Chapter 7
Inclusive Education in Republic of Korea

Hyun-Ki Shin and Yoon-Suk Hwang

Abstract Republic of Korea has seen exponential growth in not only the economy but also inclusive education. According to special education statistics (Ministry of Education, 2019), over 70% of school-aged students with disabilities are physically placed in general schools. Despite the quantitative growth in inclusive education and the existence of an inclusive education policy, it is questionable that the students placed in general classrooms and special classrooms of general schools receive appropriate individualised educational services as students with disabilities in regular schools return to special schools. Contrary to a global trend of special education moving away from segregation and making its way towards inclusion, Korean inclusive education has evolved in a way that necessitates strengthening both inclusion and segregation by extending specialised support for inclusive education and opportunities for special education. The authors in this chapter will discuss Korean cultural and traditional backgrounds, statistics showing the current status of special and inclusive education, policies and legislation of Korean special and inclusive education, research on curricula, and teacher training for inclusive education. Implications for the advancement of inclusive education will be explored.

Keywords Cultural backgrounds · Inclusion · Inclusive education · Policies · Legislations · Republic of Korea

H.-K. Shin (✉)
Department of Special Education, Dankook University, Yongin-si, Republic of Korea
e-mail: shinkiha@dankook.ac.kr

Y.-S. Hwang
Brisbane, QLD, Australia

W. Beamish, M. Yuen (eds.), *The Inclusion for Students with Special Educational Needs across the Asia Pacific*, Advancing Inclusive and Special Education in the Asia-Pacific, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-2221-3_7

Introduction

Republic of Korea has seen exponential growth in both the economy and special education. Inclusive education has been a strategic direction at which policies of Korean special education aimed. However, this policy-led approach posed challenges and limitations to the implementation of inclusive education. Contrary to a global trend of special education moving away from segregation and making its way towards inclusion, Korean inclusive education has evolved in a way that necessitates strengthening both inclusion and segregation by extending specialised support for inclusive education and opportunities for special education. In this chapter, we will discuss cultural backgrounds, current statistical status, and policies and legislation of Korean special education to investigate the sources of these rather conflicting implementation practices, along with current research in pre- and in-service teacher training for inclusive education. We will then explore practical implications for the advancement of inclusive education.

Inclusive Education in Republic of Korea: Cultural Contexts

As a mono-cultural and mono-ethnic society, Republic of Korea has a long history and tradition of homogeneous lifestyles. People with disabilities had a role to play within this community living culture and were looked after as fellow humans by people in the village. People with disabilities by default were included in the archetypically integrated lifestyles. In this traditional society, ties within family kinship were highly regarded. As seen in Simcheongjeon, a Korean folk tale from the Joseon Dynasty (1392–1910), filial Simcheong and her neighbours looked after and lived harmoniously with people with disabilities, such as Simcheong's father. However, traditional attitudes towards people with disabilities and levels of social inclusion for them have declined (Jung, 2005).

Lee (1981) found the cause of such regression and discrimination against people with disabilities in agricultural cultures, which was explained by five types of orientation. Orientation towards general persons mark the first characteristic. In agricultural culture where labour is precious, people were divided into two categories, those with labour force and those without. People without labour force were naturally excluded in this structure. People who know how to manage the entire process of cultivating, storing, and trading crops were regarded as capable persons. This tendency was also found in academic achievements. Students who were good at all subjects, rather than selected ones, were acknowledged as excellent. With orientation to all-rounders, the second characteristic of agricultural cultures, people with disabilities were perceived as being incomplete.

A class structure existed in Northeast Asia consisting of four categories of people based on professions (i.e. *Sa* for gentry scholars, *Nong* for farmers, *Gong* for artisans and craftsmen, and *Sang* for merchants and traders). People in a higher class (e.g. *Sa*) governed those in a lower class (e.g. *Sang*). People could easily become frustrated in this hierarchical structure, and people with disabilities could become easy targets for displacement of their frustration. From the western perspective, prevailing shamanic practices in agricultural cultures resulted in a deficiency of super-ego, and this manifested in the lack of care for people with disabilities. Lastly, traditional welfare for the old through cooperation within village communities has become weakened, resulting in the lack of care for the disadvantaged.

Despite their continuing effects, no proper consideration has been given to these cultural backgrounds and traditional problems in developing and implementing inclusive education policies. Inclusive education policies developed in different cultures were applied under the force of special legislation without undergoing cultural adaptations. The inevitable results of not taking specific cultural backgrounds into consideration are reverse inclusion. In 2014, the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (the Committee) responded with 66 principal areas of concern and recommendations for adopting and implementing the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD; United Nations, 2006). Of these the following concern is related to article 24, Education, and raises the issue of a reverse from inclusive education to segregated education in Republic of Korea (CRPD, 2014):

> 45. The Committee is concerned that, despite the existence of an inclusive education policy, students with disabilities in regular schools return to special schools. It is further concerned about reports that students with disabilities enrolled in regular schools fail to receive education that is suitable to their impairment-related needs.

It is important to understand the necessity of taking unique cultural backgrounds into consideration when developing and implementing inclusive education policies to put into practice the universal principle that every human being is equal before the law.

Inclusive Education in Republic of Korea: Current Statistics

According to the Korean Statistical Information Service (2020), the Korean population is 51,843,195 as of March 2020 (male 25,858,743; female 25,984,452). Of these the kindergarten, primary, and secondary school-aged population is 6,136,793. The Korean school-aged population includes 137,225 students with multi-cultural backgrounds. Of these 116,766 students (i.e. 85%) are from internationally married families. The number of students with multi-cultural backgrounds has increased by 15,013 (i.e. 12.3%), compared to 122,212 in 2018. This trend shows that the recipients of special education services have been extended to students with multicultural backgrounds and support programs have been diversified in language and communication.

There are 92,958 school-aged students with special education needs (SEN), comprising 1.5% of the total school-aged population (Ministry of Education, 2019). Table 7.1 shows the types of their educational placement. Of 92,958

Table 7.1 The current status of school-aged students with SEN

Year	Total	Infant	K	P	M	H	P-H
2019	92,958	532	5989	41,091	18,462	21,502	5382

Note: *P* primary schools; *M* middle schools; *H* high schools; *P-H* post-high school

Table 7.2 Educational placement of school-aged children and young adults with SEN

Placement	Special school (28.0%)	General schools		Special education support centre (0.5%)	Total
		Special unit (54.7%)	General classroom (16.8%)		
Students with SEN	26,084	50,812	15,687	375	92,958

Table 7.3 The types of disabilities of students with SEN

Type	ID	ASD	PI	DD	HI	SLI	EB	VI	HI	LD
No.	49,624	13,105	10,200	7309	3225	2204	2182	1937	1763	1409
%	53.4	14.1	11.0	7.8	3.5	2.4	2.3	2.1	1.9	1.5

Note: *ID* intellectual disability; *ASD* autism spectrum disorder; *PI* physical impairment; *DD* developmental delay; *HI* hearing impairment; *SLI* speech/language impairment; *EB* emotional disturbance; *VI* visual impairment; *HI* health impairment; *LD* learning disability

school-aged students with special education needs, 28% are placed in special schools and 71.5% in general schools.

Although the majority of students are enrolled in general schools, only 16.8% are in general classrooms and 54.7% are placed in special units/classrooms either on a full-time or part-time basis, indicating their physical level of inclusion (Table 7.2). Despite the quantitative growth (i.e. the increasing number of students with SEN enrolled in general schools), it is questionable that the students placed in general classrooms and special classrooms of general schools receive appropriate individualised educational services. The recommendations made by the Committee (2014) for adopting and implementing the CRPD add weight to this doubt.

As presented in Table 7.3, over 67.5% of school-aged populations with SEN have intellectual impairment (Ministry of Education, 2019). It is most likely that they require adjusted curriculum and behavioural support. However, general education teachers supporting students with SEN in general schools usually receive the bare minimum amount of in-service training, such as disability awareness. Little opportunities are available for them to receive specialised in-service training on curriculum adaptation and behavioural support. In addition, pre-service training in special education largely occurs at an undergraduate level. This teacher training system limits opportunities for general and special education teachers to work collaboratively.

Inclusive Education in Republic of Korea: Legislative Contexts

The legislative backgrounds of Korean special education can be found in *the Special Education Promotion Act* (1977–2008). The enactment of *the Special Education Promotion Act* (1977–2008) was the turning point for special education to move away from charity-based benevolent social work to state responsibility. Korean Ministry of Education announced the Special Education Development 5-Year Plan during the second 5-Year Economic and Social Development Plan (1967–1971) that established special schools and classes, creating a compulsory primary education curriculum at special schools, securing the special education workforce, and providing financial support to private special schools. This 5-Year Special Education Plan presented the basic level of development for special education but was invalidated as the military government at that time prioritised economic development over other aspects of development. Special education subsequently became part of the Long-Term Comprehensive Education Plan, which was announced during the third 5-Year Economic and Social Development Plan (1972–1976).

Korean special education in the 1960s and 1970s was centred around private schools catering for students with hearing and/or visual impairment run by benevolent social workers. Education for students with intellectual disabilities and physical disabilities, such as cerebral palsy and brain injury, was about to begin. Education for students with disabilities was not seen as an astute use of scarce economic resources when economic growth was the national priority, students without disabilities were educated in over-crowded classrooms, and schools operated two or three shifts a day to reduce student occupancy. Special education had a low priority. Leaders of special education during this time called for the enactment of *the Special Education Promotion Act* (1977–2008) under the catchphrase of "it is time to show national interest in education for students with disabilities, as gross national income per capita is over $1,000".

Special Education Promotion Act

The Special Education Promotion Act (1977–2008) is the forerunner of *the Act on Special Education for Persons with Disabilities*. It was enacted on 31 December 1977 and enforced on 1 January 1979. It has been amended a few times until 2008 since promulgating its second revision in 1994. According to Paragraph 6, Article 2 (Definitions), "Integrated Education is defined as providing children with disabilities with special education at regular schools (i.e., non-special schools) as usual or temporary bases for the development of normal social adaption abilities". Despite the differences between integration and inclusion, the authors used "integration" to keep the term used in government translated legal documentation. Paragraph 1 of Article 13 (Prohibition of Discrimination, etc.) explains that "When children with disabilities want to enter schools, the principal should not take any actions that would put these students at a disadvantage, such as refusing to receive applications and denial of acceptance to those who passed entrance examinations due to their disabled condition". Paragraph 2 of Article 13 further stated that "Special school principals at all school levels should take appropriate measures to provide appropriate convenience for entrance examination and schooling for children with disabilities based on types and degree of disability". Contrary to the clear statement concerning prohibition of discrimination for entrance procedures, there are no specifically stated measures to prohibit discrimination regarding schooling procedures.

In *the Special Education Promotion Act* (1977–2008), integrated education was regarded as the extension of special education methods. Paragraph 1 of Article 15 (Integrated Education) stated that "Without due reasons, principals at regular schools should accept the request from students with special education needs or their parents or principals of special education institutes for integrated education". Paragraph 3 of Article 15 (Integrated Education) further specified that "Principals at regular schools should establish and operate special classrooms in accordance with the presidential Decree and provide materials and equipment necessary for special education within the limits of budgetary appropriations".

As found in the expressions, "without due reasons (Article 15, Paragraph 1)" and "within the limits of budgetary appropriations (Article 15, Paragraph 3)", Korean inclusive education was presented as a recommended practice reflective of the national social-economic contexts, rather than a necessary practice ensuring students with disabilities' right to education. Inclusive education in a legal sense began through the establishment of special classrooms in regular schools, rather than enrolment of students with disabilities in regular classrooms in regular schools.

Act on Special Education for Persons with Disabilities, ETC

Despite the contribution of *the Special Education Promotion Act* (1977–2008), new legislation was necessary to reflect social changes that people with disabilities face in the twenty-first century. The Act on Special Education for Persons with Disabilities, ETC (2018) was newly enacted to meet the needs of people with disabilities living in the knowledge information society. This act mandated the early identification, assessment, and evaluation of disabilities, free education for young children under the age of 3, the extension of compulsory education from kindergarten to high school, and the establishment and operation of special education support centres, enabling recruitment of professional staff.

Contrary to its forerunner, the Act on Special Education for Persons with Disabilities, ETC (2018) defined "integrated education" as "education provided for persons eligible for special education in a regular school with other persons of the same age which is suitable for the educational needs of each individual without any discrimination according to the type and level of disability (Article 2, Paragraph 6)". Another advance was stating "Prohibition of Discrimination (Article 4)" based on the Act of the Prohibition of Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities, Remedy against Infringement of their Rights, ETC (2017). Furthermore, Article 21 (Integrated Education) includes Paragraph 1, “The head of a school at each education level shall apply his/her best endeavour to realize the principle of integrated education in executing the various policies on education”; Paragraph 2, “The head of a regular school where persons eligible for special education are placed under Article 17 shall establish and execute a comprehensive plan for education, which includes the adjustment of curriculum, support of assistants, support of learning assistive devices, and training of teachers, etc.”; and Paragraph 3, “If the head of a regular school provides integrated education under paragraph (2), he/she shall install and operate a special class in accordance with the standards under Article 27, and be equipped with the facility, equipment, textbooks and teaching equipment prescribed by Presidential Decree”. Together, they legally documented the will to implement inclusive education.

However, the Act on Special Education for Persons with Disabilities, ETC (2018) is a special act and different from general acts, which are higher acts (e.g. *the Framework Act on Education* and *the Elementary and Secondary Education Act).* For example, Paragraph 1, Article 4 (Equal Opportunities in Education) of *the Framework Act on Education* (amended in 2007) states that “No citizen shall be treated with discrimination in education for reasons of gender, religion, faith, race, social standing, economic status, or physical conditions, etc.”. Article 59 (Integrated education) of *the Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (amended in 2012) documented “Where any person who needs special education intends to receive education at an elementary school, middle school, high school, or various kinds of schools equivalent thereto, the State and a local government shall establish policies necessary for conducting integrated education, such as providing for separate admission procedures and curricula”. There is a limitation in assuming that students with disabilities will automatically be part of “all citizens” in Article 4 of *the Framework Act on Education* (amended in 2007) and “any person who needs special education” in Article 59 of *the Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (amended in 2012). Although the Act on Special Education for Persons with Disabilities, ETC (2018) and its predecessor have contributed, as special acts, to education for people with disabilities, they also separated special education from education for all. For this reason, there is now a call for integrating special education-related acts into their higher acts, such as *the Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (amended in 2012), to actualise inclusive education for all.

Inclusive Education Portrayed in Korean Legislations and Policies

Inclusive education has been the key theme of Korean special education policies in the twenty-first century. Inclusive education in Republic of Korea drew policy attention when the United Nation declared 1981 as the International Year of Disabled Persons (IYDP) to promote participation and equality. The Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development (2005) at that time announced *2005 Special Education Operational Plan*, established the operational goal of "maximising education effectiveness for all students through sharing responsibilities between general and special education", and took the basic direction of "strengthening and generalising inclusive education" (p. 22–27). This is the first publicly proclaimed national policy that aimed to strengthen the implementation of inclusive education through shared responsibilities between general and special education. This basic theme remains current.

As discussed earlier, inclusive education portrayed in special education legislation and national policy takes the form of establishing and operating special classrooms in general schools (e.g. Article 15, the *Special Education Promotion Act*, 1977–2008), which is similar to resource rooms that were prevalent in the 1970s in the USA under the principles of mainstreaming or the least restrictive environment. Although Article 17 (Placement and Education of Persons Eligible for Special Education) of *the Act on Special Education for Persons with Disabilities, ETC* states required measures for the instalment and operation of an inclusive education plan, it does not specifically mention general classroom-centred inclusive education with necessary measures. In addition, Paragraph 3, Article 21 (Integrated Education) of *the Act on Special Education for Persons with Disabilities, ETC* specified that the head of a regular school provides the facility, equipment, textbooks, and teaching equipment prescribed by the presidential decree for integrated education. This further indicates that inclusive education in Republic of Korea still remains at the level of physical inclusion and has not progressed into educational/academic inclusion or social/psychological inclusion. This resulted in a phenomenon of reverse integration, attracting 66 concerns and recommendations on adopting and implementing the CRPD from the Committee in 2014.

Inclusive Education in Republic of Korea: Research Contexts

Upon the announcement of "2005 Special Education Operational Plan", the Korean government set the objective of "creating school cultures for students with and without disabilities to learn to live together" (Ministry of Education & Human Resources Development, 2005, p. 19). There were three specific directions taken to meet this objective. First, disability-related curriculum resources and pedagogy were developed for schools to raise disability awareness in students without disabilities. In addition, students without disabilities were provided with opportunities to take part in activities designed to experience what it is like to have disabilities. Lastly, students without disabilities were given opportunities to volunteer at disability support facilities to raise awareness of disabilities.

However, these approaches to promote inclusive education did not generate the expected outcomes because they did not take into consideration power dynamics of

Korean school cultures. "Performance and university entry exams" are prime in Korean education. In an overly competitive environment, exam scores are the only concern for students and parents, and teachers are expected to take on the role as experts in improving exam scores rather than implementing inclusive education to nurture all-round future citizens. Korean inclusive education policies took a top-down approach, but "Creating school cultures for students with and without disabilities to learn to live together" (Ministry of Education & Human Resources Development, 2005, p. 19) literally means the creation of a new culture, which needs to organically evolve within individual schools. Major shifts in school philosophies are imperative for competitive school cultures to transform into community-oriented cultures that promote co-living, and changed school philosophies need to be reflected in curriculum delivery. This entire process takes time and signifies the importance of having a balance between philosophical and methodological approaches towards inclusive education that is not optional but compulsory.

Teachers' Attitudes Towards Korean Inclusive Education

Research on inclusion for young children with disabilities began in the 1990s when setting the onset time on the basis of published work (Cho & Lee, 2009). The Act on Special Education for Persons with Disabilities, ETC (2018) ensures free education for young children with disabilities under the age of 3 and compulsory education for those over the age of 3. A maximum number of young children with disabilities placed in a single kindergarten classroom were limited to four in order to enable individualised education (Noh et al., 2011). Reflecting social and legal change, 5060 of 5186 young children with disabilities were enrolled in regular classrooms (1638) and special classrooms (3422) of early childhood inclusive education facilities (Ministry of Education, 2019).

The quantitative expansion of early childhood inclusive education was accompanied by the growth in research on early childhood inclusive education. According to a thematic review of qualitative research published between 2007 and 2016 (Cho, 2017), the most often studied topic was perceptions and requirements of inclusive education for young children with disabilities (36.2%) followed by curriculum and pedagogy (25.6%), collaboration and teaching profession (21.2%), and experience of and practice for inclusive education (17%). In addition, the majority of qualitative studies under review had teacher participants, echoing the criticality of teachers for success of inclusive education for young children with disabilities as previously recognised by Lee et al. (2007). Collaboration among all stakeholders is vital for the implementation of inclusive education and is worth researching (Noh et al., 2011). In this line, Lee et al.'s (2019) narrative inquiry showed a journey on experiencing change in educational philosophy and practices as a regular kindergarten teacher and developing a sense of agency in implementing inclusive early childhood education.

In 1971, Chil-Sung Primary School in Daegu ran special classrooms to manage over-crowding and under-achievement among students. This could be seen as the beginning of integration in primary school settings, if one takes it as the establishment and operation of a special classroom within a regular school. There is a belief that putting inclusion into practice in primary education settings is more straightforward than secondary education environments because there is more time left for students to prepare for university entry exams, which creates more room for teachers and parents to focus on critical non-academic education. To examine this belief, Son (2012) conducted in-depth interviews with special education teachers, regular education teachers, parents of students with and without disabilities, and students without disabilities about beneficial and challenging aspects of inclusive education in primary schools. The findings suggested that inclusive education is beneficial for social development in students with disabilities, but it induces stress in them as these students are often academically neglected. Inclusive education is beneficial for debunking myths about disabilities and nurturing social service spirit in students without disabilities. However, studying with students with disabilities sometimes compromises the safety and rights to learning of students without disabilities. Parents of children with disabilities prefer inclusive education to special education, whereas parents of children without disabilities tend to be ambivalent about the effects of inclusive education. Regular education teachers find inclusive education demanding and rather unsatisfactory because it is difficult to provide individualised education to students with disabilities in their classrooms given their lack of specialised skills and knowledge, time, and resources.

In addition to academically highly competitive environments, lack of a research base to inform best practice adds to challenges in implementing inclusive education in secondary education settings. Lee (2010a) screened and analysed 53 research studies on secondary inclusive education published over the last 10 years. Of the 53 papers under review, 20 studies concerned attitudes of students without disabilities towards students with disabilities and peer relationships, 23 examined teachers' and parents' attitudes towards inclusion and students with disabilities, whereas only 3 studies attempted to investigate inclusive secondary education from the perspectives of students with disabilities. An imbalance was also found in the examination of the operation of inclusive classrooms (e.g. curriculum management) as more studies were conducted in middle schools (six studies) than high schools (one study). This discrepancy may reflect the field difficulties in conducting inclusive education in high school settings.

The majority of studies with secondary education teachers explored their understanding of inclusive education, specific types of disabilities, and curriculum and pedagogy to identify their needs for learning how to implement inclusive education. By contrast, there was little research on reporting how these needs were met and with what effects. Despite the dominance of subject learning, only 7 of 53 studies examined secondary inclusive education curriculum and pedagogy. Furthermore, of the 20 studies concerning the attitudes of students without disabilities towards students with disabilities and peer relationships, the majority of studies examined the effects of disability awareness programs and their related activities. Taken together with the expressed need of regular education teachers for the professional development on disability understanding and awareness programs (Lee, 2010a), research suggests the field needs for raising disability awareness and understanding.

Special Education Curriculum for Teachers

Full inclusion necessitates all students' participation in social and academic learning and access to regular curriculum (Park, 2019). Reality, however, is not anywhere close. A range of factors may explain these discrepancies, such as lack of preparedness on the part of teachers who are responsible for inclusive education (Hwang, 2008; Lee, 2010b), but difficulties in the curriculum operation cannot be disregarded. Teachers in inclusive education settings expressed difficulties in finding ways of engaging students with disabilities in academic learning (Park, 2010), suggesting that teachers are insufficiently supported in their use of the curriculum guide when teaching students with disabilities.

Teachers frequently make decisions on what, when, and how to teach, along with how to conduct assessment. Therefore, the curriculum needs to include operational guidance, which can be different in its scope and standards depending on the levels of curricula. Guidance for the national-level curriculum would be presented at the general, universal, and standardised scope and levels, whereas province and school level curricula reflect regional and school characteristics and therefore would be more specific and practical. In addition, curriculum normalisation entails a balance between strengthening the national-level curriculum and specialising the school-level curriculum (Hong, 2002). Guidance on academic and pedagogical inclusion also needs to be presented differently depending on the curriculum levels.

Inclusive Education and the Special Education Curriculum

The Korean Special Education Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2015) includes only a limited amount of guidance on inclusive education. For example, guidance on inclusive education in Generals states the compilation, operation, and support for the school-level curriculum. Little guidance is provided on teaching, learning, and evaluation in inclusive education settings, which makes little contribution to the development of inclusive education learning and teaching methods and strategies. In addition, guidance on inclusive education in Generals suggests overall directions (e.g. education opportunities for all students, national-level curriculum support) only. Detailed information on or examples of the operation and implementation of the curriculum are not provided in either Particulars or Commentaries.

One role of curriculum is to guide teachers in their development of education activities. Insufficient teacher support for designing meaningful learning activities and programs results in inadequate academic inclusion (Shin, 2008). The curriculum support would be necessary to create learning environments so students with disabilities can actively participate in classroom learning activities. It would be important to provide guidance on inclusive education in Generals comprehensively addressing a range of aspects of inclusion. Taking a specific and differentiated approach to regular curriculum access for students with disabilities is an international trend (Lee & Jung, 2010).

Including guidance on inclusive education in Particulars of the special education curriculum would provide more specific and direct support for teachers. This is because Particulars consist of all subject-specific and non-subject-specific curricula, and instructional inclusion can be performed at this operational stage of curricula. Whether guidance is included in Generals or Particulars, they are still at the national curriculum level. Further specified guidance, such as detailed explanations and concrete examples, can be provided in Commentaries and/or Teachers' guide, which will provide more practical support for the operation of the province-, school-, and classroom-level curriculum.

In addition to the curriculum and subject specific guidance previously mentioned, it would be important to provide guidance on how to take disability-specific information into consideration for instructional inclusion if students' disabilities create particular learning requirements. An example approach would be that the national-level curriculum points to an overall direction of inclusion, while Commentaries and Teachers' guide provide more specific guidance on individual subject content, disability-specific characteristics, and learning requirements they can potentially create and ways of differentiating curriculum to accommodate disability specific learning requirements.

Korean inclusive education has been led by special education. The National Institute of Special Education (NISE) supports the implementation of inclusive education through the development and distribution of teaching and learning materials to be used at regular schools in collaboration between special and regular education teachers. Examples of recently developed and distributed materials are Individualised Education Plan Field Strengthening and Operation Guidebook (Jung et al., 2019), School Curriculum Inclusive Education Support Teacher Role Models (Kim et al., 2019), and Assessment and Evaluation Manuals for Students with Disabilities (National Institute of Special Education, 2016).

Special Education Pre-service and In-service Teacher Training

Despite areas needing improvement, Korean special education has seen rapid growth over the last decades in supporting students with disabilities, which could not have happened without well-trained capable teachers. After all, teachers are one of the most important contributing factors for student success (Hattie, 2012). As society has changed, the education needs of students have evolved to the degree they require services beyond those provided by traditional special education. A range of additional learning needs of students call for highly specialised teaching-learning services. Regular and special education do not appear to effectively respond to such demands as there are 33,635 secondary school students who dropped out of their schools (Korean Educational Developmental Institute, 2019), casting doubt on not only teacher expertise, accountability, and effectiveness but also the validity and reliability of teacher training.

Korean special education teacher training began with a teaching degree at a high school level in 1950. Since then, teacher training systems have undergone a lot of change, establishing and abolishing teacher certificates issued on the basis of majors in specific disability types; introducing a double degree system for early childhood, primary, and secondary education pre-service teacher training; and introducing a double or minor degree system for secondary special education pre-service teacher training, to name a few. Issues of special education teacher training have been widely studied, such as improvements in special education teacher training and curriculum, and qualification standards for teachers working in special education schools (Jung, 2016).

Teachers in the twenty-first century are expected to be equipped with expertise and effectiveness to provide quality education services for all and to prepare students for life-long education. Recent approaches to amalgamating special and regular education, full inclusion, universal design for learning, response to intervention, and positive behaviour support are national-level education policies and instructional strategies that have become key factors influencing special education teacher training. Investigation of the history of teacher training would be instrumental for contemplating how to prepare teachers ready for future.

Bright and Dark Historic Sides of Special Education Teacher Training

Special Education Teacher Training

A greater number of tertiary education institutes providing special education teacher training courses, extended teacher training periods, and increased university admission quotas for the department of special education had pros and cons. Extended teacher training periods contributed to the enhancement of quality teacher training, and increases in admission quotas enabled addressing special education teacher shortage. Taking multi-tracked approaches to special education teacher training (i.e. bachelor, post-graduate, and special education post-graduate degrees) produced special education teachers with a range of subject expertise. This also contributed to the enhancement and diversification of quality teacher training.

However, rapid increases in university admission quotas, especially extending teacher training to a post-graduate level (i.e. Master's degree in special education) resulted in unwanted consequences. Graduates majoring in special education had higher employment rates, which motivated a number of universities to seek permission from the Ministry of Education to establish new departments of special education. This increased the danger of producing an excessive number of graduates and lowering the quality of teacher training. Contrary to the intention of quality special education teacher training, in some cases graduate schools in education have been functioned as a stepping stone to promotion among some regular education teachers.

Teacher Qualifications

Special education teacher qualification systems need to take into account concepts of special education, the area and scope of special education services, and teacher disposition prior to progressing into teacher skillsets. Special education, as a minority education sector, endeavoured to develop and establish teacher training programs that are quality matched to general education teacher training programs within relatively short periods of time. Introduction of a minor special education degree and temporary implementation of special education teacher qualification exams met the special education teacher shortage while maintaining minimum standards of special education teachers. Moving away from disability-specific special education teacher training (e.g. majoring in intellectual disability within special education) to disability integrated teacher training (e.g. majoring in special education) and multi-tracked approaches to special education teacher training encouraged experts with diverse subject expertise to become special education teachers and addressed the narrowness of special education.

On the other hand, the improvement processes of teacher qualifications systems lacked a research base on concepts of special education, the area and scope of special education services, and teacher disposition and quality. The status of special education policies and qualifications became secondary to regular education. Special education systems attempted to claim their position by assimilating to regular education systems, neglecting the specificity of special education. Disability integrated qualifications also endangered the specialty of sensory disability and other types of disability specific education.

Teacher Training Curriculum

Curriculum for special education teacher training has begun to unify across tertiary education institutes since 2007 and has been stabilised through undergoing multiple changes in 2016, which marked the organisation of national quality insurance systems. Curricula for primary and early childhood special education teacher training were relatively well established. Special education extended its academic scope and re-established ten disability-specific subjects reflective of legal terms and regulations. Opening up special education training at post-graduate levels to graduates with various subject skills and knowledge enabled a response to the diverse learning needs of students with disabilities.

Problems were noticed. Departments of special education established in tertiary education institutes with no previous history of training teachers showed major limitations in the operation of curriculum and over-reliance on casual academics for curriculum delivery because of a lack of relevant human resources and infrastructure. In addition, some tertiary education institutes created cultures where academics paid more attention to meeting university admission quotas and less to their responsibilities for teaching, research, and pastoral care. A mismatch between how special secondary education teachers are trained and what they are expected to teach in the field remains unchanged. Difficulties in securing expertise among special education teachers (e.g. learning prerequisites and dealing with student internalising problems) warrant a mention.

Teacher Education in a New Learning Era

Korean special education began by training teachers for students with moderate to profound disabilities and accommodating students' specific types of disabilities, such as sensory, intellectual and physical disabilities. Until inclusive education was specifically mentioned in the Special Education Promotion Law (1994), segregated- and disability-type-specific education approaches influenced special education teacher training. Teacher training focused on types of disabilities has evolved into disability integrated approaches with a focus on a mild to borderline level of disabilities. There are many factors influencing perspectives about teacher expertise, such as attitudes and beliefs about learning, teaching and disabilities, education policies, regular education responses to learning requirements of students with disabilities, disability characteristics, and research on effectiveness of special education services and pedagogies. Changes in these perspectives necessitated a shift in special education teacher training.

Schools are changing. The large majority of students with disabilities are now placed in special and regular classrooms of regular schools (Ministry of Education, 2019). The inclusion movement called for innovative approaches to teacher training systems for both regular and special education teachers to fulfil their new roles. Effective regular education teachers collaborate with special education teachers with knowledge about curriculum and pedagogy to motivate students for learning and differentiate student learning content and processes. Effective special education teachers collaborate with general education teachers with knowledge about evaluation, assessment, learning, and behaviour intervention. Mutually complementary roles provide impetus to training both teachers together, such as the provision of special education for obtaining both qualifications and the provision of dual qualifications for all teachers (Mastropieri et al., 2017).

Teacher Effectiveness and Tasks for Korean Special Education Teacher Training

Traditionally special education was intended to provide special, supplementing, and meaningful services for students whose learning requirements were not easily met by regular education. However, it is questionable whether special education has been fulfilling this intention. School leaders and parents embrace the concept of normalisation and focus on securing equal learning opportunities. However, special education has focused on unequal (i.e. equitable), relevant, tailored, and individualised opportunities. It is important to remember some students with disabilities have been treated differently. What makes education for students with disabilities equal may be unequal learning and teaching, such as the provision of more frequent, intensive, individualised, and carefully designed learning experiences.

Teacher effectiveness indicates teachers who are effective for obtaining positive outcomes, attracting attention because it influences student attendance and learning. Quality effective special education teachers have been often conceptualised from the perspectives of input factors (i.e. qualifications that are believed to be useful for promoting effective practices) and students' positive outcomes. Input factors include preparedness, specialty development hours, teaching experience, and qualification status. Another way is examining what teachers actually do and whether it is known to be the practices that are conducive to promoting students' positive outcomes. A third approach is considering what quality effective special education teachers are expected to achieve in relation to situating one's own teaching on research-based practices.

Based on Korean special education training history and new teaching roles in changing times, the following suggestions are made to assist training quality effective special education teachers. The field of special education needs to move beyond inclusion and towards magnanimity. Taking disability integrated approaches for training teachers would be more compatible with the future of special education. While retaining the current 4-year pre-service teacher training period, it would be beneficial to include 1-year advanced field training curriculum in industry-university partnership, benchmarking the Finnish models of training teachers at post-graduate levels and the US models of stressing field work and experience.

The current curriculum of post-graduate schools of education designed for general education teachers to become qualified to teach special education needs to be improved, quality controlled, and extended from 2.5 years to 3 years. The current curriculum of undergraduate school of special education needs to reduce general elective units and focus more on gaining field experiences and units that are related to curriculum, counselling, collaboration between special and general education teachers, and pedagogies supporting students with internalising and externalising problems. It would be more appropriate to have research-based and university-designed teacher training programs in alignment with the national directions of teacher training, rather than imposing nationally standardised teacher training programs.

Prospects of and Recommendations for Korean Inclusive Education

The Ministry of Education (2017) announced *the Fifth Special Education Development 5-Year (2018–2022) Plan*. This plan includes the establishment of 22 new special schools and 1250 new special classrooms in regular schools, which attracted concerns from the Parents Solidarity for Education Rights because this goes against the directions of inclusive education. Korean inclusive education is centred around including students with mild to borderline disabilities. A number of parents who organised inclusive education for their children with disabilities during their primary schooling periods decide to enrol them in special schools for secondary education because of discrimination and psychological withdrawal experienced at regular schools or better job training available in special schools. This reverse from inclusive to segregated education echoes the Committee's concerns and recommendations for adopting and implementing the CRPD (2014). This suggests inclusive education has not been properly implemented over the last 10 years despite *the Act on Special Education for Persons with Disabilities, ETC* (2018) stating the right of students with disabilities to be educated without discrimination and with their peers.

When the two tracked approaches, strengthening segregation by extending special education opportunities and progressing inclusion by extending specialised support, were adopted in Korean special education, the above problems were to some degree expected to happen. Implementation of inclusive education requires collaboration between general and special education, which can only result from proper planning and preparation, such as centralising administration and communication systems within a general school and building research-based planning and support systems. Special education-related legislation was promulgated, and implementation plans were announced without proper planning. This swift action contributed to the rapid growth of inclusive education. However, it also created the educational phenomenon of children with disabilities subsequently returning to more segregated special schools, leaving behind deep scars like those of adoption terminated children.

The Parents Solidarity for Education Rights argued that priority should go to developing policies supporting quality inclusive education rather than merely increasing the number of special schools that deprive students of social interaction and development and sets them up for exclusion in communities. The National Human Rights Commission of Korea also advised the Korean government to adopt policies that enhance people with disabilities' rights to education in inclusive education environments. In order to advance inclusive education, it is important to identify and strengthen facilitating factors and address inhibitory factors. The enhancement of regular-special education teachers' capacity to conduct inclusive education and the development of shared responsibilities and a shared vision for inclusion among key stakeholders, such as school leaders and policy makers, would be critical facilitating factors (Park et al., 2015). A practice example would be supporting research and development for a universal core school standard curriculum that embraces both general and special education curricula.

Martin Buber (1996) said that a different name for human being is relationship. If inclusion is established to recover human relationships, prior to focusing on methodological aspects of inclusive education, based on a belief that all human beings deserve respect, this may bring more positive instruction effects in inclusion.

References

Buber, M. (1996). *The letters of Martin Buber: A life of dialogue*. Syracuse University Press.

Cho, H.-K. (2017). The trends and future directions in qualitative research related to inclusive education of young children with special needs. *The Korean Journal of Early Childhood Special Education, 17*(3), 251–275.

Cho, H.-K., & Lee, B.-I. (2009). An analytical study on research trends in early childhood special education–A review of Korean special education journal articles published between 1994 and 2007. *The Korean Journal of Early Childhood Special Education, 9*(2), 1–42.

Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. (2014). *Concluding observations on the initial report of the Republic of Korea*. https://www.ohchr.org/en/countries/asiaregion/pages/krindex.aspx

Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge.

Hong, H.-J. (2002). Understanding curriculum & curriculum development. *Mooneumsa.*

Hwang, S.-Y. (2008). Investigating stress level of regular class teachers in elementary and middle schools. *The Journal of Inclusive Education, 3*(2), 107–124.

Jung, C.-K. (2005). *There is no person to be disposed in the world*. Moonhakdongne Publishing Group.

Jung, D.-Y. (2016). *Educating exceptional children: Year 0–8*. Seoul Korea.

Jung, J.-Y., Park, M.-H., Sung, S.-Y., Song, N.-N., Lee, K.-J., Lee, J.-H., … Kim, D.-K. (2019). *Individualised education plan field strengthening and operation guidebook*. National Institute of Special Education.

Kim, J.-H., Kim, H.-K., Son, J.-Y., Yim, J.-H., & Park, C.-Y. (2019). School curriculum inclusive education support teacher role models. *National Institute of Special Education*.

Korean Educational Developmental Institute. (2019). *Current statistics of adolescents who dropped out of schools*. https://kess.kedi.re.kr/mobile/post/6678743?itemCode=03&menuId=m_02_03_02

Korean Statistical Information Service. (2020). *National population statistics.* https://bit.ly/3woMXey

Lee, D.-S., & Jung, H.-S. (2010). A review on the international trend and current topic of curriculum for special education. *Korean Journal of Special Education, 45*(1), 41–60.

Lee, G.-T. (1981, July 27–28). *Korean consciousness structure towards welfare of persons with disabilities.* Paper presented at the Modern Society and Disability Welfare.

Lee, H.-S., Lee, B.-I., & Cho, H.-K. (2019). A narrative inquiry study on inclusive classroom management experience majoring in early childhood special education: A special reference to Master's degree program students at graduate school of special education. *The Korean Journal of Early Childhood Special Education, 19*(3), 97–113.

Lee, S.-H. (2010a). Review of trends and future directions in research regarding secondary inclusive education in Korea. *The Journal of Special Education: Theory and Practice, 11*(3), 339–369.
Lee, S.-H., Choi, Y.-H., & Oh, S.-R. (2007). Implementing components for inclusive education of young children with disabilities based on the Korean research literature. *The Korean Journal of Early Childhood Special Education, 7*(3), 1–27.
Lee, Y.-S. (2010b). Preparing general education preservice teachers for inclusion: A conceptual framework. *Special Education Research, 9*(1), 95–120.
Mastropieri, M. A., Scruggs, T. E., & Hauth, C. (2017). Special education teacher preparation. In J. M. Kauffman, D. P. Hallahan, & P. C. Pullen (Eds.), *Handbook of special education* (2nd ed., pp. 40–52). Routledge.
Ministry of Education. (2015). *Special education curriculum generals*. Ministry of Education.
Ministry of Education. (2017). *The fifth special education development 5-year (2018–2022) plan*. Ministry of Education.
Ministry of Education. (2019). *2019 special education statistics*. https://www.moe.go.kr/boardCnts/view.do?boardID=316 & lev=0&statusYN=W&s=moe&m=0302&opType=N&boardSeq=77872
Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development. (2005). 2005 *Special education operational plan*. 22–27. Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development.
National Institute of Special Education. (2016). 2016 Annual Report of Special Education.
Noh, J.-N., Lee, Y.-S., Kang, M.-A., Park, D.-H., & Lee, Y.-R. (2011). Early intervention/early childhood special education, qualitative research and research trends. *Special Education Research, 10*(1), 305–328.
Park, E.-H., Lee, D.-S., Lee, S.-H., Lee, Y.-S., & Kang, J.-I. (2015). *A study on effect and development plan for inclusive education*. Korean Ministry of Education.
Park, M.-H. (2010). Analysis on status of instructional inclusion and readiness for implementing inclusion of students with disabilities of inclusive classroom teachers in elementary schools and pre-service teachers. *The Journal of Special Children Education, 12*(3), 369–388.
Park, N.-S. (2019). The direction of support on the curriculum-level for curricular inclusion of students with disabilities: Based on the curriculum guidelines of Korea and Japan. *The Journal of Special Education: Theory and Practice, 20*(2), 353–375.
Shin, H.-K. (2008). Critical issues of educational assumptions for all with diverse educational needs in inclusive classrooms and practices. *Journal of Special Education, 15*(2), 3–31.
Son, Y.-H. (2012). Qualitative research on inclusive education problems. *The Journal of Special Children Education, 14*(2), 91–113.
The Act on Special Education for Persons with Disabilities, ETC. (2018). https://elaw.klri.re.kr/kor_service/lawView.do?hseq=46846&lang=ENG
The Act on the Prohibition of Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities, Remedy against Infringement of their Rights, ETC. (2017). https://elaw.klri.re.kr/kor_service/lawView.do?hseq=45890&lang=ENG
The Elementary and Secondary Education Act *(Amended in* 2012*)*. https://elaw.klri.re.kr/kor_service/lawView.do?hseq=52609&lang=ENG
The Framework Act on Education (Amended in 2007). https://elaw.klri.re.kr/kor_service/lawView.do?hseq=49091&lang=ENG
The Special Education Promotion Act (1977-2008). https://law.go.kr/LSW/lsInfoP.do?lsiSeq=83658#0000
United Nations (UN). (2006). *Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities (CRPD)*. https://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convoptprot-e.pdf