanations of the policy process.

To conclude the research, chapter 6 presents main findings and discussions, policy recommendations, limitations, and further directions of the study. The summary includes the findings of the study with discussions of the findings. For the implications, the study suggests teacher organizations are major agents affecting teacher policies; this has policy implications for TEPD and cautionary advice on blindly borrowing policies from other countries. The chapter closes out by indicating limitations of the current study and possible further research.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

To address the primary research questions, this chapter is divided into four separate sections: teacher evaluations, theories of policy formation and change processes, justifications of the theoretical framework of this study, and summary of the chapter. The first section utilizes a series of questions that provide guidance to answers in understanding teacher evaluation systems. The questions include a) How teacher evaluations came to the forefront of the world’s attention, b) Why it is important now, c) How teachers are being evaluated, and d) How teacher evaluation policies are formed and changed.

The second section presents three main models of policy formation and change – Policy Process Stages Model (PPSM), Multiple Streams Framework (MSF), and Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF). For each model, an outline of each theory is stated, and the strengths and weaknesses are discussed. In addition, studies that adapted each model to analyze the Teacher Evaluation for Professional Development (TEPD) or Gyo-won-neung-lyeog-gae-bal-pyeong-ga policy are provided. The section then presents a genealogy of studies that apply ACF both international and nation-specific (i.e. Korean cases).

The third section discusses the four justifications for adapting ACF as the main theoretical framework of the study. ACF is used to analyze and discuss TEPD in this study because it helps to provide answers to the research questions, considers causal relations among external factors and policy subsystems, uses the unit of analysis that is based on the belief systems of advocacy coalitions in policy subsystems, and presents the change of policy from a long-term perspective.
Teacher Evaluation

The literature on assessing the effectiveness of previous existing teacher evaluation models have dominated the discourse on teacher evaluation (Darling-Hammond, 2013; Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010; Peterson, 2004; Strong, Gargani, & Hacifazlioglu, 2011). The studies that discuss the effectiveness of teacher evaluations are divided into two types. First, a school of scholars studied the relationship between teacher evaluation and the growth in student academic achievements (Darling-Hammond, 2013; Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010; Marzano, Toth, & Schooling, 2012; Steinberg & Sartain, 2015). While the results present a positive, direct relation between teacher evaluation and growth of student outcome (Goldhaber, 2002; Hanushek et al., 2005; Wright, Horn, & Sanders, 1997), concerns in regards to fairness, accuracy, and potential adverse effects are warning signs in terms of using student academic performances as a method to evaluate teachers (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012; Fuller et al., 2015; Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010).

Second, mixed results are found in the effectiveness of teacher evaluation on teacher productivity and improvement in terms of instructional capacity (Rockoff et al., 2008; Strong, Gargani, & Hacifazlioglu, 2011; Taylor & Tyler, 2012). While some scholars suggest teachers are more effective when they have more autonomy in making classroom decisions (Bascia, 2009; Hanushek, 2011), others believe that teachers become more effective when they are evaluated. Their notion is that evaluating teachers can help them learn new information about their own performance, which leads to developing new instructional skills and putting long-run efforts for teaching preparation (Taylor & Tyler, 2012).

Another large body of studies in teacher evaluations focuses on assessing and suggesting modifications for teacher evaluation models. Research in this category can be explained through five components of teacher evaluation: purposes (Gabriel & Woulfin, 2017; Marzano, 2012), criteria and contents (Darling-Hammond, 2013; Winters & Cowen, 2012), evaluators (Danielson
& McGreal, 2000; Peterson, 2004), methods (Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010; Rockoff & Speroni, 2010), and usage of results (Harvey-Beavis, 2003; Ramirez, Clause, & Davis, 2001). Teacher evaluation not only allows the decisions of school administrators to focus on teacher personnel such as hiring, promotion, and inducement but also leads them to develop and improve teachers’ capability and quality (McGreal, 1983; Valentine, 1992; Webb, Montello & Norton, 1994). The five components of teacher evaluations are further discussed in later sections.

Although there are some disagreements (Glazerman et al., 2010), student growth in achievements is one of the prevailing criteria used for evaluating the effectiveness of teachers (OECD, 2013b). In terms of evaluators, the literature warns of the danger of including administrators (principals and vice-principals). The reason is that the administrators often lack accuracy in evaluating teachers. (Peterson, 2004). Discussions of methods of teacher evaluation are mainly focused on classroom observation (Grossman et al., 2014; Winters & Cowen, 2012), parents and student surveys (Mayo, 1997), peer review (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017), and self-evaluation including portfolios (Curry & Cruz, 2000; Danielson & McGreal, 2000). The use of the results is determined in accordance with the purposes of teacher evaluation. In summary, studies are heavily weighted as to how the teacher is evaluated in order to enhance their effectiveness. However, the scholarly community has neglected the policy processes of teacher evaluation, especially in identifying teachers and teacher organizations to participate in the policy processes. The participation of teachers and organizations are important because it determines the success of teacher evaluations as metrics to evaluate the quality of teachers.

The literature on teacher evaluation in the context of Korea follows the same international trend, except that a large body of Korean literature consists of teacher perceptions on teacher evaluations. A body of research was propelled to the forefront of investigations on perceptions of TEPD, and most research deals with perceptions from teachers (Kang & Moon, 2009; K. S. Kim, 2014; K. T. Kim & Lee, 2011) including parents and students as well (Kim,
Kim, & Park, 2012). Prevailing studies on perceptions of different stakeholders may lead to attempts on conducting research on the participation of the stakeholders in policy processes.

However, little research on teacher evaluation explicitly outlines the involvement of different stakeholders in policy processes, especially teachers or teacher organizations as major agents of the evaluation. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2015) has published guidelines for policy-makers and decision-makers on teacher policy-making and argued to include teachers and their representative organizations in the policy-making processes. The participation of teachers and teacher organizations in policy formation and change processes on teacher policy is critical since they are the major agents of the policy (Tuytens & Devos, 2009; Kim, 2009). The key to success in policy implementation is involving policy stakeholders in the discussion. Despite the importance of directly including teachers in the policy processes (Danielson, 2001; Danielson, 2011; Donaldson, 2012), the academic community has not extensively explored this field. Thus, my study identifies teachers as stakeholders and aims to seek their influences in the policy processes.

This section follows the trail of four questions in order to understand teacher evaluation and makes connections to the next section. The first question is answered when the rise of global interest on teacher quality was mentioned, which spontaneously shed light on to teacher evaluations. Then the discussion moves to address how attention toward teacher evaluations was initiated in Korea. The second part displays the reasons to focus on why teacher evaluation is critical in the present time. Then the chapter moves to the third part and seeks answers on how teachers are being evaluated with five components – purpose, criteria and contents, evaluators, methods, and use of results – that comprise teacher evaluations. The section ends by introducing the processes of formation and changes in teacher evaluation policy that lead to the second section of the chapter.
**How did Teacher Evaluation Come to the Forefront?**

Starting from the turn of the century, teacher evaluation has become more of a global trend as one of the primary strategies to measure teacher accountability (Ellett, & Teddlie, 2003; Huber & Skedsmo, 2016; N. Kang, 2013; Steinberg & Donaldson, 2014). A global recognition of linkage between teacher quality and improvement in student performance led to teachers being accountable for students’ outcomes (Duke, 1995). It seems reasonable to expect teachers to be accountable for their students’ achievements because teachers have more contact that is direct and work closely with students than any other educational source (Ellett & Teddlie, 2003). Global transition of accountability is noticeable in both national teacher evaluation policy reforms (Huber & Skedsmo, 2016) and international teacher surveys.

With a growing interest toward teacher evaluation in the global community, international institutions – the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) – started asking questions related to teacher evaluation through existing surveys. In the beginning, the questions asked were very simple; they asked whether the target country had a national-level teacher evaluation policy. Although there have been active scholarly discussions around teacher evaluation, it was not until 2003 that the OECD and IEA stepped forward and allowed the global community to compare their teacher evaluation policies and seek opportunities for development. The IEA’s Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) started to ask questions about teacher evaluation in their third wave, TIMSS 2003 and their second wave in PISA 2003 for the OECD’s Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA).

Soon after the institutions opened a voyage on international comparisons of teacher evaluation, a report published by the OECD in 2006 heralded a new era for national teacher evaluation systems to the global society. Since the publishing of the international review report,
Teachers Matter: Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers, national systems for teacher evaluation have been pushed to the forefront of the world’s attention. The report discovered the lack of adequate teacher evaluation systems in countries around the world and suggested possible teacher policy options that can improve teacher quality. The report underscores the importance of defining professional standards and systemizing the teacher evaluation policy that intensifies, limits, and allows classroom decisions based on evidence-based research. In addition, the report underscores the necessity of teacher certification and professional development as the mechanisms to ensure highly trained professionals to make classroom decisions based on evidence. Corresponding to a need of systematic teacher evaluation policies, educators and policy-makers have promoted further research on teacher evaluation and have strongly engaged in lively debates about ideal models (Darling-Hammond, 2013; Hull, 2013; Isore, 2009).

Moreover, the report published by UNESCO in 2006 supported the reform in teacher evaluation towards attaining teacher quality. Another report, Teachers and Educational Quality: Monitoring Global Need for 2015, reflects the demand and supply of qualified teachers in 149 countries. It emphasizes the pivotal role of teachers in achieving quality education and thus, the necessity of evaluating teachers of their capability.

In 2008, the OECD initiated Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS), which included sophisticated international data that directly asked teachers and principals in 24 countries questions on teacher evaluation policy in their own countries. Every five years results from the new waves of TALIS studies help better understand teacher evaluation policies of each country and allow comparative analysis for the global community. The second wave, TALIS 2013, covers 33 countries and the upcoming TALIS 2018 surveys 47 countries, including 18 non-OECD members. TALIS has not only escalated comparative research on teacher evaluations but also drawn attention to teacher quality to the world.
As a result, most countries today have teacher evaluation policies at the national and/or state-level, and Korea is one of them (OECD, 2014). The result from TALIS 2013 shown in Figure 2-1 reports that over 95 percent of schools in each nation are using teacher evaluation systems. The only holdouts are Italy, Estonia, Finland, Brazil, Bulgaria, and Denmark. However, teacher evaluation policies are still being disputed as to their effectiveness. The countries with smaller percentages of schools implementing teacher evaluation systems are going through controversies around the effects of teacher evaluations and having disagreements around measuring teacher quality itself.

![Figure 2-1. Percentages of Schools in Each Nation participating in Teacher Evaluation Adapted from OECD (2014).](image)

Korea is not an exception to this trend of nationwide implementation of quality-oriented teacher evaluation policy. It was not until 2004 when discussions arose whether to revise the existing teacher evaluation policy or create a new teacher evaluation that emphasizes professional development. Although there was a teacher evaluation policy – Teacher Evaluation for Performance (TEP) or Geun-mu-seong-jeog-pyeong-jeong – since 1964, the policy was to evaluate teachers as civil workers. In 1995, another teacher evaluation called Performance-Based
Incentive System (PBIS) or Seong-gwa-sang-yeo-geum-pyeong-ga was initiated for personnel purpose. TEPD, the new policy to evaluate teachers for developing their professional capacity, has been implemented nationwide in Korea since 2010. However, the discussions for the new policy arose in 2004 both externally and internally.

Previous studies identified that teacher policy reforms in a country are influenced both by global (i.e. external) and local (i.e. internal) contexts (Akiba & LeTendre, 2009; Akiba & LeTendre, 2017; Anderson-Levitt, 2003; Baker & LeTendre, 2005) and a good example is TEPD. Externally, the OECD’s visit to Korea in 2004 affected the discussions of teacher accountability and evaluating systems due to their increase demand of quality. As mentioned previously, the OECD revealed their interest towards teacher evaluation by adding items that specifically ask about teacher evaluation in their international survey, PISA 2003. Since then, the OECD created an education committee to assess the evaluation system in several countries and provide advice on teacher evaluation systems that focus on teacher quality and released a report that deals with international reviews in 2005 (Akiba, 2013; N. Kang, 2013). Koreans started to problematize the existing teacher evaluation system as it is insufficient to measure teachers’ professionalism and quality.

Internally, the discussion of teacher evaluation that has its emphasis on teacher quality occurred as shadow education (e.g. tutoring, cram schools) expanded and distrust in public education increased (The Presidential Commission on Policy Planning [PCPP], 2008). The criticism of public schools escalated, and the blame was placed on poor teaching and low quality of teachers. The argument was brought up by the advocacy coalition of Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development (MEHRD), parental organizations, and media that supported the implementation of TEPD. They argued that the teacher evaluation policy should serve as a function of weeding out unqualified teachers (Seo, 2012). Moreover, they expressed doubts about teacher quality in public education and claimed that surging shadow education was a result of the
low quality of teachers, and this caused polarized views. In other words, they claimed that the expansion of shadow education was a consequence of low teacher quality in public education; thus, teacher quality should be dealt with in order to enhance public education. As a means to develop teachers’ professionalism, they supported a new teacher evaluation system (i.e., TEPD) that measures teacher capacity. As “teacher quality has become a political concept” (LeTendre & Akiba, 2017, p. 572), initiation of discussions as well as formations and changes in teacher evaluation policy were influenced by political changes and strategies of the ruling party (Weaver-Hightower, 2008). TEPD was not an exception to the political influence, and this political motivation provided evidence for advocacy coalitions using public sentiments to push forward TEPD (J. Kim, 2008).

In 2004, the Korean government, in response to such external suggestions and internal complaints, started a discussion on revising or forming a teacher evaluation policy that solely centralized on teacher quality (PCPP, 2008). However, it took longer for a new nationwide teacher evaluation policy to be implemented. Although, by 2010 the Teacher Evaluation for Professional Development (TEPD) was finally implemented. The long duration for the nationwide implementation, compared to other policy formation processes, was the consequence of a lack of consensus on evaluating the teachers that was created because of the strong resistance from teacher organizations.

**Why is it Important Now?**

The attention on teachers has been ongoing, but the unprecedented focus on teacher quality has risen dramatically throughout the last few decades. Regardless of the global attention on enhancing teacher quality with a connection to accountability, each nation has different trajectories that reflects local contexts (Akiba & LeTendre, 2009; LeTendre, 2013). Curricular
reforms and infrastructure in schools were viewed as main components to ensure positive students’ outcomes, whereas the quality of teachers was considered as a secondary category. However, for the last few decades, in accordance with teachers being identified as a key factor in school improvement and student academic achievements (Hanushek & Rivkin, 2006; OECD, 2005; Stiggins & Duke, 1988; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005), teacher evaluation policies that assess teacher quality became apparently important around the world, including Korea.

Studies on TEPD should be underscored in the present for several reasons. Some group of scholars may claim that research on TEPD in Korea is no longer an issue because the implementation of TEPD is slowly phasing out. However, such perspective is a narrow view that only focuses on the applicability or effectiveness of the policy. Studies on TEPD for the present are even more compelling because they allow researchers to concentrate not only on the unique features of TEPD itself but also the formation and change processes of the policy after a decade of implementation.

Since the making of TEPD has a long history, conducting research on TEPD is important because it allows scholars and policymakers to learn diverse lessons. The first discussion on TEPD was initiated in 2004 and it took six years for nation-wide implementation. TEPD has been implemented for about a decade, and including discussions; it has almost a 15-year history. The policy has undergone multiple reforms, and it was likely that another major reform would be made to the policy since the government showed the intention of merging two teacher evaluation policies into one (Ministry of Education [MOE], September 3, 2015). However, there were constant controversies on issues in regards to the metrics in measuring teacher quality such as how to quantify or evaluate teachers and who were qualified to evaluate teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2013). One of the reasons TEPD constantly was embroiled in controversy was that this policy directly affected teachers. With TEPD’s purpose evaluating teachers’ capacities and
develop their professions, teachers distrust the evaluation policy as they see it as a challenge to their ability (Gabriel & Woulfin, 2017).

Conducting research on TEPD is critical because it depicted in manifold ways of the policy formation and change processes for more than a decade since the implementation. Although TEPD was implemented nationwide during the “Participatory Government,” it had lost its validity in school settings because it did not have sufficient legal baseline. With this “failed success,” policymakers can learn that they should include teachers and teacher organizations, who are the main agents of the teacher policy to the policy processes from the very beginning. While the previous literature on teacher participation narrowly focused on participating in decision-making at schools (Kemper, 2017; Taylor & Bogotch, 1994), the importance of teacher participation in policy-making processes (Danielson, 2001; Danielson, 2011; Donaldson, 2012) attracted more attention recently. Therefore, studying TEPD has been very important since it plays a pivotal role in understanding the policy processes.

How are Teachers Being Evaluated?

Concurrent with the increased emphasis on teacher quality, the discourse on reforming teacher policies towards fostering teacher quality has expanded worldwide. For instance, a number of studies aim to learn the means of reforms from one another through comparative research. Teacher policy reforms can be done in many areas such as teacher education and certification, recruitment and hiring, professional development and evaluation, and career advancement.

---

2 “Government of Participation” is a nickname of a government ran by President Rho Moo Hyun that took over the power from 2000 to 2005. The nickname reflects the direction, attempt for a participation of different stakeholders. They are further discussed in Chapter 3. Context for the Study.
advancement (Akiba, 2013). Among the reforms in such fields, teacher evaluation policy is indeed a major reform that is related to enhancing teacher quality.

Although the global trend in teacher evaluation reform is towards accountability, the characteristics of the reforms at the national level vary across countries, which are respectively influenced by local contexts (Akiba, 2013). For instance, the accountability reforms in the United States and Korea are remarkably different. In the United States, an increasing number of states are implementing teacher evaluations that heavily rely on the growth of students’ academic achievement for evaluating teachers (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012; Fuller et al., 2015). The evaluation results are then used for providing monetary incentives such as merit-based raises or bonuses. On the other hand, in Korea, principals, vice-principals, peer teachers, parents, and students evaluate teachers through class observations and surveys (N. Kang, 2013; N. Kang, 2017; Kim & Youngs, 2016; Yoo, 2018). The results were intended to be used for teachers’ professional development; however, the use of the results had been accused to be insufficient and weakly connected to the training of the teacher and enhancing teacher quality (Bae & Joo, 2014; Kim & Joo, 2016).

The global expansion of the implementation of teacher evaluation systems then questioned how to measure the quality of teachers. The definition for teacher quality varies by country, and the differences rely on each country’s unique contexts, cultural roles of teachers, and statuses and identities of teachers (Anderson-Levitt, 2001; LeTendre, 1994, Akiba, LeTendre, & Scribner, 2007). Although there has not been an agreement, in terms of the definition of teacher quality, scholars outline some important components of teacher quality. For instance, in some cultures, personal characteristics of teachers, such as passion, commitment, and devotion are emphasized, whereas other cultures might rely more on teachers’ professional knowledge and understanding of content (Akiba & LeTendre, 2009). The components of teacher quality lead to the components of teacher evaluations that evaluate teacher quality.
Disputes among advocacy coalitions on designing TEPD model were related to the five components of teacher evaluations: purposes, criteria and contents, evaluators, methods, and use of results. In other words, the question of how teachers are being evaluated can be divided into five sub-questions: a) what are the purposes of teacher evaluations? b) what are the criteria and contents of teacher evaluations? c) who evaluates teachers? d) what are the methods of teacher evaluations? and e) how are the results used? All five components are interrelated to one another; for instance, the purpose of teacher evaluation determines criteria and contents of the evaluation. The section below analyzes these five components to answer these questions on how teachers are being evaluated.

**Purposes of Teacher Evaluation**

Teacher evaluations vary with a range of different approaches, depending on purposes and the evaluations, involve at least two competing logics: accountability logic or development logic (Gabriel & Woulfin, 2017, p. xvi). It is important to note that as Marzano (2012) mentioned, “measuring teachers and developing teachers are different purposes with different implications” (p. 16). The accountability logic of teacher evaluation corroborates the purpose of measuring, sorting, and selecting teachers against criteria based on their quality (Duke, 1995; Gabriel & Woulfin, 2017; Marzano, 2012). Purposes of teacher evaluation that falls into the category of the accountability logic or a summative purpose (Darling-Hammond, Wise & Pease, 1983, p. 287) are personnel decision-making such as employment, promotion, and dismissal. However, sorting teachers of unqualified and problematic may or may not be related to their dismissals.

The logic behind the development relates to the notion that evaluators assess teachers to support and develop their expertise (Gabriel & Woulfin, 2017; Marzano, 2012). This logic leads to a formative purpose of teacher evaluation, which the results are used to make improvements
Formative evaluation is “a qualitative evaluation on the teacher current practice, aimed at identifying strengths and weaknesses and providing adequate professional development opportunities for the areas in need of improvement” (Isore, 2009, p.7). The examples of development logic, or formative purpose, include teacher evaluation for professional development and the evaluation to identify high-performing teachers to reward and make acknowledgments (OECD, 2015). Simply put, summative purposes are to make consequential decisions for quality assurance, and formative purposes are to enhance teaching practice itself (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Isore, 2009; National Education Association [NEA], 2016).

Korean cases suggest two types of teacher evaluation that are responsible for two different purposes since 2015 reform. Prior to the major reform in 2015, there were three types of teacher evaluations with three different purposes, respectively (OECD, 2013a). TEP started from 1964 aimed for personnel purpose, specifically to promote teachers to administrative positions, whereas PBIS implemented in 1995 had incentive providing purpose. TEPD started in 2010 was implemented with a rising call for teacher evaluation policy that aims to improve teaching professions and developing teacher quality. However, teacher evaluation policies were reformed into two types in 2015, Performance Evaluation (PE) and TEPD. PE includes two purposes: promotion and providing incentives. As the focus is on TEPD, this study put more emphasis on the formative purpose of professional development and enhancement of teacher capacity.

Policy formation and implementation are closely related to political purposes, (Weaver-Hightower, 2008) and TEPD, in particular, corresponds to the part of the government’s major strategies. While the detailed discussion on implementing TEPD started in 2004, the need for a new teacher evaluation that aims for accountability actually initiated in 1995 (Jeon, 2004). The so-called 5.31. Reform (1995) is an extensive educational reform that influences educational policies (Presidential Education Reform Advisory Committee [PERAC], 1995), and it accounted
for the introduction of TEPD. It was not until 2003, that the political party in power strategically politicized issue of accountability through teacher evaluation policy.

Prior to initiation of discussion in teacher evaluation reform, the presidential camp of Roh Moo Hyun presented ‘policy reform for enhancing teacher professionalism.’ In 2003, when President Roh was elected, the government announced a national agenda, which slightly changed from the presidential camp, ‘teacher promotion policy reform and enhance teacher professionalism’ (PCPP, 2008). This means that new teacher evaluation was not an independent policy agenda but started as a general teacher personnel policy reform. In 2004, when the discussions rose both from the public and OECD, it was then differentiated to an independent policy of interest. Hence, policy and politics are interrelated so that researchers can scrutinize the ecological system and context of the policy when analyzing the policy processes (Weaver-Hightower, 2008; Sabatier, 2007).

**Criteria and Contents of Teacher Evaluation**

A teacher’s job is far too complex to be evaluated only with certain limited aspects (Winters & Cowen, 2012), which led to a discourse on criteria and contents of the evaluation. Indeed, “a singular focus on ‘instructional efficiency’ does not begin to capture the true complexity of a teacher’s job” (LeTendre & Akiba, 2017, p. 572, emphasized in original). Consequently, teachers were not evaluated only by how they taught but also by how they interacted with students specifically within the context of the situation. The Korean government announced TEPD to evaluate teachers based on two criteria – instructional efficiency and student guidance after understanding the complexity of the teacher’s job (MOE, September 3, 2015). Instructional efficacy refers to evaluating teachers with their preparation, implementation, and utilization of their class materials in relations to instructions, whereas student guidance includes
understanding students’ personal problems, guiding students in terms of career, and enhancing students’ adaptability at school (Choi & Park, 2016). However, the path to finding an agreement on the criteria and contents was not an easy task.

In the process of searching for a compromise in establishing the advocacy coalitions had lively discussions on creating standardized criteria and contents (J. Kim, 2008). The components of TEPD, criteria and contents, were established and agreed upon, which was done relatively easily compared to other components of the policy. As a result, the agreement was a form of standardization. Even though these components were established, the advocacy coalitions still went through multiple dissents in regards to the subcomponents. The sub-components should be included as the criteria and contents in order to effectively and efficiently assess teacher quality (Seo, 2006).

Some scholars argue that standardized criteria and contents as a form of evaluating teachers are very critical (Darling-Hammond, 2013). The standard as to how teachers should be evaluated is a commonly discussed issue when forming a new evaluation system. By standardizing the criteria and contents of the evaluation, it helps to diminish the problems of objectivity, reliability, accuracy, and validity of the evaluation results (Murphy, Hallinger, & Heck, 2013) during the evaluation process. Moreover, standardizing evaluation may lead to a consensus of different stakeholders with teacher evaluation as TEPD did. From the TEPD case, it can be seen that different emphasis on criteria and contents by stakeholders were highlighted, which often caused conflicts at the policy formation stage since the emphasis was often related to the beliefs and interests of stakeholders. Thus, one of the means to lessen these conflicts was to invite the stakeholders to the policy formation and change the processes to make decisions on standards of criteria and contents together.

Nevertheless, standardization of the evaluation is contentious for several reasons. The biggest controversies centered on finding qualified and competent evaluators to set the standards
Including multiple stakeholders as evaluators could be an ideal approach but finding qualified evaluators was a different concern. Having sufficient qualifications is critical not only in setting the standards but also in comprising evaluators (Darling-Hammond, 2013; Storey, 2000). Another point of contention for standardized evaluation proffered is whether it is feasible to set the standards to evaluate individuals whose innumerable differences dwell (Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Pease, 1983). Teachers have different experiences that result in generating various characteristics; thus, evaluating teachers only with standardized criteria and contents may neglect and rule out such differences, which can lead to criticism against these evaluations. Moreover, there were concerns around standardizing teacher evaluation since it “imposes on teaching work [which] may be seen as counterproductive to the extent that it constrains teachers in using their professional or personal judgment” (Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Pease, 1983, p. 302).

The issue of standardized criteria and contents is closely related to and preceded by the question of what criteria and contents should be included. Danielson and McGreal (2000) suggested two fundamental approaches to criteria and contents of teacher evaluations: inputs and outputs. These inputs and outputs concepts are different from the notions generally discussed in the educational field. Predominantly, inputs in education correlate to resources used to educate students, whereas outputs refer to the direct effects on students with regard to their knowledge acquisition and skills (Levacic, 2000). However, Danielson and McGreal’s (2000) intention, concerning inputs and outputs, are confined to criteria and contents of teacher evaluation – how teachers are evaluated in respect of criteria and contents.

On one hand, evaluating teachers with their inputs refers to evaluating “an enumeration of teacher tasks that reflect the complexity in their work.” On the other hand, when teachers are evaluated with their outputs, it means that teachers are assessed through the achievements such as student learning or performance, as an “indication of the quality of teaching” (Danielson &
McGreal, 2000: 32). In short, inputs assess the endeavors of teachers in regards to teaching or raising their instructional quality, while outputs assess the results that teachers achieve through their students; for instance, Value-Added Measures (VAM) is the approach that measures outputs of teachers.

As noted previously, the purpose of TEPD is to enhance professionalism and through two fields – instructional capacity and student guidance – TEPD attempts to achieve the goal. As it will be dealt in more detail in the later chapters, instruction criteria are divided into preparation, implementation, and assessment and utilization, whereas student guidance criteria are divided into personal maturity and social maturity of teachers (Choi & Park, 2016). One thing to note is that students’ academic outcome is not one of the criteria for evaluating teachers in Korea. It is quite different from the global trend where VAM is one of the most widely used approaches when evaluating teachers (OECD, 2013b).

One of the most contentious debates on teacher evaluation with summative purpose and accountability logic is considering gains of students’ academic achievement in relation to individual teachers through VAM (Darling-Hammond, 2013; Harris, Ingle, & Rutledge, 2014; Steinberg & Donaldson, 2014). The assumption of using VAM is that a student’s achievement who is taught by a specific teacher reflects the teacher’s effectiveness (Darling-Hammond, 2013; Fuller et al., 2015). Policymakers and scholars who demand explicit evidence for teacher contributions to student learning that underlies the accountability of teachers (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012) have welcomed the approach. They are intrigued by VAM because they assume the model would be able to provide estimations on teachers’ effectiveness while controlling student-level demography (e.g., race, socioeconomic status, English language proficiency) to avoid distortion to the effects from teachers (Amrein-Beardsley & Holloway, 2017; McCaffrey et al., 2005). Regardless of controlling for such non-educational factors, VAM remains notorious for neglecting the influence of those factors (Darling-Hammond et al., 2012).
Moreover, while the strategy of using VAM to evaluate teachers has been widely used in the global community (OECD, 2015), a growing body of contemporary studies is concerned with using VAM for accountability purposes (Darling-Hammond, 2013; Fuller et al., 2015). The concerns with VAM that were suggested by previous literature primarily pertain to three categories: a) methodological concerns (e.g., validity, reliability, bias), b) logistical concerns (e.g., transparency, fairness, usability), and c) consequential concerns (e.g., effects on school culture and teaching profession, high-stakes attached to achievements) (Amrein-Beardsley & Holloway, 2017, p. 3; Darling-Hammond, 2013; Duke, 1995; Fuller et al., 2015; Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010). Using student growth in academic achievement for evaluating teachers, thus, remains controversial.

Students’ academic achievement using VAM is not an indicator for teacher evaluation in Korea due to strong resistance from teachers and teacher organizations. Instead, TEPD policy evaluates teachers with their instructional capacity and the ability for student guidance (Choi & Park, 2016; N. Kang, 2013; N. Kang, 2017). Korean teachers are evaluated for their extensive care and guidance toward their students through questions such as “Is (s)he enthusiastic about education that builds students’ character, and about career guidance?” or “Does (s)he try to understand students’ psychological status and personal problems and provide proper guidance?” Although there are some scholars who suggest VAM to Korean teacher evaluation model (Yoo, 2018), it is very unlikely that student achievement scores will be used to evaluate teachers due to fierce opposition from the main agents: teachers and teacher organizations.

**Evaluators of Teacher Evaluation**

Globally, incorporating multiple evaluators has often viewed as a key to success in teacher evaluation (OECD, 2013a; OECD, 2015; Danielson & McGreal, 2000). Including
manifold evaluators increases reliability and objectivity of teacher evaluation since opinions and perspectives of evaluating teaching capacity may differ by different stakeholders (Peterson, 2005; K. Lee, 2010). Despite the importance of including multiple evaluators (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2012; Peterson, 1987; Toch, 2008), there is not much literature that explicitly suggests an ideal number of evaluators needed to effectively increase the accuracy of teacher evaluations.

Instead, a group of scholars emphasized the importance of training evaluators to be “qualified” or “skilled” as a pivotal matter that should not be undertaken (Danielson, 2011; Darling-Hammond, 2013; Storey, 2000). Although there is a need to develop qualified evaluators, especially for students and parents (Y, Jung, 2010), there is little research that provides means to develop the qualified evaluators (Kim & Kim, 2016). It is important to note that disagreement with the skills and qualifications of evaluators led to lack of consensus in the results after the evaluation. Therefore, policymakers should take the means of training evaluators into account when involving diverse evaluators (Weaver-Hightower, 2008; Sabatier, 2007).

Korea also followed the global trend in involving multiple evaluators for multidimensional evaluation, specifically for TEPD; however, constant controversies arise in whom to include as evaluators. Currently, TEPD includes principal, vice-principal, peer teachers, parents, and students (MOE, 2015a; MOE, 2015b). At the beginning of the discussion stage of implementing TEPD, there were concerns of including administrators due to the concern of duplicating two other teacher evaluations (i.e., TEP and PBIS). Principals and vice-principals already play a role as an evaluator in two existing teacher evaluation policies, which lessens the necessity of another new teacher evaluation (Kwon, 2012). Moreover, the supporters of this position argued that if TEPD involved administrators, it implied that the results would be eventually connected to the personnel purposes, which was not an original purpose of TEPD explicitly announced by the government (J. Kim, 2008).
Furthermore, consistent problems that later affected revising TEPD were proposed in a relation to parents and students as competent evaluators. As the discussion on confining the evaluators held the most dissenting views in TEPD, teachers were constantly and fiercely against including parents and students as evaluators due to their lack of qualifications to evaluate teachers (Kim & Joo, 2014). However, parents were included as evaluators for TEPD as distrust grew among parents in public education and teacher quality, which in turn, initiated the discourse on TEPD. Additionally, the perspective that parents and students were both beneficiaries and consumers (Peterson & Stevens, 1988) led both parents and students to evaluate teachers through TEPD (Joo, 2017).

Nevertheless, parents also posed a risk in their evaluation because they barely knew the teachers who they were evaluating. Additionally, parents are worried because their kids might get disadvantage from the teachers. TEPD says the policy guarantees the evaluators’ anonymity, but parents are worried if their anonymity would not be guaranteed. This led to the decrease in participation of parents, which also increased the possibility of lowering the reliability of the results (Kim, Kim, & Park, 2012). Moreover, including students to evaluate teachers was another contentious issue (MOE, September, 2015). As a result, the government announced in 2015 to reform evaluations from parents and students to satisfactory surveys that contain suggestions. In addition, students in lower grades who were considered to lack sufficient intellectual cognitive abilities to evaluate teachers were also excluded as evaluators. Furthermore, as a means to increase the reliability of the results, answers from the top 5% and bottom 5% of students in middle school and high school were also excluded from the results (Choi & Park, 2016; MOE, September, 2015).

The dissenting views of whom to include as evaluators from the advocacy coalitions are related to their beliefs. As briefly mentioned above, since TEPD model was revised to limit the participation of parents and students as evaluators, this study first focuses on enumerating belief
systems of each advocacy coalitions. Further, this study outlines how the advocacy coalitions coordinated their different viewpoints and belief changes of the advocacy coalitions affected the process of policy formation and change.

**Methods of Teacher Evaluation**

Aligned with a global trend in incorporating multidimensional evaluators, integrating multiple evaluation methods empower and strengthen objectivity, validity, and reliability of the evaluation. Drawing on multiple sources and evaluation methods is advisable to measure different abilities and obtain a comprehensive view of teachers’ qualities (OECD, 2013a; Peterson, 1987; Rockoff & Speroni, 2010). Using only one method to evaluate teachers would result in underestimation or overestimation of teachers depending on the strengths of the individual teacher. Therefore, diverse evaluation methods are necessary to measure the multidimensional aspects of teachers.

Different methods of teacher evaluation are used in accordance with the evaluators. Teachers who are being evaluated can create a portfolio for self-evaluation and may be engaged in interviews with the administrators (Kersten & Israel, 2005; Wolf, Lichtenstein, & Stevenson, 1997). Peer reviews are conducted by colleagues, and self-evaluations are conducted by the teachers themselves. Parents and students can evaluate teachers through surveys or descriptive statements (Mayo, 1997). While classroom observation is generally undertaken by the administrators, multiple evaluators including teacher colleagues and parents may refer to classroom observation for evaluating teachers as well (OECD, 2013a).

Each method has its individual strengths that compensate for the weaknesses of the others, providing justification to incorporate multiple methods for evaluating teachers. Classroom observation is the most widely used method because it not only allows evaluators to witness the
teacher’s teaching capacity but also to easily detect interactions between teachers and students (OECD, 2015). Moreover, it provides the evaluators, in particular principals and vice-principals, direct experience with the teacher which helps direct future interactions (Winters & Cowen, 2012).

However, certain critical aspects should be considered when using classroom observation to evaluate teachers. First, the observer’s qualifications are pivotal since classroom observation could be more effective if the observer is experienced and insightful (Wragg, Haynes, & Wikely, 2002). Qualified observers help teachers by not only identifying struggles teachers are having but also individual aspects for improvement (Winters & Cowen, 2012). Furthermore, observations should happen frequently as a teacher’s job involves engaging in complex tasks. Although there is controversy as to the optimal frequency of teacher observation, the consensus is that current classroom observations are too infrequent – once every three years or even up to two to three times a year – to be informative and suggests complementing this with other methods of evaluation (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Winters & Cowen, 2012).

Other supplementary methods used by nations to judge teacher performance more soundly include students’ academic growth, portfolio, and interviews (OECD, 2013a). As mentioned previously, including growth in students’ test scores is the second most used method for evaluating teachers globally (OECD, 2013b) despite cautions cast by many scholars around the world (Amrein-Beardsley & Holloway, 2017, p. 3; Darling-Hammond, 2013; Duke, 1995; Fuller et al., 2015; Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010). Although classroom observation and student outcome growth are commonly used methods around the world, their faults are that they may not take into consideration the context and environment of a specific classroom. Methods such as teacher portfolio and teacher self-evaluation can be used to overcome such shortcomings and enhance the effectiveness of teacher evaluations by considering the context (Curry & Cruz, 2000; Danielson & McGreal, 2000). In addition, the portfolio can be more than a collection of
information when it is supported by conversations and interviews with teachers, deliberations, and reflective writings (Wolf, Lichtenstein, & Stevenson, 1997).

The perspective of the teachers who are being evaluated is also essential since it allows the inclusion of their own opinions on their performance, which may assist in individualized professional development (Mayo, 1997; OECD, 2013a). In this sense, teacher colleagues who interact amongst each other are all eligible as evaluators because they are able to contextualize each other’s daily teaching environment. Hence, a group of scholars suggests receiving feedback from teaching colleagues (i.e., peer review) provides an opportunity for better feedback (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Peer review is often considered relevant especially to the specific curriculum and even more helpful when teachers receive feedback from their peers who are in the same teaching field or content area within the school (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; OECD, 2014).

In accordance with the global trend, the Korean government also uses multiple methods in order to evaluate a wide range of teacher qualities. Particularly, the implementation of TEPD is aligned with a growing need for multidimensional perspectives for teacher evaluation (K. Kim, 2008; E. Kim et al., 2006; Seo & Song, 2004). As a result, TEPD was constructed with diverse evaluation methods – classroom observations, peer review, and satisfaction surveys from parents and students – as the teaching profession needs an evaluation that includes multiple methods (MOE, September, 2015). TEPD does not include student growth in their academic outcomes or portfolios, which opens room for criticism from teachers and scholars who support the importance of teachers’ roles in helping student development and self-evaluation that allows comprehensive contexts (B. Kim & S. Kim, 2007; Yoo, 2018). Instead, TEPD allows teachers’ involvement through writing “a plan for professional development” that includes schedules for training (N. Kang, 2017; OECD, 2014, p. 136) in accordance with the results they receive.
Use of Evaluation Results

The use of results is closely related to the purpose of evaluation and accordingly, the mechanisms of using the results can be divided into two: summative use of results and formative use of results (OECD, 2009; OECD, 2013a; OECD, 2013b). On one hand, summative use of results determines career decisions (i.e. tenure decisions, contract renewals, or promotions), salary increases and performance rewards, and sanctions for underperformance. On the other hand, formative use of results mainly involves professional development for teachers to improve teacher quality (OECD, 2013b).

Teacher evaluation results used for the summative purpose are often controversial (Harvey-Beavis, 2003; OECD, 2009; Ramirez, Clause, & Davis, 2001). The use of evaluation results can be controversial, especially for summative purposes, because the results often lead to sensitive problems such as losing jobs. There is a wide consensus among a school of scholars that the development of fair and reliable indicators and performance-based reward programs have been designed and implemented poorly (Harvey-Beavis, 2003; Mohrman et al., 1996; Ramirez, Clause, & Davis, 2001). Thus, having universally agreed to standards are necessary to lessen conflicts among stakeholders (OECD, 2009; OECD, 2013b). However, the importance of having a consensus on standardized criteria for the use of results does not only apply to the results related to career advancement or sanctions for underperformance, but also to monetary incentives as well as other rewards such as sabbatical periods and opportunities for school-based research (OECD, 2009; OECD, 2013a).

Contentions around the use of teacher evaluation results are one of the acutest and chronic sources of tensions among different policy actors such as government, teacher organizations, and parents’ organizations in Korea (H. Kang, 2011). The government and parents’ organizations put more emphasis on the summative use of the results such as promotion and
sanction of unqualified teachers, whereas teacher organizations are against using the results for personnel purposes (H. Kang, 2011). The need to hold teachers accountable for their students’ academic achievement derived from parents’ dissatisfaction in regards to public education led to a discussion on inducing a new teacher evaluation that measures teacher ability. However, the purpose of TEPD was framed to have a formative purpose (i.e., teachers’ professional development) after facing strong resistance from teacher organizations.

In terms of the TEPD results that are used for formative purposes, the empirical research suggests that teachers are satisfied with how schools inform their results (Yoo, 2018). However, teachers perceive that the connection between the results and professional development is insufficient (Bae & Joo, 2014). In other words, there was lack of consensus in using the results of TEPD. Moreover, teachers were against being evaluated. There has been literature that reported teachers identify themselves as professionals and main agents to lead the education reform, not the subject of the reform (Tschannen-Moran, Salloum, & Goddard, 2015).

According to J. Choi (2015), teachers argue that they are willing to make good use of the results only when TEPD results are used to help them; for example, using the results for training based on the individual’s professional cycles. What is important to note is that the teachers’ request is centered on providing and guaranteeing the opportunity for them to choose in terms of evaluation and the use of the results (J. Choi, 2015). In other words, teachers want autonomy in their professional development and their opinions to be reflected in the evaluation policy by letting teachers participate in the policy processes. Thus, lively discussions with teachers are critical to achieving the originally intended purpose, which is for fostering teacher quality through motivating teachers (Hanushek, 2011).
How are Teacher Evaluations Formed and Changed?

Correspondingly, scholarly work has not paid much attention to questions around ‘how do teacher evaluation policies form and change?’ Korea is a government-centric nation but is moving towards decentralization. The executive, legislative, and judicial branches are responsible for policy formation and change in Korea (Jang et al., 2016), leading to influence from government-affiliated organizations (e.g. Korean Educational Development Institute [KEDI]). However, the participation level of teachers or teacher organizations in this process is considered low. It was not until the early 2000s that the government attempted to include diverse policy actors in policy formation and change processes. When a new administration that aimed for the participation of multiple stakeholders came into power in 2003, key stakeholders were invited to the policy formation and change discussions. Discussion on the implementation of TEPD started around this time and teacher organizations were involved in the policy process.

Studies on teachers and teacher organizations’ involvement were primarily centered on decision-making in schools or classrooms (Ben-Peretz, 2009; Taylor & Bogotch, 1994), not on the policy level. The widely agreed consensus on teachers’ participation in decision-making is that it increases positive teaching outcomes. Previous studies indicate that teachers who have more experience in collaborative cultures and have more autonomy in decision-making tend to demonstrate more positivity in their professional identity and attitudes towards teaching (Flores & Day, 2006). Moreover, providing teachers a voice in school-level decisions improves teacher retention (Kemper, 2017). The same was applied to teacher evaluation; teachers’ direct involvement in the preparing, implementing, and providing follow-up of the evaluation process were important factors in teacher professional development and school improvement (Darling-Hammond, 1997). Similar results are shown when expanding these results of school or classroom level to the policy level. Research suggested positive influences of major stakeholders’

Only few research studied the participation of teacher organizations in relation to policy process of teacher evaluation. Katz (2015), in his dissertation, studied the roles of teacher organization and districts on teacher evaluation reforms by conducting case studies of three school districts in California. Katz identified the district-union collaboration on teacher evaluation reform and identified the roles of leaders, participants, and observers as initiators, conveners, and facilitators. The study focused on the collaborative relations among teacher organizations and local government, not as a conflicting relationship. However, Korean literature on teacher organizations’ participation in teacher evaluation policy process is centered on conflicts between the organizations and the government. Moreover, the studies presented uneven results for identifying the two teacher organizations as being affiliated to one advocacy coalition or two different advocacy coalitions.

Kim, Park, and Joo (2009) analyzed the political relationship around teacher evaluation policy streams (i.e., TEPD) in Korea with the Policy Stream Framework (SPF) suggested by Kingdon (2003). In their study, Kim and his colleagues analyzed the conflicts and political relationships among stakeholders including MEHRD, interest groups (i.e. teacher organization and citizen group), political parties, media, and academia. Teacher organizations in the study were depicted as opponents of the policy, affiliated to the same advocacy coalition. Although the research described multiple groups that were involved in the policy stream, most movements were made between teacher organizations and the government. According to Kim, Park, and Joo, teacher organizations made radical movements as an opponent group including interrupting public hearings and protesting.

Cho (2009) studied the primary factors and policy change processes of teacher evaluation policies in Korea by using Advocacy Coalition Process Framework (ACPF), which is
a combination of the ACF and Anderson’s Policy Process Stage Framework (PPSF). The author divided the coalitions into three: a support coalition, a complement coalition, and an abolition coalition. Cho concluded that the teacher organizations, which were affiliated with a complement and an abolition coalition, and external factors have influenced the formation of the policies. The study confirmed that teacher organizations had different strategies and resources to support their stances on the policy.

N. Kang (2013) took the perspective of “discursive democracy” by Habermas (1996) and examined the process of teacher evaluation policy development in Korea by analyzing policy documents and statements from various organizations. Similarly, N. Kang (2017) used the framework of school culture emphasizing the importance of the culture of those involved in the policy process. In both studies, Kang concluded that TEPD had been implemented without consensus and without full support from the stakeholders. Her studies confirmed that there had been continuing conflicts and disagreements with TEPD and the two teacher organizations had different stances. Furthermore, Kang found that the opponents were militant enough to delay the government’s procedures for TEPD implementation.

Most Korean studies that explored the role of teacher organizations on policy change of teacher evaluation policies have perspectives of a conflicting political situation. Nevertheless, the studies that analyzed TEPD and the relationship among policy actors including teacher organizations are critically limited since they assumed teacher organizations were in the same coalition (e.g., Kim, Park, & Joo, 2009). In addition, there is little literature that only seeks the role of teacher organizations on the processes of TEPD policy change. Although Cho (2009) in the study, made an effort to divide teacher organizations into separate coalitions, the study analyzes the policy processes until 2008, which was even before the implementation of TEPD. The study has its limitation on failing to adopt the further policy processes because TEPD has gone through multiple changes since 2010.
Formation and change processes of teacher evaluation policy can be studied in the appliance to theories of the policy process. There are multiple theories to explain policy processes and each has different emphases. Therefore, the next section describes three major theories of the policy formation and change processes. Furthermore, the section below explores strengths and weaknesses and narrow down to one theory, ACF, the theoretical framework of this study.

Theories of the Policy Formation and Change Processes

Policy process refers to a series of actions or steps of policy formation and change. Analyzing the policy processes requires a holistic view because the processes are complex and interrelated (Weaver-Hightower, 2008; Sabatier, 2007). Initiation of policy discussion, decision-making prior to implementation, conflicts among policy actors, implementation, enactment and change through reforms in policy, and the dissolution of policy are all factors of the policy process. Although many theories attempt to depict the policy process with different focus and features, not many studies capture the complexity of the policy process.

One of the perspectives suggests capturing the interrelated policy actors and relationships in complex environments and structures going through multiple processes of change and equilibrium through ecology metaphor (Weaver-Hightower, 2008). Policy processes and contexts can be viewed as ecologies since “every contextual factor and person contributing to or influenced by a policy in any capacity, both before and after its creation and implementation, is part of a complex ecology” (Weaver-Hightower, 2008, p. 155). ACF permits researchers to analyze policy processes that have similar perspectives of ecology metaphor.

As it will be further discussed in the section below, ACF explains policy processes by orienting policy subsystems with advocacy coalitions of policy actors who share the same beliefs (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014). In addition, ACF highlights the interactions with external factors
such as institutional structures and belief changes in advocacy coalitions (Sabatier & Weible, 2007). Similarly, ecology research emphasizes the roles of actors in an ecosystem where they have multiple roles and play on several competing teams simultaneously, existing within complex relations such as competition, cooperation, predation, and symbiosis (Weaver-Hightower, 2008). Moreover, as ACF assumes, all the actors and relationships among them interact with and are influenced by the environment, social, and institutional structures in ecology research.

The difference between ACF and the ecology metaphor is the unit used for analysis, and this unit is the basis for the conceptual framework of the research in analyzing policy processes of formation and change in TEPD. While ecology metaphor centers on individual actors as the unit for analysis, ACF underscores advocacy coalitions, which is a group of actors. This study puts its emphasis on analyzing the influence of teacher organizations that are affiliated with advocacy coalitions rather than the individual actors. Thus, the study uses ACF for the conceptual framework.

The following section presents three commonly used models in regards to policy formation and change processes: Policy Process Stages Model (PPSM), Multiple Streams Framework (MSF), and Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF). This section touches upon the introduction of each model, explore studies that applied the model to TEPD research, and provides evidence for using ACF as a theoretical framework for my study.

**Policy Process Stages Model**

PPSM is a model that divides the policy process into a concatenation of stages and explains the factors that affect policy process within each stage (Sabatier, 2007). The original work was developed by Lasswell (1956) and later refined by others, Jones (1977), Dunn (1981, 2008), Anderson (1984), and Brewer and DeLeon (1983). The first seven-stage model developed
by Lasswell (1956) was more of a prescriptive and normative model rather than descriptive and analytic (Jann & Weigrich, 2007, p. 43). The refined stages of policy process vary by scholars, but they described policy processes in four stages: agenda setting, policy formation and legitimation, implementation, and evaluation (DeLeon et al., 2010; Sabatier, 2007).

Even though PPSM was considered the most influential framework for understanding policy process in the 1970s and early 1980s, it was subjected to inescapable criticisms from the beginning of the late 1980s (Sabatier, 2007). Also called the stages heuristic (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1999), the framework lacked causal theoretical bases that explained policy process within and across stages (Sabatier, 2007; Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1999). In addition, PPSM was criticized by the characteristics of the framework as “too narrowly depicts the scope of the policy process research” (DeLeon et al., 2010) and overly simplistic (Sabatier, 2007). Moreover, this rational model was even accused of being inaccurate in regards to describing the sequence of stages (Nakamura, 1987; Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1999).

Although several scholars had attempted to suggest counter arguments supporting PPSM, it was rarely used as a stand-alone framework (Weaver-Hightower, 2008; Sabatier, 2007). Followers of PPSM contended that the framework had its strengths in playing a role of categorizing policy actions that vary by stage (Brewer & deLeon, 1983). Indeed, PPSM moved the “policy sciences” (Lasswell, 1951) forward and contributed to developing policy process theory. However, this rational model “relies on an assumption of value-neutral decision-making, ignores issues of power, and underestimates the highly contested nature of education” (Weaver-Hightower, 2008, p. 153). Thus, with devastating shortcomings, PPSM nowadays is seldom used as a singular theory when conducting a research on the policy process.

Research that applied policy networks (Ryu, 2013) to analyze TEPD policy processes presented an example of PPSM serving a supplementary function. By using Marsh and Rhodes’
(1992) Policy Networks Framework (PNF)\(^3\) as the main concept, Ryu (2013) complemented the framework with Dunn’s (1981) PPSM, which consisted of four stages: agenda setting, policy formulation, policy implementation, and policy evaluation. Both PPSM and PNF, however, were long debated, anticipating the advent of specific policy networks and policy outcomes (Rhodes, 2006). In addition, PNF, in particular, fails to describe and theorize changes in policy networks (Richardson, 2000) rather it explains the “stability, privilege, and continuity” (Rhodes, 2006, p. 436). PNF is similar to ACF, the framework that I applied, in a way that both emphasize the interaction and configuration of actors within a policy network or policy subsystem (Richardson, 2000, p. 298). However, PNF only rests its explanation on institutional arrangements rather than on belief systems. Thus, the study applied ACF to bail out the problems of PNF and PPSM, and further yielded the understanding of policy networks dynamics (Rhodes, 2006).

**Multiple Streams Framework**

MSF is a framework that attempts to explain the policy formation processes under “conditions of ambiguity” (Zahariadis, 2007, p. 65). MSF takes the premise that the “organized anarchy,” in which ambiguity is dominant. MSF has three characteristics: fluid participation, problematic preferences, and unclear technology. In an organized anarchy, the participation is often fluid, meaning policymakers such as legislators and bureaucrats are frequently replaced as turnover and decisions are drifted. Moreover, policymakers are forced to make decisions without having formulated precise preferences, which it drives to describe organized anarchies to “a collection of ideas rather than a coherent structure” (Cohen, March, & Olsen, 1972, p. 1).

---

\(^3\) PNF is a framework developed by Marsh and Rhodes in 1992 focusing on “sets of formal institutional and informal linkages between governmental and other actors structured around shared if endlessly negotiated beliefs and interests in public policy making and implementation” (Rhodes, 2006, p. 426). The framework uses four components – membership, integration, resource, and power – to describe characteristic changes in policy networks.
Furthermore, members of the anarchy often neglect responsibilities in legislative structures. In addition, the legislatures often refer to experiences to guide their decisions, which result in frequent trial-and-errors (Zahariadis, 2007).

First developed by Kingdon (1984) based on Cohen, March, and Olsen’s (1972) “garbage can model,” MSF views policy process as composed of three streams of actors and processes: a problem stream, a policy stream, and a politics stream (Sabatier, 2007, p.9). A problem stream consists of problems and their proponents, a policy stream includes the solutions to problems, and a politics stream involves elections and elected officials. The streams operate independently except during “windows of opportunities” when some or all of the streams intersect by chance. If the entrepreneurs are successful with coupling the various streams through “window,” substantial policy change happens (Kingdon, 1995; Sabatier, 2007; Zahariadis, 2007).

MSF has been widely used to analyze various policy arenas (Sabatier, 2007) and its strength is in its eligibility to examine the process of policy change under conditions of ambiguity through a single lens. In addition, MSF presented a better explanation for policy processes in the real world compared to PPSM by focusing on different combinations of the streams (Birkland, 2001; Weaver-Hightower, 2008). Moreover, MSF captures the rapid changes in dynamics in policies (Zahariadis, 2007), which often is the case in Korea. For instance, Park (2012) applied MSF to analyze the formation and change process of TEPD, claimed that the most influential stream for agenda setting was a political stream (i.e. change of the ruling party), and stressed the importance of the roles of different policy actors.

Nevertheless, MSF is not suitable to be used as the main framework for analyzing TEPD for several reasons. First, MSF does not focus on collective actions (Schlager, 2007). Instead, it pays attention to the actions and strategies of well-situated individuals (i.e. policy entrepreneurs), and the conditions that support the emergence of “broad-based collective action and the coupling of events and the activities of policy entrepreneurs” (Schlager, 2007, p. 303). However, formation
and change processes of TEPD are closely related to collective actions of coalitions, particularly teacher organizations. Furthermore, TEPD cannot be viewed as an adventitious result of streams, coupling in conditions of ambiguity; rather, it was planned with coherent structures as a policy project for more than a decade (Cho, 2008). Hence, MSF is not applicable to analyze the processes of TEPD.

**Advocacy Coalition Framework**

ACF is a framework that focuses on the “interactions of advocacy coalitions – each consisting of actors from a variety of institutions who share a set of policy beliefs – within a policy subsystem” (Sabatier, 1999, p. 9). Since the inception of ACF in 1988, in order to cope with limitations of pre-existing theories that emphasized top-down approach, Sabatier, Jenkins-Smith, Weible, and their associates continued to develop the framework for the last 30 years (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014). According to the proponents of ACF, policy change is a product of compromise between the coalitions within the subsystem (Sabatier & Weible, 2007) as well as events outside the subsystem (Sabatier, 2007).

There are three underlying premises of ACF. First, unlike the rational choice framework assuming self-interested actors pursue material interests, ACF puts emphasis on belief systems as a motivation for individual actors (Jenkins-Smith & Sabatier, 1993; Sabatier, 1988; Sabatier & Weible, 2007). Second, the role of policy subsystem, which is the main unit of analysis of ACF, contributes to the comprehension of policy processes (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014). In policy subsystems, at least two advocacy coalitions share the same beliefs, which reflect the strategies of certain policies or programs. Third, to maximize the understanding of policy processes and changes, ACF is more beneficial when it came to adopting long-term perspectives for over a decade. Many of these belief systems in advocacy coalitions are very stable (Sabatier & Weible, 2007).
Based on these assumptions, ACF has a conceptual structure that explains the processes of policy formation and changes in causal relationships (Sabatier & Weible, 2007).

Figure 2-2 shows the framework of this study and how the ACF is used but adapted and simplified. The overview of the framework displays the role of advocacy coalitions within the policy subsystem. Policy subsystem consists of advocacy coalitions formed by shared beliefs and resources. Each coalition uses beliefs and resources to determine subordinate strategies and attempts to influence policy formation and change processes. The belief system consists of a three-tiered structure including deep core beliefs, policy core beliefs, and secondary beliefs. The belief system is discussed further in the next section. Additionally, the figure depicts the relations between external factors and the policy subsystem. They both affect one another, meaning that external factors affect changes in policy subsystem and policy subsystem influences changes in external factors. External factors consist of relatively stable parameters, external subsystem events, and long-term coalition opportunity structures. Relatively stable parameters include basic attributes of the problem area and fundamental sociocultural values and social structure whereas external subsystem events involve changes in socioeconomic conditions, public opinion, and
systemic governing coalition. ‘Long-term coalition opportunity structures’ engage a degree of consensus, which is needed for major policy change and openness of the political system.

‘Long-term coalition opportunity structure’ was newly added into a 1999 model by Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith in response to the constant criticisms on neglecting other contexts (Y. Kim, 2014). Prior to the addition of the concept, ACF was criticized that it could only be applied to the U.S. context, which involved the development of citizenry engagement and rapid advancement of democratization toward pluralism system (Sabatier, Weible, & Ficker, 2005). Accordingly, the newly added component served as a complementary function for the analysis to include unionism systems, mostly shown within European countries. The table below (Table 2-1) displays a quadratic table of the typology of long-term coalition opportunity structures, in which a degree of consensus was needed in order for major policy changes to occur (Sabatier & Weible, 2007). Both factors are divided into high, medium, and low to explain the variations of coalition opportunity structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Openness of political system</th>
<th>Degree of consensus needed for major policy change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Pluralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Recent corporatist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Traditional corporatist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sabatier & Weible (2007, p. 201)

In a pluralist society, the United States, for instance, consists of high or medium degree of consensus that is necessary for major policy change and a wide-open political system. In the corporate world, which includes many European countries, the corporate ladder engages in a high degree of consensus, which is necessary for major policy change, but the corporate world consists more of a closed political system in comparison to the United States (Sabatier, Weible, & Ficker, 2005). However, recent trends in the corporate world have involved to the same degree of
consensus, and the newly updated political system is more open than the previous system (Sabatier & Weible, 2007; Sewell, 2005; Weible, 2006). For many Asian countries, where the government plays an important role in decision-making, an authoritarian executive, who represents a low degree of consensus, plays an important role in a closed political system. An open system refers to a system that allows diverse discussion among policy stakeholders, whereas a closed system is a system that often engages in unilateral decisions without collecting various opinions of the stakeholders. In the analysis, the study explores the changes in the degree of consensus in Korea and the possible influences that have caused changes in the process of making and developing TEPD.

Key Concepts of Advocacy Coalition Framework

Among the components that comprise of ACF, this study focuses on advocacy coalitions and their belief systems, resources, and strategies and roles of teacher organizations in the formation and change of TEPD. One cannot explain ACF without mentioning advocacy coalitions and belief systems. Advocacy coalitions are defined by “actors sharing policy core beliefs who coordinate their actions in a nontrivial manner to influence a policy subsystem (Jenkins-Smith, et al., 2014, p. 195)” Within the coalitions, principal coalition actors play a consistent and prominent role, while auxiliary coalition actors are on the periphery of the coalition and play a lesser role since they are only involved only for a short period (Sabatier & Weible, 2007; Weible & Sabatier, 2005). This study concentrates on analyzing the interactions among principal actors – education ministry and two teacher organizations – who participated in the process of forming and revising TEPD.

Through policy-oriented learning, the actors within the same advocacy coalition share belief systems and strengthen their beliefs, while the actors between advocacy coalitions
exchange their opinions (Sabatier & Weible, 2007). Policy-oriented learning is defined as “enduring alternations of thought or behavioral intentions that result from experience and which are concerned with the attainment or revision of the precepts of the belief system of individuals or of collectives” (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014, p. 198). Attending forums is one of the major means to guide policy-oriented learning. Although it may be a source of minor change, it can affect major policy change as it repeatedly occurs over time (Sabatier, 1993; Zafonte & Sabatier, 2004).

Belief systems

ACF presents individuals in coalitions with members who share a three-tiered hierarchical belief system that encompasses deep core beliefs, policy core beliefs, and secondary beliefs (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Sabatier, 1993; Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1999; Sabatier & Weible, 2007). First, deep core beliefs, which are placed in the top tier of the belief system, are the most fundamental and basic beliefs that shape advocacy coalition’s core values; hence, these beliefs are rarely changed. These beliefs contain generalized norms, ontological axioms on human, traditional positions (e.g. left-wing or right-wing). For instance, beliefs on excellence versus equality and market versus government are the deep core beliefs (Sabatier & Weible, 2007). The fact that these deep core beliefs do not relate to a stance on a particular policy makes them applicable to all the positions on policies that the advocacy coalition claims (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014).

Second, contrary to deep core beliefs, which suggests broader and general perspectives on policies, policy core beliefs involve an actual policy. In other words, beliefs that are applicable to a certain policy are linked to policy core beliefs. Policy core beliefs tend to be normative and empirical, and contain basic orientations, strategies, and order of priorities. The policy core beliefs are not often changed but subjected to change in certain conditions or extreme conflicts (Sabatier & Weible, 2007).
Lastly, secondary beliefs, or instrumental aspects, are located on the bottom tier of the belief system. Secondary beliefs contain specific instrumental means that are easily changeable relatively to two other beliefs (i.e., deep core beliefs and policy core beliefs), and they are limited to specific policies. The examples include detail rules for the specific program, financial support, assessment of achievements, and designing concrete strategies. The change in secondary beliefs can occur despite some disagreements among actors or limitations on evidence, suggesting subjects to be easily changed (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Sabatier, 1993; Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1999).

**Resources and Strategies**

Previous studies have shown that most research has been centered around the belief systems, but there are still several underdeveloped areas within the role of resources and strategies of advocacy coalitions (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Sabatier & Weible, 2007). ACF depicts advocacy coalitions as a group that is formed by people who share the same beliefs and resources, and together, they determine strategies that policy actors would use in their attempts to influence the formation and change of policies. While some studies present a typology of policy-relevant resources and strategies (Sabatier & Weible, 2007; Sewell, 2005), virtually none has focused on the impacts that various resources and strategies have had during the policy process (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Sabatier & Weible, 2007). Studies indicate that conceptualizing resources and strategies could be done rather easily, but aggregating and operationalizing them can be very difficult.

Resources are “an important contribution for providing the theoretical leverage for understanding the capacity for a coalition to make strategic decisions and to engage in various activities to influence policy subsystems” (Jenkins-Smith, et al., 2014, p. 198). ACF suggests six types of resources, and each resource includes formal legal authority, public opinion, information,
mobilizable troops, financial resources, and skillful leadership (Sabatier & Weible, 2007; Weible & Sabatier, 2005). First, a major resource to the coalition is formal legal authority. Government-related officials are the actors in positions of legal authority. The advocacy coalition that has more of its actors in positions of formal legal authority is more likely to be featured as a dominant coalition. Major strategies that involve legal authorities include placing the coalition in positions of legal authority through elections or campaign lobbying. Second, public opinion that shows support for an advocacy coalition’s stance is a major resource for policy actors. Sabatier and Weible (2007) stated that a typical strategy concerning public opinion is “to spend a lot of time trying to garner public support” (p.203). Third, information, in regards to the severity and causation of problems and the costs and benefits of policy changes, is an important resource. Policy actors “often distort information to bolster their argument” (Sabatier & Weible, 2007, p.203), and the information is interpreted differently based on the beliefs of the coalition (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014). Fourth, leadership groups of coalitions often use members (i.e., mobilizable troops) to engage in various political activities. Advocacy coalitions with minimal financial resources tend to rely heavily upon this inexpensive resource. The strategies that use mobilizable troops include public demonstrations and fund-raising campaigns. Fifth, financial resources can be used to purchase other resources such as funding research to produce information, bankrolling politicians to gain access to legislators, and initiating media campaigns to earn public support. Lastly, skillful leadership can play a significant role to strategically and efficiently use resources and attract new resources to an advocacy coalition (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014).

**Hypothesis about Advocacy Coalitions**

The hypothesis in regards to the stability of advocacy coalitions over time has largely been confirmed by many studies (Weible, 2005; Zafonte & Sabatier, 2004). ACF argues that “on
major controversies within a policy subsystem when policy core beliefs are in dispute, the lineup of allies and opponents tends to be rather stable over periods of a decade or so” (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014, p. 195). However, previous studies documented that stability of coalitions often shows defection and change in coalition composition is not uncommon. The reasons for defection and membership change in coalition composition include major events that took place internally or externally, such as elections (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; p. 195; Zafonte & Sabatier, 2004), and “strategic decisions by coalitions actors to achieve short-term political objectives” (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014, p. 195; Nohrstedt, 2005).

Meanwhile, the hypothesis about coalition actors’ agreement on beliefs has few confirmations and the findings partially support the hypothesis (Ingold, 2011; S. Kim, 2003; Larsen, Vrangbaek, & Traulsen, 2006; Zafonte & Sabatier, 2004). ACF assumes “actors within an advocacy coalition will show substantial consensus on issues pertaining to the policy core, although less so on secondary aspects” (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014, p. 195). The reasons for the mixed support varies in conceptualizations and measurement of belief systems in coalitions. Previous studies pointed out that it is difficult to clarify the distinction between policy core beliefs and secondary beliefs.

This study adapts ACF to analyze TEPD formation and change processes with an emphasis on the participation of teacher organizations. By adapting the key concepts of ACF, the study examines how teacher organizations affiliated with various advocacy coalitions influence the policy formation and change processes. In doing so, the study focuses on the changes in the belief systems, resources, and strategies. Moreover, the study reviews whether the case of TEPD is aligned to the core postulates of advocacy coalitions from ACF. External factors devoted to policy change are investigated as well. The following section continues with the genealogy of studies that applied ACF and provides justification for the use of ACF as a main theoretical framework in the study.
**Genealogy of Studies Applying ACF**

ACF is one of the most frequently used frameworks to understand the policy processes in the global community (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014). Table 2-2 displays the empirical applications of the ACF from 1987 to 2013 by policy topics and continents. The most frequently used policy topic is environment (57%), while health (11%), finance/economics (8%), social (7%), education (6%), other topics (5%), technology (3%), and recreation/tourism (3%) follows. Although ACF was not used much within the education field, educational studies that use ACF is continuously growing. As of continent category, ACF is widely used in North America, where ACF was first developed. Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith (1999) later included ‘long-term coalition opportunity structure’ component of the ACF model to consider European context. Both continents, in which each country consist of 42 percent of the total continent category, sum up to 84 percent. Research for within Asia (7%), inter-continent (3%), Africa (3%), Australia (2%), and South America (1%) only represent a few percents from the total. However, research that applies ACF is expanding rapidly in Korea.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Topic</th>
<th>Number of Applications (%)</th>
<th>Continent</th>
<th>Number of Applications (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>128(57)</td>
<td>North America</td>
<td>95(42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>24(11)</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>94(42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/economics</td>
<td>17(8)</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>16(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>17(8)</td>
<td>Inter-continent</td>
<td>6(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>13(6)</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>6(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other topics</td>
<td>12(5)</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>5(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>7(3)</td>
<td>South America</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/tourism</td>
<td>6(3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224(100)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>224(100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014, p. 2010
Since the first publication of ACF research in Korean context in 2002, research has increasingly applied ACF as the scientific basis to the studies (Jang et al., 2016). Three articles were published in 2003, 2006, and 2008; then, nine articles were published in 2009, 13 articles in 2010 and 2011, and 12 articles in 2012 (Chun, 2014). In regards to the policy topics of ACF research, Korean studies show a trend similar to the rest of the world. Just like the trend of international research, the environmental topic is the most frequently studied (27%). While the environment is the utmost used topic in global research that partakes more than half of the total ACF applied research, fields in the environment (27%) and sociology (23%) share half of the ACF research in Korea. Next are health (12%), culture (12%), finance/economics (9%), education (7%), technology (7%), and others (3%)\(^4\) (Chun, 2014). In the education field, particularly, there were 18 publications from 2007 to 2016 with a steady use of ACF (Sun et al., 2017). However, education research that applies ACF is still less in comparison to other policy topics, and there is even less research that uses ACF to analyze policy processes of TEPD.

The weaknesses of ACF can lead to a failure in justifying the use of the framework. For instance, ACF still deprives in explaining the changes in the policy process in all countries other than the pluralist and unionism countries (Cho, 2009), in which coalitions existed for more than a decade. Moreover, ACF has its weakness due to the possibility of providing insufficient or even distorted comprehensions of the policy change process, in which took place in the policy subsystem that only existed for less than a decade (Choi & Park, 2014; Fenger & Klok, 2001). These issues imply that ACF could neglect applications to other contexts and may not be suitable to be used as an analytical framework for policy subsystems that existed for less than ten years. In addition, ACF is criticized for underestimating the role of the government (Lim, 2006). ACF tends to focus on the political influences of interest groups only and depict the government as a

\(^4\) Out of 69 articles, there are 19 environment, 16 sociology, 8 health, 8 culture, 6 finance/economics, 5 education, 5 technology, and 2 others (Chun, 2014).
passive actor. Furthermore, there are some underdeveloped areas such as the types and roles of resources, strategies, and activities (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Sabatier & Weible, 2007). Some criticize finding mixed results in regards to core postulates of ACF. For example, even though ACF suggests that individual actors follow their belief systems to perform strategies, the actors in advocacy coalitions have shown to not act accordingly to their beliefs and, instead, establish a strategic alliance with the actors from opponent coalitions when necessary (Baek, 2008).

Despite the weaknesses, the use of ACF as a framework has been expanding widely thanks to its strengths. ACF understands the policy change based on pluralists’ perspective. As mentioned above, some scholars have criticized that ACF rules out the countries, where they do not follow pluralist conventions (Cho, 2009). However, ACF has its advantages in possibilities of application to diverse contexts in the world. The ACF can apply to not only countries with the pluralist system such as the United States, but also European countries with unionism system, as well as countries like Korea where societal trends in policy change have been moving from a government-centric system towards active policy participation from diverse actors (Y. Kim, 2014). In addition, ACF incorporates aspects of both top-down and bottom-up approaches and integrates the stages of policy cycles (Coeurdray et al., 2015). It considers relevant actors not only the traditional “iron triangle” of bureaucracy, legislators, and interest group leaders but also researchers and journalists (Coeurdray et al., 2015; Sabatier & Weible, 2007). While there are weaknesses in the ACF framework, the strengths of ACF have proven to be useful and, hence, used as a theoretical framework for this study.

**Justification for Applying Advocacy Coalition Framework**

The aim of this study is to explore the policy processes of TEPD regarding its formation and change, and the participation of teacher organization in the appliance to ACF. The study
examines the changes in the belief systems, resources, and strategies of teacher organizations that are affiliated to advocacy coalitions, as well as how the changes influenced the processes of TEPD. Moreover, the study probes into external factors that affect policy change.

The study finds ACF as a more promising theoretical framework for the following four reasons. First, ACF is suitable to explain the influences of teacher organization on the policy process of TEPD, which is the focus of this study. As mentioned previously, this study aims to highlight the participation of teacher organizations in regards to TEPD. Some research suggested multiple stakeholders in advocacy coalitions of TEPD, which comprised of parents, researchers, and media interest groups (N. Kang 2017; Kim, Park, & Joo, 2009). However, this study does not focus on those policy actors because these coalition actors, also known as auxiliary coalition actors, were only involved in the process of policy change for a short duration (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014). Instead, the study focuses on teacher organizations and the government (education ministry), in which these coalition actors, which consist of principal coalition actors, played a more dominant role and consistently participated in the policy process from beginning to end.

Second, this study adapts ACF because ACF’s unit of analysis is based on the belief systems of advocacy coalitions in policy subsystems. While self-interest or power could be possible factors in motivating policy actors to perform, belief systems are critical factors for motivations of individuals’ movements, according to ACF (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Sabatier & Weible, 2007). Especially, in the field of educational policy, paradigm and ideology may play a significant role in making decisions of policy actors (Cho, 2008). ACF is useful in analyzing educational policies that lie acute tensions on ideological matters rather than material interests among policy actors (Sun et al., 2017). In making the TEPD policy, many conflicts were encountered due to the differences in beliefs and ideologies among the various coalition groups. Therefore, this study uses ACF to analyze TEPD.
Third, ACF is helpful to understand policy process of formation and change from a long-term perspective (e.g., a period of a decade or so). Policies that have a history of more than a decade can be well explained by major concepts of ACF. Although Cho (2008) attempted to analyze TEPD formation and change processes through a modified version of ACF\(^5\), the study only covered policy process prior to the nationwide implementation of TEPD in 2010. From the period of initiation of discussion on TEPD, it took almost 15 years to finally implement the TEPD. Hence, research on TEPD is imperative, and the analysis can be conducted with ACF.

Lastly, ACF has its strengths in allowing researchers to present causal stories (Sabatier & Weible, 2007). A school of researchers emphasized the importance of telling causal stories in public policy research (Birkland, 2016; LeTendre & Akiba, 2017; Stone, 1989; Stone, 2011). Moreover, describing the cause of a problem is important because it strongly suggests solutions to the problem (Birkland, 2016, p. 228). ACF analyzes rationale of TEPD policy changes by engaging influences from advocacy coalitions through their belief systems, resources, and strategies. Furthermore, ACF enables exploring causal stories among advocacy coalitions, external factors, and policy process.

**Summary of the Chapter**

This chapter discusses teacher evaluation, theories of policy formation and change processes, and justification of the theoretical framework of this study. The first section answers four questions to understand teacher evaluation. The questions include a) How did teacher evaluation come to the forefront? b) Why is it important now? c) How are teachers being evaluated? and d) How are teacher evaluation policies formed and changed? First, teacher

\(^5\) Cho (2008) used Advocacy Coalition Process Framework (ACPF), which is a complementary framework that combined ACF and Anderson’s (1984) PPSM.
evaluation came to the forefront within educational policy making and captured the attention of the world although increased interests in teacher quality and accountability. The evidence for the emergence of high-interest in teacher evaluations can be seen through global trends in national reforms, and even sophisticated questions on teacher evaluation system are added in international surveys. In Korean context, the interest of teacher evaluation arose partially from OECD’s advice on teacher evaluation system, which focused on enhancing teacher capacity. In addition, the voice of criticizing public education within Korea led to distrust of teacher quality and to the argument for introducing a new teacher evaluation policy that centers on improving teacher quality.

Second, conducting research on TEPD at the present time is crucial, because it allows researchers to concentrate on not only the unique features of TEPD itself but also the formation and change processes of the policy after 15 years of history. Third, teacher evaluation system consists of five components: purpose, criteria and content, evaluator, method, and use of results. The context of these five components created controversy among the advocacy coalitions as each group had their own version and criteria for the policy. Fourth, teacher evaluation policies in Korea, in particular, were formed and changed by authoritative figures, but with TEPD, diverse policy actors were invited in the policy making and changing processes as the new administration that aimed to incorporate the voices from multiple stakeholders.

The second section presented the theories of policy formation and change processes in regards to teacher evaluation system. The section highlighted three theories (i.e., PPSM, MSF, and ACF), introduced each theory with strength and weaknesses, and provided examples of TEPD application. As ACF is the theoretical framework of this study, the sections discussed key concepts of ACF in depth. The major concepts included advocacy coalitions, belief systems, resources and strategies, and external factors that influence the policy process. Moreover, the section discussed genealogy of studies applying ACF in the global community and Korean context.
The third section clarifies four justifications for using ACF as a main theoretical framework for this study. First, ACF, through key concepts of principal and auxiliary coalition actors, permits focusing on analyzing the participation of teacher organizations in policy processes of TEPD. Second, ACF enables analyzing teacher organizations’ belief systems in advocacy coalitions, particularly in ideologically conflicting situations. Third, ACF helps to understand the policy processes of TEPD in depth that has a history of over ten years. Lastly, ACF allows considering the causal stories of TEPD policy processes. Hence, these characteristics of ACF accounted for the decisions in analyzing the policy processes of TEPD.

Further discussions on the policy formation and change processes of TEPD are developed by connecting ACF with the document analysis method. The next few chapters describe the reasons for using document analysis as the main method of this study and present results of the influences of the teacher organizations in the process of making TEPD. The important role of causal stories playing in policy research, highlighted by many scholars (Birkland, 2016; LeTendre & Akiba, 2017; Stone, 1989; Stone, 2011), is supported by document analysis, which is one of the best methods to analyze causal relationships (Patton & Sawicki, 1993). Belief changes and consequences of change can be examined through documents published by teacher organizations and the government and explain the process behind the policy process of TEPD and the importance of participation from key stakeholders in the policy process.
Chapter 3
Context for the Study

Since 2000, Korean education has come to the forefront of global attention after the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) results were presented to the world. Throughout the PISA assessments, Korean students ranked high in subject areas including science, mathematics, reading, collaborative problem solving, and financial literacy. Hence, many countries hoped to achieve the same level of success in student aptitude like Korea. This led to leaders in many countries, including the former President of the United States, to call for an educational model that benchmarked the success of the Korean education system (Kim & Youngs, 2016).

Among the many factors that led to the success of the Korean education model, the strong teacher policies can be largely attributed to the high quality of teachers. This garnered global attention toward heightened teacher policies in Korea, corresponding with a rise of a global interest toward educational accountability (Akiba, LeTendre, & Scribner, 2007; N. Kang, 2013; Tuytens & Devos, 2014). The emphasis on educational accountability led many countries to change their focus and increase the intensity of teacher instruction as well as the veracity of teacher performance within the classroom. Globally, scholars and policymakers studied the link between teacher quality and student achievement, and subsequently, they reformed their educational policies around successful outcomes (Tuytens & Devos, 2014).

Teacher evaluation policies in Korea has a checkered history. The continuous debate around these policies implementation existed since its inception. Major debates are around the existence of the evaluation policy itself and the details of the policy. For instance, stakeholders discussed whether the evaluation policy is necessary for teachers, how often teachers should be
evaluated, and in what categories should be used as metrics for evaluating teacher quality. Teacher evaluation policy is still an ongoing process, in which annual revisions are constantly made.

The chapter consists of three sections: Korean educational context, teacher evaluation policies in Korea, and teacher organizations in Korea. The first section provides a brief description of the educational context in Korea and explains how it ties into teacher evaluation policies. The educational context includes the current administration and decisional systems, the administrations that were accountable for Teacher Evaluation for Professional Development (TEPD) or Gyo-won-neung-lyeog-gae-bal-pyeong-ga policy process, laws related to TEPD, and characteristics of schools and teachers. The second section briefly introduces teacher evaluation policies, which were enacted prior to the 2015 reform in Korea, compares the three different evaluation systems, and discusses the current teacher evaluation system focusing on TEPD in particular. The last section introduces teacher organizations in Korea – Korean Federation of Teachers’ Associations (KFTA) or Han-gug-gyo-won-dan-che-chong-yeon-hab-hoe and Korean Teachers and Education Workers Union (KTU) or Jeon-gug-gyo-jig-won-no-dong-jo-hab – by describing the history, formation, and perspectives of the organizations on major educational policies that occurred from 2001 to 2014. Different perspectives of the two teacher organizations on educational policies helps predict their belief systems, which facilitated different strategies on TEPD policy process.

**Educational Context in Korea**

The following section provides educational context of Korea by presenting four major area. First, the section introduces the current administration structure and decisional system to enhance understanding of the context around TEPD policy process. Second, the section displays
the administrations in relation to TEPD policy process. Multiple administrations and education ministries are accountable for the policy process of TEPD since the analysis dealt with total 13 years (2004-2016) of TEPD policy process. Third, legal structure and laws accountable for TEPD are discussed. Lastly, characteristics of schools and teachers in Korea were provided.

**Current Administration Structure and Decisional Systems**

The current education administration system in Korea is composed of a three-tiered system: Ministry of Education, Metropolitan and Provincial Offices of Education, and District Offices of Education (Korean Educational Development Institute [KEDI], 2015). As an authoritarian and centralized governmental system, the responsibility and authority of teacher policies are delegated from the central to the local governments and from the local governments to the individual schools in accordance with policies aimed at expanding local and school autonomy (KEDI, 2010). The promotion of autonomy and diversity were results of the 1995 reform initiative, which aimed to shift the focus from a provider-centered to a consumer-centered education (N. Kang, 2017). As a result, schools in Korea have some of the highest levels of autonomy over its curriculum and student assessment compared to other OECD countries. Although leaving resource allocation to school discretion is below the OECD average (OECD, 2016), the Korean government is gradually increasing the level of autonomy and that trend affected the implementation of TEPD. The model of TEPD was changed to a direction of providing more autonomy to local districts and individual schools.
Administrations Accountable for TEPD Policy Process

The formation and revision of TEPD spanned five governmental regimes and three educational ministry leaderships, which all shaped the direction of policy change. Each subsequent governmental regime had a different focus on education, and the regime renamed the ministry of education to match the regime’s educational policy agenda (Table 3-1). In other words, policy directions were predictable by referring to the names of the regime. Since each administration had variations in approaches and ideologies, TEPD was affected by the change in regimes. Political directions often engaged in strategies to deal with teacher organizations (e.g., carrot-or-stick approach) and influenced the policy process. More specifically, the shifts from a liberal to a conservative regime accelerated the implementation of TEPD. The implementation of TEPD was delayed during the liberal regime as the government aimed to involve multiple voices in the decision-making process. However, implementation and other policy decisions were expedited as the regime shifted to a conservative regime, in which the government pursued the traditional way of making political decisions – government-oriented decision-making.

TEPD was initiated during the Kim Dae Jung administration, known as People’s Government, and the Roh Moo-hyun administration, known as the Participatory Government. The name for the education ministry of both regimes was Ministry of Education Human Resources Development (MEHRD) from February of 2001 to February of 2008. TEPD was initiated during the People’s Government and Participatory Government. Like the nickname of both regimes, both administrations allowed active interactions among multiple stakeholders.

However, the next two regimes under President Lee Myung-bak and Park Geun-hye did not use explicit nicknames for the education ministry. These two regimes sought to recapture power back to the federal government while neglected the opposition from teacher organizations. Under President Lee Myung-bak, the government placed its focus solely on economic growth and
practical use, thereby naming the education ministry the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MEST), which lasted from February 29, 2008 to March 22, 2013. Under President Park Geun-hye, the ministry was named the Ministry of Education (MOE), which still exists under President Moon Jae-in of today.

Table 3-1. Names of the Education Ministry involved with TEPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timespan</th>
<th>Name of the Ministry</th>
<th>Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roh Moo-hyun administration (Participatory government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23, 2013 – Present</td>
<td>Ministry of Education (MOE)</td>
<td>Park Geun-hye administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moon Jae-in administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legal Structure and Laws Related to Teacher Evaluation for Professional Development**

The Korean government is based on a presidential system, and the law has a hierarchical structure of constitution, legislation, regulations, and orders (Figure 3-1). In Korea, “the constitution defines all of the hierarchical structure down to all levels, and in others, it provides for the national legislature to determine the process of delegation of authority from one level to a lower level” (International Foundation for Electoral Systems [IFES], 2016, p. 1). For instance, “the constitution defines the fields in which states or provinces may legislate but allows the state or province to decide what local matters are delegated to cities or counties” (IFES, 2016, p. 1). The same rule applies to building a legal basis for TEPD.
Figure 3-1. Hierarchical Structure of Laws related to TEPD

TEPD has been accused of lacking its legal basis because the government failed to amend the higher-level law – Elementary and Secondary Education Act – to include TEPD implementation. In other words, the implementation of TEPD lacked justification because the higher-level law did not mention TEPD. Providing legal grounds for TEPD was one of the issues that teacher organizations were most against. As a result, the government was only able to enact the Presidential decree and the Order due to strong resistance from teacher organizations.

Teachers in Korea

Understanding the features of teachers helps to comprehend the contexts of the introduction of a new teacher evaluation policy in Korea, teacher organizations’ opposition, and the scope of this study. First, many high achieving high school students expect to become teachers in Korea (Park & Byun, 2012) and once students graduate from a four-year certified program from college, they must pass a very competitive entry examination administered by the government to become teachers (N. Park & H. Park, 2018). Korean teachers are known for their higher salaries, a higher level of respect, and below-average teaching time compared to other
OECD countries (OECD, 2016). In addition, a higher percentage of teachers in Korea believe that the value of teachers is considered very high compared to other teachers in OECD countries (OECD, 2016). Moreover, job security and retirement benefits are also a driving force to become teachers in Korea (N. Kang, 2017). However, these features functioned as an argument for the public to criticize teacher quality when the economic crisis occurred in 1997. The public criticized the system that provided a safety net to unqualified teachers and claimed for inducement of a new teacher evaluation policy that thoroughly examines teacher quality.

Second, compared to most other OECD countries, Korea has a higher percentage of teachers under the age of 40 in all grade levels (i.e., elementary, middle, and high school). This suggests that there is a steady supply of teachers to fulfill the needs of the education system (OECD, 2016). The total number of teachers in elementary, middle, and high school in 2016 was 428,404 (MOE, 2016c). Among them, 183,452 were elementary school teachers, 109,525 were middle school teachers, and 135,427 were high school teachers. However, as the number of students decreased dramatically over the last decade, the government recently announced a plan to reduce the number of recruiting new teachers (Yonhapnews, April 30, 2018). This caused resistance from teacher organizations resulting in a strong rebellion towards TEPD; the government had not made sufficient conversations with the major stakeholders.

Third, this study concentrates on the TEPD model for regular teachers, although TEPD has categories to differentiate evaluations for different types of teachers. Korean teachers are distinguished by their positions, contract type, and subjects that they teach. By position, teachers are divided into principals, vice-principals, master teachers⁶, department head teachers, and regular teachers. Teachers can also be divided by contract type: regular teachers, full-time

---

⁶ The master teacher policy is one that selects “master teachers” with an expertise in teaching so that the master teachers can consult and advise peer teachers by developing and distributing effective teaching and learning skills, and enhancing professional teaching competency for all teachers in general (MEST, 2010).
contract teachers, and part-time contract teachers. By subjects, there are English native assistant teachers, extracurricular teachers, health teachers, and special education teachers. There are also non-teaching teachers such as nutrition teachers, librarians, and professional school counselors. One thing to note is that when TEPD was first implemented in 2010, the model did not differentiate the categories to evaluate different types of teachers. The revisions were made in the directions of providing variations to evaluate different types of teachers more accurately.

Teacher Evaluation Policies in Korea

Currently, there are two teacher evaluation policies in Korea since 2015 reform: Performance Evaluation (PE) or Eob-jeog-pyeong-ga and TEPD. Before the 2015 reform, there were three independent teacher evaluation policies in Korea: Teacher Evaluation for Performance (TEP) or Geun-mu-seong-jeog-pyeong-jeong, Performance-Based Incentive System (PBIS) or Seong-gwa-sang-yeo-geum-pyeong-ga, and TEPD. However, the policies were heavily criticized because they had numerous problems such as redundancy of content from multiple evaluations, evaluation inefficiency, credibility issues, and seniority-based evaluations (MOE, September, 2015). In response to these problems, the government decided to merge two of the three existing policies into one after two years of discussions. However, the merging could not occur due to strong criticism. Currently, a call for merging all the policies into one is under review.

The following section provides a brief introduction of each teacher evaluation and the comparisons of TEP, PBIS, and TEPD, which were enacted prior to the 2015 reform. Comparing three evaluations serves as a background to understand the formation of the current evaluation system. All three policies are intertwined with one another; hence, a single table for the comparisons among the three policies allows to logically capture the similarities, which was one of the main criticisms against the previous teacher evaluation policy system. The section ends
with introducing the current teacher evaluation that was created with more emphasis on TEPD after the 2015 reform.

Comparing Three Teacher Evaluation Policies before the 2015 Reform

Understanding the details of previous teacher evaluations is critical because the current evaluation policies were formed based on the previous evaluation policies. Moreover, problems that resulted in reforms of TEPD can be inferred by comparing the three teacher evaluations. Problems and details of TEP and PBIS not only resulted in introducing TEPD but also were used as main arguments for teacher organizations to affect the implementation process of TEPD. Thus, the study presents Table 3-2, which depicts the comparisons among three teacher evaluation policies that existed prior to 2015 reform. The table consists of 13 features of each policy: the year of implementation, purpose, emphasis, regulations, evaluation model, evaluation type, evaluation timeline, evaluation targets, evaluation participants, evaluation contents, emphasis of each policy, notification systems, and problems of evaluation policies.

The first teacher evaluation policy was TEP, which was implemented in 1964 based on Educational Civil Servant Promotion Regulation. Next, PBIS was implemented in 2001 based on Civil Servant Incentive Regulation, and TEPD was last to be implemented in 2010 based on Teacher Training Regulation. The purposes were to decide on promotions for teachers to administrative positions, provide incentives based on teachers’ performance, and enhance teacher professionalism, respectively. In relation, TEP emphasized evaluating the qualification, attitude, work performance, and capability. PBIS focused on the difficulty of the job (e.g., department head teacher), award records, professional development records, while TEPD emphasized the

---

7 Appendix B and Appendix C provide in-depth information for the chronological developments of TEP and PBIS, respectively.
overall school management capacity to evaluate principals and vice-principals and for evaluating teachers, it centered on academic instructions and student advising.

PBIS and TEPD shared some of the features such as the evaluation model and evaluation targets. Both policies encompassed the same evaluation model, in which the central government provides a basic agenda and allows autonomies to the Metropolitan and Provincial Offices of Education and individual schools to choose the details of evaluation criteria. TEP, however, was strictly based on a single model from the central government, namely a nationwide standardized model. PBIS and TEPD shared another component, which was evaluation targets – principals, vice principals, and teachers – whereas TEP evaluated vice-principals and teachers. In terms of evaluators, TEP and PBIS both had the same evaluators including principals, vice-principals, and peer teachers. TEPD included students and parents in addition to the evaluators of TEP and PBIS. This resulted in severe oppositions from teacher organizations and their arguments were eventually reflected in the 2015 reform.

All other features varied by evaluation policies: type of evaluation, evaluation contents, and notification system. First, types of evaluations were as follows. TEP was a result-oriented, relative evaluation that was used to determine ranking. PBIS was a performance-oriented, relative evaluation to divide the ratings, and TEP was a diagnostic and improvement mechanism, multidimensional evaluation in which every member participates in the absolute evaluation to investigate the level of professionalism. However, teacher organizations argued that these variety of evaluations caused confusions.
Table 3-2. Three Teacher Evaluation Policies prior to the 2015 Reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Implementation</th>
<th>Teacher Evaluation for Performance</th>
<th>Performance-Based Incentive System</th>
<th>Teacher Evaluation for Professional Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Deciding on promotions for teachers to promote like administrative positions</td>
<td>Providing incentives based on teachers’ performance</td>
<td>Enhancing teacher’s professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>Qualification, attitude, work performance, and capability</td>
<td>Difficulty of job (e.g., department head teacher), award records, professional development records</td>
<td>• Principals/vice-principals: overall school management capacity • Teachers: academic instructions and student advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>Educational Civil Servant Promotion Regulation</td>
<td>Civil Servant Incentive Regulation</td>
<td>Teacher Training Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation model</td>
<td>Nationwide standardized model</td>
<td>Autonomies over criteria are given from the central government to Metropolitan and Provincial Offices of Education and individual schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation type</td>
<td>Result-oriented, relative evaluation to determine the ranking</td>
<td>Performance-oriented, relative evaluation to divide the ratings</td>
<td>Diagnosis and improvement mechanism, multidimensional and absolute evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>September to November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Vice-principals and teachers</td>
<td>Principals, vice principals, and teachers</td>
<td>Principals, vice-principals, peer teachers, students, and parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators</td>
<td>Principals, vice-principals, and peer teachers</td>
<td>Principals, vice-principals, peer teachers, students, and parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation contents</td>
<td>• Vice-principal: qualification and attitude, work performance and competency • Teacher: qualification and attitude, work performance and competency • Principals are not targets of the evaluation</td>
<td>• Principal, vice principal, school incentives: Different by each Metropolitan and Provinces based on standards provided by the MOE • Teacher: academic instructions, student advising, assigned tasks, professional development</td>
<td>• Principal/vice-principal: school management • Master teacher: advising teaching methods, academic instruction, and student advising • Regular teacher: academic instruction, student advising • Extracurricular teacher: support students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification system</td>
<td>Reveal the scores to vice principal and teachers who mark request</td>
<td>Notify by ratings (i.e., S, A, and B) to the individual principal, vice principal, and teachers</td>
<td>Notify principal, vice principal, and teachers with five-scale check lists and descriptive responds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from the Ministry of Education (MOE) (2014a); MOE (2015b, p. 5); Sejong City Office of Education (2015)
Second, evaluation contents had some overlapping features, which led for teacher organizations to claim that they are burdened by the overlap. Principals are not targets of TEP, but for PBIS and TEPD, principals shared the same evaluation contents with vice-principals as both belong to the administrative positions. Vice-principals in TEP were evaluated with qualification and attitude (i.e., personality, manner), work performance and competency (i.e., support for educational activities and research, support for teachers in general, administration, and office management. In PBIS, the Metropolitan and Provinces had autonomies to decide on evaluation contents for principals and vice-principals, which may contain school management, support for professional development, satisfaction, support for educational activities, and improvement in academic ability. In TEPD, both were evaluated on their overall school management performances. Teachers were evaluated differently from the principals and vice-principals. For TEP, they were evaluated with qualification and attitude (i.e., personality, manner), work performance and competency (i.e., academic instruction, student advising, educational research, assigned tasks). PBIS based their evaluation on academic instructions, student advising, assigned tasks, and professional development, while TEPD based their evaluations on instruction, student advising for both master teacher and regular teacher, additional evaluation for master teachers on advising teaching methods to peer teachers, and extracurricular teacher with supporting students.

Third, the notification system for TEP was to reveal the scores to vice principal and teachers and report newly assigned scores to Local Office of Education, but the results were secluded from the individual vice principal and teachers. In the case of PBIS, ratings (i.e., S, A, and B) were provided to the individual principal, vice principal, and teachers. Lastly, for TEPD, the results were notified to the principal, vice principal, and teachers with five-scale checklists and descriptive response.
Problems regarding TEP were that the evaluation was meaningless except for the teachers who aimed to receive better results for promotion purposes. The evaluations affected the teachers who had pending promotions more than the actual high-performing teachers. PBIS was accused of not being practical since only the ratings but not the details were provided. Moreover, teachers were prone to show a low rate of acceptance due to differences in benefits. TEPD had issues on teachers evaluating their peers subjectively and students and parents lacking qualification to evaluate teachers (MOE, 2014). Another problem was the different timelines of the evaluations in which increased burden to teachers. Teachers were being evaluated at all times with different evaluation policies. For instance, teachers were evaluated with PBIS in February then with TEPD in September to November, and last with TEP in December. Moreover, problems occurred due to duplication of the evaluation contents. For instance, PBIS and TEPD shared the same evaluation contents of advising students and academic instructions. Hence, the needs for the new teacher evaluation policy, which were to integrate and combine the redundant evaluation systems, appeared in a response to the problems discussed around previous evaluation policies. However, as the new teacher evaluation policy was created, not integrating the previous evaluations, teacher organizations fiercely opposed to the implementation of TEPD by claiming three overlapping evaluation systems are unnecessary and even inefficient.

A Need for a New Teacher Evaluation Policy

The study confines the starting point for the analysis to 2004, which is the initiation of discussing the introduction of a new teacher evaluation – TEPD. However, almost a decade has passed since the first discussion of a need of a new teacher evaluation policy occurred. According to the report published by PCPP (1995), the Korean government referred to models from other
countries\textsuperscript{8}– the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and Japan – to stimulate the discussion of reforming education system towards the coming era of globalization and information age. The Education Reform Plans for Establishing New Education System, often called 5. 31 Reform because it occurred on May 31\textsuperscript{st} of 1995, engendered the rise of consumer-oriented perspective in the education field. Nevertheless, it was not until 2004 that this new call for teacher evaluation policy gained valid interest in Korea.

**Current Teacher Evaluation for Professional Development Policy**

On September 3, 2015, the government announced a newly amended teacher evaluation policies declaring that the new policy would start from the spring semester of 2016. The core contents of the revisions were: a) existed TEP and PBIS would be simplified and integrated into one policy – PE, b) TEPD would be improved and maintain as a separate evaluation policy, and c) evaluation terms and criteria are modified and evaluation time would be standardized so that both evaluations would be done at the same school year. Concerning the problems of continuous confusions and redundancy due to multiple policies related to teacher evaluation, the government aimed to merge all teacher evaluation policies into one.

The section below introduces the current TEPD with six criteria from TEPD implementation master plan and manual published by MOE (2015a; 2015b). The basic structure of TEPD had not been dramatically changed since the first model of TEPD. Thus, it is noticeable that such complexity of criteria reflects a long discussion among multiple stakeholders prior to
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\textsuperscript{8} The Korean government included seven examples of four countries. The models in the United States include the Nation at Risk (1983) from the Reagan administration’s, Goals (2000) policy from the Bush administration, Educate America Act (1994) from the Clinton administration. From the United Kingdom, the Education Reform Act 1988 from Thatcher Cabinet was presented. The educational reform plans (1983, 1989) from France and Japanese system of interim council for education (1984) from Nakasone Cabinet was depicted as examples of educational reforms in foreign countries (PPCP, 1995).
nationwide implementation in 2010. The criteria include: a) purpose, b) autonomous evaluation processes, c) criteria and contents, d) evaluation methods and evaluators, e) notification of evaluation results, f) use of evaluation results. As the focus of this study confines to regular teachers, the section excluded explanations for the evaluations in regards to principals, vice-principals, and master teachers.

First, the purpose of TEPD was to recover trust in public education through developing teachers’ professional capacity. One reason for implementing TEPD was brought by the need for school reform. The public at that time had lost their faith in public education and high demand for quality education. Thus, the government announced a new teacher evaluation that can enhance teaching profession. By developing teacher’s professional capacity, the government believed that they would be able to provide quality education to the public.

Second, local districts and individual schools had the autonomy to decide on the details in promoting evaluations to parents and students, evaluation items, timelines, and committees for evaluation management. Before the evaluation, teachers provided information about their performance to peer teachers, students, and parents. Teachers promoted the participation of evaluation and provided information to the parents during meetings held at the beginning of the school term. The information included the features of parent satisfaction survey, methods of collecting related information and interpretation, participation processes and methods, and results from previous year and plan for support. Vice-principals were required to provide training to students about the evaluation. MOE recommended installing a banner on their school webpage so that participants could access to the evaluation system easily.

Individual schools decided on the details of parental participation methods, training for the parents, and methods to provide information through open classes and counseling for the parents. Deciding on parental participation method means schools could decide how they want the parents to participate in the evaluation and assure parents that they could select either online
or paper-based survey. Additionally, schools included student participation methods when they created a yearly plan for school education.

Metropolitan and Provincial Offices of Education were allowed to edit and supplement the evaluation items of manual and examples from MOE and could add more items before distributing to individual schools. Individual schools had authority to create the detailed items based on the manual and examples from MOE. MOE recommended including items that were related to main issues in their own schools (e.g. as interaction with students and students’ adjusting to school life) and items in depth. Moreover, there were no strict regulations or detailed guidelines for evaluation timeline and processes rather than the end date. Evaluating every year and completing by the end of November were ground rules, but individual schools could decide on the detailed timeline, and each Metropolitan and Provincial Offices of Education decided on the due dates for the completion. Allowing flexible timelines for each school helped in meeting high completion rates.

Committees for evaluation management were organized in each school. Committee members were comprised of teachers, parents, and external experts from 5 people to a maximum number of 11. In addition, each school was required to have two or more number of parent consulting member. Autonomy was given to each school to discuss the roles of the parent committee, provide trainings for the parent consulting member, promote participation of parents, support open computer lab for students and parents for the survey.

Third, evaluation contents were comprised of three hierarchical levels: areas, elements, and criteria (Table 3-3). Autonomy was given to individual schools in evaluation contents as well; the individual school could add criteria if the school had unique activities. Regular teachers were evaluated with different contents from master teachers, principals, and vice-principals. There were two areas, and each area consisted of three elements each with two to four criteria. On one hand, in academic instruction area, teachers were evaluated with three elements: lesson
preparation, lesson implementation, and assessment and use of its results. Lesson preparation, then, was divided into two: analyzing curriculum and planning. Lesson implementation was comprised of four criteria, which were the ability to create learning environments, ability to throw adequate questions, interact with students, and use of materials. Ability to throw adequate questions referred to using clear articulations and asking logical, divergent, and open questions. Assessment and use of its results contained two criteria: assessment content and methods as well as the use of assessment results. It related to whether the teachers were assessing students with adequate contents and methods that aligned with the lesson goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic instruction</td>
<td>Lesson preparation</td>
<td>Analyzing curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning: lesson goals, teaching and learning methods, assessment plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson implementation</td>
<td>Creating learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment and use of its results</td>
<td>Assessing students (content and methods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of assessment results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student guidance</td>
<td>Counseling and providing information</td>
<td>Understanding students’ characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advising and preventing problematic behaviors</td>
<td>Career education and supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advising on life habits and character development</td>
<td>Advising on school adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advising on health and safety matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advising on basic life habits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advising on character development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Choi & Park (2016, p. 163); N. Kang (2013, p. 165); MOE (2016, p. 15).

On the other hand, in the area of student guidance, teachers were evaluated with three other elements: counseling and providing information, preventing problematic behaviors, and advising on life habits and character development. Counseling and providing information had three criteria, which were understanding students’ characteristics, providing counseling, and providing career education. Advising and preventing problematic behaviors contained criteria as
follows: advising on school adjustment and advising on health and safety matters. Advising on life habits and character development also had two criteria to evaluate teachers: advising on basic life habits and advising on character development.

Fourth, evaluation methods were self-evaluation, peer evaluation, student survey, and parent satisfaction survey. Evaluations were completed through classroom observations, which obtained direct information on actual academic instruction and student guidance activities as well as indirect information that captured routine activities. Teachers were required to complete self-evaluation before evaluating their peers. However, self-evaluation was not included in the results that teachers receive at the end of the year. The usage of the results and submitting reports were discussed in the later section.

Peer evaluations had to be completed by five or more peer teachers and should include at least 10 elements and 12 items. MOE recommended increasing the number of peer teachers to guarantee anonymity and to secure objectivity. Among five evaluation participants, two of the participants had to be either a principal or vice-principal and the master teacher or department head teacher. If neither master teacher nor department head teacher was available, a teacher approved by department head could be assigned. All the teachers who were targeted by the evaluations should also participate in evaluating peer teachers. However, English native assistant teachers did not participate and evaluate other teachers.

Student survey was divided into two: opinion survey from elementary school students and satisfaction survey from middle school and high school students. Students from grade 1 to grade 3 were excluded from the survey; only elementary school students from grade 4 to grade 6 could participate for opinion survey. From middle school 1st grade to high school 3rd grade, students partook in completing the satisfaction survey. Students who went to the target school for less than two months were excluded from the evaluation. Each school had authority to select a specific number of classes that could participate in the evaluation. The questionnaires for
elementary school students (i.e. grade 4 to grade 6) consisted of three descriptive type items. In addition, two questions were asked to middle school and high school students: ‘What is a good thing about your teacher and/or teaching?’ and ‘What do you want more from your teacher?’ Each Metropolitan and Provincial Offices of Education added and edited other items as needed.

Parent satisfaction surveys were for parents of elementary school 1st graders to high school 3rd graders. However, parents whose child had attended their current school for less than two months could not partake in completing the evaluations. Parent satisfaction survey included five items in total, in which more than one item from each criterion of academic instruction and student guidance. Each school could decide on how they wanted their parents to participate (e.g. whether to mix paper survey and online survey or not) and plan for parental participation.

All evaluators evaluate teachers with five-scale Likert-type checklist items and descriptive type items. As briefly mentioned above, elementary school students who participated in the evaluation were only required to answer the descriptive type items, but not the five-scale Likert-type checklist items. The five-scale Likert-type checklist was then converted to 100 percentiles. MOE did not allow information to be released on the five-scale items, which were converted to 100 percentiles, since it could affect the participants and distort the response.

Fifth, superintendents, chiefs of local governments, and school principals notified the evaluation results to individual teachers by evaluation type and also provided total scores. For the teachers who had rejections, they could access the original evaluation data. The original evaluation data included result scores by each evaluation (i.e. peer evaluation, parent satisfaction survey, and student satisfaction survey) and descriptive type evaluation results.

Sixth, the use of evaluation results varied by teachers. After each teacher received the results, each of them was required to submit a report, ‘a plan for professional development,’ that included plans for professional development based on self-evaluation and the results that they received. The evaluation aimed to diagnosis teachers on their professional capacity and identify
their needs on professional development. With such purposes, teachers analyzed their own results. Moreover, teachers were able to plan and receive personalized professional development by writing a report.

Between January and August of the following year, teachers were subjected to attend professional development. Each teacher received different measures based on their results - sabbatical leave, professional development for capacity improvement, and professional development by evaluation criteria (Table 3-4). Teachers with excellent ratings were given a year-long sabbatical leave to further their professional capacity. Teachers with low ratings were required to receive professional development for capacity improvement. Low ratings meant receiving less than 2.5 from peer evaluation or parent satisfaction survey. Those who got the low ratings for the first time were mandated to complete a short-term professional development for 60 hours or more. Those who received low ratings in the previous year and current year were mandated with 150 hours or more of long-term basic professional development, and teachers who received low ratings for three years consecutively were required to take a long-term intense professional development course for 6 months or more. All the other teachers were subjected to attend professional development by evaluation criteria, which was scheduled for 15 hours or more. Those teachers were required to receive basic, intense, and supplementary professional developments, according to the results of evaluation criteria.

Table 3-4. Types of Customized Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Types of professional development</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent ratings</td>
<td>Sabbatical leave</td>
<td>Sabbatical leave for furthering professional capacity</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low ratings</td>
<td>Professional development for capacity improvement</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>60 hours or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term and basic</td>
<td>150 hours or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term and intense</td>
<td>6 months or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the others</td>
<td>Professional development by evaluation criteria</td>
<td>Basic, intense, supplementary, etc.</td>
<td>15 hours or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from MOE (2016, p. 41).
In summary, teacher evaluation policies in Korea went through multiple revisions, and TEPD in particular, is subjected to change in the direction of incapacitation due to strong resistance from teacher organizations. After the first initiation of the teacher evaluation policy (i.e. TEP) in 1964, which was more related to promotions rather than improving teacher quality, another teacher evaluation policy (i.e., PBIS) was created in 2001 to provide incentives for high performing teachers. However, both teacher evaluation policies failed to serve as a venue to improve teaching capacity and specialty. With a local need for improving teacher quality and an international rise of a need for teacher quality and accountability, Korean government declared introducing another teacher evaluation (i.e., TEPD) in 2004. Due to strong resistance from teacher organizations, however, the nationwide implementation did not happen until after 2010.

In 2015, a major reform on teacher evaluation took place in response to debates on multiple problems caused by three redundant teacher evaluation policies and ended up with two evaluations – PE and TEPD. Teacher evaluation policies had a very strong relationship with teacher organizations. In other words, the history of teacher evaluation was parallel with the interactions among government and teacher organizations. Thus, the following section provides histories and characteristics of teacher organizations in Korea to help better understand the contexts prior to discuss the influences of teacher organizations to TEPD policy process in the next chapter.

**Teacher Organizations in Korea**

Teacher organizations in Korea had actively engaged in policy changes since the dualistic system started in 1999, which was also the year when the collective bargaining was legalized. Under current laws, teacher organizations belong to two categories: teacher professional associations and teacher labor unions. On the one hand, KFTA was organized by teachers in the
pursuit of freedom of association mentioned in the Article 21 of the Constitution. It was a specialized organization regulated by the Framework Act on Education, the Act on Promotion of Teachers Status. On the other hand, the Article 33 of the Constitution served as the legal basis for KTU, Korean Union of Teaching and Education Workers (KUTEW), and Free Trade Union of Teachers (FTUT). These unions were regulated by the Act on the Teachers Trade Union Establishment and operation (P. Jung, 2015).

KFTA and KTU continuously influence the landscape of Korean education policies, although they generally had little power in influencing the policies. However, TEPD was an atypical case in that the government intentionally allowed teacher organizations to be involved in the policy formation and change processes. With the government’s goal of inviting multiple stakeholders to the TEPD policy discussions, teacher organizations had more influence on the policy processes than in most other areas of educational policy. Thus, the TEPD case, taken alone, may give the impression that Korean teacher organizations have more influence on the policy process than normal. To understand the contexts of teacher organizations’ influences, the following section explains: a) the histories and brief background information of KFTA and KTU and b) the contentions between KFTA and KTU concerning major educational policies.

**Chronological History of Teacher Organizations in Korea**

Table 3-5 displays the chronological history of teacher organizations in Korea. The history of Korean teacher organizations started in 1947 when the Joseon Education Association, the first teacher organization in Korea, was founded. JEA was established for the purposes of “promoting educational development and contributing to the global culture (D. Kim, 2016, p. 7)”. In the following year, the organization changed its name to the Korean Education Association (KEA) as Korea was liberated from Japan. KEA was the only legal teacher organization for
almost 50 years that embraced all the teachers without drawing distinctions among school types (i.e., national, public, and private), school levels (i.e., elementary school, middle school, and high school), gender, positions, or teaching experiences (D. Kim, 2016). KEA had changed its name to KFTA in 1989 and had been actively engaging in various spheres in policy processes and enhancing teacher’s professional development since then.

It was not only after in the late 1990s that the government legalized KTU, which ushered Korea into a new era of the dualistic system of teacher organization. Both expectations and concerns arose in 1999 as the government announced a dualistic system of teacher organizations. On the one hand, the dualistic system of teacher organizations was expected to expedite the development of education and protect the rights and interests of teachers by fostering competitions in good faith between teacher organizations. On the other hand, the new system also brought up concerns regarding the potential division of teaching profession if they fail to narrow down agreement due to ideological differences. (Jeong, Jung, & Youn, 2001).

Table 3-5. Chronological Development of Teacher Organizations in Korea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Periods</th>
<th>Major Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1947</td>
<td>Joseon Education Association (JEA): a start of KFTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>JEA changed the name to Korean Education Association (KEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 1987</td>
<td>Union for Korean Teachers (UKT): a start of KTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>KEA changed its name to Korean Federation of Teachers’ Associations (KFTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Korean Teachers and Education Workers Union (KTU) was founded based on UKT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1999</td>
<td>Legalization of KTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Dualistic system of teacher organizations began</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from D. Kim (2016); Jeong, Jung, & Youn (2001)
Shaded area indicates histories of KTU and unshaded indicate histories of KFTA

KTU played a pivotal role in legalizing teacher unions in Korea that subsequently led to the dualistic system of the Korean teacher organizations. KTU was first initiated on August 13,
1987, as a meeting of a group of initiators at the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) hall of Seoul Gangnam branch. In September of the same year, Union for Korean Teachers (UKT) that integrated nationwide unions was founded corresponding to the meeting that was held a month prior to the foundation of UKT. About a decade later, in 1989, KTU was founded based on UKT. It took another decade (i.e., 1999) for KTU to be legalized and hence a new era for teacher organizations in Korea (P. Jung, 2015).

However, after 14 years of being a legal organization, KTU was once again announced as illegal by Ministry of Employment and Labor on September 24, 2013. The main reason behind the change of status was that KTU kept the membership for nine teachers that should have been dismissed. This incidence left KFTA as the only formal teacher organization in Korea. About a year later, on September 19, 2014, High Court in Seoul suspended the decision for declaring KTU as an illegal union. However, KTU was declared to be an illegal union in 2016 and there were constant discussions on legalizing KTU again as the regime had changed. President Moon Jae-in had pledged as a presidential candidate for legalizing KTU (Newsis, July 3, 2017). On August 17, 2017, the 100th day of establishment of the Moon Jae-in government, KTU had urged an immediate change of its legal status (Yonhapnews, August 17, 2017). Currently, while KTU is waiting for a decision from the Supreme Court, KTU members are demonstrating in front of the government building.

Jung (2006) asked the roles of both teacher unions in a survey based on 300 teachers who belong to KFTA, KTU, or neither of the two organizations in Jeollabuk-do Province. In this study, teachers answered that both KFTA and KTU made positive influences on the society. KFTA had provided professional development and in-depth information to enhance teachers’ professional capacity, whereas KTU had led the movements for democracy in school management, involved in improving teachers’ social and economic conditions, and made
teachers’ opinions be reflected in teacher policy by engaging actively in policy processes since the planning phase.

**Different perspectives of KFTA and KTU on educational policies**

As were founded based on different laws, the two teacher organizations differed in collective bargaining as well. KFTA’s collective bargaining with MOE, on the one hand, is based on the Special Act on the Improvement of the Teachers Status enacted in 1999 to improve educational conditions and enhance teaching profession capacity. KTU’s collective bargaining, on the other hand, was based on the Labor Relations Commission Act. As KTU lost its legal status since 2016, however, collective bargaining from KTU has not been activated since then.

In addition, these two teacher organizations had been expressing different perspectives on educational policies depending on their founding purposes. Conflicts and/or having different perspectives between two teacher organizations (i.e., KFTA and KTU) were due to their differences in roles and functions (Shin & Lee, 2009). Moreover, the members that consist of each organization is different as well. Principals, vice-principals, and teachers can be members of KFTA, whereas KTU membership limits to teachers only. Including the administrators as members led KFTA to a more conservative organization since they have authority over the decision-making. Table 3-6 depicts different perspectives on educational policies between KFTA and KTU. As soon as the dualistic policy of teacher organization had been legislated in 1999, two teacher organizations had both been contributing to the debates for policy decisions. Most perspectives concerning each educational policy from KFTA and KTU were opposite to each other, but in some cases, both teacher organizations headed for the same conclusion with different suggestions for details.
The first confrontation between KFTA and KTU began in 2001 in regards to PBIS. KFTA agreed on the basic logic of the PBIS that teachers might receive incentives based on their performances, whereas KTU strongly resisted against the policy and called for equal wages for all teachers. In 2008, regarding School Information Disclosure System and School Autonomy system, KFTA had agreed to both policies, whereas KTU had insisted for partial amendments for the former and disagree to the later. For another instance, KFTA agreed on the policy to allow autonomous private high schools in 2009, whereas KTU disagreed. In the same year, KFTA changed their stances on the TEPD to support the implementation, whereas KTU remained strongly resisting against the implementation of TEPD.

Table 3-6. Stances on Educational Policies: KFTA versus KTU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Educational Policy</th>
<th>KFTA</th>
<th>KTU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>PBIS</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>School Information Disclosure System</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School autonomy policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Autonomous private high school policy</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEPD</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Ordinance for student’s human rights</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free school meal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innovation schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open recruiting principal employment system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National assessment of educational achievement (i.e., Standardized test)</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Differentiated instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Recording the wrongdoing of school violence onto the assailant student’s cumulative school record</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master teacher system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Establishment of international middle school, autonomous high school, and special-purposed high school</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Kyohaksa’ Korean history textbook</td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>Disapprove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Direct election system of the Superintendent</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from D. Kim (2016, p. 8); Suh & Choi (2009, p.108)
In 2011, KFTA and KTU continued to battle against each other in several other occasions. Specifically, KFTA disagreed whereas KTU agreed to a) the ordinance for student’s human rights, b) the free school meal policy, c) the innovation school policy, and d) open recruiting principal employment system. On the contrary, the policies that KFTA agreed and KTU disagreed to were a) the national assessment of educational achievement – also known as standardized test – and b) differentiated instruction policy to divide students, teach and assess them based on their achievement scores. Regarding the open recruiting system for principals, although KFTA acknowledged the problems caused by the current promotion system, any radical change to the procedure of recruiting principals might lead to chaos in the teaching profession. Moreover, the open recruiting system had numerous problems in terms of qualifications. However, KTU was in favor of the system and claimed that adapting the open recruiting system for principal would overcome the problems of principal promotion system by scores and open a new phase in the teaching profession. Hence, KTU would put all efforts to legalize the system.

In 2012, the problem around school violence arose above the surface and discussions on recording the wrongdoing of school violence onto the assailant student’s cumulative school record. KFTA agreed to the recording claiming that the recording the school violence onto the assailant student’s cumulative school record is an effective countermeasure, while KTU disagreed with a rationale that the recording itself is not an effective countermeasure; the recording did not reduce on school violence. Therefore, structural causes such as decreasing the number of students in one class and abolishing competitive educational system should be considered. In the same year, the master teacher system also was an issue and KFTA agreed, on the contrary, KTU disagreed with the policy.

In 2013, the policies on the establishment of international middle schools, autonomous high schools, and special-purpose high schools were implemented along with the strengthening of the educational quality in general schools. KFTA agreed to the policy as they believed the schools
have their purposes on human resource development. However, they insisted on reducing the enrollment size and even canceling the school establishment should there be any situation in which the schools do not retain the establishment purpose. KTU disagreed to the policy and asserted the revocation of the privileged schools (i.e., international middle school, autonomous high school, and special-purpose high school) in that such schools would weaken the education quality in general schools due to cream-skimming excellent students into the privileged schools.

Another policy that KFTA and KTU disagreed with each other in 2013 was an issue on the *Kyo-hak-sa* Korean history textbook. KFTA claimed that the *Kyo-hak-sa* textbook’s conviction for pro-Japanese or conservatism is unfair. They asserted that the other seven textbooks also had errors and it was only a question of which textbook contains more errors. On the contrary, KTU asserted that the *Kyo-hak-sa* made textbooks based on the Japanese colonial view of history. The problem with the textbook of *Kyo-hak-sa* was not comparable with other seven textbooks, thus the approval should be canceled immediately.

KFTA, in 2014, disagreed to the direct election system of the Superintendent, whereas KTU agreed to direct election. KFTA stated that the direct selection system of the Superintendent was only weighted towards local self-government and democracy. The policy was ostracizing and damaging the constitutional values of pursuing independent, professional, and political neutrality in public education. KTU insisted that abolishing direct selection system of the Superintendent is an action that damages the educational autonomy. It was a mere attempt to alter the policy by political interests and diminishing political neutrality in public education autonomy.

In summary, the disagreement between KFTA and KTU is predictable after analyzing those cases. Consistent results are shown from both teacher organizations. The analysis of their different views on educational policies from 2001 to 2014 suggests that there are similar and consistent perspectives in each teacher organization. The consistency of the perspectives are the belief systems that the coalition owns and it will be further discussed in the next chapter.
Summary of the Chapter

Education and teacher policies in Korea gained global attention after PISA results were released in 2000. Not long after the attention toward Korean teacher policies, teacher evaluation policy reforms came forward along with an international recognition that educational accountability has its responsibility on increasing student achievement. Educational accountability premises the link between teacher quality and student academic achievement and this notion has led to global discussions on teacher evaluation policy reforms.

Educational contexts in Korea were explained to help better understand TEPD policy process through current administration structure and decisional systems, four administrations accountable for TEPD policy process, legal structure and laws related to TEPD, and characteristics of teachers in Korea. Understanding administration structure and decisional systems in Korea help to comprehend how the government reacted to the teacher organizations’ opinions. Four administrations that TEPD process occurred had different emphasis on their directions. This implied that variations in their political ideology may have led to performing different strategies to deal with teacher organizations and affected policy process of TEPD in turn. Legal structure and laws related to TEPD showed the hierarchy of Korean laws. Through that, it is noticeable that in order for a law to have a justification, it should have a base on the higher law.

Teacher evaluation reform in Korea is unique in the sense that there has been a checkered history of the implementation of multiple teacher evaluation systems. Moreover, TEPD is distinguishable from other teacher evaluation policies due to the power that teacher organizations possessed in hindering the implementation of the policy. Korean teacher evaluation policy first started in the 1960s with TEP and PBIS was then added to the system in 1990s. A decade later, a new teacher evaluation policy, TEPD, arose to the public attention. Currently, there are two
teacher evaluation policies – PE and TEPD – that were established since the major reform in 2015. The sophisticated details regarding the TEPD policy heralded prolonged discussions among the stakeholders before any agreement be reached.

Two major teacher organizations, KFTA and KTU had different perspectives on educational policies. Each had different characteristics and purposes from the beginning of their foundation and these differences resulted in different opinions on educational policies including teacher policies. However, both teacher organizations share their beliefs on certain values, one of which being that the policy should not be a threat to teachers. Teacher organizations have had little power in influencing educational policies, but TEPD was an atypical case that the government accepted their influences in policy formation and change processes. Regarding TEPD, teacher organizations were allowed by the government, which aimed to include diverse stakeholders in the political discussions, to be largely engaged with the policy processes. The next chapter discusses how their shared and/or different beliefs led to being affiliated to the same advocacy coalition and/or be separated and resulted in different advocacy coalitions that affected the policy process of TEPD.
Chapter 4
Methodology

This study explores the processes of policy formation and changes of Teacher Evaluation for Professional Development (TEPD) or Gyo-won-neung-lyeog-gae-bal-pyeong-ga and focuses on the influences of key stakeholders – teacher organizations. The study mainly concentrates on the internal changes of belief systems, resources, and strategies from these two teacher organizations – Korean Federation of Teachers’ Associations (KFTA) or Han-gug-gyo-won-danche-chong-yeon-hab-hoe and Korean Teachers and Education Workers Union (KTU) or Jeon-gug-gyo-jig-won-no-dong-jo-hab – while it seeks external factors that may have affected the changes of the policy. In addition, the study examines whether or not the case of TEPD aligns with the core postulate of advocacy coalitions from Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF).

To find ways to answer to the research questions, the methodology chapter consists of four sections: research design, data sources and collection, data analysis, and limitations. The chapter first starts with the research design section and discusses the rationale behind using qualitative document analysis, the main method. Then, data activities that was adapted for data analysis in this study are described. Next, the data sources and collection section illustrate the collected data based on the conceptual framework of the study (i.e. ACF) and data collection timeline. Then, the data analysis section presents the steps used in data collection and organization, data condensation, data coding, and data display. The chapter ends with a discussion on limitations of the methodology.
Research Design

This study employs qualitative methods to conduct research. Specifically, the study uses document analysis as it is best suited to answer the research question on the role of teacher organizations in TEPD policy formation and change processes. This study confines the period from 2004 to 2016; thus, the study collected and analyzed the data within that period. Although TEPD was implemented in 2010, the actual articulation on implementing TEPD had begun in 2004 by a declaration from the Minister of Education, Ahn Byung-young (see Chapter 3. Context for the Study). In addition, the study presents current situation by using some documents in 2017 to help predict the further direction of TEPD processes. The section below further discusses the rationale for qualitative document analysis and data activities used in the study.

Rationale for Qualitative Document Analysis

Many scholars support qualitative research with compelling reasons in various ways and it served as a rationale for undertaking a qualitative research. First, a qualitative approach allows the researcher to study a phenomenon in a natural setting (Cresswell, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014) and understand social processes in context (Esterberg, 2002). Moreover, as Cresswell (1998) states, a qualitative researcher builds “a complex, holistic picture, analyzes words, reports detailed views of informants, and conducts the study in a natural setting” (p. 15). By conducting qualitative research, researchers can explore the meanings of social events through understanding contexts (Esterberg, 2002). In addition, “thick descriptions” (Geertz, 1973) that are nested in a context make a strong potential for revealing complexity (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014). Furthermore, research questions in qualitative studies often contain “what” or “how” and even assess causation. Since my research focuses on the roles of
individuals (i.e. policy actors) who are involved in the policy processes in a natural setting and having a purpose of comprehending the changes in beliefs through understanding contexts, I found it compelling for conducting a qualitative study.

Within the arena of qualitative research, the study uses document analysis (Bowen, 2009; McBeth, Shanahan, & Jones, 2005; Patton & Sawicki, 1993) as the main method and the rationale for the decision is based on three factors. Those are a) functions of document analysis that provide background, contexts, and tracking changes; b) characteristics of objectivity, reliability, validity of documents as qualitative data; and c) applicability of document analysis for an intensive qualitative study that furnishes rich explanations. Such strengths in using document analysis provide compelling reasons and serve as a rationale for undertaking document analysis in this study.

First, document analysis is the most suitable methodology for this study given that the purpose of the study that is to identify background and context when the policy was first introduced and the processes of development and changes of the TEPD. Bowen (2009) evinces functions of documentary material. As Bowen (2009) emphasizes, “documents can provide data on the context within which research participants operate—a case of text providing context, if one might turn a phrase” (p.29). He continues stating that documents, bearing witness to past events, provide background information and historical insight. Researchers can understand historical roots of that past events through such information and insight. In addition, documents provide “a means of tracking change and development” (Bowen, 2009, p. 30). The researcher can compare the documents to identify the changes. For instance, even subtle changes in a document can reflect substantive developments (Bowen, 2009; Yin, 1994). Accordingly, document analysis allows revealing causal relationship (Patton & Sawicki, 1993). By referring to documents, it not only provides explicit changes but also corroborates the causal relationship of events. Hence,
document analysis is the best method for my study since the study aims to understand contexts, background information, identify the changes in the policy, and causal relationships.

Second, document analysis is the most realistic and objective strategy to obtain reliable and valid data because documents allow conducting a research with objective and public evidence (Berelson, 1952; Neuendorf, 2017). According to McBeth, Shanahan, and Jones (2005), “documents express valid beliefs and they are important sources in measuring policy beliefs” (p.415). Although there is some controversy among ACF researchers in the use of public consumption documents (e.g. newsletters, newspaper editorials, and internet websites), using documents are valid and reliable for my research which aims to explore the positions of organizations because the language used in such documents is considered “political spin” (McBeth, Shanahan, & Jones, 2005, pp. 415-416, original emphasized). Moreover, documents include certain perspectives and stances that reflect their positions on certain events. In this sense, documents even serve as “a platform for developing insights into the processes and factors that lie behind divergence” (Bryman, 2012: 551). It can be applied directly to this study that teacher organizations might have indeed faced numerous discussions within the associations, but eventually, the organizations have produced documents after gathering their opinions and announcing them to the public. In other words, the press releases, statements, white papers, reports, and even newsletters represent their collected opinions. Making use of documents provides a balanced portrayal of the organizations by using their newsletters and press releases, but not having the research assess them. Using document analysis, thus, reduces researcher bias, which then enables reliable research.

Third, document analysis is particularly applicable for intensive research producing rich descriptions and explanations on a single phenomenon, program, event, or organization (Bowen, 2009; Yin, 1994). Moreover, as Merriam (1988) pointed out, “documents of all types can help the researcher uncover meaning, develop understanding, and discover insights relevant to the
research problem” (p. 118). Therefore, document analysis is a perfect method for my research that seeks understanding of the connections between belief changes in teacher organizations and policy changes in TEPD. Furthermore, not only belief changes that are articulated in the documents of organizations but also exogenous factors that affected belief changes are feasible when conducting document analysis.

Data Activities

Data collected from various sources are analyzed systematically through continuous and interactive data activities. As well as the connections and interactions of data activities, characteristics of flexibility can also be understood by Maxwell’s (2005) rubber band analogy. In addition, Bryman (2012) explains a series of interactive steps of data activities that include: collection of relevant data, interpretation of data, conceptual and theoretical work, tighter specification of the research questions, and collection of further data. In short, data activities are interrelated and flexible in terms of order of an occurrence.

This study adapted the data activities – data collection, data condensation, data display, and drawing and verifying conclusions – suggested by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014). Miles and Huberman (1994) viewed qualitative data analysis as an interactive work of three activities – data reduction, data display, and conclusions drawing/verification – that flow concurrently and occurs “before, during, and after data collection” (p.11). In this study, data collection and analysis of data are in iterative process. This means that collection and analysis have “repetitive interplay” (Bryman, 2012, p. 566) between them. Thus, after the analysis was conducted, more data was collected. Detailed procedures are further discussed later in the chapter.

The interactive model is depicted in Figure 4-1 below. Later in their 3rd edition, Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) changed the term of data reduction to data condensation since the
term “reduction” implies a negative connotation. Thus, this study uses the revised term “data condensation” in this study although the concept itself is the same with what Miles and his colleagues meant in their previous study. Each component is applied to present data analysis of this study with a brief introduction of each term later in the chapter.

![Diagram](image)

Figure 4-1. Components of Data Analysis: Interactive Model
Source: Miles, Huberman, & Saldana (2014, p. 14)

**Data Sources and Collection**

The study relies heavily on 2,074 documents from three data sources as in accordance to research questions: government and two teacher organizations (i.e. KFTA and KTU). The main data for the study are official documents from KFTA, KTU, and Korean government and they include: a) press releases, white papers, regulations, official manuals and guidelines for using TEPD from the government; and b) statements, press releases, press conferences, public hearing, reviews, and newsletters from each teacher organization. All documents are accessible publicly
through each website of KFTA, KTU, and government. The following section focuses on the data in relation to the concepts from ACF.

**Conceptual Framework and Data Sources**

As discussed in the literature review chapter, the study follows a conceptual framework of ACF. One of the main assumptions of ACF is that policy changes occur with the processes of interactions and attempts at resolving conflicts among advocacy coalitions. Moreover, the coalitions are formed in alliance to shared belief systems, lay out strategies along with the beliefs, and possessed resources to influence policy changes. Changes in advocacy coalitions take place both endogenously and exogenously, derived from inside and outside of the coalitions (Sabatier & Weible, 2007). In this regard, it can simply be said that policy changes are influenced by changes in belief systems of advocacy coalitions, deducing agreements from conflicts among advocacy coalitions, and exogenous factors. Thus, the study is designed to capture the main concepts of ACF and data was collected from adequate data sources accordingly.

Table 4-1 below displays types of data corresponding to the concepts of ACF presented above. The concepts are categorized into four: beliefs, resources, strategies of teacher organizations, conflicts among teacher organizations, influences of teacher organizations on policy change, and external factors. Concepts and data sources (i.e. teacher organizations and government) are connected to one another; for instance, most data from teacher organizations were used to seize concepts related to teacher organizations. Data from the organizations are highly consumed throughout the whole analysis process, whereas documents from the government, compared to documents from teacher organizations, are used in parts that are related to describing policy change in general and external factors. This framework steered the early data
collection and data analysis and guided subsequent data collection and analysis as emerging themes developed.

Table 4-1. Conceptual Framework for ACF and Types of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts from ACF</th>
<th>Types of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs, resources, and strategies of teacher organizations</td>
<td>Statements, press releases from teacher organizations, press conferences, public hearings, reviews, collective bargaining, internal announcements, propaganda materials, materials for forums, newsletters, media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts among teacher organizations</td>
<td>White papers, internal announcements, propaganda materials, reviews, newsletters, media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of teacher organizations on policy change</td>
<td>Policy change: governmental documents (press releases, white paper, regulations, manuals/guidelines for TEPD), newsletters, media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence of teacher organizations: press releases, press conferences, statements, public hearings, media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External factors</td>
<td>White papers, statements, press releases from teacher organizations and government, press conferences, public hearings, internal announcements, propaganda materials, newsletters, media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of data that were collected for the first category – beliefs, resources, and strategies of teacher organizations – include all documents from teacher organizations that are statements, press releases, press conferences, public hearings, reviews, collective bargaining, internal announcements, propaganda announcements, materials for forums, newsletters, and media sources. For the second category – conflicts among teacher organizations – white papers from the government, internal announcements, propaganda announcements, reviews, newsletters, and media sources. The third category – influences of teacher organizations on policy change – is divided into two parts: policy changes and influences of teacher organizations. To capture policy changes, this study used governmental documents that are press releases, white paper, regulations, and manuals/guidelines for TEPD and newsletters from KFTA and KTU. For assessing the influence of teacher organizations, the study utilized press releases, press conferences, statements, and public hearings from KFTA and KTU as well as media resources.
Lastly, with respect to exogenous factors category, the study used documents from both teacher organizations and government and they include white papers, statements, press releases, press conferences, public hearings, internal announcements, and newsletters.

Table 4-2 presents data sources by organizations and types of data. Each teacher organization has two data sources and government has three data sources. For KFTA, documents that include statements, press releases, press conferences, public hearings, forums, and collective bargaining were collected from their headquarter website (http://www.kfta.or.kr/) and KFTA’s newsletter that is provided for their members but also open to the public had a separate website (http://www.hangyo.com/). The same is applied to KTU: for the documents published and/or shared by KTU that include statements, press releases, press conferences, propaganda announcements, public hearings, and reviews was available from their headquarter website (http://www.eduhope.net), and KTU also had a separate website for their newsletters which is also available for the public (http://news.eduhope.net/). Governmental documents are from three websites that contain press releases and white paper (http://www.moe.go.kr/main.do?s=moe), legal regulations for TEPD (http://www.law.go.kr/main.html), and manuals/guidelines for using TEPD in school settings (http://www.moe.go.kr/main.do?s=moe, http://www.archives.go.kr/next/viewMain.do).

Table 4-2. Data Types and Sources by Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Data Source (Website)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KFTA</td>
<td>Documents(^a)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kfta.or.kr/">http://www.kfta.or.kr/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hangyo.com/">http://www.hangyo.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTU</td>
<td>Documents(^b)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.eduhope.net">http://www.eduhope.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td><a href="http://news.eduhope.net">http://news.eduhope.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td><a href="http://www.law.go.kr/main.html">http://www.law.go.kr/main.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.archives.go.kr/next/viewMain.do">http://www.archives.go.kr/next/viewMain.do</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Documents for KFTA include statements, press releases, press conferences, public hearings, forums, and collective bargaining

\(^b\) Documents for KTU include statements, press releases, press conferences, propaganda announcements, public hearings, and reviews
Data Analysis

This study adapted an interactive model for data activities (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014), which includes four components that are data collection, data condensation, data display, and drawing and verifying conclusions. Drawing and verifying the conclusion will be discussed in the results chapter, while this section explains the data analysis procedures in addition to the three components. Although coding is included in data condensation (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014, p. 73), this study describes coding as a separate section for in-depth understanding. Thus, the following sections include data collection and organization, data condensation, coding, and data display to explain analytic procedures of the study.

Data Collection

The data was collected over a period of eight months within two cycles, and all data are publicly accessible via the internet. Data were collected from seven websites: two from KFTA, two from KTU, and three via government websites. Data condensation and coding was simultaneously collected while gathering data. Data collection did not occur for the whole eight-month period, but it took about one day to ten days to gather data for each cycle.

This study uses multiple strategies for collecting data from teacher organizations and government. All data was downloaded and saved electronically in folders with Microsoft’s Word format or Hangul (i.e. Korean version of ‘MS Word’) format. First, two teacher organizations had two websites; one for the official website for general purpose and the other for newsletters. For the official websites of teacher organizations, the study used two strategies to collect data. First, the study used search engine in the website with keywords of either “TEPD” or “teacher evaluation policy.” For “teacher evaluation policy” keyword, because it sometimes also contained
documents for other teacher evaluation policies, I clicked one by one and verified whether the document is related to TEPD or not and then excluded the data irrelevant to TEPD. Hence, it is noticeable that data condensation was happening at the same time. Second, I clicked each menu on the website to search for data. And under the menu, I looked for relevant sub-menus that may contain documents related to TEPD; however, I also checked other sub-menus as well.

For instance, as Figure 4-2 below displays, I visited KFTA headquarter website (http://www.kfta.or.kr) and typed “Kyo-won-neung-ryuk-gae-bal-pyung-ga (TEPD)” and “kyo-won-pyung-ga (teacher evaluation policy)” into the search engine where it is numbered 1 in the example. Then I moved on to the second strategy which is indicated as number 2 in the example, and click on the main menu of “Kyo-chong-so-sik (News of KFTA)” marked with circle and then visit sub-menu marked with rectangular such as “Bo-doe-ja-ryo (press releases).”

![Figure 4-2. Example for Data Collection Procedure through Screenshot of KFTA](image)

9 Other teacher evaluation policies refer to Performance-Based Incentive System (PBIS, Seong-gwa-sang-yeo-geum-pyeong-ga) or Teacher Evaluation for Performance (TEP, Geun-mu-seong-jeog-pyeong-jeong).
Data Condensation

Data condensation is the process of “selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the data that appear in the full corpus of written-up field notes, interview transcripts, documents, and other empirical materials” (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014, p. 12). Activities for data condensation include clustering data, writing summaries, writing analytic memos, developing themes, generating categories, and coding (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014). Data condensation activities, themes, categories, and coding will be discussed in the next section.

Some of the data condensation occurred simultaneously with data collection as it has been discussed briefly in the previous section. During data collection, I checked and verified the documents to extract data that are only related to the study. After downloading data, I clustered data by relocating them into categorized folders. In the first cycle for data collection, the data was placed in folders by their published organizations and by years. Later, in the second cycle of data collection, I created another category to relocate the data to folders by the types of the document. The detailed display of the condensed data in folders is to be presented in the later section.

In regards to transforming the data as one of the data condensation strategies, I converted Hangul files into Word or PDF format. Data condensation also happened contemporaneously with data collection. Converting file formats was necessary for using NVivo 11 Plus software program, one of the most frequently used program for qualitative research (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014). Since NVivo 11 Plus only recognizes Word and PDF formatted files, I modified the file formats. By using the “Word frequency” function in Nvivo 11 Plus, I compared the terminologies each organization has used to express their opinions on TEPD. Counting frequency of the words is one method of document analysis. As Bryman (2015) states, “the use of some
words rather than others can often be of some significance, because it can reveal the predilection for sensationalizing certain events” (p. 295).

Consequently, the data was condensed to 2,074 documents in total. Data from KFTA made up 1,006 documents; KTU 1,026; and government 42. Data from teacher organizations are displayed in Table 3-3 and data from the government are shown in Table 3-4. Data are categorized into two types: published documents and newsletters. Published documents include press release, press conference, collective bargaining, radio interview, and indirect published documents. The two teacher organizations published the similar amount of documents from 2004 to 2016; however, their focus was somewhat different. KFTA more focused on publishing newsletters than external or internal documents, whereas KTU put more emphasis on publishing external documents.

KTU had distinctive features compared to KFTA. First is from the external document category. The indirect published document type is a unique feature of KTU, which indirectly mentioned TEPD. They were either in the form of a) inserting TEPD into the document that focus is on other matters (e.g. school violence); or b) mentioning not only TEPD but also other issues with equal emphasis (e.g. press release for evaluating the first year of Park Guen-hye administration). Second, from the internal document category, KTU posted materials that are from branches. Both KFTA and KTU have branches throughout Korea, but KTU is more tightly connected with other branches, whereas KFTA is loosely coupled with others and somewhat function independently. This trend is observable from the data as well. This is inducible because this study focused on collecting data only from the headquarter website and this indicates that KTU headquarter is more tightly related to other branches.
Table 4-3. Data from Teacher Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Published Documents</th>
<th>KFTA</th>
<th>KTU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press release</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press conference</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective bargaining</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Announcement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propaganda materials</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference materials</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Published Documents)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newsletters</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Announcement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propaganda materials</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference materials</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Documents and Newsletters)</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-4 depicts the number of documents by type. A total number of collected documents published by the government is 21 and include press release and white paper, regulation, and manuals/guidelines for using TEPD in school settings. In the press releases and white paper category, there are press releases on the implementation of TEPD, revised plans, and white papers for the coming year for the modified version. Regulation types include documents that state legal discussions and regulations (i.e. policy). Manuals and guidelines for TEPD are the documents provided to each Metropolitan and Provincial Office of Education to distribute the modified version to the schools in their districts. The relations among federal government and Metropolitan and Provincial Offices of Education is explained in the next chapter.

Table 4-4. Data from the Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number of documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Press release, white paper</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuals/guidelines for TEPD</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coding

Codes are labels that assign symbolic meaning to descriptive data and also function as separating, compiling, and organizing the data (Charmaz, 1983; Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014). They are commonly formed in words or short phrases that provide “summative, salient, essence-capturing, and/or evocative attributes” (Saldana, 2009, p. 3) to collected data. In qualitative research, similarities and differences are used to generate categories and through those categories, data are grouped and compared. And an analytic strategy that focuses on relations of similarities and categorizes by the similarity is called coding (Maxwell & Chmiel, 2014).

The study started with initial coding to generate broad concepts and themes, then went on to deductive coding after creating a list of a priori codes from ACF, and then coded again with inductive coding, which allowed me to find more emerging codes. First and third cycles of coding were based on the grounded theory that has an aspect of researchers to “constantly compare phenomena coded under a certain category so that a theoretical elaboration of that category can begin to emerge” (Bryman, 2012, p. 568; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Coding requires being in a constant state of “potential revision and fluidity” (Bryman, 2012: 568). Thus, I went back and forth to coding activities and used both deductive and inductive approaches to create codes and categorized data under the codes.

The first coding process was initiated soon after the initial data was collected. Scholars of qualitative research advise analyzing simultaneously with data collection and when analyzing, developing a list of broad coding categories (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Charmaz, 2006; Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014), and suggest collecting data by using this preliminary category of codes. The initial coding activity that was used was an open coding that is a process of “breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualizing, and categorizing data” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 61). In addition, descriptive coding was used that is to assign labels to summarize basic topics
in a word or short phrase (Saldana, 2009). Through this initial coding, I was able to generate emerging themes, which later grouped and categorized to be compared with concepts from ACF. For instance, on January 5, 2017, when I started collected documents from KTU, a very broad theme, “con TEPD” emerged. Later, this initial code was grouped under policy core.

Second cycle coding was based on a deductive approach which uses a priori codes or theoretically generated codes (Bryman, 2012). A priori codes are based on the concepts from ACF, particularly belief systems of advocacy coalitions. ACF assumes that actors can be aggregated into a number of advocacy coalitions who share beliefs and the belief systems are organized into a hierarchical structure (Sabatier, 1998; Peffley & Hurwitz, 1985). This tripartite structure of belief systems starts from the broadest level to beliefs that are more specific and it includes deep core beliefs, policy core beliefs, and secondary beliefs (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014).

Using the conceptual framework as a guide, a series of categories with three big themes was created: deep core beliefs, policy core beliefs, and secondary beliefs. For instance, studies in ACF suggest contrasting concepts that are “individual freedom” vs. “social equity and “Left” vs. “Right” (Sabatier, 1998: 103) as one of the core beliefs. By using such concepts, “educational values” category and codes with “educational excellence” vs. “educational equity” were created.

Third cycle coding was more heavily based on grounded theory than the first cycle. After collecting some data and creating a list of codes through deductive and inductive approaches in first and second coding cycles, the third cycle of coding was conducted to seek theoretically elaborated codes that emerge from the data. With the basic framework of ACF consisting of a list of a priori code, a more detailed code under secondary beliefs category was created. For instance, subcategories of the legalization of TEPD, evaluation contents, evaluation methods, and consequences of evaluation were included. Another example is using the “individual freedom” vs. “social equity” code that was developed in second cycle coding. While analyzing data for the third round, the codes for the values that teachers focus on were captured: “autonomy” vs.
“professionalism” and placed under “teacher values” category. “Autonomy” is regarded as individual freedom for teachers in teachers’ point of view, whereas “professionalism” stands for putting more emphasis on social goods that is to teach students. Moreover, their roles as a teacher imply teachers are willing to or at least ready to sacrifice their individual freedom or autonomy.

Figure 4-3 shows an example of the codes used in the study. Some codes are colored to link with Figure 4-4 that displays relations among codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Teacher organizations influencing TEPD policy process</th>
<th>2. Align with ACF theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Belief systems</td>
<td>2.1. Lineup of allies and opponents stable over decade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1-A. Core beliefs</td>
<td>A. Yes  B. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Educational Values</td>
<td>2.2. Consensus on pertaining policy core, less so on secondary beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Educational Orientation</td>
<td>A. Yes  B. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student-oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-A. Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-B. Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-1-B. Policy Beliefs</th>
<th>3. External factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Implementation of TEPD</td>
<td>3-1. Relatively stable parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Pro</td>
<td>A. Basic attributes of problem area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Con</td>
<td>B. Fundamental sociocultural values and social structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1-C. Secondary Beliefs</td>
<td>3-2. External subsystem events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Legalization</td>
<td>A. Changes in socioeconomic conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Pro</td>
<td>B. Changes in public opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Con</td>
<td>C. Changes in systemic governing coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluation contents</td>
<td>3-3. Long-term coalition opportunity structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Morality</td>
<td>A. Degree of consensus needed for major policy change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Teaching</td>
<td>B. Openness of political system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Student advisory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluation methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Multidimensional evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(inclusion of students and parents as evaluators)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Principals, vice-principals, peer-teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Self-evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Consequences of evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Connect to personnel and remuneration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Professional development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Autonomous application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2. Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3. Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3-A. Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Legal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Illegal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Aggressive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4-3. Screenshot of Codes

To conduct coding activities, Microsoft Word, Hangul (Korean word program), and PDF programs were used. Many qualitative researchers use NVivo program for coding because it
provides useful services such as nodes and even creates a tree that displays relationships among codes. However, NVivo was not able to be used because all the collected data were in Korean and NVivo does not offer analysis for data written in Korean language. Therefore, this study used Word, Hangul, and PDF files for coding and generated a sheet through Microsoft Excel to create a list and categorized the data by title, dates of published, type, emerging themes, and main ideas of documents.

Data Display

Data display is “an organized, compressed assembly of information that allows conclusion drawing and action” (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014: 12), and the episodes of data display occur by charts, matrices, graphs, and networks. It provides an overall summarization that shows types and purposes of the data as well as relationships among codes and relationships among data. This section presents two displays to help understand the relations: a table of content-analytic matrix and a flow diagram that depicts relations among codes adapting from ACF.

Table 4-5 displays the matrix of content-analysis driven by codes. A content-analytic matrix is a table that “batches or brings together all related and pertinent data” (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014: 148) for exploratory analysis. Moreover, it not only helps clarify understanding of the relationships among codes, but also allows one to check issues such as oversimplifying or distorting of analysis. From belief systems category, the example displays policy beliefs and secondary beliefs. The changes in policy beliefs of KFTA are explicitly shown through the matrix and make easily observable the differences and disagreements among government, KFTA, and KTU on secondary beliefs.
Table 4-5. Example of Content-Analytic Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>KFTA</th>
<th>KTU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Policy Beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of TEPD</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con $\rightarrow$ Pro with conditions</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Secondary Beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Legalization</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>Con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Evaluation Contents</td>
<td>Include morality</td>
<td>Only instructional capacity</td>
<td>No need to evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Evaluation Methods</td>
<td>Multidimensional evaluation</td>
<td>Exclude students and parents</td>
<td>Self-evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Consequences of evaluation</td>
<td>Connect to personnel and remuneration/Professional development</td>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>Autonomous application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4-4 depicts relations of some of the codes in Figure 3-3 by adapting conceptual framework (i.e. ACF) of the study and it mainly shows three parts: policy subsystem, belief systems, and external factors. The codes that are colored are linked to some of the codes that are shown in Figure 4-3. First, the middle part of the figure is policy subsystem, the focus of the study. The colored are the sub-codes of ‘teacher organizations influencing TEPD policy process’ code (see Figure 4-3). Coalitions in policy subsystem are formed by shared beliefs and based on the beliefs and resources, the coalitions decide strategies to perform (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014). Then the government authorities make decisions on the policy. Coalitions aim to affect the decisions through their strategies. If the decisions are successfully made, then it moves on to legislating institutional rules and to policy outputs and policy impacts. However, as the arrows indicate, if any of the procedure did not work out, the policy process goes back to the top and it repeats the processes from influences of coalitions to governmental decisions.
Second, the right part of the figure describes three-tiered belief system and all three are shown in Figure 4-4 as well. As the belief systems are in the hierarchical structure, the broadest level is the deep core beliefs, which involve general ontological and normative assumptions about human nature (Sabatier & Weible, 2007). At the next level are policy core beliefs and these are applications of deep core beliefs. As policy core beliefs are bounded by topic to the policy subsystem, they have territorial and topical components (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014, p. 191). The last level is the secondary beliefs, which deal with specific instrumental means for obtaining desired outcomes in policy core beliefs.

Third, the left part of the figure displays external factors that interact with policy subsystems. It means that external factors not only influence coalitions in policy subsystem, but also the factors can be affected by changes in policy subsystems. All these are included as codes, which are displayed in Figure 4-3. There are three components of external factors: relatively stable parameters, external subsystem events, and long-term coalition opportunity structures. Relatively stable parameters include basic attributes of the problem area, fundamental sociocultural values and social structure, and basic constitutional structure. External subsystem events mean changes in socioeconomic conditions, public opinion, systematic governing coalition, and other policy subsystems. Long-term coalition opportunity structures are a degree of
major consensus needed for major policy change, the openness of the political system, and overlapping societal cleavages. For example, the case that external factor influencing coalitions in policy subsystem can be the elections resulting in changes in the leadership of coalitions and probably funding. Conversely, actions made by coalitions can affect changes in public opinion on the policy.

Limitations

Validity and reliability are two factors that qualitative researchers should be concerned about during processes of designing the study, collecting and analyzing the data, and judging the quality of the study (Golafshani, 2003; Patton, 2002). Validity and reliability can be expressed with other terminologies such as dependability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 300), trustworthiness, quality, rigor (Golafshani, 2003, p. 602), and this implies they are not separated but interrelated. One of the strategies to improve validity and reliability is triangulation.

Most qualitative researchers are expected to draw upon document analysis in combination with other qualitative methodologies (Denzin, 1970) such as interviews and observations (Yin, 1994) for triangulation purposes – the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon (Denzin, 1970, p. 291). However, triangulation does not only refer to using multiple methodologies, but also using different data sources (Bowen, 2009; Bryman, 2012). Researchers attempt to provide a ‘confluence of evidence that breeds credibility’ (Eisner, 1991, p. 110) by triangulating data (Bowen, 2009; Neuendorf, 2017). Although this study solely depends on document analysis, this study tried to improve validity and reliability of documents by collecting data from solid and reliable data sources.

In addition, document analysis is constantly gaining its stance as a ‘stand-alone method’ in many qualitative studies (Bowen, 2009; Cho, 2008; Thomas, 2011). Although researchers
should guard against over-reliance on documents, there are studies that documents are the only reliable, necessary, and realistic data sources such as historical and cross-cultural research (Bowen, 2009; Merriam, 1988; Wild et al., 2009).

There are four additional strategies that the study used to reduce methodological issues and diminish limitations. First, the study went through two cycles of data gathering activities to improve validity and reliability of the data. Soon after the initial data collection, the study collected data that are targets of analysis and then several months later I went back to check if there are any data that was left out in the first cycle of data gathering. Second, the study used three cycles of coding for different reasons. After conducting initial coding with free coding and descriptive coding strategies, the study made a list of a priori codes. Then in the third cycle, the study elaborated the priori codes with emerging codes, which increased validity and reliability of the analysis. Third, the study was clarified by having constant conversations with critical colleagues. Verifying the analysis results to a third person is considered one of the strategies to improve validity (Cresswell, 2007). Fourth, the study used a checklist for evaluating documents from Bryman (2012, pp. 561-562) to raise the reliability of the collected data (see Appendix A). The examples from the checklist include verification of sources, the reason of production of the document, validity issue on the author of the document, and verification whether or not the document is genuine.

Summary of the Chapter

In accordance with the research questions that mainly examine the changes in belief systems of teacher organization affecting formation and changes in TEPD, this study undertook document analysis as the main research method for several reasons. First, document analysis is useful in analyzing background and contexts as well as tracking changes, which provide adequate
information that is essential to understanding the study. Second, documents, a type of qualitative data, are objective, reliable, and valid for the studies that aim to investigate the influence of belief systems in advocacy coalitions that reflect their positions on certain policy. Third, since document analysis is applicable for intensive qualitative studies that generate ample explanations, it enables the study to uncover not only the changes in policy subsystems in which advocacy coalitions posit but also exogenous factors that influence the changes in policy subsystems.

This study critically depends on documents from KFTA, KTU, and the government, which were all publicly accessible. The study is confined from 2004 – when the discussion around TEPD first arose – to 2016. The documents from teacher organizations include external documents (e.g. press releases that include statements and reviews, press conferences, collective bargaining, newsletters) and internal documents (e.g. internal announcements, briefing, propaganda materials, reference materials, newsletters). Governmental documents contain press releases, white papers, regulations, and manuals and guidelines for using TEPD.

By following the interactive model of data activities from Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014), this study uses four activities to conduct research: data collection, data condensation, data display, and drawing and verifying conclusions. First, data was collected, while condensing the data at the same time. Data collection took place for over eight-month period and divided into two cycles. Initial data gathering was to narrow down research questions, and most of the data that were used for analysis was collected in the first cycle. After, more data was collected for the second cycle to fill in data that might have omitted in the first cycle. Second, data condensation was conducted simultaneously with data collection. For additional data condensation, several strategies such as converting data format and creating folders to group data into categories were involved. Third, as a part of data condensation, the data was coded within three cycles. The first cycle included open coding and descriptive coding that allowed broad concepts to emerge. In the second cycle, a list of a priori codes was created from the conceptual framework, and the third
cycle engaged in coding based on grounded theory to develop codes from finding more emerging codes. Fourth, this chapter presented two data displays: a table of content-analytic matrix and a flow diagram, depicting the relations among codes that were adapted from the major concepts of ACF. Both table and diagram enhanced the relations within the codes and collected data.

Not all qualitative research is completely valid and reliable, which applies to this study as well. One of the frequently used strategies to improve validity and reliability is triangulation. Triangulation combines multiple methodologies. Although the study can be criticized because it only used document analysis as the sole methodology, the involvement of multiple data sources solves the criticism of infringing triangulation (Bowen, 2009; Bryman, 2012). In addition, document analysis is constantly gaining the stance of a stand-alone method (Bowen, 2009, p. 29; Cho, 2008; Thomas, 2011) and reputation of document analysis on exclusive usage. Moreover, the study used four strategies to enhance validity and reliability. The strategies involved two cycles of data collection, three cycles of coding, having conversations with the critical third person, and using a checklist (Bryman, 2012) for evaluating documents.
Chapter 5

Results

Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) explains the process of policy change through interactions between advocacy coalitions within a policy subsystem, which are often affected by external factors such as political and socioeconomic conditions. Altogether, these interactions between advocacy coalitions and exogenous factors vastly influence the decisions of the government (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 2007). Hence, the results and analysis of policy change are explained through the changes within the policy subsystem and external factors. In the policy subsystem model, two or more advocacy coalitions exist, and each coalition consists of individuals who share the same belief systems (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014).

As shown in Figure 5-1, the advocacy coalitions for the case of Teacher Evaluation for Professional Development (TEPD) or Gyo-won-neung-lyeog-gae-bal-pyeong-ga were generally divided into three over its history: an advocacy coalition for supporting TEPD, an advocacy coalition for supporting TEPD with conditions, and an advocacy coalition for opposing TEPD. This study focused on the principal coalition actors of these advocacy coalitions: the education ministry of each administration and two teacher organizations – Korean Federation of Teachers’ Associations (KFTA) or Han-gug-gyo-won-dan-che-chong-yeon-hab-hoe and Korean Teachers and Education Workers Union (KTU) or Jeon-gug-gyo-jig-won-no-dong-jo-hab. The education ministry was a supportive advocacy coalition; some scholars also included parent associations and scholar groups into groups as allies of the supportive advocacy coalition. (Cho, 2009; N.

---

Kang, 2013; Kim, Joo, & Park, 2009). However, as mentioned previously, this study emphasized the voices of principal coalition actors more (i.e., education ministry) and less so on auxiliary coalition actors (e.g., parent organizations, scholar groups). Thus, the education ministry represents the coalition that supports TEPD. With respect to the teacher organizations, KTU adhered to the opposing standpoint, whereas KFTA changed its positions on TEPD, depending on the details of the policy. Previous studies on ACF have shown that although allies and opponents of advocacy coalitions tend to be stable over time, it was not uncommon to go through periods of defection, in which membership changes occur within the advocacy coalitions (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Nohrstedt, 2005; Zafonte & Sabatier, 2004). Moreover, disagreement across policy core beliefs could result in the creation of a third advocacy coalition (Sabatier & Weible, 2007; Weible & Sabatier, 2005). This chapter further discusses the application of these concepts and analyses the applying such concept and analyzing KFTA case. In order to answer the research questions, the chapter focuses on three aspects. The three aspects are a) the changes in advocacy coalitions, belief systems, resources, and strategies, b) the influences from teacher organizations on policy formation and change processes of TEPD, and c) the external factors that influenced the policy subsystem.

Figure 5-1. Advocacy Coalition Composition of TEPD Policy Process
To answer the research questions, this chapter presents the findings by period of TEPD policy process. Accordingly, the chapter construes of six sections: a) the overview of the findings, b) the period of discussion and introduction of TEPD (2004-2007), c) the period of discussion on the implementation of TEPD (2008-2010), d) the period of post-implementation of TEPD, e) the external factors, and f) the summary of the chapter. The first section provides an overview of the findings, which serve as a roadmap to further discuss the analytic results. The next three sections present the findings of interactions between advocacy coalitions during each TEPD policy process period and findings of external factors that led to changes within the policy subsystem. Beliefs, resources, and strategies of advocacy coalitions are presented for each period.

Overview of the Findings

The study confines the period of analysis from 2004 to 2016, which can be divided into three major periods of TEPD policy process. As depicted in the Figure 5-2, the three periods are a) the period of discussing the introduction of the new teacher evaluation policy (2004-2006), b) the period of discussing the details for implementing TEPD (2007-2010), and c) the period of post-implementation of TEPD (2011-2016). The first period started the discussion by introducing TEPD in 2004 and ended with the finalization of the TEPD model in 2006. The second period involved the initiation of the pilot operation in 2007 to nationwide implementation of TEPD in 2010. The third period was the period of post-implementation of TEPD, in which the model was revised with the establishment of the Presidential decree in 2011 and the order in 2016.
Table 5-1 presents the overview of the findings. Each period involved administrations, several major events that pinpointed the change in policy process and organizations that were affiliated with the advocacy coalitions. Policy process of TEPD involved three administrations – Roh Moo-hyun administration (the Roh administration hereafter), Lee Myung-bak administration (the Lee administration hereafter), and Park Geun-hye administration (the Park administration hereafter) – that led to the introduction, implementation, and revision of TEPD.

The first period of TEPD policy process discussed the introduction of TEPD in relation to the Roh administration. Although the basic idea of introducing a new teacher evaluation policy to evaluate the teacher’s accountability was first mentioned in 1995, it was not until the Roh administration in 2004 that the introduction of TEPD was first discussed with specific plans to form and implement the policy. After initiating the discussion of introducing TEPD, the Roh administration executed pilot operations in 2005 and 2006 to converse and agree upon a model for TEPD. Moreover, the Roh administration announced advance notice of legalization in 2006 to build a legal basis for TEPD. The Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development (MEHRD) was the supportive advocacy coalition and teacher organizations - KFTA and KTU - were the opposition advocacy coalition during this period.
Table 5-1. Overview of the Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
<td>Roh Moo-hyun Administration</td>
<td>Roh Moo-hyun Administration Lee Myung-bak Administration</td>
<td>Lee Myung-bak Administration Park Geun-hye Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy Coalitions</strong></td>
<td>Supportive Opposition</td>
<td>Supportive Supportive with conditions Opposition Supportive Supportive with conditions Opposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizations</strong></td>
<td>MEHRD KFTA, KTU</td>
<td>MEST KFTA KTU MEST/ MOE* KFTA KTU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development (MEHRD); Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MEST); Ministry of Education (MOE); Korean Federation of Teachers’ Associations (KFTA); Korean Teachers and Education Workers Union (KTU)

* The name for the education ministry changed from MEST to MOE in 2013.
The second period of TEPD policy process involved two administrations – the Roh administration and the Lee administration. The Roh administration initiated the pilot operations in 2007 with the model that finalized during two pilot operations in 2005 and 2006. The Lee administration continued the execution of pilot operations for two more years in 2008 and 2009 prior to the nationwide implementation of TEPD in 2010. During this period, the government attempted to build a legal basis for TEPD prior to the nationwide implementation but failed to legalize TEPD due to strong oppositions and conflicting opinions from teacher organizations. Three advocacy coalitions appeared during this period: a supportive advocacy coalition, a supportive advocacy coalition with conditions, and an opposition advocacy coalition. Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MEST), KFTA, and KTU were affiliated with each advocacy coalition.

The third period of TEPD policy process was the period of post-implementation, which included the Lee administration and the Park administration. As the Lee administration failed to build the legal basis for implementing TEPD prior to the nationwide implementation of TEPD in 2010, the government constantly attempted to legalize TEPD to justify the implementation. As a result, the Lee administration established the Presidential decree in 2011 and the Park administration established the order in 2016. Moreover, the revisions took place every year during this period, including the 2015 reform, which was a triumph for the teacher organizations because their opinions were reflected upon the revisions. The same composition of advocacy coalitions continued in this period: supporting, supporting with conditions, and opposing advocacy coalitions. The supportive advocacy coalition involved the education ministry and changed its name from MEST to the Ministry of Education (MOE) in 2013. KFTA stayed in the conditionally supportive advocacy coalition that suggested changes in details for TEPD model, whereas KTU was affiliated to the opposition advocacy coalition, which constantly opposed the legalization and implementation of TEPD.
The sections below further expand the discussion on the influences of teacher organizations on policy process of TEPD. Moreover, each section delves into the changes of policy subsystem with advocacy coalitions and their belief systems, resources, and strategies by following the chronological sequence of major events that implicated causal relationships. External factors that affected changes in the policy subsystem are highlighted periods.


The following section addresses the period of discussing the introduction of TEPD that took place from 2004 to 2006. Each subsection enumerated the major events and described the dynamics between the advocacy coalitions followed by their belief systems, resources, and strategies of the advocacy coalitions. More emphasis is centered on teacher organizations since the goal of this study is to identify the influence of teacher organizations in the processes of TEPD formation and change.

A distinctive characteristic of this period included the attempts made to open communication between two advocacy coalitions. Throughout the policy processes of TEPD, supporting and opposition advocacy coalitions were in conflict. However, during this period, the Special Council was formed so that advocacy coalitions could meet, discuss and attempt to agree on details in regards to the TEPD plan. Attending the meetings by the Special Council is a great example of policy-oriented learning, a concept generated from the ACF. By attending meetings within the Special Council, advocacy coalitions conducted policy-oriented learning, which led to alternations of their own belief systems.

Teacher organizations allied and affiliated with the opposition advocacy coalition during this period. Although their deep core beliefs were different, their policy core beliefs appeared to be the same, which resulted in the formation of allies during this period. In addition, teacher
organizations formed a task force team to stand against the introduction of a new teacher evaluation policy. There were few varieties in terms of resources and strategies during this period, but there were enough to oppose the introduction of a new teacher evaluation policy.

**Major Events from 2004 to 2006**

The five major events that were accountable for this period were a) the initiation of the discussions for introducing a new teacher evaluation policy (2004), b) the announcement of draft plans (2004-2005), c) the formation of the Special Council (2005), d) the execution of pilot operations for selecting a single model of TEPD (2005-2006), and e) the advance notice of legalization (2006). This is the period when discussions on a new teacher evaluation, which later became the TEPD, were introduced. The discussion was unilaterally initiated by the government, which did not involve opinions of the teacher organizations. Thus, teacher organizations protested vehemently against introducing a new teacher evaluation policy, soon after the discussions were initiated. The government announced draft plans, disregarding opposition from teacher organizations. However, as the protest became aggressive, the government attempted to consider opinions from teacher organizations and created the Special Council that involved leaders from the stakeholder groups. Despite disagreements among the teacher organizations, the government executed pilot operations to select a single model of TEPD and announced advance notice of legalization. The following sections describe the five major events that showed an outbreak of severe conflicts between two advocacy coalitions – supportive advocacy coalition and opposition advocacy coalition.
As discussed in the previous chapter, discussions about implementing TEPD was invigorated as a call for involving accountability of teachers. The actions of the government, advocating an introduction of a new teacher evaluation policy for teacher accountability, derived from perceived public needs and the suggestion from OECD advisory group. As consequence of the prevalence of shadow education, public education and quality of teachers were questioned. Moreover, the visit from OECD advisory group suggesting reforms in teacher evaluation policy brought up the discussion of introducing a new teacher evaluation policy. However, the very first discussion about the need for a new teacher evaluation policy that accounts for educational outcomes derived from a decade before in 1995 from the so-called 5.31 reform. Nevertheless, it was not until 2004 that this new call for teacher evaluation policy gained valid interest in Korea through motivations derived both locally and globally.

On February 2, 2004, the Minister of Education, Science, and Technology Ahn Byung-young announced implementing a new teacher evaluation (later named TEPD in 2006), which triggered the acceleration of strife between the government (i.e., supportive advocacy coalition) and teacher organizations (i.e., opposition advocacy coalition). Attending a conference to accelerate the normalization of school education, the Minister of Education, Science, and Technology Ahn Byung-young (Feb. 2, 2004) declared as follows:

“We will introduce a competitive system to the teaching profession to improve teacher quality. Teachers are the wellsprings of public education, so by introducing the system, teachers can keep up the tension and develop themselves in regards to teaching students” (PCPP, 2008, p. 12).

The gist of the announcement was to reinforce public education. In other words, it was a promise from the government that they would no longer tolerate unqualified teachers and schools. As one of the means of normalizing public education, he mentioned the introduction of new teacher evaluation (PCPP, 2008). This announcement shocked the educational world, including
teacher organizations, because it was the first announcement from the government’s head of education that explicitly expressed a strong will to implement a new teacher evaluation policy. In accordance with the statement at the conference, the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MEST) announced a promotion plan for teacher evaluation as a part of the Shadow Education Expenses Reduction Plan.

The announcement of draft plans (2004-2005)

Prior to pilot operation, MEST suggested three draft plans (i.e. April 23, 2004; December 29, 2004; and May 2, 2005) and accordingly, there was a deep conflict between the two advocacy coalitions. The supporting coalition firmly continued to develop draft plans and disregarded opposition from the counterpart. However, the details of the plans, as well as basic directions, were altered, which was different from the original intent due to continuous objections of the opposition advocacy coalition (i.e., teacher organizations). The opposition from teacher organizations greatly influenced the governmental decisions because teachers are the main agents who are directly related to the policy. If teachers do not accept the newly implemented policies, there is a high chance of the new policy to fail (PCPP, 2008).

After announcing the new teacher evaluation policy, MEST formed a task force team on March 11th of 2004 and held a public hearing for establishing reform plan of personnel policy of teachers on April 23rd of 2004. The public hearing aimed at discussing teacher evaluation policy in relation to personnel system around implementing a new teacher evaluation policy until early 2005. The public hearing was defeated by KTU; as a result, KTU released a statement in response to the remarks that were made from the Minister of MEST. The statement asserts the following three points:
“As we KTU have stressed several times, introducing a new teacher evaluation policy is a very sensitive problem so that it will be difficult to produce actual results if there is no prudent approach with sufficient discussions. Thus, we KTU define our standpoint as follows:

First, as the additional teacher evaluation on top of the existing teacher evaluation policy, Teacher Evaluation for Performance (TEP) or Geun-museong-jeog-pyeong-jeong puts an extra burden on the teachers. …

Second, evaluating teachers but not considering the entire teaching context is a new type of means that controls teachers. …

Third, we should not underestimate the limit and danger of multidimensional evaluation. … If the government starts a multidimensional evaluation regardless of the problems, parents cannot help evaluating teachers only with visible outcomes such as the results from National College Entrance Exam (NCEE) of their students. Eventually, there is a high chance of new teacher evaluation policy to degenerate into pressure method to raise test scores…” (KTU press release, June 4, 2004).

Consequently, due to strong resistance from teacher organizations, MEST attempted to consult with teacher organizations to ask for an agreement, “which was already retreated from the initial intent” (PCPP, 2008, p. 18). The task force team found by MEST revised the plan to separate the existing TEP from the new teacher evaluation, in which the original intent was to reform existing promotion policies. In addition, the team agreed on a gradual reform and review to weed out unqualified teachers apart from this new policy. Moreover, they decided to open the venue for discussion to include students and parents as evaluators. MEST attempted to consult with teacher organizations, but they clarified their stance, opposed the introduction of a new teacher evaluation policy, and expressed their concerns and doubts on “using the evaluation result negatively” and “possibility of relating compensation and system of qualification” (PCPP, 2008, p. 18).

Although consulting with teacher organizations failed, MEST proceeded with revising a draft plan for a new teacher evaluation policy. In August 2004, MEST asked three academic
associations – the Korean Educational Research Association (KERA), the Korean Educational Administration Society (KEAS), and the Korean Society for Educational Evaluation (KSEE) – to perform a policy research for reforming teacher evaluation policy. As a result, MEST announced the revised draft plan on December 29th of 2004, which eventually provided a basis for TEPD.

The key points of the draft plan are as follows:

1. The main purpose is to develop teachers’ expertise, which focuses on improving instructional capacity.

2. Not only teachers but also principals and vice-principals are also the targets of evaluation.

3. School administrators, peer teachers, as well as parents and students should participate in the evaluation process.

4. Each school should have an organization exclusively for teacher evaluation and should be operated in accordance with the situation of each school.

<Press release from MEST, December 29, 2004>

Figure 5-4. Main Issues presented at the Public Hearing for the TEPD Draft Plan

KFTA criticized MEST for introducing a new teacher evaluation policy with more haste than caution by releasing a statement on the same day of the public hearing. KFTA argued that teacher evaluation policy should not be approached with “populism” (KFTA press release, December 29, 2004). KFTA stated that they were “not against the evaluation policy itself”, but they were against the teacher evaluation policy that was propelled through “media manipulation.” The organization said that the government was “aggravating distrust in teachers and putting too much weight on education consumer theory that neglects features of education so that misleading education into commercialization” (KFTA press release, December 29, 2004).

Disregarding strong resistance from teacher organizations, MEST, however, attempted to release a revised plan for teacher evaluation in February 2005. In this plan, MEST settled two
points: a) the new teacher evaluation result can only be used for developing teacher ability and
should not relate to personnel and b) supporting measures should be strengthened for the teachers
who are in need of professional development. Both teacher organizations strategically confronted
MEST by convening the ad-hoc committee, holding press conferences, and releasing statements.

MEST pushed ahead and planned to open another public hearing three months later, on
May 3rd of 2005, to release a draft plan for improving teacher evaluation policy. MEST invited
leaders of the teacher organizations, but the leaders refused to attend the public hearing and KTU,
in particular, illegally occupied the building, which caused law enforcement to become involved.
This incident led KTU to express their regret toward the incidences that occurred at the public
hearing through a press release:

“Although the public hearing on May 3rd was supposed to be a place for
discussion in regards to the teacher evaluation policy, MEST has announced that
they will unilaterally push the policy and announced nationwide implementation
through media on May 2nd.

… If the government is willing to resolve educational problems such as relieving
student stress from competition and funding schools to update the educational
system from the “backward school setting [geo-ku ro kyo-shil],” the government
should stop this enforcement policy. In addition, the government should consult
with teacher organizations to ensure internal stability in public education” (KTU

As a response, the Minister of MEST asked for understanding and cooperation of
teachers through a letter (MEST, May 5, 2005).

Nevertheless, the resistance grew more intense as time elapsed. Teacher organizations
formed a joint task force (May 18, 2005) and held a joint press conference (May 23, 2005). On
the same day of the press conference, teacher organizations were engaged in a physical fight with
the police because they tried to submit the signed petition against the new teacher evaluation
policy to MEST. The petition included signatures from 254,800 teachers among 400,000 teachers
in Korea, which meant that 63 percent of teachers were opposed to the implementation of a new
teacher evaluation.
The Formation of the Special Council (June - November, 2005)

MEST formed a Special Council that aimed to discuss improvement in public education on June 3rd of 2005. Forming the Special Council, which included all advocacy coalitions, provided a platform for policy-oriented learning (Sabatier & Weible, 2007). Policy-oriented learning is defined as “enduring alternations of thought or behavioral intentions that result from experience and which are concerned with the attainment or revision of the precepts of the belief system of individuals or of collectives” (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014, p. 198). The 22 conferences and meetings within the Special Council were incidents in which KFTA and KTU acknowledged differences in their opinions in implementing a new teacher evaluation policy through policy-oriented learning.

The Rho Moo-hyun administration identified “a hidden intention of forming the Special Council” in a report that was published at the end of the regime, which directly expressed concerns toward non-cooperation of teacher organizations, implying that the decisions made by the government were possibly influenced by teacher organizations.

“The hidden intention of the government in forming the Special Council that consists of leaders from MEST, teacher organizations, and parents’ organizations stemmed from the new teacher evaluation policy. Teachers are the main agents and targets of this policy; thus, it is necessary to obtain the cooperation and support of teachers in order to guarantee that the policy would be taken into effect. In addition, the Special Council was especially formed due to the recognition of the chaos in the educational environment. Even though 250,000 out of 400,000 teachers are in opposition to the policy, there is still a high chance that the policy will be implemented at the school sites since the government will likely enforce the policy. Therefore, cooperative processes are necessary to secure the effectiveness of the policy even though the planning and execution portion may be difficult.” (PCPP, 2008, p. 36)

Teacher organizations showed mixed reactions to the formation of the Special Council. KFTA issued a press release and welcomed the idea of openly consulting with the government, which the council stated that “it seems a little late, but it is a natural and justifiable decision of the government to turn around the stance from a unilateral decision to a decision after consulting with
teacher organizations” (KFTA newsletter <Korean Education Newspaper>, June 20, 2005).

However, KTU members showed mixed reactions to the agreement during discussions with the Special Council – some welcomed the agreement while others remained skeptical and questioned whether their opinion would be reflected. (KTU newsletter <Education with Hope>, July 5, 2005).

The Special Council was valid from June 20, 2005 to November 3, 2005 when KTU suddenly changed their stance, and MEST strongly reacted and stated that they would execute a pilot operation even though there was no agreed consensus. Throughout the twenty-two meetings that took place within four and a half months, the Special Council could not draw a conclusion that was agreed upon by all organizations except for one. All organizations agreed to create another policy for the unqualified teacher matter and exclude from the TEPD policy. However, there were still disagreements on how or when the policy should be implemented.

The conflicts were heightened soon after the Minister of MEST issued a press release (August 3, 2005) on two issues: the policy for weeding out unqualified teachers would go into effect from September 1, 2005, and the first pilot operation for a new teacher evaluation policy would be executed during September 2005. The underlying intention of MEST in dealing with the plans for unqualified teachers was “to prevent teachers’ vague concerns at an early stage that the results of teacher evaluation will be used as a personnel purpose” (PCPP, 2008, p. 40). A day after the announcement, KFTA and KTU issued a joint statement as a joint task force and lodged a vehement protest on MEST's unilateral decision (Joint task force press release, August 4, 2005).

Due to disagreements on certain details of the draft plan, this joint task force was eventually dismissed. The disagreement heavily relied on whether the evaluation result should be only open to the principal or target teachers. However, the teacher organizations agreed that they opposed the immediate and rapid implementation of the new teacher evaluation policy without
caution. Differences between the two teacher organizations became more apparent as they disagreed on the pilot operation plans.

The execution of pilot operations for selecting a single model of TEPD (2005-2006)

The first two pilot operation was executed, even though the leaders of organizations in the Special Council could not unanimously agree on a decision. The second pilot operation, specifically, functioned as a trigger for KTU to fight back with strategies that were more aggressive. The two teacher organizations that formed a joint task force also had different stances in regards to the second pilot operation. As a result, the differences in opinion between the two organizations led to the separation of the joint task force.

The first pilot operation was executed during the second semester of 2005 in September, while the second pilot operation was executed in the first semester of 2006\(^\text{11}\). As noted in the previous section, MEST decided to unilaterally announce the execution of the first pilot operation in September 2005. Since then, teacher organizations fought back by releasing a joint protest statement. However, the government continued with the execution of the second pilot operation.

For the second attempt of the pilot operation, the Special Council allowed the pilot schools to choose between two plans because the council could not bridge the differences. However, the Special Council compromised and made some agreements with some components of the plan. They agreed on the purpose of the evaluation, targets, criteria and contents, evaluation methods, frequency of evaluation, and usage of results\(^\text{12}\). However, they disagreed on

\(^{11}\) The semester system in Korean K-12 education is largely divided into two. The first semester starts from March 2 and ends in mid or late July. After a summer break for about a month and a half, the second semester starts from September 1 and ends in February with a winter break for about a month from December to January and another short spring break in between February and March.

\(^{12}\) The Special Council agreed to the six components: purpose (i.e., enhancing instructional expertise), targets (i.e., teachers, principals, vice-principals), criteria and contents (i.e., lesson plan, lesson preparation,
the evaluator, formation of a committee for evaluation management, and the degree of access to the results. Consequently, the pilot schools were authorized to choose the model between the two plans, which contained components that were unanimously agreed upon.

MEST suggested Plan A, while the teacher organizations suggested plan B, in which principals and vice-principals should be excluded from the evaluation and committee for evaluation management. In addition, MEST supported opening the results to both the principal and target teacher, but teacher organizations disagreed in regards to the principal (MEST press release, Nov. 7, 2005). Teacher organizations were opposed to both ideas due to “extreme distrust” of the administrators (PCPP, 2008, p. 46). Moreover, both teacher organizations disagreed on the execution of the pilot operation.

Decisions that KTU made in regards to the strategies that they used to express their disapproval on executing pilot operations gave rise to an internal dissension among KTU members. KTU was strongly against the pilot operation, and on November 4, 2005, they announced that they chose to side with the collective movements for the legal vacation. Although legal, the damage could potentially be significant to students who were studying for the NCEE, the Korean equivalent to the American standardized tests for college admissions. However, on November 11, KTU announced that they would postpone the collective movement even though 71.4 percent of KTU members voted for the movement after acknowledging the public sentiment and concerns toward NCEE. This resulted in internal dissension among KTU members, which later resulted in ousting of KTU president, Lee Soo-il at the end of November (Yonhapnews, November 27, 2005). President Lee decided to hold back the collective movement as a strategy to appeal to public sentiment, but the members supported to proceed with the aggressive strategy teaching activities, and curriculum activities for teachers), evaluation methods (i.e., peer review, satisfaction surveys from students and parents), span of evaluation (i.e., once a year), and use of results (i.e., only used to improve professionalism but not on personnel purpose).
that could impede the decision of government by inflaming media attention. KTU demonstrated additional strategies such as issuing multiple press releases, holding press conferences, committing head shave strikes, visiting or threatening the model schools for pilot operation, and invading the office of Superintendent, while KFTA conducted a withdrawal movement for the Minister of Education as a strategy to go against MEST’s rush on executing pilot operations.

Due to the weakening of KTU allies, MEST seized the opportunity and pushed their plans forward by announcing that they would take strong disciplinary actions by the Government Officials Act for teachers who chose to participate in collective movements to support the legal vacation. In addition, the government announced that they would charge teachers or the organization for obstruction – if they chose to visit or call pilot schools. MEST used media to distribute publicity materials in hopes that they could use media to address any doubts and concerns among the teachers. Moreover, MEST held meetings, started workshops, and provided consulting to pilot schools in order to decrease negative awareness and form a consensus.

The government announced a revised plan to push forward with TEPD on October 20, 2006 after two announcements of the pilot operation results. On March 6, 2006, MEST presented the first results of the pilot operation. The results were criticized not only from KTU but also the media because of its hasty operation. The results from the second pilot operation were announced on September 26, 2006 at the Teacher Evaluation Policy Conference. The conference was considered to be successful even though KTU held a press conference in front of the building. KFTA made it clear that they agreed on the need for a new teacher evaluation policy, but they were against the enactment of the policy within that year. KTU was strict with their opinions and stated that they could not trust the results of the pilot operations, and teacher evaluation policy should be reexamined and discussed by returning to the starting point.

Leaders of the teacher organizations, parents’ organization, principal organization, scholars, and managers of model school evaluations attended the conference to share their
standpoints on five issues, which was later reflected in the TEPD plan. The five issues included a) principals and vice-principals’ participation in teacher evaluation as evaluators, b) parents and students’ participation as evaluators, c) time span for the evaluation to be once a year or once every three years; d) criteria of the evaluation to expand above instructional matters, and e) use of the evaluation results. The changes were reflected in the TEPD plan, which was announced on October 20, 2006, and based on the discussions from the conference. Principals, vice-principals, parents, and students were included as evaluators, in which the time span for the evaluations was once every three years and the criteria for the teacher evaluation included both instructional contents and student guidance. The results were used to write a self-report of professional development plans that included training. The issue was an enactment, a legal base for implementing TEPD.

**Advance notice of legalization (2006)**

Nationwide implementation of TEPD aligned with the government’s attempt on legalizing TEPD. In Korea, the government makes a policy and submits a bill to the National Assembly to make a legal basis (Yim, 2012). Although a policy can be implemented without a legal basis, legalization provides justification as well as authority and compulsion to implementation processes.

The conflicts around legalizing TEPD started on November 1, 2006 when MEST announced the advance notice of legalization. Government’s continuous effort to legalize TEPD began at this time as well. Once the Special Council was unable to reach a consensus, the government decided to announce the advance notice of legalization, disregarding the opposition from teacher organizations.
Teacher organizations immediately reacted to the government’s unilateral decision. KFTA announced a press release on November 15, 2006, that strongly opposed the government’s advance notice. KTU went on head shaving strikes and hunger strikes. In addition, KTU collectively decided on a one-day legal vacation on November 22, 2006. The government confronted KTU squarely and took disciplinary actions, such as reducing salaries, giving reprimands, and giving warnings. 436 teachers participated in the collective movements for the legal vacation, which was more than four times the number of teacher participation since 2000. However, the government did not succumb to the oppositions, and in December 2006, MEST submitted a legislative bill to the National Assembly.

Policy Subsystem

The advocacy coalitions in policy subsystem are formed with shared belief systems and attempt to influence the policy process through resources and strategies (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Sabatier, 1999). Thus, identifying advocacy coalitions and the organizations allied in the advocacy coalitions as well as their belief systems, resources, and strategies helps capture the influences of the advocacy coalitions on the policy process. In addition, investigating these components and comparing them by period identifies the changes in allies, belief systems, resources, and strategies of advocacy coalitions. Therefore, the section below provides the results of the analysis of the belief systems, resources, and strategies of advocacy coalitions to answer the first research question. Further, answers to the second research question are provided at the end of the section.
Advocacy coalitions

The key issues that accelerated conflicts between the two advocacy coalitions was the initiation of discussion on introducing the new teacher evaluation policy, the announcement of draft plans, the formation of the Special Council, execution of pilot operations, and the advance notice of legalization. The supportive advocacy coalition included MEHRD, whereas the opposition advocacy coalition involved both teacher organizations – KFTA and KTU.

During this period, two teacher organizations were attached to the same advocacy coalition, in which both organizations were against the sudden introduction of a new teacher evaluation policy and legalization of TEPD. Starting from the first discussion of introducing the new teacher evaluation policy, teacher organizations belonged to the same advocacy coalition that opposed the rapid and immediate implementation of a new teacher evaluation policy. This led to a creation of a joint task force between the two teacher organizations.

Belief systems

ACF presents a three-tiered hierarchical structure for belief systems: deep core beliefs, policy core beliefs, and secondary beliefs (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Sabatier & Weible, 2007). Deep core beliefs refer to basic orientations and fundamental beliefs that act as a lens to view the world, which suggest a general direction to multiple policies. Policy core beliefs involve a specific direction on an actual policy (i.e., pro or con), which contains strategies and order of priorities. Secondary beliefs contain instrumental means, in which the scope and direction of the two beliefs are much narrower – like specific rules for certain policies or detailed direction of strategies.
Beliefs systems of advocacy coalitions in relation to TEPD during 2004-2006 are presented in Table 5-2. First, deep core beliefs for the supportive advocacy coalition cherished student-oriented values, emphasized accountability of teachers, and aimed for reflecting the public opinions of the policies. The opposition advocacy coalition praised teacher-oriented values and emphasized teachers’ distinctive characteristics and professionalism, arguing those characteristics should be reflected in teacher policies. Second, the supportive advocacy coalition supported the introduction of the new teacher evaluation as their policy core belief. On the other hand, the opposition advocacy coalition was against the sudden, immediate, and rapid introduction of the new teacher evaluation policy. Third, the advocacy coalitions had four secondary beliefs: evaluators, open results from evaluations, the relation between TEPD and TEP, and legalization of TEPD. The supportive advocacy coalition believed principals, vice-principals, peer teachers, as well as students and parents should be included as evaluators. However, the opposition advocacy coalition was strongly against the idea of including principals, vice-principals, students, and parents as evaluators. Additionally, the supportive advocacy coalition agreed upon opening the results of the evaluation to the principals, whereas the opposition advocacy coalition disagreed on the matter. In terms of the relation between TEPD and TEP, MEHRD argued to create an independent policy for TEPD, but teacher organizations claimed to merge the two policies into one since creating another teacher evaluation policy (i.e., TEPD) would increase the burden of teachers. Lastly, the advocacy coalitions had opposite stance on the legalization of TEPD. The government supported the legalization, but the teacher organizations opposed the legalization.
### Table 5-2. Belief Systems of Advocacy Coalitions (2004-2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief systems</th>
<th>Supportive Advocacy Coalition</th>
<th>Opposition Advocacy Coalition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MEHRD</strong></td>
<td><strong>KFTA, KTU</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep core beliefs</td>
<td>• Student-oriented</td>
<td>• Teacher-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Emphasized accountability</td>
<td>• Emphasized distinctiveness,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accept the public opinion</td>
<td>professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy core beliefs</td>
<td>• Supported introduction</td>
<td>• Opposed to the sudden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the new teacher evaluation policy</td>
<td>and rapid introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the new teacher evaluation policy</td>
<td>of the new teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators</td>
<td>Principal, vice-principal, peer teachers, students and parents</td>
<td>• Opposed to including principal, vice-principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary beliefs</td>
<td>Open the result of evaluation</td>
<td>Close to the principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation between TEPD and TEP</td>
<td>Create an independent policy for TEPD</td>
<td>Merge two policies into one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legalization</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Resources

Advocacy coalitions need resources to link their beliefs to policy output. In other words, the advocacy coalitions attempt to influence the policy process with resources and perform actions through strategies they planned (Sabatier, 1999). The types of resources suggested by ACF include legal authority, public opinion, information, mobilizable troops, financial resources, and skillful leadership (Sabatier & Weible, 2007; Weible & Sabatier, 2005). Advocacy coalitions, during this period, possessed multiple resources. Teacher organizations, although they were affiliated to the same advocacy coalition, showed differences in their resources.

First, the resources of supportive advocacy coalition (i.e., MEHRD) were legal authority, public opinion, information, and leadership. As the government-affiliated organization, MEHRD
had legal authorities not only to make decisions on policy-related matters such as executing pilot operations and announcing advance notice of legalization but also take disciplinary actions to the opposition advocacy coalition. Moreover, the government provided information to the media, and through media, they were able to convey their message to the public to gain support for their stance. Furthermore, the government was able to enforce the plans to implement the new teacher evaluation regardless of a unanimous agreement from other policy stakeholders.

Second, the membership of KFTA and KTU provided, large numbers of mobilizable troops that greatly affected the TEPD policy processes. Each teacher organization shared the press release or reports of their opponent groups – the government and parent union – when the materials were constant with their beliefs. More than half of the total teachers in Korea are members of either KFTA or KTU, suggesting strong human resources (Presidential Education Reform Advisory Committee [PERAC], 2008). These human resources were effective especially with signature-seeking campaigns and nationwide large-scale protests. The government could not neglect the fact that when more than half of teachers are against the policy, then the likelihood of policy failure is predictable.

Third, KTU experienced a change in leadership during this period. On November 27th of 2005, the president of KTU voluntarily resigned because more than half of KTU members disagreed with the strategies suggested by the president of KTU. The president strategically postponed the collective movement to appeal to public sentiment, but more than half of the members wanted to pursue the plan. This internal dissension on the president’s strategy resulted in a change of leadership. Three months later, the newly elected president of KTU conducted and pursued more aggressive and intense strategies compared to the previous president. Skillful leadership that supported aggressive strategies affected the decisions of MEHRD and delayed the implementation and legalization of TEPD.
Strategies

Advocacy coalitions had their most severe conflicts during the introduction, implementation, and legalization of TEPD. These conflicts necessitated the implementation of various strategies to appeal to others. First, this study has shown that the two advocacy coalitions used different strategies. The intensity of strategies can be roughly divided into two: less intense and aggressive. Less intensive strategies refer to the strategies that involve words rather than actions whereas aggressive strategies involve more intense and collective actions. Examples of less intensive strategies include issuing statements through press releases, conferences, and newsletters. Aggressive strategies include protests, collective movements, rallies, strikes, joint task forces, and authoritative disciplinary actions by the government.

Second, the results suggest that the types and intensity of strategies that organizations used can vary by organization, though affiliated in the same advocacy coalition. KFTA tend to use more intensive strategies than KTU. For instance, KTU's strong resistance appeared after MEST unilaterally announced the execution of pilot operations. Although KTU also used less intensive strategies, they went on hunger strikes, shaving strikes, and collective movements to convey their disagreement with governmental decision. Unlike KTU, KFTA did not use these strategies to show their dissatisfaction against the government because they believed that they were professionals who should keep their dignity.

Third, the advocacy coalitions used less intensive strategies (e.g., press release, press conference) at first, but increasingly used aggressive strategies (e.g., strikes, collective movements, joint task force, impeding public hearing) during the later stage. The results showed that teacher organizations used aggressive strategies when the government did not reflect their argument. Moreover, the teacher organizations strategically attracted attention from the media to create issues and delay the decisions of the government. For instance, KTU used media, which is
considered to be an aggressive strategy, to highlight their opinions (e.g., hunger strikes or head shaving strikes).

The government adopted a carrot-and-stick approach to conciliate teacher organizations by partially accepting their stances but firmly continuing the process of implementing the new policy. For instance, one example of using the “carrot” approach was forming the Special Council to open venues for conversations that included the opposition advocacy coalition. On the other hand, taking disciplinary actions (e.g., reducing salaries, giving reprimands, and giving warnings) to the teachers who participated in the collective movements and adhering to their intended direction regardless of the opposition were performed as the “stick” approach by the government.

Nevertheless, teacher organizations constantly and fiercely expressed their resistance to the new policy from a less intense (e.g., press release and statement) to a more aggressive strategy (e.g., illegal invasion of the public hearing held by MEHRD, forming a joint task force, and submitting signed petition). Consequently, the government sensed strong opposition from teachers and formed a Special Council that is composed of leaders from MEHRD, teacher organizations, and parents’ organization. Teacher organizations, in fact, did affect the modification of the government’s draft plans of the new teacher evaluation policy.

The transition of the intensity of strategies performed by advocacy coalitions, from less intense to aggressive, can be better understood when viewed chronologically. First, as shown in Table 5-3, teacher organizations affiliated with the opposition advocacy coalition formed a joint task force to effectively and strategically relay their opinions in implementing a new teacher evaluation policy. On one hand, KFTA opened a forum on February 26, 2004, to gather opinions on the new policy by inviting KFTA members and educational scholars (KFTA press release, Feb. 26, 2004). In the forum, KFTA agreed to present the preceding conditions, which is to include teachers’ voice in the policy formation process. On the other hand, KTU released a statement about the announcement of the Minister of Education. KTU stated that “unreasonable
evaluation may harm the stability of teaching profession which leads to decreasing the quality of education” (PCPP, 2008, p. 12). Both teacher organizations expressed their opinions on banning the introduction of a new teacher evaluation policy by opening forums and publishing newsletters and statements as main strategies.

Second, prior to pilot operations, MEST announced three draft plans. This was the period when the newsletters and documents published by advocacy coalitions were the highest in numbers. In relation to the draft plans, the main arguments were a) whom to include as evaluators and b) setting relationships between a new teacher evaluation policy (i.e., TEPD) and existing teacher evaluation policy (i.e., TEP). In the end, regardless of resistance from teacher organizations, MEST included principals and vice-principals as evaluators. Students and parents were also included in the evaluation but teacher organization’s strong opposition was taken into a consideration so that students and parents participate in the evaluation process through satisfaction surveys. In addition, although there was controversy in regards to the relationship between TEPD and TEP, the government decided to maintain TEP as it is and create a new policy for TEPD because each evaluation had a different purpose.

Third, the formation of the Special Council comprising of leaders from teacher organizations, parents’ organization, and MEST, was an attempt by the government to consult with related policy stakeholders. Through 22 meetings within the council, KFTA and KTU identified differences starting with the issue of opening the evaluation results to principals. In other words, participating in the council meetings functioned as a policy-oriented learning tool for both teacher organizations that they used to strengthen their stances. However, both teacher organizations showed much more similarities since they both were against the rapid implementation and legalization.
Fourth, execution of pilot operations caused the most ferocious oppositions from KTU. KFTA’s stance at this stage was they assent to the need of introducing a new teacher evaluation policy that solely aims at improving teachers’ capacity. What they were against was the legalization of TEPD within that year. Thus, KFTA did not oppose the idea of executing pilot operations. However, this was a different case for KTU that strongly resisted and denied the need for a new teacher evaluation policy itself. KTU framed this issue as a matter of life and death,

### Table 5-3. Strategies of Advocacy Coalitions (2004-2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Events</th>
<th>Strategies of Supportive Advocacy Coalition</th>
<th>Strategies of Opposition Advocacy Coalition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussing the introduction of the new teacher evaluation policy (2004)</td>
<td>• Issued press releases • Opened a public hearing</td>
<td>Occupied the public hearing held by MEHRD*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement of draft plans (2004-2005)</td>
<td>• Issued press releases • Opened a forum</td>
<td>• Created and attended a joint task force • Announced joint statement • Submitted signed petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Council (2005)</td>
<td>Formed the Special Council</td>
<td>Attended the Special Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execution of pilot operations (2005-2006)</td>
<td>Enforced the execution of pilot operations</td>
<td>Issued press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance notice of legalization (2006)</td>
<td>• Announced the advance notice of legalization • Took disciplinary actions (reducing salaries, giving reprimands, and giving warnings)</td>
<td>Issued press release</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher organizations published newsletters throughout the period; *indicate an illegal strategy
which led to actions that are more aggressive. They visited and threatened principals of model schools, occupied the Superintendent’s office, and shaved their hairs. Nevertheless, the government maintained a firm stance on implementing TEPD so that they continued with pilot operations.

Lastly, the strategies became more aggressive soon after MEHRD announced the advance notice of legalization in 2006. Two teacher organizations were strongly against the legalization of TEPD. KFTA immediately issued a press release to express their strong opposition on legalizing TEPD. KTU performed more aggressive maneuvers than KFTA. KTU went on collective movements to take legal vacation, head shaving strikes, and hunger strikes. MEHRD, however, took disciplinary actions such as reducing salaries, giving reprimands, and giving warnings to the teachers who participated in the collective movements.

**Answers to Research Question 2**

Research question (RQ hereafter) 2 with two sub-questions discussed whether or not the case of TEPD is aligned to the core postulates of advocacy coalition from ACF. RQ 2-1 dealt with the constitution change in advocacy coalitions, and RQ 2-2 referred to the substantial agreement on policy core beliefs and less agreement on secondary beliefs among policy actors within advocacy coalitions. First, answers to RQ 2-1 should be discussed later with much evidence. RQ 2-1 referred to the likelihood of stabilized advocacy coalition in regards to the constitution over a period of ten years or more. However, the findings from this period (2004-2006) do not provide sufficient evidence whether or not the advocacy coalitions of TEPD policy subsystem because this section presented results from only three years of the policy process. Thus, the answers to RQ 2-1 should be considered later with more evidence.
Second, the case of KTU corroborated the assumption of RQ 2-2. RQ 2-2 asked whether or not the policy actors within advocacy coalitions show substantial consensus on pertaining to policy core beliefs. In November 2005, KTU showed the evidence for a subdivision within their organization due to internal dissension. More specifically, the case of KTU could be interpreted as having disagreements across components of secondary belief, especially having dissension on the strategy they wanted to perform. The president of KTU postponed the collective movement as a strategy to appeal for public approval, even though more than half of the members of KTU disagreed to postpone the strike. This provoked internal dissension and led to the ousting of the president. The case of KTU correlated and aligned with the hypothesis, in which the policy actors within a coalition could have disagreements on secondary beliefs but substantial consensus on policy core beliefs (i.e., opposing to the implementation of a new teacher evaluation policy).

The Period of Discussing the Details for Implementing TEPD (2007-2010)

TEPD was implemented nationwide starting from March 2010. Discussions prior to nationwide implementation seemed endless due to strong resistance from teacher organizations. Although teacher organizations were against executing pilot operations, the government pressed ahead with the pilot operations and announced nationwide implementation regardless of strong opposition. Pilot operations were executed every year since the first operation took place in 2006. This section contains dynamics among three advocacy coalitions for three pilot operations – 2007, 2008, and 2009 – and nationwide implementation in 2010.

Regardless of severe conflicts among the advocacy coalitions, two major elements propelled nationwide implementation of TEPD after seemingly endless discussions. One was a strong enforcement by the government, and the other was the change in KFTA’s stance on TEPD. The election of a new president in KFTA brought the change in their belief system and influenced
a shift in their stance. After KFTA changed their stance from disagreement to agreement on implementing TEPD, KFTA urged that nationwide implementation of TEPD should be preceded by the legalization of the policy. Regardless of the government’s continuous effort to legalize TEPD, building a legal basis for TEPD was unachievable prior to nationwide implementation of TEPD due to strong oppositions from KTU.

The section includes three major findings. First, although strong opposition from KTU, KFTA’s change in their stance led to the implementation of TEPD nationwide in 2010. This indicates a change in the constitution of advocacy coalitions. The discussion period involved three advocacy coalitions. KFTA shifted their frames and emphasis on TEPD; for instance, KFTA opposed the implementation of TEPD in the previous period, but then changed to oppose the hasty implementation of TEPD. Later, KFTA framed TEPD as a duplicate and wasteful evaluation and suggested conditions to the government would need to satisfy in order for them to support the implementation of TEPD. Moreover, KFTA suggested conditions that would improve working conditions and build a legal ground precedent to the implementation. Second, this period also showed evidence of subdivision of a coalition advocacy from internal dissension of KFTA. Change in the stance of KFTA was not a unanimous consent but a unilateral decision by the leadership group. Third, both teacher organizations influenced the policy process of TEPD by positioning themselves in different stances. The government enforced their plans regardless of KTU’s opposition due to KFTA’s support on TEPD implementation. However, KFTA was conditional, and they asked to build a legal basis prior to TEPD implementation. The condition suggested by KFTA could not be fulfilled due to KTU’s opposition. Confrontation from KTU influenced alteration in detailed plans of the government; MEST was not able to build a sufficient legal basis for TEPD implementation.
Major Events from 2007 to 2010

The following section describes three pilot operations in 2007, 2008, and 2009 and nationwide implementation that occurred in 2010. In addition, the section includes the interactions among advocacy coalitions on the matter of legalizing TEPD. Pilot operations during this period were different from the ones executed during the previous period. Previous pilot operations were to finalize the TEPD model, whereas the pilot operations during this period were to seek a room for improvement prior to the nationwide implementation of TEPD. Although the opposition advocacy coalition strongly resisted, the government successfully implemented TEPD due to the advocacy coalition that supported the conditional implementation. The condition referred to the legalization of TEPD prior to implementation. However, legalization was not successful due to the resistance of the opposition advocacy coalition.

Pilot operations of TEPD (2007-2009)

Teacher organizations continued their strong resistance on executing pilot operations after the announcement of TEPD plan in October 2006. Teacher organizations held press conferences and occupied public hearings hosted by the government. Nonetheless, MEST persisted with strongly enforcing the execution of pilot operations with the confirmed plan. Moreover, MEST announced that they would legalize TEPD starting from 2007. Consequently, teacher organizations fiercely resisted the decisions of the government through more aggressive strategies as the government pushes the implementation of TEPD forward.

On February 16th of 2007, the government announced to execute the pilot operations in the school year of 2007 with 506 selected schools. Therefore, teachers in the pilot schools were evaluated with the new model. KFTA and KTU published a press release and held a press
conference to express their opposition on the pilot operations. Both organizations feared the implementation of TEPD because the government gradually expanded the pilot operations by involving more schools. KTU stated as follows through a press conference on January 31, 2007:

“TEPD instigates competition among teachers and reinforces regulations by individualizing teachers. In the end, the results of TEPD will be used to restructure teachers by relocating teachers and/or firing us. We are against TEPD because it suppresses teachers’ autonomy and it does not help us develop professionally.”

KTU expressed their distrust in implementing TEPD and stated that the results of the evaluation may be used for personnel purposes even though the government promised that the results would be used only for professional development. In addition, the statement revealed the KTU’s emphasis on teachers’ autonomy and cooperation among teachers.

While KTU retained their strong opposition to both implementing TEPD and executing pilot operations, since 2007, KFTA’s stance started to change as the new president of KFTA was elected. KFTA’s press releases prior to 2007 consistently conveyed their strong opposition to the implementation of TEPD. However, starting from February 2007, KFTA started to use the following phrase, which implied their change in their position of implementing TEPD: “KFTA, as a professional teacher organization, agree in principle of the intent of TEPD.”

KFTA’s positioning in implementing TEPD started to show an incremental change in 2007. KFTA consistently opposed the speedy implementation of TEPD, but did not create a stance of outright opposition. Starting from this moment, KFTA placed themselves in a good position to win the political battle of attrition. KFTA framed the issue by opposing the hasty implementation of the policy and strategically waited for the measure to be weakened and delayed until the government grew weary. The press release published by KFTA on February 20, 2007 revealed their emphasis on democratic procedures when selecting schools for pilot operations.
“The success of TEPD should be preceded by democratic procedures such as collecting opinions from the school setting and asking for prior consent from teachers. ... However, the selection process for pilot schools was not democratic because it happened during January when schools were on vacation, which made it difficult to gather opinions from teachers. In addition, the selection process of the government was done only with the principal, which indicated there was a lack of discussions and consensus.”

During pilot operations in 2007, both teacher organizations expressed their opposition by putting out press releases and holding press conferences. However, as the government firmly retained their position in implementing TEPD as well as legalizing the policy, strategies of teacher organizations became more aggressive. For instance, both KFTA and KTU participated in protests and KTU, in particular, went on an all-night demonstration in June 2007. Even though the protest was illegal, the government pushed their plans ahead to expand pilot operations.

After the pilot operations were finished in November 2007, the government held a forum at the end of November 2007 to discuss operation results. In the forum, the government announced to expand the number of schools that would participate in pilot operations in 2008. While KFTA and KTU pursued their opposition with aggressive strategies, MEST accelerated the execution of the pilot operation by holding another forum. The forum held on December 26, 2007 was to introduce best practice cases of 2007 pilot operations. It was a forum to share case studies that represented the operation of individual classrooms and cases of processing system via online and offline.

Two more pilot operations were executed after 2007 before the nationwide implementation in 2010. Pilot schools expanded from 506 schools in 2007 to 669 schools in 2008. In 2009, the government expanded even more, and 1,570 schools were executed for pilot operations of TEPD (MEST, 2010). The government was prepared for nationwide implementation of TEPD as pilot operations were executed. Although the implementation was delayed due to KTU’s fierce resistance, the government strongly enforced the expansion of pilot operations, which led to implementing TEPD in the end.
Nationwide implementation of TEPD (2010)

Nationwide implementation of TEPD was possible due to the change in KFTA’s stance to support TEPD. Throughout the period of pilot operations from 2007 to 2009, MEST pushed ahead with the plan to implement TEPD by holding forums and expanding the size of the pilot operation despite opposition from teacher organizations. Moreover, KFTA changed from their negative stance on implementing TEPD to accepting the agreement, which led to a nationwide implementation of TEPD in 2010. During this period, KFTA shifted their emphasis to the problems of TEPD not the implementation of the TEPD itself. They could not fully support the implementation of TEPD because they believed the TEPD policy was redundant of previous policies. They suggested improving working conditions of teachers in return for their support in the implementation of TEPD.

On October 24th of 2008, MEST announced that TEPD would be implemented nationwide starting from March 2010 at the National Assembly’s administrative inspections and briefing. As a response to the announcement, KFTA announced a statement on the same day through a press release and stated that they were ready to embrace the implementation of TEPD, however, under certain conditions:

“We, KFTA, declare that it is time to consider the implementation of TEPD positively only when the government offers a rational solution for redundant teacher evaluations and suggests a blueprint for enhancing education.

... KFTA view that it is now the time to end conflicts on implementing TEPD, which was nothing but a wasteful debate among government, parent associations, teacher organizations, and political sphere. Indeed, 500,000 teachers in Korea have no reason to turn away from teacher evaluations after putting effort into fostering younger generations with pride and professionalism.

... However, we strongly urge that it is pivotal to have sufficient discussions with teacher organizations before implementing TEPD. Moreover, the government should be aware of the danger in connecting TEPD with teacher personnel policy. TEPD should not be used for personnel purposes as the government had promised several times.
... Therefore, KFTA will consider implementing TEPD in a positive manner when the issue of duplication with other teacher evaluations are solved and the government improves conditions in an education setting. Moreover, the government should consider the school setting and the importance of teacher personnel policy. Furthermore, KFTA will consider positively of the implementation of TEPD when TEPD is discussed after conducting research on public and parent opinion.”

In 2009, TEPD was considered to be one of the major government projects even after a change of political regimes (i.e., the conservative party seized power). It is typical that when a different party comes into power, very few of the previous party’s reforms were retained. However, the case of TEPD showed a contrasting result to such norm. It indicated a deep support for the ideology behind the reform. Moreover, it can be interpreted as a strategic move for the new party that aimed to approach populism since the public supported the reform of the teacher evaluation policy. After the Lee administration took over power, MEST conducted a survey with the total number of 1,013 (500 teachers and 513 citizens over the age of 19) in March 2009. MEST reported on March 23rd of 2009 that 63% teachers and 76.3% citizens assented to the implementation of TEPD. Moreover, 55.2% teachers and 81.3% teachers answered that TEPD would improve feedback among the school education systems.

As soon as the government announced the survey results, teacher organizations criticized MEST and stated that they used surveys that empowered their positions. KFTA published a newsletter on March 30th of 2009, questioning the government’s intention to announce such survey results. KFTA was against the hasty implementation of TEPD, thus, the organization, sensing a rapid change in policy process after the regime change, criticized the announcement of the government. In the newsletter, KFTA expressed regret with the following:

“Survey results can vary by the characteristics of the sample population. In addition, we can learn from the previous surveys that survey results that can be framed by the conducted institute’s intention. ... Thus, it is a pity that the government is trying to use the survey results as a means to put out the opposition from the teachers.”
MEST once again expressed their strong will to enforce their plans to proceed with nationwide implementation of TEPD. On July 20th of 2009, the Minister of Education, Ahn Byung-man announced that TEPD would be implemented nationwide starting from March 2010 regardless of whether TEPD gains legal basis or not (MEST, 2010). Policy without legal basis was acceptable, but its legitimacy could be questioned. In addition, the government could not force the policy to be implemented in real settings because they did not have authority. However, the government pushed the implementation forward because they have discussed the policy for some time, and based on their judgment, it was necessary to implement the policy by force or TEPD would never be implemented (MEST, 2010).

The fractures in agreement within the opposition advocacy coalition led to the implementation of TEPD. It was KFTA that changed their stance on TEPD, while KTU remained opposed to the implementation of TEPD by publishing newsletters, committing protests, putting out press releases, and holding press conferences. KFTA changed their position from opposition to agreement on the nationwide implementation of TEPD. On April 23rd of 2009, KFTA expressed their regret on MEST’s unilateral announcement on nationwide implementation of TEPD. However, three months later, on July 21st of 2009, KFTA issued a press release and stated their positive interpretation on MEST’s enforcement and their conditional agreement on implementing TEPD:

“The Minister of Education, Ahn Byung-man’s announcement [on the implementation of TEPD starting from 2010] shows desperate movement after the continual limping of the National Assembly on passing the TEPD bill. However, we are concerned about the possibility of not achieving the goals of professional development and enhancing teacher capacity due to lack of legal grounds. If TEPD is implemented nationwide without a legal basis, there could be a juridical dispute because the validity is not guaranteed.”

Furthermore, as aligned with the statement from July 21, 2009, KFTA announced their unconditional support for the legalization of TEPD on August 12th of 2009. This means that KFTA agreed on implementing TEPD nationwide only with a legal basis. However, the majority
of KFTA members disagreed with that decision. A day after the announcement of unconditional support for the legalization of TEPD, the president of KFTA issued a letter aimed to convince the general population of the organization’s position. This is further discussed in the next section that deals about the legalization of TEPD.

Starting from March 2010, the government’s efforts to implement TEPD nationwide proceeded apace. On September 22nd of 2009, MEST announced an additional pilot operation for the fall semester of 2009 with an additional 1,594 schools. In December 2009, MEST reported a survey, once again, presenting that 86.4% of citizens and 69.2% of teachers are in support of the implementation of TEPD. However, teachers and public opinion differed in the use of the results. 79.3% of citizens supported the idea of using the results of TEPD in the personnel system, whereas 69.8% of teachers were against it. After the final forum with experts on January 20th of 2010, which was to improve and finalize the model of TEPD, TEPD was implemented nationwide. However, due to a strong resistance from KTU, the government failed to build a legal basis for TEPD prior to the nationwide implementation.

The government’s attempt on building a legal basis for TEPD (2007-2010)

Teacher organizations desperately attempted to block the legalization of TEPD. A provisional session of the National Assembly, which was held in February 2007, was closed due to the teacher organizations’ struggle against the deliberation on the bill for TEPD. Similarly, the provisional session of the National Assembly held in March 2007 was also closed.

The strategies of teacher organizations became more aggressive as the opposition became more severe. KTU issued an objection statement, shared breaking news on the struggles with the members to ask for cooperation, held rallies, and attempted to contact individual members of the National Assembly to rule out the deliberation of TEPD. In addition, KTU announced a survey
they conducted of teachers in pilot schools as a response to the government’s announcement of a survey. The results were contradictory; the results from KTU had more opposition in implementing TEPD from the teachers than the ones from MEST. KFTA also held rallies and assemblies and visited the National Assembly to ban legalization.

KFTA also held rallies and assemblies and visited the National Assembly to ban legalization. However, KFTA’s president, Lee Won-hee’s visit to the president of the Education Committee under the National Assembly implied the change in their stances on the implementation of TEPD. When the president of KFTA, Lee Won-hee, visited the president of Education Committee under the National Assembly (Kwon Chul-hyun), they discussed the passing of the TEPD legislation. They had contradictory opinions on passing the bill. On one hand, president Kwon stated that the opposing parties made a mutual consent of passing the bill. He continued:

“The public wants to use teacher evaluations, and the discussion has continued for many years now. Therefore, we made an agreement to deal with the matter this time. Although teacher organizations asked for more discussion, it would never happen if we try to make the best teacher evaluation model. We thought we should pass the bill first regardless of shortcomings and then gradually compensate for the defects” (KFTA’s newsletter <Korean Education Newspaper>, Aug. 14, 2007).

On the other hand, president Lee of the KFTA expressed disagreement to the statement and pointed out:

“Professionals should evaluate the teachers, not the students and parents. This is an abnormal system that no other countries have. In addition, it is a huge problem that existing teacher evaluations [i.e., TEP and Performance-Based Incentive System, PBIS or Seong-gwa-sang-yeo-geum-pyeong-ga] are redundant compared to TEPD. Enacting the law after in-depth discussions and complementing the shortcomings based on the execution results of pilot operation would not be harmful. After that, we will declare to take the initiative in accepting TEPD” (KFTA’s newsletter <Korean Education Newspaper>, Aug. 14, 2007).
President Lee strongly stated that KFTA would not look on idly for handling the bill with haste. In addition, he spoke strongly that they would stop the incident, and they would do head-shaving strikes as well as illegal campaigning if necessary.

MEST also desperately instilled effort to legalize TEPD prior to nationwide implementation. The government did their utmost to create an advantageous environment to the passage of a bill although they did not ask for teacher organizations’ cooperation. MEST visited and persuaded the members of the Education Committee under the National Assembly. In addition, the government published TEPD to form positive public opinions. MEST seek to form a friendly atmosphere from teachers through executing pilot operations.

The government’s continuous effort on legalizing TEPD was impeded by the opposition advocacy coalition and led to the implementation of TEPD nationwide without a firm base of the law. In May 2008, the bill was automatically disposed at the 17th National Assembly because the fiscal year was over. During November and December of the same year, three members of the National Assembly proposed three legislative bills for TEPD. In April of 2009, the Education, Science and Technology Committee (ESTC) suggested an alternative legislative bill that combined the three proposals, and the bill was accepted. However, five months later in September of 2009, ESTC decided to recommit to the bill after revision was completed. Although most members of the Education Committee under the National Assembly agreed with implementing TEPD, they were defensive to pass the bill because of the strong opposition of KTU and the political situation, in which the presidential election was coming. In the end, in the year of nationwide implementation of TEPD, TEPD was implemented without feasible legal basis. The legislation prior to the nationwide implementation could not happen due to strong oppositions of teacher organizations.
Policy Subsystem

This section deals with the policy system that was observed during the discussion period of TEPD implementation from 2007 to 2010. The period includes three pilot operations that took place between 2007 and 2009, implementation of TEPD in 2010, and legalization conflicts of TEPD from 2007 to 2010. During this period, the government expanded execution of the pilot operations regardless of opposition from the teacher organization. The number of pilot schools gradually increased from 506 schools in 2007 to 669 schools in 2008, 1,570 schools in 2009, and 3,164 schools at the end of 2009 (MEST, 2010). Eventually, nationwide implementation of TEPD started since March 2010.

Nationwide implementation of TEPD was made possible due to strong enforcement by the MEST. Additionally, KFTA’s change in their position from opposing to supporting the implementation of TEPD with a condition of legalizing TEPD prior to the nationwide implementation, positively affected the nationwide implementation. The reason was that the government was then available to justify the implementation of TEPD, which was approved by the teacher organization. Despite the rejection from the members of KFTA, the president of KFTA unilaterally announced the support of the implementation of TEPD.

In terms of legalization, although the government failed to build legal grounds by amending a higher-level law (i.e., Elementary and Secondary Education Act), the government announced that they would utilize the Presidential decree as the legal basis for TEPD implementation. As discussed in the previous chapter, the Korean government is based on a presidential system, and the law has a hierarchical structure of constitution, legislation, regulations, and orders. National Assembly has the legislative authority to establish laws, but a president can also create a legal basis for policies through enacting the Presidential decrees. However, a policy should be based on the higher-level law for the policy to have a full legal
basis. In other words, if a Presidential decree does not have a firm legal basis, the policy could be a target of criticism due to its insufficient legal grounds. For instance, TEPD is under the law of Elementary and Secondary Education Act. For TEPD to gain full legal grounds, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act should mention TEPD. However, due to strong resistance from KTU, the government could not guarantee the amendment of the Act. Instead, the government announced a Presidential decree that a president has the authority to enact. Although KFTA asserted building a legal basis prior to implementation, the enactment of the Presidential decree occurred only after the nationwide implementation of TEPD. Teacher organizations’ opinions greatly influenced the process of legalization and this is discussed more in detail in the next part.

In the meanwhile, advocacy coalitions, belief system, resources, strategies, and answers to RQ 2 are presented in the following sections.

Advocacy coalitions

Changes in the constitutions of advocacy coalitions were a distinctive characteristic during the time period surrounding TEPD. Three advocacy coalitions are accountable for this period: supportive advocacy coalition, conditionally supportive advocacy coalition, and opposition advocacy coalition. Each advocacy coalitions are affiliated to MEST, KFTA, and KTU. In the previous period, both KFTA and KTU were affiliated to the same advocacy coalition – the opposition advocacy coalition. However, fractures within the advocacy coalition started in July 2007 when a new president of KFTA was elected. In 2009, the third advocacy coalition was created when KFTA announced to unconditionally support the legalization of TEPD. This critical period resulted in the change of political party and the constitution of advocacy coalitions.

The change in belief systems was accountable for the changes in advocacy coalitions. Previous studies found that the possibility of a third coalition could be explained by disagreement
across policy core beliefs (Sabatier & Weible, 2007). Advocacy coalitions were formed by shared beliefs; thus, fracture of advocacy coalition could be investigated through changes in belief systems. Therefore, the following section clarifies belief systems of each advocacy coalitions during this period (i.e., 2007-2010) and identifies changes compared to the previous period (i.e., 2004-2006).

**Belief systems**

ACF argues that the likelihood of change in belief systems differ by their tier. Deep core beliefs are least likely to be changed, whereas policy core beliefs are more likely to be changed when there are certain conditions or extreme conflicts. Secondary beliefs are easily changeable compared to the two other beliefs (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Sabatier & Weible, 2007). The case of TEPD corresponds to this change in beliefs.

There were three advocacy coalitions during this period and each coalition had different belief systems (Table 5-4). First, the deep core beliefs and policy core beliefs of the supportive advocacy coalition have not changed since last period. Moreover, secondary beliefs related to evaluators, pilot operations, and legalization remained the same. Second, the opposition advocacy coalition lost its allies and KTU solely represent the coalition. KTU’s policy core beliefs on disagreeing with the implementation of TEPD remained the same as well as secondary beliefs. Third, KFTA affiliated to a different advocacy coalition and conditionally supported the implementation of TEPD. KFTA requested the legalization of TEPD prior to nationwide implementation and no connection to the personnel system as conditions. Secondary beliefs of KFTA had changed significantly in terms of agreeing to pilot operations and legalization of TEPD. However, they maintained their position as the evaluator of TEPD to opposing the inclusion of students and parents as the evaluators.
KFTA and KTU were affiliated to different advocacy coalitions due to their difference in deep core beliefs, policy core beliefs, and secondary beliefs. To begin with, the different purposes resulted in different deep core beliefs of each organization. KFTA’s major purpose was to enhance the teaching profession, whereas KTU was founded for improving democracy in schools and the teaching profession (P. Jung, 2015). Moreover, a teacher’s sense of duty was included as the deep core belief of KFTA, whereas autonomy of teachers was involved in the deep core belief of KTU. KFTA highlighted that the teachers’ duty is to teach students; thus, KFTA, claiming that they are a professional teacher organization, declared to end the dispute and concentrate on teaching students. However, KTU had a different perspective where teachers require autonomy and authority over their school decisions; hence, they disagree with TEPD because it aggravates competition among teachers where they need cooperation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief systems</th>
<th>Supportive Advocacy Coalition</th>
<th>Supportive Advocacy Coalition with Conditions</th>
<th>Opposition Advocacy Coalition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deep core beliefs</td>
<td>MEHRD</td>
<td>KFTA</td>
<td>KTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student-oriented</td>
<td>• Teacher-oriented</td>
<td>• Teachers’ sense of a duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Emphasized accountability</td>
<td>• Emphasized distinctiveness/professionalism</td>
<td>• Autonomy of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accept the public opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy core beliefs</td>
<td>Supported the implementation of TEPD</td>
<td>Conditionally-supported the implementation of TEPD</td>
<td>Opposed to the implementation of TEPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary beliefs</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal, vice-principal, peer teachers, students and parents</td>
<td>• Opposed to including principal and vice-principal</td>
<td>• Strongly opposed to including students and parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot operations</td>
<td>Agree with pilot operations</td>
<td>Disagree with pilot operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legalization</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Resources**

Types of resources that advocacy coalitions had during this period (i.e., 2007-2010) showed little difference, but the advocacy coalition that possessed certain resources had changed compared to the previous period (i.e., 2004-2006). The resources of the supportive advocacy coalition – MEST – included legal authority, public opinion, information, and leadership, which was similar in the previous period. The resources of supportive advocacy coalition with conditions (i.e., KFTA) were public opinion, mobilizable troops, and strong leadership. The opposition advocacy coalition (i.e., KTU) possessed public opinion and mobilizable troops. During this period, MEST obtained public opinions through media as well as surveys from the public. Teacher organizations were also able to achieve public opinions through surveys.

The distinctive resources that advocacy coalitions possess compared to the previous period are the strong leadership of KFTA. In the previous period, it was KTU, which had strong leadership that led to change of policy process – delaying nationwide implementation of TEPD. Contrarily, the strong leadership of KFTA resulted in a change of policy – implementation of TEPD nationwide during this period. As soon as the president of KFTA, Lee Won-hee was newly elected in early 2007, KFTA’s stance on implementing TEPD started to change. However, the change in their position on TEPD was not explicit so that the public was astonished when president Lee announced that KFTA would support MEST’s plan on implementing TEPD nationwide in 2009. The evidence is found on the radio interview with the president of KFTA, Lee Won-hee on August 13, 2009. The president Lee stated a couple of reasons on changing their decisions:

“We are just clarifying our position on TEPD and it is not a total change from one side to another. However, we decided to agree on implementing TEPD with full support for three reasons. First, we agreed to the implementation because one of the core assertions from us, which was disconnecting the results of TEPD to promotion system, was reflected in the newly suggested plan by MEST. Second, agreeing to the implementation was a friendly gesture to bring peace back to
teaching profession. Third, it was our will to head back to what teachers are meant to be; improve teaching professionalism” (Sisun Jibjoong, Aug. 13, 2009).

Additional comments were related to emotions. President Lee from KFTA stated, “teachers have claimed that their dignity had been hurt” because of this long endless fight. Thus, KFTA decided to end this conflict and go back to a normal life (Sisun Jibjoong, Aug. 13, 2009).

The problem, however, was that the members of KFTA had not agreed to the change of KFTA’s position on TEPD. As the rage from the members of KFTA increased, the president of KFTA issued a letter to post on their website on August 13th of 2009 and elucidated the announcement of support for the government’s decision on implementing TEPD. The letter stated that the decision was made after a meeting where 400 KFTA attended. President Lee underscored three points: a) the stance on TEPD did not change because KFTA agreed with the intent of TEPD implementation from the very beginning, b) as a professional teacher organization, KFTA is responsible for closing the wasteful dispute, and c) KFTA announced to support the nationwide implementation of TEPD because the government promised to disconnect the personnel system from the TEPD.

KFTA is more politically sensitive, therefore less likely to strongly guard teachers’ interests. KFTA president’s desire on entering politics directed a strong leadership to change the policy core and support the government’s decision. In fact, KFTA’s president, as a leader of a conservative teacher organization, often used the presidential position as a stepping-stone to enter politics when the conservative political party has power in a regime. Since the foundation of KFTA in 1989, all presidents either entered politics or attempted to enter politics. President Lee during this period was not an exception. As the regime changed in 2008 and the conservative party seizes power, president Lee supported the plans of the government to enter the politics. After serving out his term, he ran for the Superintendent of the Seoul Metropolitan Office of
Education but failed. The president’s unilateral decisions resulted in a decrease of KFTA members.

*Strategies*

Strategies that advocacy coalitions used during the period from 2007 to 2010 were very monotonous compared to the previous period from 2004 to 2006. Table 5-5 demonstrates the strategies of advocacy coalitions from 2007 to 2010. All advocacy coalitions used press releases and press conferences for all major events that took place during this period. The supportive advocacy coalition and the conditionally supportive advocacy coalition opened forums to gather opinions and information. The opposition advocacy coalition was the most aggressive in the use of the strategy. KTU conducted illegal all-night demonstrations to oppose the pilot operations.

Table 5-5. Strategies of Advocacy Coalitions (2007-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Events</th>
<th>Supportive Advocacy Coalition</th>
<th>Supportive Advocacy Coalition with Conditions</th>
<th>Opposition Advocacy Coalition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEHRD</td>
<td>KFTA</td>
<td>KTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot operations</td>
<td>• Opened a forum</td>
<td>• Opened a forum</td>
<td>• Conducted all-night demonstrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Issued press release</td>
<td>• Issued press release</td>
<td>• Issued press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Held press conference</td>
<td>• Held press conference</td>
<td>• Held press conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationwide Implementation of TEPD</td>
<td>• Issued press release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Held press conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts on building legal grounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher organizations published newsletters throughout the period; * indicate an illegal strategy.

Figure 5-5 depicts the trend in the number of newsletters published by teacher organizations by year. The figure indicates a difference between teacher organizations on
publishing newsletters and implies the intensity of opposition. First, the two teacher organizations published different amounts of newsletters. The total number of newsletters published by KFTA was 910, whereas KTU published 726 newsletters regarding TEPD. When compared to the total number of documents published by KFTA was 86 and by KTU was 121, it is noticeable that KFTA had more emphasis on publishing newsletters than KTU.
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Second, the pattern of internal press coverage implies the intensity of opposition. Two teacher organizations showed different patterns of newsletter coverage. The peak for both teacher organizations appeared in 2005 – KFTA published 214 newsletters (23.52% out of total) and KTU published 163 newsletters (22.45% out of total). This coincides with when the pilot operations for selecting a single model for TEPD started. According to the previous result, the period from 2004 to 2006 was the time when the opposition was the fiercest. Thus, this graph indicates the relationship between the number of newsletter and intensity of opposition; the fiercer the opposition was, the more newsletters were published. The second most published newsletter of KFTA – Korean Education Newspaper, or Han-gook-kyo-youk-shin-moon – was
published during this period. These newsletters were published in 2010 when TEPD was implemented nationwide. Although fewer newsletters were published during this year compared to 2005, it still implies that KFTA were strongly opposed to implementing TEPD without having a firm legal basis.

KTU’s newsletter – Education with Hope, or Hee-mang-kyo-youk – shows a gradual decrease as the years go by. However, KFTA had another peak in 2010 with 174 newsletters when TEPD was implemented nationwide. The decrease in releases of KTU’s newsletter can be explained for several reasons. First, in 2005, the use of the term teacher evaluation was mixed across TEP, PBIS, and TEPD. As the term teacher evaluation and TEPD was clarified, it seemed that the number of news articles on teacher evaluations decreased. Second, KTU had more interest toward PBIS, which was also an ongoing issue. Thus, there were fewer articles on TEPD compared to PBIS. Third, after KTU had been declared to be an illegal union in 2013, KTU paid more attention to legalizing the organization. For instance, in 2014, other social issues such as the sinking of Sewol ferry disaster gained more attention, leading less focus to TEPD, which was the policy that already had been implemented.

Answers to research question 2

RQ 2-1 discussed the tendency of advocacy coalitions to be stable over ten years or more (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Sabatier & Weible, 2007). Indeed, advocacy coalitions in policy subsystem are formed based on shared belief systems (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014). Thus, advocacy coalitions can ally and affiliate with other coalitions based on their changing shared or disagreed belief systems. The changes of the allies and opponents were manifested during this period; KFTA changed their stance on the nationwide implementation, which directed to the fracture in the opposition advocacy coalition. However, whether or not the case of TEPD supports
the hypothesis on the stability of advocacy coalition should be determined after a period of a decade or so since the hypothesis included the condition for viewing the policy process from a longer perspective.

The change in the constitution of advocacy coalitions was due to the election of a new president of KFTA. This finding is aligned to the previous studies that defection or change in coalition composition often occurs, while advocacy coalitions are generally stable over a long period (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014). More specifically, the finding follows the line of the previous studies that documented one of the reasons for the change in coalition composition is elections (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Zafonte & Sabatier, 2004). Through the major internal event, electing a new president, KFTA started to change their stance in 2007 and announced for an unconditional support for the legalization of TEPD. Thus, although considering the coalition change, the decision on whether or not this study supports the hypothesis of stability in advocacy coalition constitution should be determined after analyzing at least a decade of the policy process.

RQ 2-2 asked whether the actors within an advocacy coalition show substantial consensus on issues pertaining to the policy core belief, although less so on secondary beliefs. The case of KFTA shows a contrasting result to the case of KTU. Previously, the case of KTU that internal dissension on postponing the aggressive strategy suggested a support for RQ 2-2. All members of KTU made a substantial consensus on the policy core belief, which is to oppose the introduction of a new teacher evaluation policy, they had disagreements on the secondary belief, which is deciding the means to performing strategy. However, the case of KFTA suggested an opposite result; there was an internal dissension on the policy core belief. KFTA’s change in their stance from disagreeing to agreeing on implementing TEPD and announcement of unconditional support for legalizing TEPD had not preceded the substantial consensus of the actors in the advocacy coalition – in this case, the members of KFTA. The president’s strong leadership enforced the change in the policy core belief regardless of the members’ agreement. Therefore,
the case of TEPD presented a partial support for the assumption of ACF on the consensus among coalition members retaining to the policy core belief but less so on secondary beliefs.

**The Period of Post-implementation of TEPD (2011-2016)**

This is the period when teacher organizations’ interest gradually decreased or even can be said that the fight was ended. The decrease in interest on TEPD can be attributed to three reasons: 
a) TEPD was already implemented thus teachers laid aside the matter of TEPD, b) teacher organizations paid more attention to other policies that gained more interest from the society, and c) TEPD had been incapacitated from the school settings because it does not have punishment regulations due to the lack of a legal base on the higher law.

The composition of advocacy coalitions did not change during this period. Three advocacy coalitions were accountable for this period: a supportive advocacy coalition, a supportive advocacy coalition with conditions, and an opposition advocacy coalition. KTU kept on opposing the implementation of TEPD and KFTA requested for revisions of TEPD. Thus, revisions were made every year ever since the implementation of TEPD in 2010. The model changed with the direction of giving local districts and individual schools greater autonomy in operating TEPD.

Moreover, this period engaged continuous attempts of the government on building a stronger base in terms of legalization. Since incapacitation of TEPD in the school settings derived from lack of legal grounds, the government constantly attempted to enact related laws. As a result, the government established the Presidential decree in 2011 and the order in 2016.
Major Events from 2011 to 2016

Major events from 2011 to 2016 involved enactment of the Presidential decree (2011), revisions of TEPD models (2011-2015), and the establishment of the order (2016). Teacher organizations constantly issued press releases with their request on revising TEPD models. Accordingly, the government amended the policy every year and in 2015, TEPD was greatly reformed when the major reform for three teacher evaluation policies took place.

Revisions of TEPD models (2011-2015)

Teacher organizations issued press releases every year since TEPD was implemented nationwide in 2010 to request revising the details of TEPD. KFTA, in particular, was actively engaged in issuing press releases to request revision of TEPD model. KTU, on the other hand, had more interest in the issues in regards to the legalization of TEPD and continuously disagreed to the implementation of TEPD. KFTA issued a statement on October 15, 2010 with four requests: abolition of parents’ satisfaction survey, reform in TEPD methods such as including teacher’s self-evaluation, evaluate teachers on an absolute scale, vitalization of customized training and conduct evaluation with process-centered evaluation.

On December 13th of 2010, the government announced a plan to improve the TEPD model to reflect the requests from teacher organizations. The revisions included the use of the results to induce improvement on teachers’ professionalism by engaging trainings but not relate to personnel or pay system. Parent satisfaction survey was reformed from parents evaluating all teachers to evaluating homeroom teachers. In addition, parents could decide on the teachers they want to evaluate. Individual schools were given an autonomy to sample students for the student satisfaction survey. Moreover, MEST encouraged the submission of self-evaluation report when
peer teachers evaluate them. More autonomy was given to the individual schools to decide on training for teachers with bad results.

As a response, KFTA issued a press release and stated that they acknowledged MEST’s effort on reflecting teacher organizations’ request for revising TEPD model. KFTA stated that they acknowledge MEST’s effort on reflecting teacher organizations’ request for revising TEPD model. However, KFTA requested more objectivity of the evaluation itself and a gradual reform that can achieve the goal of TEPD – enhancing teacher capacity.

After the results of TEPD was announced in 2011, KTU issued a statement through press release and criticized the low participation rate of students and parents in evaluating teachers. 78.9% of students participated in the student satisfaction survey, whereas only 45.6% of parents partook in the parent satisfaction survey. In addition, KTU excoriated MEST as the following:

“MEST had enforced the implementation of TEPD without legislative proceedings from the National Assembly but through the Presidential decree – a method to impose their plan. In doing so, MEST has not conducted research on the effectiveness of TEPD in improving education quality or teacher capacity. MEST’s only concern is to attain the showing of the education ministry” (KTU, Dec. 28, 2011).

On April 12th of 2012, KFTA issued a press release on their stance on details of TEPD model. KFTA had four main requests on revision. First, KFTA continued to request using the result of the evaluation for improving instructional capacity and professional development. They strongly oppose to connecting the result of the evaluation to personnel and pay system. In addition, KFTA requested for various training programs for professional development, which teachers have autonomy to choose for their own professional development. Second, the government should make amendments to Elementary and Secondary Education Act to guarantee legal stability. Discussion with teacher organizations should be preceded prior to enacting lower-level legislation with detailed execution plans. Third, KFTA claimed the need for revising parent satisfaction survey. Under the situation in which parents’ low participation rate on demonstration
classes, which is to observe classes while teacher demonstrates, made it impossible for parents to evaluate teachers precisely. Such parents relied on their children’s subjective judgment, which was an indirect evaluation that created multiple errors. Fourth, KFTA strongly presented the need for an overall reorganization of student satisfaction survey. Aside from objectivity of the evaluation criteria, students’ tendency of emotionally evaluating teachers and the herd mentality led to a distortion in the results. KFTA continued and requested for countermeasures for such matter.

On September 29th of 2013, the education ministry (i.e., the MOE) announced that all 17 Metropolitan and Provincial Offices of Education would implement TEPD. This was the first time for all local districts to implement TEPD since the government announcement for nationwide implementation of TEPD. KFTA released a statement on the same day and insisted on a phase-out of student satisfaction survey for the elementary and middle school levels. Moreover, KFTA expressed their regret on the new administration’s continuous implementation of TEPD that has been questioned from school settings for the past four years. Furthermore, KFTA demanded an enactment of an order to regulate parents to participate in demonstration classes for class observation at least once a semester. They insisted that the ultimate goal for parent satisfaction survey is to change the parent satisfaction survey to school satisfaction survey.

After the criticism from teacher organizations, the Park administration executed pilot operations of an improvement plan for 18 pilot schools in 2013 and 65 schools for 2014 and 2015. Symposia were held in November 2014, a policy forum to discuss reorganizing teacher evaluation policies took place on December 14, a public hearing was held on July 15th to discuss improvement plan for the teacher evaluation policies. Moreover, the government held meetings to gather opinions of Metropolitan and Provincial Offices of Education in July 2015, and consultative meeting to review the improvement plan in August 2015.
Consequently, MOE announced a reform in TEPD on September 3rd of 2015. The so-called 2015 reform not only dealt with TEPD, but all three teacher evaluation policies, which announced the merged of PBIS and TEP to create Performance Evaluation (PE) or Eob-jeog-yeong-ga. Major reform for TEPD was related to student satisfaction survey. Satisfactory survey from elementary school students changed to only be used for teachers’ self-reflection. Moreover, satisfactory survey from middle school and high school students were revised by excluding 5% from each extreme as a means to increase the reliability of the survey results. In addition, the government expanded the autonomous operation of TEPD in Metropolitan and Provincial Offices of Education. Furthermore, the ratio of student guidance criteria was increased from 20% to 30% to emphasize the importance of student guidance quality for teachers.

Legalizing TEPD: Establishment of the Presidential decree (2011) and the Order (2016)

TEPD has been accused of not having a sufficient legal basis because it was not based on a higher-level law, Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Instead, TEPD was based on the lower-level laws – the Presidential Decree No. 28198 established in 2011 and the Order No. 217 established in 2016. As discussed in the previous part, a policy should be based on a law in order for the policy to gain a full legal ground. Laws in Korea are established by National Assembly, but a president can also enact a Presidential decree, which provides a weak basis for a policy. TEPD, however, was not mentioned in the Act, which led to partial authority to the implementation of the policy; the government cannot justify punishing teachers who did not participate in the evaluations. As a consequence, not having a legal base on a higher-law partially led to the neutralization of TEPD.

According to the consultants who were hired to improve TEPD, teachers in real school settings became more and more indifferent to TEPD. One of the reasons for incapacitation of
TEPD in schools derived from not having a strong regulation to punish schools and teachers for violating the law. MEST could not insert an additional article about penalty because TEPD lack justification and teacher organizations were against inserting additional articles in regards to penalty.

MEST announced on January 19th of 2011 through a press release that ‘Regulations for training teachers’ will be amended to build a legal base for TEPD. KTU issued a press release on the same day and criticized the plan of amending the regulation. They argued that MEST’s enforcement on implementing TEPD through revising teacher training regulation violates the social consensus because it is not based on the higher-level law. Moreover, KTU criticized that amending the teacher training regulation would run counter to MEST’s consistent perspective on guaranteeing the autonomy of Metropolitan and Provincial Offices of Education and individual schools.

KTU announced statements and issued press releases throughout the period. However, the government persisted with establishing legislation related to TEPD. Consequently, the government announced the establishment of ‘the Order for implementing TEPD’ in 2016 to provide a legal basis for TEPD implementation. Teacher organizations showed contrasting perspectives on the matter of legalization. KFTA urged to build legal grounds for TEPD, whereas KTU opposed to legalization of TEPD and insisted for the abolition of TEPD.

**Policy Subsystem**

The period of post-implementation of TEPD involved revisions of TEPD models (2011-2016) and constant attempts from the government to build legal grounds to TEPD, which resulted in the establishment of the Presidential decree (2011) and the Order (2016). As TEPD had incapacitated from the school setting, interests from teacher organizations moved away to other
issues. Thus, there were fewer conflicts among advocacy coalitions during this period. The political battle among advocacy coalitions seemed to be finished by the end of this period.

**Advocacy coalitions**

Advocacy coalitions during this period (i.e., 2011-2016) remained the same compared to the previous period (i.e., 2007-2010): a supportive advocacy coalition, a supportive advocacy coalition with conditions, and an opposition advocacy coalition. The organizations that were accountable for each advocacy coalition were MEST (MOE from 2013), KFTA, and KTU, respectively. The composition of advocacy coalition was stable since 2009 when the fracture of the opposition advocacy coalition occurred. During this period, the advocacy coalitions conceded the fight. Accordingly, the belief systems of each advocacy coalition had not changed much since 2009.

**Belief systems**

Teacher organizations’ consistent argument with its basis from the stabilized belief systems led to influences in policy change. As the constitution of advocacy coalition remained the same from the previous period, the belief systems of advocacy coalitions were also observed to be the same. The intensity of dispute was not as severe as that of previous periods. The secondary beliefs of both teacher organizations were stabilized to include students and parents as evaluators. Their consistent argument on such matter affected the change in TEPD model; the government announced to minimalize the role of students in TEPD as one of the details of 2015 reform. Although the government failed to amend the higher-level law – Elementary and Secondary Education Act – they succeeded in establishing the Presidential decree in 2011 and the Order for
implementing TEPD in 2016 with the support of both secondary beliefs of supportive advocacy coalition and supportive advocacy coalition.

Table 5-6. Belief Systems of advocacy coalitions (2011-2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief systems</th>
<th>Supportive Advocacy Coalition</th>
<th>Supportive Advocacy Coalition with Conditions</th>
<th>Opposition Advocacy Coalition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEST/MOE</td>
<td>KFTA</td>
<td>KTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep core beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student-oriented</td>
<td>• Teacher-oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Emphasized accountability</td>
<td>• Emphasized distinctiveness, professionalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accept the public opinion</td>
<td>• Teachers’ sense of a duty</td>
<td>• Autonomy of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy core beliefs</td>
<td>Supported the implementation of TEPD</td>
<td>Conditionally-supported the implementation of TEPD</td>
<td>Opposed to the implementation of TEPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary beliefs</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal, vice-principal, peer teachers, students and parents</td>
<td>• Opposed to including principal and vice-principal</td>
<td>• Strongly opposed to including students and parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legalization</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The name for education ministry changed from MEST to MOE on March 23, 2013.

**Resources**

As the interest toward TEPD lessened, teacher organizations put less effort on TEPD. As a result, there was less variety of resources and strategies during the period. The resources that the government mainly used during this period was a legal authority, information, and leadership. Teacher organizations used information, mobilizable troops, and leadership. KFTA, having a close relation to the government after the conservative party took power, used information from the government and conjunctly related to the decisions of the government. KTU, in particular,
conducted rallies and protests to ban TEPD, which indicated the resource of mobilizable troops. In addition, a leadership of KTU led the members of KTU to partake in rallies and protests.

**Strategies**

Advocacy coalitions conceded the fight during this period. The strategies that were performed from 2011 to 2016 by teacher organizations were limited to issuing press releases and publishing newsletters for both revisions of TEPD models and attempts on building legal grounds for TEPD. KTU conducted a rally, but the purpose of conducting a rally was not solely for TEPD. Opposition to the implementation of TEPD was protested along with other societal or educational issues such as Sewol ferry disaster and principal open recruitment system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Events</th>
<th>Supportive Advocacy Coalition</th>
<th>Supportive Advocacy Coalition with Conditions</th>
<th>Opposition Advocacy Coalition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEST/ MOE</td>
<td>KFTA</td>
<td>KTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisions of TEPD models</td>
<td>• Held a public hearing</td>
<td>• Issued press release</td>
<td>• Issued press release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Issued press release</td>
<td>• Held press conference</td>
<td>• Published newsletters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Held a symposium</td>
<td>• Held a symposium</td>
<td>• Published newsletters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Held consultative meetings</td>
<td>• Executed pilot operations</td>
<td>• Rallies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Executed pilot operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts on building legal grounds</td>
<td>• Held a public hearing</td>
<td>• Issued press release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Issued press release</td>
<td>• Published newsletters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The name for education ministry changed from MEST to MOE on March 23, 2013.

The education ministry – MEST from 2011 to 2013 and the MOE from 2013 to 2016 – during this period used multiple strategies to gain social consensus as well as agreement from teacher profession. For the revisions of TEPD models, the government held a public hearing, press conference, a symposium, and consultative meetings. Moreover, the government issued press releases to announce their plans. Furthermore, after the improvement plan was developed,
the government executed pilot operations for three years – 2013, 2014, and 2015 – to announce the 2015 reform. To build legal grounds of TEPD, the government held a public hearing and issued press releases before and after the establishment of the Presidential decree and the order.

The total number of the documents published during 2004 to 2016 by KFTA was 86 and KTU was 121. When comparing the graphs of the newsletter from the previous section and documents from Figure 5-6 below, the graphs of each organization resemble one another. This pattern suggests a consistency of the publication. In other words, one organization did not put more emphasis on a certain type of publication, but as the interest grew both news articles and documents also increased. For example, the peak volume of newspaper articles from KFTA and document publication is in 2005.

A total number of documents including statements, press releases, and other official documents is much larger for KTU (i.e., 121) than KFTA (i.e., 86). Compared to KFTA, KTU constantly makes references to TEPD through their press releases and statements. When adding the number of other statements that indirectly mentions TEPD, the number added up to 270. However, in the case of KFTA, fewer references on TEPD can be interpreted as TEPD’s strategy to focus on one issue per statement.
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The terminology that was used by KTU was more aggressive and stronger than that of KFTA’s. The examples that KTU used include expressions such as “change for the worse”, “impede the progress”, “to achieve after protest”, “strike”, “immediately”, “unilaterally”, “fight with all our energy.” From the results of usage in strong expressions, it is inferable that KTU may have more radical actions than KFTA, which is consistent with the results of strategy comparison. The delay and weakening of the government’s original plan corroborated the influence of KTU’s strong opposition.

**Answers to research question 2**

RQ 2 dealt whether or not the case of TEPD supports the core postulates of advocacy coalitions from ACF. First, synthesized results regarding the case of TEPD partially supported the stability of coalition composition. Stability in the constitution of advocacy coalition over periods of a decade or so was asked through RQ 2-1. During the period of discussing the introduction of a new teacher evaluation policy (2004-2006), the constitution of advocacy coalitions was stable with two coalitions – supportive advocacy coalition and opposition advocacy coalition. However, starting from 2007 when a new president of KFTA was elected, a possibility of a third advocacy coalition increased. In 2009, KFTA announced to support the implementation of TEPD with a condition that the policy should be legalized prior to the nationwide implementation. This critical period led to the fracture of opposition advocacy coalition and creation of the third advocacy coalition – a supportive advocacy coalition with conditions. Since then, the composition of advocacy coalitions was stabilized and both teacher organizations influenced policy process affiliated to different advocacy coalitions. Therefore, the case of TEPD partially supported the stability in the constitution of advocacy coalitions over a long period, although there existed
subdivisions from time to time, which previous studies had confirmed the possibility of subdivisions due to major internal or external events.

Second, the case of TEPD provided mixed results for the second assumption of ACF. RQ 2-2 dealt with the substantial consensus of the policy actors within the advocacy coalition on the issue of retaining the policy core belief although less so on secondary belief. Subdivision in KTU supported the assumption, while the example of KFTA disputed the assumption. For instance, KTU’s internal dissension was to perform a collective movement to oppose the introduction of a new teacher evaluation policy in 2005. However, as the president of KTU unilaterally announced delaying the date for the collective movement, the members of KTU protested and ousted the president. The creation of a subdivision was based on the dispute on strategy, a secondary belief. On the other hand, the case of KFTA presented a different base of the belief system to form a subdivision; KFTA had an internal dissension on the policy core belief – whether agreeing or disagreeing to the implementation of TEPD. In 2009, the president of KFTA unilaterally announced the support for implementing TEPD nationwide. This decision was made based on the strong leadership that had a politicized behavior. As a conservative organization, the presidents of KFTA used the position as a stepping-stone to enter politics when a conservative party was in power. Similarly, the president of KFTA in 2009 launched into politics after the conservative party came into power in 2008. However, in the long run, the composition of advocacy coalitions was stable since 2009 after the third advocacy coalition emerged. Therefore, this study suggested that the case of TEPD presented mixed results that partially supported the advocacy coalition’s hypothesis, a hypothesis that involved the internal consensus on policy core beliefs although less agreement on secondary core beliefs.
External Factors that Affected Policy Subsystem

ACF underscores the influences of external factors on policy change (Sabatier & Weible, 2007). Figure 5-7 depicts the relations between external factors and policy subsystem. External factors are comprised of three elements in this study: relatively stable parameters, external subsystem events, and long-term coalition opportunity. According to the advocates of ACF, external factors are necessary condition rather than sufficient condition (Cairney, 2015; Weible, Sabatier, & McQueen, 2009). In other words, “a major external event is a necessary but insufficient condition for major subsystem change” (Cairney, 2015, p. 491).

The following section is divided into three sections: a) relatively stable parameters, b) external subsystem events, and c) long-term coalition opportunity structures. First, in the relatively stable parameters, basic attributes of the problem and fundamental sociocultural values are analyzed to explain the relatively stable parameters. For the external subsystem events, the study includes changes in socioeconomic conditions, changes in public opinions on teacher quality, and changes in the systematic governing coalition. Lastly, long-term coalition opportunity structures involve a degree of consensus needed for major policy change and openness of political system.
Relatively Stable Parameters

Relatively stable parameters are extremely difficult to change except in a very long term so that the coalitions seldom use them as strategies (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 2007; Weible & Jenkins-Smith, 2007). Nevertheless, the parameters are subjected to change the behaviors of the actors in advocacy coalitions. The ACF suggests the factors of relatively stable parameters are basic attributes and distribution of natural resources, sociocultural values and social structure, and basic constitutional structure. In a relation to TEPD, the factors of relatively stable parameters, which have existed for quite a long time, include basic attributes of the problem and fundamental sociocultural values. For TEPD, basic attributes of the problem can be explained through previous teacher evaluation policies – TEP and PBIS. Next, fundamental sociocultural values are related to the paradigm shift that emphasizes autonomy and the principle of free market.
Basic attributes of the problem: Existing teacher evaluation policies

The basic attributes of the problem were related to the previous teacher evaluation policies with PBIS, in particular (Kim & Joo, 2014). As discussed earlier, there already have been two different teacher evaluation policies: TEP and PBIS. Nevertheless, both evaluation policies had been consistently criticized with a number of problems by scholars and teachers. Although the main purpose of TEPD was to improve teachers’ professional capacity and help them with professional development (MEST, 2010), the problems of the existing policies were not solely about providing appropriate feedback to teachers to enhance their performance. Instead, the additional problems engaged interweaving with many other problems such as lack of acknowledgment on uniqueness and expertise in the teaching profession (Kwon, 2012).

Ever since the implementation of Teacher Evaluation for Performance (TEP) on July 8th of 1964, scholars had been continuously criticizing the policy. The criticisms were its ineffectiveness in evaluating teachers’ performance and its limitations on providing basic information to help teachers for their professional development (J. W. Kim, 2008). More in detail, the problems suggested by scholars could be simplified into five issues (K. Kim, 2008; E. Kim et al., 2012; Kim & Joo, 2014; Kim, Park, & Joo, 2009; E. Kim et al., 2006; Kwon, 2012; Y. S. Park, 2008).

First was the problem with the usage of the evaluation results. The evaluation results from TEP was used only for promotions, not for teachers’ professional development. In addition, the evaluation only mattered to teachers who were interested in promotions. Thus, the needs for a new teacher evaluation policy that could include all teachers to improve their professional capacity aroused. Second, the evaluation criteria were accused of being abstract; hence, the evaluation solely depended on the evaluators, which hindered objectiveness of the evaluation. Third, principals and vice-principals who were the only evaluation participants also was an issue.
The teachers were against this particular matter due to the subjectivity of the evaluation results. Fourth, the evaluation held the same standard for all the teachers; thus, the policy was criticized because it was unable to consider the differences among teachers regarding the region, school level, and development stage of teachers by their teaching experiences. Fifth, comparative evaluation method and the regulation concealed results from targeted teachers, which impeded appropriate feedback.

Additional evaluation policy, PBIS, was implemented in 2001 with a need for incentives to enhance teachers’ motivation. Scholars had criticized a single wage system assuming that the system does not support teachers with improving professional development. Ten years later, in 2011, school incentive system was newly implemented. The PBIS had been implemented with a growing discussion on extrinsic motivation (i.e., monetary incentives) will have a greater impact on improving teacher quality since individual teachers will put more efforts onto professional developments. However, there were problems that evaluating teachers objectively was almost impossible since educational achievement and performance were difficult to measure (J. Jeon, 2009; Kim & Joo, 2014; Y. S. Park, 2008). In this regard, discussions on inducement of a new teacher evaluation were initiated and played a vital role for the implementation of TEPD.

Fundamental sociocultural values and social structure: A paradigm shift

The paradigm shift from an authoritarian and centralized governmental system to a system that allows participation and autonomy to lower levels of the administration led to the policy formation and changes of TEPD. It may seem that the government acted more centralized, but compared to the past teacher policies, there is two evidence for a change in the political system that influenced policy process of TEPD. First, the government allowed multiple stakeholders to speak of their interests during policy processes. Second, the government’s
decentralization movement changed the TEPD model to provide autonomy in implementing TEPD for the local administrations and individual schools. Paradigm is a structure or a theoretical frame that defines opinions, values, and perspectives of a contemporary and a paradigm serves as one of the most critical factors to create a public opinion and influential to not only policymaking but also change (Hall, 1993). Korea used to have a strong authoritarian and centralized governmental system, which caused society to neglect the local differences and variations. Following such administrative system, schools had to follow the rules from the provincial and district governments and central government.

Moreover, the paradigm shift led by the “PISA-shock” is accountable for the policy reform. The “PISA-shock” refers to the phenomenon of nations underwent reforms in their educational systems that occurred after the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) announced the international comparisons of student achievement (Waldow, 2009). Korea was not an exception to such paradigm shift that allows autonomy; the 5.31 education reform was a trigger to bring teacher accountability to the field. The slogan of the 5.31 education reform that took place in 1995 was the establishment of a new educational system in the globalized and information-oriented society. The 1995 circa was a new era of globalization and expansion of technologies that is based on the enormous information. The reform was an attempt to adapt the societal change and related to educational policies. Goals of the 5.31 reform include diversification of schools, improvement of teacher quality and autonomy, increase of public expenditure for education as 5% of GNP, and the establishment of the school-based management system that is to provide autonomy to individual schools.

In addition to the rise of autonomy, the principle of free markets was applied to education. The emphasis on efficiency and efficacy provoked competitions among schools and among teachers, needs for the evaluation of the schools and teachers’ performance. As the focus
changed to consumer-oriented, which means the focus is on students and parents, the need for teacher evaluation to enhance high-quality education had aroused.

**External Subsystem Events**

External subsystem events are the events that affect change in policy subsystem leading policy change and the examples include changes in socioeconomic conditions, public opinion, and systemic governing coalition (Sabatier & Weible, 2007; Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014). The inducement of TEPD derived from several major events such as the financial crisis provoked in 1997 followed by a shortening of teachers’ retirement age and in turn, the insecurity of teaching profession. In addition, the increased demand for quality education and discussions on emphasizing accountability that arouse both inside and outside of the country and the change in the political regime and governmental system triggered the policy formation and change processes of TEPD.

**Changes in socioeconomic conditions: The IMF Bailout**

Changes in economic situations or environmental changes often lead to changes in policies. Although the economic or environmental change may not directly result in the change of the existing policy, such changes may influence and play a pivotal role to the changes of the policy (Fowler, 2004; Ilon, 1994). In Korea, such change was mainly accused of the severe financial crisis, so-called the International Monetary Fund (IMF) bailout occurred in 1997. It was an economic crisis that Korean government had to loan 55 billion dollars from the IMF with certain conditions such as expanding the limit for foreigners to purchase stocks, allowing
foundation of the affiliated foreign bank, and clear out insolvent financial institutions in Korea (Cho, 2008).

Thus, the IMF crisis led to a decrease in financial support of many parts of the administrative systems including educational finance. In 1999, due to the exacerbation of the education financial budget, the financial conditions in individual schools faced a crisis as well and the legislative change of shortening teachers’ retirement age from 65 to 62. Indeed, the shortening of teachers’ retirement age was not solely due to a decrease of educational support. It was a mixed result of critics from the public toward unqualified teachers and problematic teachers, dissatisfaction expressed by parents on aged teachers, and government’s need for reforming teaching profession with low cost.

In addition, the IMF bailout triggered critics of teachers that teaching profession was perceived to be one of the most secured occupations in Korea and that unqualified and problematic teachers were in the safety-net causing corruptions and decrease in public education quality. As teaching profession was recognized to be one of the most secured occupations, more high-quality students applied to become teachers. However, even though there were many highly qualified teachers, the public accused teachers who were very experienced but unqualified, which led to a new teacher evaluation policy that could improve teacher capacity. The changes in such socioeconomic conditions led teachers’ retirement age to be shortened as a counter solution in decreasing the budget for teachers’ professional development.

Changes in public opinion on teacher quality

TEPD started with a public demand for quality education in and out of the country (PERAC, 2008). At first, discussions on the inducement of TEPD arose from the public, which is the external phase to teacher community. The primary discussion began from a massive increase
in a field of shadow education, which was then perceived as a failure of public education. The increase in private education (i.e., shadow education) led to a loss in trust within the realm of public education.

Another phenomenon that caused critics on the teacher quality by the public was called “classroom collapse” (N. Kang, 2013; H. Lee, 2003), “school collapse” (Song & Lee, 2015) or the crisis in public education. In 1999, teachers posed a social phenomenon that teachers’ unable to manage students’ behaviors in their classrooms and that their authority is being threatened (N. Kang, 2013; H. Lee, 2003). The failure of teachers to control students result in losing trust in public education. The loss of trust in public education, as in turn, contributed a public demand for improvement on teaching quality.

In addition, OECD recommendations for improving teacher quality in 2004 led Korean government to invite scholars to discuss on a new teacher evaluation, which later became the TEPD. After their visits to Korea in April 2003, Coolahan, Santiago, Phair, and Ninomiya (2004) indicated in their country note the room for improvement in teacher professional development system. They suggested reforming the teacher evaluation policy by focusing school as a whole at a center, not exclusively evaluating teachers as individuals. Furthermore, they recommended using multiple methods such as self-evaluation, peer evaluation, and classroom observation. The government tried to take the consultation seriously and reflected on implementing a new teacher evaluation policy on the following year after their visit.

Changes in systemic governing coalition

The regime change in Korea was one of the most influential factors that affected the TEPD policy formation and change processes. First, a regime change to a government that was in fond of teacher evaluations influenced an active introduction of the new teacher evaluation
policy, TEPD. Korea elects a new president every five years and the change in a dominant party often cause a change in policy into an opposite direction. It was a mere discussion in prior to the Participatory Administration in 2003. As noticeable from the name of the administration, the government emphasized participation of diverse stakeholders for policy process. Improving teacher’s professional capacity was one of a presidential pledge of the president of the Participatory Administration, Roh Moo-hyun.

It was not only the president’s strong will on improving teacher quality, but also the Minister of Education’s volition that allowed introducing a new teacher evaluation policy. On February 2nd of 2004, three months later from the day when the second Minister of Education for the government, Ahn Byung-young was appointed, the Minister declared the need to induce the new teacher evaluation policy that could improve teacher quality through competition among teachers. Even though resistance was met from the teacher’s society, Roh administration enforced operating pilot schools.

Second, the shift from a liberal to a conservative regime likely is a major factor in explaining the acceleration of the TEPD implementation. After the regime change to the Lee administration, a conservative political party, the efforts to implement the TEPD from the government continued, but the government lessened the involvement of teacher organizations in the policy process. As a presidential candidate, Lee Myung-bak supported teacher evaluation policy for teachers’ professional development. The previous government had to face multiple delays due to strong resistance from the teacher organizations. However, the public need for enhancing public education was strong enough to support the governmental decision on enforcing nationwide implementation of TEPD in 2010. Moreover, as an administration that aimed for efficiency in every field, the Lee administration implemented TEPD regardless of the resistances of teacher organizations. Furthermore, the same administration succeeded in enacting TEPD by regulation although it took another two years from the implementation to be legislated.
The major reform to teacher evaluation policies took place in 2015, in the next administration, the Park administration. The major reform resulted in combining TEP and PBIS as well as revising the TEPD in terms of evaluation targets. As a result to the 2015 reform, students of elementary school from grade 1 to grade 3 was ruled out from the teacher evaluation, student and parent evaluation on teachers had changed to the satisfactory survey, and top 5% and bottom 5% of the student satisfaction survey result was also excluded from the evaluation result. One of the most controversial issues that caused teacher organizations’ strong opposition was hereby solved through the 2015 reform.

When the current administration came into power, scholars predicted that TEPD would be operated with more autonomy for each Metropolitan and Provincial offices of Education. Such prediction was based on the president’s announcement in July 2017. The newly elected president, President Moon declared that there should be a ‘recovering democracy in education and enhancing education autonomy.’ Therefore, it was predictable that the TEPD would not be the exception for decentralization of government.

**Long-Term Coalition Opportunity Structures**

Long-term coalition opportunity structures were added to the framework in 2005 to enable global application of the ACF (Sabatier & Weible, 2007). The long-term coalition opportunity structures involved the degree of consensus needed for major policy change and openness of the political system. In Korean context, as the political regime changed and society developed to a more democratic structure, the degree of consensus needed for major policy change arose and the political system moved to a more opened system. As a strictly centralized government, most policy changes were influenced mostly by the decisions of the government. However, as Korea had gone through democratization movement since the mid-1980s, and as the
society developed, more autonomy was given to the lower levels of the administrative system. Moreover, a higher degree of consensus was needed for policy change as Korean political system constantly moved to a direction of the open system. Therefore, discussions with multiple stakeholders were welcomed to shape and develop policies.

With such phenomena of decentralization, the government provided more autonomy and allowed multiple voices from various stakeholders in regards to TEPD. Teacher organizations were empowered to maintain their own beliefs and given the opportunity to influence TEPD policy change. Although the government had strongly enforced some factors of the policy such as nationwide implementation in 2010 and legislation in 2011 regardless of strong resistance, teacher organizations successfully influenced the implementation and reforms in TEPD.

**Summary of the Chapter**

The previous sections dealt with the analytic findings of a) the changes in advocacy coalitions, belief systems, resources, and strategies, b) the influences from teacher organizations on policy formation and change processes of TEPD, and c) the external factors that influenced the change in policy subsystem. The chapter presented the results by dividing policy formation into three periods: the period of discussing the introduction of TEPD (2004-2006), the period of discussing the implementation of TEPD (2007-2010), and the period of post-implementation of TEPD (2011-2016). In addition, external factors that influenced the change in policy subsystem were discussed with three components: relatively stable parameters, external subsystem events, and long-term coalition opportunity structures. Accordingly, the summary of the chapter is presented with four major points.

First, the changes in belief systems had close relations to the changes in advocacy coalitions. For instance, the composition of advocacy coalition changed as the policy core belief
of KFTA changed during the period of discussion on implementation of TEPD (2007-2010). In the first phase, there were two advocacy coalitions – supportive advocacy coalition (education ministry) and opposition advocacy coalition (KFTA and KTU). In the following phase, the constitution changed to involve a supportive advocacy coalition (education ministry), a supportive advocacy coalition with conditions (KFTA), and an opposition advocacy coalition (KTU). KFTA was affiliated to the same advocacy coalition with KTU in the early stage of the policy process, but KFTA changed their stance on the implementation of TEPD because KFTA changed their political core belief from opposing to supporting the implementation of TEPD in exchange for better teacher conditions. In other words, this disagreement across policy core belief resulted in the creation of a third advocacy coalition (Sabatier & Weible, 2007; Weible & Sabatier, 2007). The changes in resources and strategies were connected partially to the change of belief systems and interest of advocacy coalitions. The secondary beliefs – located at the last tier of a belief system – were accountable for selecting the details, prioritizing, and using resources and strategies. For instance, KTU strongly opposed the implementation and legalization of TEPD, which resulted in performing more aggressive strategies than KFTA.

Second, teacher organizations’ oppositions and supports influenced the policy process of TEPD. To begin with, due to strong oppositions from both teacher organizations (i.e., KFTA and KTU), it took six years before the nationwide implementation of TEPD. Korean educational policies were notorious for their rapid and immediate implementation. Compared to such reputation, TEPD was considered to be a policy that took time before implementation. Another influence from both teacher organizations’ strong opposition was the change of evaluators that took place as the 2015 reform. Teacher organizations consistently opposed to the inclusion of students and parents as evaluators since the first draft plan was announced in 2005. Their ten-year long oppositions on such matter led to a decrease in students’ role in teacher evaluation.
In addition, each teacher organization influenced the policy process with different perspectives. Two teacher organizations were affiliated to the same advocacy coalition only during the first period of discussing the introduction of a new teacher evaluation policy (2004-2006). After then, KFTA and KTU influenced the governmental decisions differently. Affiliated to the opposition advocacy coalition, KTU’s influence was related to their strong oppositions. TEPD’s lack of legal grounds and incapacitation of TEPD in school settings were the results of KTU’s strong disapproval on legalization and implementation of TEPD. On the other hand, KFTA, affiliated to a supportive advocacy coalition with conditions, played a significant role to end the endless dispute and led to the nationwide implementation of TEPD.

Third, external factors that influenced policy subsystem of TEPD were discussed by the three components of external factors: relatively stable parameter, external subsystem events, and long-term coalition opportunity structures. Relatively stable parameter involved basic attributes of the problem, which were around the existing teacher evaluation policies. Additionally it included the fundamental sociocultural values and social structure, which referred to paradigm shifts that are a) from an authoritarian and centralized governmental system to a system that encouraged autonomy to local districts and individual schools, and b) the “PISA-shock” that triggered a global-wide reform in educational systems (Waldo, 2009). External subsystem events included changes in socioeconomic conditions (i.e., the IMF bailout), public opinion on teacher quality that teachers should be accountable for the quality of education, and systematic governing coalition due to the regime change. Long-term coalition opportunity structures referred to the degree of consensus needed for major policy change and openness of the political system. Korea had gone through democratization movement since the mid-1980s, and decentralization of governance was spreading rapidly in Korea. The changes in such structures led to a higher degree of consensus needed for a policy change of TEPD and allowed autonomy to local districts and individual schools on operating TEPD.
Fourth, the case of TEPD partially supported the core postulates of advocacy coalitions from ACF. Two questions were accountable for this matter: a) When policy beliefs are in dispute, do the lineup of allies and opponents tend to be rather stable over periods of a decade or so? and b) Do actors within an advocacy coalition show substantial consensus on issues pertaining to the policy core, although less so on secondary beliefs? First, the constitution of advocacy coalitions was generally stable, but there was a major change within the period of more than ten years. The composition of advocacy coalitions changed after five years as KFTA changed their stance from opposing to supporting the implementation of TEPD with conditions. Second, mixed results for the second question were presented. The formation of a subdivision within KTU derived from disagreement on their secondary belief (i.e., postponing the collective movement). The case of KTU suggested the assumption of internal consensus on pertaining the policy core belief, although less so on secondary belief. However, the case of KFTA involved dissension in their policy core belief (i.e., stance on implementing TEPD). The change in the policy core belief was a result of the president of KFTA’s unilateral decision without a unanimous agreement from the members of KFTA. Therefore, the two core postulates of advocacy coalitions from ACF are partially supported by the case of TEPD.
Chapter 6
Discussion and Conclusion

Involvement of teachers as major key stakeholders in the policy formation and change processes enables smooth implementation of the policy (Danielson, 2001; Danielson, 2011; Donaldson, 2012). As teacher evaluation policies being one of the most sensitive policies to teachers, seeking their consultation in finalizing the policy design is very critical for a successful implementation (Bangs & MacBeath, 2012). Using the case of teacher evaluation policy in Korea – Teacher Evaluation for Professional Development (TEPD) or Gyo-won-neung-lyeog-gae-bal-pyeong-ga – this study explored the influences of teacher organizations in the policy processes of TEPD under the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF). By doing so, this study examined the components of ACF – advocacy coalitions, belief systems, resources, strategies, and external factors – and how the components are related to the policy change.

This chapter is divided into four parts. First, the unique contributions to the literature are reviewed. Second, the main findings are summarized and discussed, with detailed descriptions of the findings concerning the three primary research questions previously raised. Third, policy implications for TEPD and recommendations for policymakers are presented. Finally, limitations and areas for future research are discussed.

Contribution to the Field

This study expanded the literature on ACF and teacher involvement in the policy formation and change processes in the following ways. First, this study explored the roles of strategies and activities of advocacy coalitions. Previous literature had suggested that there were
underdeveloped areas in regards to the role of coalition resources, strategies, and activities (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Sabatier & Weible, 2007). By analyzing the strategies and activities that advocacy coalitions demonstrated, the study defined the concept of intensity of strategies – less intense versus aggressive strategies. Moreover, the study explained the role of strategies, which was to reinforce the advocacy coalition’s stance and influence the policy process. For instance, KTU used aggressive strategies to allure the attention of the media and thus lead to a delay in implementation of TEPD. Previous studies that applied ACF did not pay much attention to defining the intensity of strategies and its subsequent effects. This study expanded the literature on ACF by defining the concept of intensity in strategies and explaining the role of strategies.

Second, the study expanded the literature on the application of ACF to the education field in Korea. Most previous studies that applied ACF were distributed around North America and European countries and less so among Asian countries (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014). Although Korean literature on ACF application dramatically increased since 2003 (Jang et al., 2016), less research introduced ACF to the education field. As ACF is now praised as a framework that can be used worldwide, adapting the framework to the understudied areas is a great contribution to the field. Specifically, this study contributed to expanding the literature on ACF application regarding both area (i.e., Korea) and field (i.e., education).

Lastly, the study contributed to expanding the literature on Korean teacher organizations that are comparatively new to international scholarly work. There were relatively few studies related to Korean teacher organizations. The organizations, however, cast an interesting case since the government had not legalized teacher unions for almost half a century from the inception of teacher association. Given that the nation allows the co-existence of two types of teacher organization as a step forward to democratization, one of the goals of this study is to examine how those two organizations with different beliefs and strategy preferences would express the opinions of their organization along the policymaking process.
Main Findings and Discussions

ACF argues that stakeholders in a policy subsystem form advocacy coalitions through shared beliefs. The advocacy coalitions yield strategies based on their beliefs and resources to influence policy formation and change processes. Moreover, ACF underscores influences of external factors on policy change indirectly through policy subsystem and directly to the policy change (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Sabatier & Weible, 2007). This study incorporated these concepts of ACF to explain the influences of teacher organizations on TEPD policy processes. However, the results, at some times, did not fully support the core postulates of ACF. Unique characteristics of teacher organizations in Korea was responsible for the partial support of the ACF assumptions.

This study surveyed the period from 2004, in which the first discussion on implementing TEPD had started, to 2016 and focused on the roles of teacher organizations in the TEPD policy process. The study highlighted the influences and interactions of stakeholders (i.e., teacher organizations and education ministry) that are principal coalition actors, who played a major role and had continuous participation to the policy process throughout the whole process (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014). Meanwhile, the study paid less attention to the auxiliary coalition actors (e.g., parents association and researchers), who played a minimal role and did not participate in the policy process throughout the whole process (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014). The following section summarizes and discusses the main findings of this study by research question.
Research Question #1: How did teacher organizations attempt to influence TEPD policy processes?

The first research question assumed that teacher organizations influenced TEPD policy processes. The findings suggested that the influence varies by teacher organization. Two teacher organizations were accountable for the analysis of this study: Korean Federation of Teachers’ Association (KFTA) or Han-gug-gyo-won-dan-che-chong-yeon-hab-hoe and Korean Teachers and Education Workers Union (KTU) or Jeon-gug-gyo-jig-won-no-dong-jo-hab. This study summarized the influences of teacher organizations into five categories: delay in implementing TEPD, nationwide implementation, failure to gain sufficient legal grounds, revisions in details of the TEPD model, and incapacitation of TEPD. Delay in implementation, failure to have a full legal basis, and incapacitation of TEPD were accountable for the fierce opposition from KTU. Revisions in details of TEPD were the results related to both teacher organizations. Meanwhile, nationwide implementation and establishing a minimal legal ground for TEPD were derived by belief changes of KFTA. Further explanations are discussed by answering the two sub-questions.

Research Question #1-1: What beliefs, resources, and strategies did teacher organizations have that influenced TEPD policy processes?

An advocacy coalition is formed by the stakeholders who share the same beliefs (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014). Likewise, teacher organizations shared the beliefs when they were affiliated to the same advocacy coalition during the period of discussing the introduction of the new teacher evaluation policy. Belief systems in ACF are presented with three-tiered structures namely deep core belief, policy core belief, and secondary belief (Sabatier & Weible, 2007). KFTA and KTU in the same advocacy coalition shared the same deep core beliefs and policy core beliefs, which functioned as a hindrance to implementing TEPD (the first influence of teacher organizations on
TEPD policy process). Their deep core beliefs were teacher-oriented values that underscored teachers’ distinctive characteristics and that professionalism should be reflected in teacher policies. Opposing to the implementation of TEPD, policy core belief, directly led to a delay in implementing TEPD nationwide. However, on the contrary, as KFTA’s changed their policy core belief to supporting the implementation of TEPD, this empowered the government’s plan and directly led to the implementation of TEPD (the second influence of teacher organizations on TEPD policy processes). Furthermore, consistent opposition on TEPD implementation by KTU directed TEPD to be incapacitated in school settings (the third influence of teacher organizations on TEPD policy process).

Secondary beliefs, which dealt with the details of the policy, affected TEPD policy process as an impediment to building legal grounds and as a trigger to revisions in the TEPD model – (the fourth and fifth influences of teacher organizations on TEPD policy processes). KTU’s strong resistance against legalizing TEPD as the organization’s secondary belief interrupted TEPD to gain a full legal basis that could have been achieved by amending the higher-level law to incorporate TEPD. Moreover, revisions on student and parent surveys were a triumph based on both KFTA and KTU’s secondary beliefs that students and parents are not eligible for partaking in teacher evaluations.

Teacher organizations were able to influence TEPD policy process through resources and strategies. Both teacher organizations used resources such as mobilizable members and had engaged leadership; but the priority for using the resources differed. Although they were in the same advocacy coalition, each used different resources and strategies. KTU made good use of teachers to conduct rallies and protests, whereas KFTA had a strong leadership that influenced a policy change. In regards to strategies, these two teacher organizations utilized press releases and newsletters, less intensive strategies, throughout the whole process but with different magnitude. KTU used aggressive strategies compared to KFTA not only in the use of belligerent
terminologies but also in terms of conducting truculent activities such as illegal strikes and occupying forums.

*Research Question #1-2: Did beliefs change? If so, how did the change in beliefs affect TEPD policy processes?*

The ACF assumes that the policy change is partially attributable to belief changes of advocacy coalitions (Sabatier & Weible, 2007). In the case of TEPD, a change in policy core belief of KFTA led to a nationwide implementation and secondary belief change allowed building a legal basis for TEPD through the establishment of the Presidential decree and the Order. During the period of discussing the introduction of a new teacher evaluation policy, KFTA and KTU formed an advocacy coalition based on shared beliefs to oppose the implementation of the policy. However, their difference in beliefs led to a fracture in the allies of opposition and affiliation to different advocacy coalitions. As discussed earlier, both teacher organizations shared the deep core beliefs that were related to the teacher-oriented values to emphasize distinctiveness and professionalism of teachers when implementing teacher policies. However, the differences in deep core beliefs – KFTA’s emphasis on teachers’ sense of a duty and KTU’s focus on teacher autonomy – led to the difference in policy core beliefs (i.e., conditionally support the policy and oppose to the policy) and subsequently resulted in the separation of the allies.

KFTA’s change in beliefs from an opposition to only opposing the haste, not the implementation itself, could be interpreted in two ways. First, the belief change was a trade of a policy core belief of policy actors for strategic short-term interests (Nohrstedt, 2005; Sabatier & Weible, 2007). By positioning themselves as only opposing to the haste, not the implementation of TEPD, KFTA put themselves in a good position to win a battle of attrition. They weakened and delayed their opposition until the government changed or grew weary (Schoppa, 1991). Second, the president of KFTA strategically supported the policy to have a positive relationship with the government. The position ‘president of KFTA’ had often been used as a stepping-stone
to entering politics. As a conservative teacher organization, KFTA traditionally had a strong relationship with the conservative party. During the period of discussing the details of the TEPD model, the conservative party took over power. Thus, the president attempting to seize the political connection and aiming for party cohesion announced the change to their stance. However, the majority of KFTA’s members had a contrasting policy core belief that is maintaining the opposition side. KFTA’s change in their stances was a leader’s unilateral decision, which neglected the internal dissension within the organization.

Research Question #2: Does the case of TEPD align with the core postulates of advocacy coalitions from ACF?

This study aimed to examine whether the case of TEPD fulfills the core postulates of advocacy coalitions from ACF. The supporters of ACF suggest applying ACF to a policy that changed with a timespan of more than a decade. They argue that it is crucial to analyze a policy with a long-term perspective (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Sabatier & Weible, 2007). During the period, the ACF avers that the advocacy coalitions remain stable when policy beliefs are in dispute. In contrast, the advocacy coalitions in TEPD changed during the period of discussing the introduction of a new teacher evaluation policy. Additionally, the ACF claims that actors within an advocacy coalition present substantial consensus on the policy core, although less so on secondary beliefs (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Sabatier & Weible, 2007). However, the case of TEPD presented mixed results by showing an internal dissension on a policy core belief. The following two sub-questions further extends the discussion.
Research Question #2-1: When policy beliefs are in dispute, do the lineup of allies and opponents tends to be rather stable over periods of a decade or so?

As previously discussed, KFTA started to show a change in their stance on TEPD implementation after three years. In the beginning, KFTA formed an ally with KTU and both were affiliated with the same advocacy coalition – the opposition advocacy coalition. The advocacy coalition had a shared policy core belief that is to oppose the implementation of TEPD. However, after three years, KFTA changed their stance and conditionally supported TEPD implementation – opposed to the haste, not the implementation itself. Furthermore, the opposition on the legalization of KFTA also changed to unconditional support after five years. Once KFTA settled with their policy core belief, the lineup of allies and opponents prone to be stable. Thus, the case of TEPD corroborates that the lineup of allies and opponents tends to fluctuate when policy beliefs are in dispute. Rather, the advocacy coalitions become stabilized only after policy beliefs are determined, and particularly, policy core beliefs contribute to the stabilization of allies and opponents between advocacy coalitions.

Research Question #2-2: Do actors within an advocacy coalition show substantial consensus on issues pertaining to the policy core, although less so on secondary beliefs?

ACF suggests that the likelihood of change in beliefs differs depending on where the beliefs are located in the three-tiered hierarchical structure. Beliefs located at the first tier – deep core beliefs – are very difficult to change, whereas policy core beliefs at the next level are subject to change in case of severe conflicts only. Secondary beliefs located at the last tier require less evidence and fewer agreements among policy actors to change. Thus, changes in the beliefs at this tier are less difficult to happen compared to other beliefs (Sabatier & Weible, 2007). Accordingly, ACF assumes that policy actors within an advocacy coalition agree more easily on issues relevant to the policy core beliefs than on the secondary beliefs (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014). However, mixed results were found in the case of TEPD policy process.
The case of KTU supported while the case of KFTA disputed the assumption of the actors within the advocacy coalitions would have substantial agreement on the policy core beliefs, although less so on the secondary beliefs. Subdivisions within KTU was created in November 2005 and lasted for three months when the president of KTU unilaterally decided to postpone and not conduct a collective movement even though it was already planned. This decision led to the ousting of the president. A new president was elected to represent the members’ opinion on strategies. More than half of KTU members supported carrying aggressive strategies, which is related to the secondary belief. Their internal dissension disagreed upon a secondary belief rather than a policy core belief. Therefore, the agreement among policy actors within KTU was to pertain their stance on opposing the induction of a new teacher evaluation and aggressive strategies.

However, the results shown by KFTA were different. Policy core belief for KFTA during the period of discussing the details of TEPD model changed from opposing to supporting the implementation with certain conditions. Although KFTA announced their support for implementing TEPD, the majority of KFTA’s members had a contrasting policy core belief, which was to maintain the opposition side. Subdivisions within KFTA was formed in September 2009 and caused a gradual decrease in the number of members. As shown previously, the president of KFTA had the desire to enter politics, which was commonly done by the previous presidents. Moreover, the leader of KFTA who possessed authoritative power and held the final say reinforced this change in policy core belief. Thus, KFTA’s change in their stances could be interpreted as the leader’s unilateral decision, which caused the internal dissension within the organization. Although the case of KTU supported the assumption, the result displayed dissent on the policy core belief among the members and indicated a rather contradicting consequence to the assumption.
Research Question #3: What are external factors that led changes to the policy change?

The ACF hypothesizes that the interactions between policy subsystem and external factors lead to a policy change (Sabatier & Weible, 2007). The major external factors are divided into three categories: relatively stable parameters, external subsystem events, and long-term coalition opportunity structures (Table 6-1). Two or three sub-categories consist of each external factor.

Table 6-1. External Factors Accountable for TEPD Policy Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Factors</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>The case of TEPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relatively stable parameters</td>
<td>Basic attributes of the problem</td>
<td>The issues around existing teacher evaluation policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paradigm shift</td>
<td>“PISA-shock,” Decentralization and democratization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External subsystem events</td>
<td>Changes in socioeconomic conditions</td>
<td>The IMF bailout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in public opinion on teacher quality</td>
<td>Prevalence of shadow education, Recommendations from OECD, Global interest towards accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in systemic governing coalition</td>
<td>Regime change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term coalition opportunity structures</td>
<td>Degree of consensus</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Openness of political system</td>
<td>Widely open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, in regards to the relatively stable parameters, this study found that incremental problems of existing teacher evaluation policies – Teacher Evaluation for Performance (TEP) or Geun-mu-seong-jeog-pyeong-jeong and Performance-Based Incentive System (PBIS) or Seong-gwa-sang-yeo-geum-pyeong – attributed to the increase in the needs for a new teacher evaluation policy. The major problems with the two existing teacher evaluations were closely related to their purposes; the results of TEP were used for promotion purposes while the results of PBIS were used extrinsic motivation (i.e., monetary incentives) to encourage high performing teachers. Thus, discussions for a new teacher evaluation policy that solely centered on enhancing teacher quality
began. In addition, a paradigm shift triggered by “PISA-shock” facilitated a discussion for a new teacher evaluation in Korea. Moreover, the paradigm shift of decentralization resulted in granting autonomy to local districts and individual schools and deciding details for the TEPD model.

Second, three changes that were connected to external subsystem events affected TEPD policy change: changes in socioeconomic conditions, public opinion on teacher quality, and systemic governing coalition. After the International Monetary Fund (IMF) bailout in 1997, the educational budget was decreased, and the government announced to shorten the teachers’ retirement age. The IMF bailout triggered a lively discussion on teacher quality because the teaching profession is considered to have high job security in Korea. The public questioned the quality of teachers as issues around shadow education prevailed the society, which led to increasing distrust in public education, namely “classroom collapse” (N. Kang, 2013; H. Lee, 2003). Moreover, OECD’s recommendations to reform teacher evaluation policy and a rise in global interest in teacher accountability altogether triggered introducing a new teacher evaluation policy in Korea. Regime change accounted for another external subsystem event that influenced TEPD policy change. The direction of policy is highly relevant to the aims of the administration in power. In case of TEPD policy process, communications among multiple stakeholders were more emphasized by the Roh administration, while less so for the Lee administration that aimed to enforce TEPD implementation. Thus, the formation and changes in TEPD policy were influenced as the regime changed.

Third, the degree of consensus and openness of political system constituted the long-term coalition opportunity structures that influenced TEPD policy change. Since the mid-1980s, as Korean society moved towards decentralization and democratization, a major policy change in the Korean society entails a higher degree of consensus. Furthermore, Korea embraced a more open political system, which allowed diverse voice from multiple stakeholders. Therefore, such long-term coalition opportunity structures led to more conversations around TEPD policy
process. Although some might argue that the high degree of consensus needed for major policy changes would delay the nationwide implementation of TEPD, meeting the agreement through conversations are important in terms of policy success in the long run.

**Policy Recommendations**

The findings of this study lead to policy recommendations in two areas. One suggestion involves key stakeholders to the policy process and the other recommends the teacher evaluation policy, including TEPD. The following five recommendations, which are based on the results from this study, outline suggestions and alterations for policymakers and scholars that are preceded by acknowledging teachers’ professionalism.

*Policy Recommendation #1: Involve teachers in the policy process from the very beginning.*

Participation of the key stakeholders in the decision-making process of teacher policies empowers positive perception from teachers (Danielson, 2001; 2011; Donaldson, 2012). Contributions of teachers on the policy process and positive perceptions conduce to a successful implementation of the policy (Akiba, 2013). Accordingly, Korean government invited key stakeholders to the discussion and attempted to involve major stakeholders in the TEPD policy processes. However, it resulted in impediments to a smooth implementation and gave the government a pyrrhic victory. Such unintended problem may have derived from missing the crucial juncture for the government to include teacher organizations. The government invited teacher organizations only after they invited scholars first to do a primary research on implementing TEPD. When designing a policy, it is important to comprehend how related stakeholders would react to the policy (N. Park & H. Park, 2018). Thus, the government should
not only consider involving the stakeholders in the policy process but also further reach to a consideration of the crucial juncture for involving major stakeholders.

As a strategic gesture to promote diverse opinions from multiple stakeholders, the Moon administration announced establishing National Board of Education (NBE) by 2020. Prior to that, the Korean government currently launched a presidential advisory body named National Education Association (NEA). NEA aims to involve communications among multiple stakeholders to establish coherent educational policies in the medium and long-term. However, the organization has been criticized for neglecting in-service teachers as members of NEA.

Teacher engagement is very crucial to apprehending substantial needs that should be applied to policies (N. Park, 2018). Policymakers should learn the lessons from the TEPD case and involve teachers in the discussion from the very beginning of the policy process.

**Policy Recommendation #2: Consider teachers who are not members of teacher organizations.**

Teachers in Korea are government officials and their interest in joining teacher organizations are decreasing annually. Especially after KTU was declared as an illegal organization in 2016, the number of members at KTU decreased dramatically – from 14.5% of total 414,000 teachers in 2015 to 1.8% of total 414,209 teachers in 2016 (Ministry of Employment and Labor, 2018). There are four reasons accountable for the decrease in teachers joining teacher organization. First, as shown from the case of subdivision within KFTA, the president’s unilateral decision to neglect the majority of the members led to the decrease in membership. In addition, KFTA also favored and represented principals more than teachers, which further caused a decrease in membership. Second, increased number of free-riders caused the decrease in a number of organization members. Individuals tend not to join organizations if they are able to obtain benefits without putting any monetary and/or non-monetary efforts. The
benefits achieved by teacher organizations are given to only the members but also all teachers.

Third, a change in the teaching profession is accountable for the decrease in teachers joining teacher organizations. Previously, principals who had authoritative power forced new teachers to join KFTA. As schools were democratized, principals can no longer impose their opinions on teachers to join the organization. Furthermore, the culture within teaching profession around individualism led for new teachers to become more indifferent in joining teacher organizations. Thus, it is less likely for teacher organizations to represent the voice of all teachers. KFTA represented the beliefs of elites, not necessarily the members, based on the evidence shown from the internal dissension around implementing TEPD. As previously discussed, teachers should be involved during policy processes. In addition to including the teacher organizations in the policy process, teachers who are not members of teacher organizations should be encouraged to speak for their opinions as well.

**Policy Recommendation #3: Maintain orientation in teacher policies.**

The findings indicated that TEPD policy changed as regime changed. Korean educational policies are notorious for their radical implementation without sufficient discussions about the policy and frequent changes of the details of the policy (Han & Jeon, 2012), which often cause critical side effects and/or malfunction of the policy (E. Cho & S. Cho, 2017). The evidence from the TEPD case that the president of the Education Committee under the National Assembly stated during the conversation with the president of KFTA in 2007 well corroborate such phenomenon. During the discussion, the president of the Education Committee commented that the committee members agreed to pass the bill first and then revise defects later; otherwise, the bill will never pass and the policy would never be implemented. Enacting an ostrich policy would increase confusion and burden teachers due to frequent changes of the policy details.
Moreover, TEPD should be aligned with other teacher policies. Maintaining orientation can enhance and maximize policy effects because it lessens unnecessary procedures to build consensus. The discussion on merging TEPD to PE and make one teacher evaluation associates with such argument. Additionally, a policy may lose its direction when a conflicting ideology serves as a basis for establishing the policy. For instance, TEPD will be incapacitated even faster when the orientation of TEPD (i.e., enhancing professional development) is ignored and used as a means to monitor teachers. Therefore, teacher policies should be aligned with the basic direction of a whole. Furthermore, the evaluation should aim to help teachers improve rather than depressing teachers’ morale. This connects to the next recommendation.

**Policy Recommendation #4: Respect teachers’ professionalism and allow more authority to teachers.**

One of the contention that KTU appealed to the government during the conflict was securing autonomy for teachers. Teachers in Korea have been highly praised for their high quality from the global community. High achieving secondary school students expect to enter the teaching profession in Korea due to high economic and social status (Park & Byun, 2015; Williams & Engel, 2012). However, teachers are appealing that they are being disrespected by the society. Recently, teachers made a petition for abolishing “teachers’ day,” arguing that they are not being respected and thus there is no point of continuing celebration a day for teachers (Seoul Shin-moon, April 24, 2018; Yonhapnews, May 15, 2018). Teachers argued that they are being left out, or ‘teacher passing’ is happening, from the policy processes. The fact that not a single in-service teacher is involved as a member of NEC furnishes evidence.

In addition to enhancing the culture to respect teachers, teachers should be given more autonomies regarding making decisions over their work. Previous studies suggested that teachers
who are given more autonomy are highly motivated to achieve high and are closely associated with a high degree of professionalism (Pearson & Moomaw, 2005). Teacher policy reforms toward accountability with monitoring purposes regulate teachers’ work extensively (Ball, 2003). Moreover, educational reforms that are based on accountability procedures threaten and diminish the ability of teachers to make decisions and teacher responsibility (Akiba, 2013; Hargreaves, 2012; Tato, 2006). Current TEPD policy gives authority to local districts and individual schools on deciding the details of the TEPD model. Giving autonomy should be expanded to teachers, which will raise the teachers’ morale and direct teachers to voluntarily seek measures to enhance their professional development.

*Policy Recommendation #5: Evaluate teachers based on their individual differences, especially, teaching experiences.*

Individual teachers show differences in many aspects and the differences are more extreme when comparing teachers by years of teaching experiences. New teachers and teachers with many years of teaching experiences possess the different amount of knowledge and/or teaching skills, and perform with distinctive capacities. Accordingly, teachers should be evaluated with different criteria to help them effectively. Current TEPD divides evaluation content based on types of teachers (i.e., principal, vice-principal, master teachers, and regular teachers). Nonetheless, more distinctions should be considered when revising evaluation contents; for instance, teachers can be evaluated based on their developmental stage (H. Park, 2009). Teachers who are new to the teaching profession could be evaluated to get more help on professional development, whereas teachers with more experiences could be evaluated focusing on encouraging teachers who burned out themselves or teachers who made outstanding growth. Unified or standardized evaluation contents may impede to distinguish diversity among teachers’
capacity and incur ineffective usage of the evaluation results. Moreover, teaching experience should be considered when using the evaluation results. As teachers are prone to possess a wide range of teaching and learning professional capacities by teaching experiences, applying unique professional development may facilitate teachers with remedies in need. Indeed, teaching experience is not the only differences individual teachers possess. Features that are more different should be dealt with when using the evaluation results.

**Limitations and Further Directions for Research**

This study has a limitation in generalizing the results to other contexts since it specifically analyzed the case of Korea. As presented in the results, advocacy coalitions and their belief systems changed throughout the TEPD policy processes. This revealed a contradicting result from the ACF’s assumption that the allies and opponents within the advocacy coalitions would rather be stable over a decade or so. However, it is difficult to generalize the findings to other policies because the study only dealt with a single case from teacher evaluation policy in Korea. Much research on policy formation heavily relies on policy diffusion. Policy diffusion is an explanatory framework that was widely spread to explain the phenomenon of uniformity and similarity in policies across nations starting from the 1980s throughout to the 1990s (Campbell, 2002). For instance, with the case of TEPD, the suggestions from the OECD was one of the main factors for the inducement of a new teacher evaluation system. Nonetheless, scholars discussed how national contexts can shape variations in policies (Anderson-Levitt, 2003; Steinmo, Thelen, & Longstreth, 1992). Although diffusions are the dominant explanation for policy formation, the importance of local influence should not be overlooked (Akiba, 2017). Thus, blindly applying Korean case study to other countries may put a severe failure of the policy. The national contexts should be cautiously taken care of when applying to other nations’ successful policies.
Further research could take several directions. Conducting research on underdeveloped area could be a possible research direction (Jenkins-Smith et al., 2014; Sabatier & Weible, 2007). One direction could be extending the discussion on the types and roles of strategies. Although there was some research that dealt with defining typologies and roles of belief systems, only few research discussed expanding the theory of ACF in regards to strategies. This study roughly defined the two types of strategies by intensity – less intensive and aggressive intensity. Future studies could extend the types of strategies by subdividing them to various categories other than intensity. In addition, the results of this study suggested that all advocacy coalitions used both strategies, but advocacy coalition opposing the policy carried out more aggressive strategies in number. Future research could further explore the relationship between the intensity of strategies and change in the policy process.

Furthermore, more research could be conducted for a comparative analysis on educational policy processes among adjacent countries with similar contexts. For instance, comparisons between Korea and Japan could open a new direction to the literature of ACF. Further research could unravel the issues whether the fluctuation in advocacy coalitions is a unique pattern in Korea or whether the result could be applicable to other nations with similar contexts as well. Moreover, comparing processes of educational policies in European countries could provide broader perspectives to the literature. For instance, comparing policy processes for educational policies in Nordic countries, where high student outcome is reported, could be conducted. The similarities and differences in the policy processes could be used as strategies for a successful implementation of policies. Further, as European context is the second most used area for applying ACF to analyze policy process, comparisons among European countries with unionism structure could establish certain patterns to help policymakers to smoothly establish policies.
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Appendix A

Checklist for Evaluating Documents

- Who produced the document?
- Why was the document produced?
- Was the person or group that produced the document in a position to write authoritatively about the subject or issue?
- Is the material genuine?
- Did the person or group have an axe to grind and if so can you identify a particular slant?
- Is the document typical of its kind and if not is it possible to establish how untypical it is and in what ways?
- Is the meaning of the document clear?
- Can you corroborate the events or accounts presented in the document?
- Are there different interpretations of the document from the one you offer and if so what are they and why have you discounted them?

(adapted from Bryman, 2012, p. 561-562)
# Appendix B

## Chronological Development of Teacher Evaluation for Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Periods</th>
<th>Major Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 22, 1961</td>
<td>Discussions about civil servant evaluation for work performance are initiated under Evaluation for Work Performance Regulation (Cabinet Decree No. 234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 16, 1962</td>
<td>Detailed rules for operations are implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep. 8, 1964</td>
<td>Teacher Evaluation for Performance is started based on Educational Civil Servant Promotion Regulation (Presidential Decree No.1963) - Evaluation criteria (Total 60): Performance results (30); task performance ability (15); job attitude (15) - Timespan: Teachers are evaluated twice a year (i.e., June and December) - Relative ranking system: A (20%); B (70%); and C (10%) - The results are revealed to the public including evaluated teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 5, 1965</td>
<td>Evaluation is reduced from twice a year to once a year in December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Total score for evaluation criteria is raised from 60 to 80: Performance results (40); task performance ability (20); and job attitude (20) - Proportion of rankings change: A (10%); B (30%); C (50%); and D (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Use of integrated scores from recent three years instead of one-time evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Decrease evaluated years from three to two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Evaluation criteria change: Qualities and attitude (24); Work performance and ability (56), total score remains the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25, 2007</td>
<td>Complete revision (Presidential Decree No. 20068) - Multi-dimensional evaluation by peer teachers is added - Evaluated results (i.e., final evaluation points) are disclosed to the targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Revised the duration: Apply scores from three years that a teacher has gained best results out of five evaluated years instead of two recent years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>A proposal for combining with Performance-Based Incentive System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Combined with Performance-Based Incentive System, revised and named Teacher Performance Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C

**Chronological Development of Performance-Based Incentive System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Periods</th>
<th>Major Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1995</strong></td>
<td>Educational Civil Servant Special Bonus (ECSSB) is first initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1997</strong></td>
<td>The incentive policy is abolished due to financial crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1999</strong></td>
<td>Civil Service Commission revises ECSSB and expands special bonus policy to all civil servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2001.2</strong></td>
<td>Civil Service Commission notifies detailed rules for operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2001.9</strong></td>
<td>Performance-based incentives are provided to all teachers by three-scale levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2001.12</strong></td>
<td>The government negotiates with KTU to completely revise or abolish PBIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2002.2</strong></td>
<td>The government announced to abolish PBIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2002.8</strong></td>
<td>Civil Service Commission and Teachers Unions accept suggestion from MEHRD that is to provide equal-amount incentives (90%) and level-differentiated incentives (10%) from Performance-Based Incentive budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2002-2005</strong></td>
<td>Equal-amount incentives (90%); level-differentiated incentives (10%); Incentives are provided once a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006</strong></td>
<td>Equal-amount incentives (80%); level-differentiated incentives (20%); Incentive are provided by installment of twice a year in July and October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2007</strong></td>
<td>Incentive is provided once a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2008</strong></td>
<td>Equal-amount incentives (70%); level-differentiated incentives (30%);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009</strong></td>
<td>Increase the proportion of level-differentiated incentives to 30-50%; Principals of individual schools can decide the detailed proportion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td>Increase the proportion of level-differentiated incentives to 50-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011</strong></td>
<td>The government introduces a Performance-Based System for individual schools that partakes 10% of Performance-Based Incentives budget; Proportions and evaluation criteria are open to the public available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2012</strong></td>
<td>Increase the proportion of Performance-Based System for individual schools from 10% to 20% of Performance-Based Incentives budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015</strong></td>
<td>A proposal for integrating PBIS and TEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016</strong></td>
<td>Revised, combined with Teacher Evaluation for Performance, and named as Performance Evaluation (PE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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