Research Article

Journal of Public and Nonprofit Affairs
Vol. 7, No. 2

NPO/NGO Education in Public Administration in South Korea

Bok Gyo Jeong – Kean University
Sung-Ju Kim – North Carolina State University

This study examines how NPO/NGO-related themes and theories are incorporated into public administration education in South Korea. By analyzing NPO/NGO-related courses in selected public administration programs, this research breaks down their curricula into major categories from the public administration and policy standpoints. This study found that civil society constitutes the public administration environment on the macro-level, while NPO/NGOs are key actors in the participatory governance and contracting-out on the micro-level. From the public policy standpoint, the advocacy function of NPO/NGOs took the central role in the public policy formation stage, while their service delivery function was highlighted in the public policy implementation stage. South Korean PA education is evaluated to take a top-down-style approach in embracing the roles of NPO/NGOs in the public policy implementation process. This study contributes to strengthening ties between PA education and NPO/NGO education and practices.

Keywords: NPO/NGO Education, Civil Society, Public Policy Process, Public Administration Categories, South Korea

The primary goal of public administration (PA) education is to prepare students to acquire skills and knowledge for public service roles (Haupt et al., 2018; Raffel et al., 2011). To delineate the required skills and knowledge for the specialized professional field of public administration, public administration educators and researchers have dedicated themselves to identifying and enhancing core competencies for public administration. The Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs, and Administration (NASPAA, 2014) highlights five core competencies[1] for accountable public administration education, and these core competencies stress commitment to public service values as the heart of the profession.

Since the early 1990s, some leading studies in the public administration education curricula have been conducted with a focus on the needs of education for management in public service (Cleary, 1990). With the increased role of nonprofits in the public sector, the incorporation of nonprofit management into the public administration discipline has ensued. Salamon (1999) states that public administration schools should incorporate nonprofit education to train professional managers in the comprehensive public and nonprofit sector. Salamon (1999) asserted workforces in both public and non-profit sectors should be collectively educated because public and non-profit institutions are interconnected and collaborate with shared objectives in public service provision. More recently, Smith (2012) indicated that understanding principles and concepts related to nonprofit management is vital for students in public administration.

Jeong, B. G., & Kim, S. J. (2021). NPO/NGO education in public administration in South Korea. *Journal of Public and Nonprofit Affairs*, *7*(2), 173–191. https://doi.org/10.20899/jpna.7.2.173–191

Since Young (1999) pointed out the close philosophical boundary between public administration and nonprofit management, nonprofit education has been gradually incorporated into public administration programs in the U.S. The Commission on Peer Review and Accreditation (COPRA) of NASPAA started to grant accreditation to the Master of Nonprofit Management Program in 2018. The School of Public Administration at the University of Central Florida is the first PA program that received NASPAA's Nonprofit Management Program Accreditation (COPRA, 2019). This recent change demonstrates that the U.S.-based PA schools have been moving toward embracing nonprofit management within its discipline and creating stand-alone nonprofit management programs and concentrations. According to Mirabella et al. (2019), in total, 339 universities and colleges offer 651 nonprofit degree programs in the U.S., and about 30% of the programs are located in public administration schools. Higher education for NPO/NGO in South Korea has also been highlighted during the last decades. In 1999, the first nonprofit education program in South Korea was founded as a stand-alone program at Song-Kong-Hoe University. As of 2018, 11 universities were offering 16 nonprofit degree programs in South Korea (Kim & Jeong, 2018). However, a few of the NPO/NGO education programs were closed down or absorbed as a major or concentration in traditional schools due to enrollment and retention issues (Kim, 2002). While declining as a stand-alone NPO/NGO higher education program in South Korea, nonprofit topics have been highlighted in public science studies such as public administration, public policy, social work, and interdisciplinary studies.

The purpose of this study is to examine the existence and prevalence of nonprofit components in the curricula of South Korean PA programs. Furthermore, this study aims to analyze the analytical frameworks of the NPO/NGO-related courses into the PA curriculum. This study investigates the following research questions: How are NPO/NGO components represented in PA curricula in South Korea in association with public administration/public policy topic categories? From the PA standpoint, this study examines the existence and prevalence of NPO/NGO-related courses in PA education by the sub-topic categories of: i) civil society as the environmental context, ii) NPO/NGOs in participatory governance, and iii) NPO/NGOs in contracting-out and coproduction. From the public policy standpoint, NPO/NGO-related courses are examined for their existence and prevalence by the sub-topic categories of i) public policy formation and ii) public policy implementation.

This paper first overviews the historical and empirical background of South Korean NPO/NGO higher education as well as that of the U.S., after clarifying the research scope based on the inter-departmental collaboration model and best location model of NPO/NGO education. Secondly, this paper provides a research framework focused on PA thematic categories suggested in this study's research questions. Lastly, after describing research methods and data collection, this study summarizes findings and discusses pedagogical implications for forecasting future PA education in regards to civil society and NPO/NGOs.

NPO/NGOs in Public Administration Education in South Korea

Since South Korean society was modernized after the early 1900s, PA education is one of the disciplines that has rapidly grown and expanded in South Korea because of multiple reasons, including government-led initiatives and modern developmental history after the Second World War. The first PA program was established in the College of Law at Seoul National University in 1948. Since then, the number of South Korean PA education programs has expeditiously increased. According to statistics compiled by the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, the number of masters-level PA programs increased from 270 in 1999 to 322 in 2011 (Moon et al., 2014). In 2013, a total of 617 PA programs were operating in various types of higher education institutions in South Korea such as universities, 2-year-colleges, and vocational colleges (Kim & Myeong, 2014). Moon et al. (2014) asserted that the majority of South Korean universities have PA programs and/or related programs including

public policy, local public administration, and other related areas. Kim (2012) stated that South Korea has the largest number of PA programs in Asia.

Highlighted educational themes in South Korean PA programs have changed over time. According to Kim and Myeong (2014), legal studies were dominant subjects in PA education in South Korea before the Second World War because of German and Japanese influence on these programs. Since modern curricula has been established in PA programs in South Korea, the curricular themes in PA programs have evolved with varied frames. Cho (2006) illustrated the evaluation of South Korean PA programs and teaching topics with four different stages. Kim and Myeong (2014) described the progress by three phases. The first phase (1950s–1970s) was the era of imitation of the U.S. PA programs in South Korea. After the Korean War (1950–1953), South Korean PA programs were forced or coerced into adopting the American PA education system from the International Cooperation Agency (ICA), also known as the Minnesota Project (Kim & Myeong, 2014).[2] In this phase, management courses focused on development, and comparative theories were highlighted in the PA programs in South Korea. The second phase (1980s–1990s) was the era of adjustment and adaptation for PA programs in South Korea. In this era, public personnel management, public financial management, organizational theory, administrative principles and policy remedies were broadly taught in PA programs in South Korea (Kim, 2012; Kim & Myeong, 2014). The third phase (2000–present) was the era of interaction with the global community and South Korean PA programs. In this era, logical thinking, multiple perspectives, critical pragmatism, and attention to new intellectual movements with the global community were emphasized (Kim & Myeong, 2014).

Based on the evolution of highlighted themes in South Korean PA education, PA programs have served to educate potential civil servants and teach professional skills and knowledge for public services. However, South Korean PA education has faced several challenges such as structural readjustment, continuously-adapted curricula, pedagogy, and its quality control for further sustainable development (Kim, 2012). Cho (2006) enumerated limitations of PA programs, including irrelevant response to social demands, lack of practical skills, and ethics and values for citizenship. Kim and Myeong (2014) asserted that PA programs in South Korea heavily rely on its educational curricula for the civil service examination, even though a substantial portion of PA graduates still find jobs in business or non-government sectors.

The NPO/NGO education in PA has not received undivided attention as an independent research topic in South Korea. PA education started to embrace values and ideas of citizen participation in the 1980s (Choi & Lee, 2009) in its curricula, which may reflect the democratization stage in South Korean history. According to Choi and Lee (2009), the primary focus of PA education was organizational theory and personnel administration in the 1960s and policy-making and planning in the 1970s. The incorporation of responsibilities, comparative administration, values, and citizen participation in the 1980s signifies the expansion of PA education scope, from centralized planning and internal management to values in decentralizing public policy environments. The 1990s' PA education started to focus on government reform and extended its focus to local governments beyond the central government. In the 2000s, South Korean PA education was reported to synthesize and converge previously partialized focuses from previous stages.

The roles of civil society[3] have been critical in the democratization process of South Korea (Cho, 2007; Cho & Kim, 2007; Jeong, 2013). The involvement of NPO/NGOs in public policy agenda setting and public discourse has been significant in South Korea (Kim, 2006). Given the substantial roles and contributions of NPO/NGOs, subsequent questions occur, such as whether and how the NPO/NGO components are embraced in PA education.

Nonprofit Academic Studies in the U.S.

During the last several decades, NPO/NGO education has been built up in American higher education since the first university-level nonprofit education was founded at Yale University in the early 1970s. A most recent study reports that a total of 339 universities and colleges provide nonprofit education courses and/or degree programs in various schools in the U.S. (Mirabella et al., 2019).

With nonprofit higher education advancing and expanding in the U.S., an array of research topics have been discussed, including required curricula in nonprofit education, types of nonprofit education programs, and the "best place" debate. Notably, the "best place" debate, focusing on the best-fitted discipline for teaching nonprofit education, began in the early 2000s (Mirabella, 2015; Mirabella & Wish, 2000; O'Neil, 2007; Young, 1999) and still continues (Alexander, 2017).

Some studies state that the default model of placing nonprofit education within one discipline is inappropriate because of practical differences between nonprofits and other kinds of organizations, as well as the interdisciplinary nature of nonprofit education (Mirabella & Wish, 2000; Smith, 2017; Young, 1999). Other studies report that the fundamental philosophical nature of nonprofits is congruous with the PA discipline (Mirabella & Wish, 2000; Young, 1999).

Conversely, scholars also pointed out limitations and constraints in non-profit education curricula covered in existing PA programs. Alexander (2017) claimed that nonprofit education in PA is under-resourced and not fully comprehensive in scope. Young (1999) affirmed that nonprofit education in PA mainly focuses on the inside function of nonprofits and tends to be more applicable to larger governmental bureaucracies.

The NPO/NGO Higher Education in South Korea

Nonprofit education in South Korea has been increasingly highlighted, keeping pace with the growth of civil society and the advancement of democracy in the country. After the 1987 Democratic transition in South Korea, civil society organizations have expanded exponentially and have played a key role in the fields of economic justice, welfare policy, women's rights, and other social/political issues (Lee & Arrington, 2008). The number and scope of nonprofit organizations[4] in South Korea has significantly increased its scale since the late 1990s in various subsectors, including civil society, social service, international aid, environment, and education.

The growth of civil society stimulated the needs of nonprofit education to existing and prospective leaders and staff in the nonprofit sector in South Korea. In a recent study, Kim and Jeong (2018) reported that 11 universities were offering 16 NPO/NGO degree programs in South Korea. This number was later updated by the same authors to 16 universities and 22 NPO/NGO degree programs, which make up 3.84% of all 417 colleges and universities in South Korea (Ministry of Education, 2019). Although the number 16 itself seems small, this is quite a substantial portion of South Korean colleges and universities, compared to 7.9% of all higher education in the U.S. (U.S. Department of Education, 2018) offering NPO/NGO degree programs (Mirabella et al., 2019). Out of the 22 NPO/NGO degree programs, six are offered in public administration or policy schools in South Korea, constituting 37.5% of the total NPO/NGO degree programs, including Kyunghee University (Graduate School of Public Policy), Sogang University (Graduate School of Public Policy), Hanyang University (Graduate School of Public Policy). While the NPO/NGO degree programs housed in PA graduate schools mainly confer civil society or NGO majors, these civil society/NGO majors often reflect the curricula of the graduate schools' fields (e.g., public affairs and policy). For

example, Social Policy and NGO (Kyungpook National University), Global Governance (Kyunghee University), and Civic Leadership (Gyeongsang National University) majors reflect the focuses and interests of the public affairs and policy schools. Another interesting case is that the Social Economy Studies major (Wonkwong University) came into the realm of PA schools. This might be because South Korea has driven the development of social enterprises by governmental policies with nonprofit organizations' influx. With the facilitative roles of government policies, a large number of nonprofits entered human services and job creation fields as hybrid organizations with their social mission and business skills.

Analytical Framework

As aforementioned, the purpose of this study is to identify the existence and prevalence of nonprofit components in South Korean PA programs, and to analyze the NPO/NGO-related courses in the PA curriculum based on the following analytical framework. The NPO/NGO components in PA education could be analyzed based on two categories: i) the public administration standpoint that covers the environmental context (macro-view) and the participatory governance and contractual partnership (micro-view) (Denhardt et al., 2013; Kettl, 2017; Kim, 2006; Lee et al., 2014; Milward et al., 1993; NASPAA, 2014; Oh, 2016; Ostrom, 2010; Renz, 2006; Rainey, 2009; Savas, 2000; Smith & Lipsky, 2009; Whitaker, 1980), and ii) the public policy standpoint that covers public policy formation and public policy implementation (Kim, 2006; NASPAA, 2014; Pressman & Wildavsky, 1973; Sabatier, 1986; Sabatier & Mazmanian, 1980).

There is no single unified classification framework to address the required educational topics in public administration education. Numerous scholars and educators have designed their structure of what PA education should cover and incorporate. Lee et al. (2014) stressed that PA education may converge a couple of major intermediary categories, including contextual aspects, PA's internal management, external relations, and other activities. The context category may include values, environment, theories, culture, and ethics (Lee et al., 2014; Oh, 2016). PA's internal management includes government structure, governance, leadership, human resource management, budget, public policy and its management, and local government (Kettl, 2017; Lee et al., 2014; Oh, 2016; Rainey, 2009; Renz, 2006). PA's external relations involve civil society and NPO/NGOs, market, media, and international/transnational actors (Kettl, 2017; Lee et al., 2014; Oh, 2016). PA's other activities encompass public service, e-government, regulations, and public sector reform (Lee et al., 2014; Oh, 2016; Stone & Moloney, 2019).

The major intermediary categories can also be re-grouped depending on the focus of education. If the focus is given to politics of the administrative process, the following will be the main components: governmental activity, governmental structure, people, decision-making and implementation, and administration in democracy (Kettl, 2017). If the focus is given to actions by participants, PA can be divided into personal actions in a public organization, the political context of PA, the inter-organizational context of public organizations, planning/implementation/evaluation, ethics of public service, managerial functions (e.g., budgeting, human resources, and leadership), and administrative reform (Denhardt et al., 2013; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2004). If the focus is given to the overall trend or context upon which the public sector stands and operates, then globalization, democratization, marketization, and other aspects, have been separately discussed (Denhardt et al., 2013; Eikenberry & Kluver, 2004; Farazmand & Pinkowski, 2006; Frederickson, 1980; Young, 1999).

When aiming to build an analytical framework related to NPO/NGO topics in public administration education, PA education can be re-grouped into two pillars of its educational

focuses: management in public governance and public policy process. This structured idea is also hinted at by NASPAA's core competencies for PA scholars and practitioners. From a pedagogical standpoint, the curriculum structure of PA departments may also be reviewed in relation to NASPAA's core competencies. The management-related competencies can be divided into two views: micro- and macro-views. The micro-view of the public administration standpoint is closely associated with public governance, leading, and management (NASPAA's competency 1). The macro-view of the public administration standpoint is mirrored in the changing administrative environment, including communication and interaction with the workforce and citizenry (NASPAA's competency 5). In addition, the public policy process-related competency will be the other pillar of PA education (NASPAA's competency 2). The two stages of the public policy process (formation and implementation) will be the main focus to clarify the connection with the NPO/NGO and civil society.

PA literature and educational textbooks also support this typology. From a macro-view management standpoint, NPO/NGOs are interpreted as one of the actors that constitute the surrounding environment of public administration and its system. NPO/NGOs interact with government agencies and their personnel as part of the surrounding environment (Oh, 2016; Rainey, 2009). NPO/NGOs are given their roles in the context of the relationship between PA and the nation or citizenship (Oh, 2016) or understood in the context of democracy (Denhardt et al., 2013; Kettl, 2017). From a micro-view standpoint, participatory governance among inter-sectoral agencies and contractual partnership between public and nonprofit agencies can be focused (Savas, 2000; Smith & Lipsky, 2009). From the public policy design and process perspective, public policy implementation itself can be a major category that includes various variables in a flow diagram of the tractability of policy problems, the ability of statute to structure implementation, and the non-statutory variables affecting implementation (Sabatier & Mazmanian, 1980).

The public management-focused aspect related to NPO/NGOs can be broken down by the types and extents of civic participation. The levels of citizen participation and participatory governance in public sector decision-making may vary depending on the society and the government.

Whether NPO/NGOs are empowered and given substantial authority in public sector decision-making or whether NPO/NGOs are regarded as non-substantial actors without substantial authority in the PA process, would become a significant criterion in assessing the portrayal of NPO/NGOs in PA education curricula. From this standpoint, it would be also worth examining whether PA education curricula incorporate a certain level of governance aspect through NPO/NGO participation or citizen participation (Ostrom, 2010; Renz, 2006). The model of coproduction can be an example that shows more engaging and sustaining citizen participation in public service delivery (Brudney & England, 1983; Whitaker, 1980). The key element is that service agents and citizens contribute to the provision of public services in a collaborative manner (Brudney & England, 1983; Whitaker, 1980). On the other hand, NPO/NGOs may simply engage in contractual partnerships with public agencies, rather than exerting a more proactive level of influence with a certain level of ownership (Savas, 2000; Smith & Lipsky, 2009).

The public policy process stage in which NPO/NGOs are engaged is crucial in determining the roles and functions of these civil society actors in public sector interactions. If NPO/NGOs get involved in the policy formation stage, the roles would more likely be advocacy-focused, information-providing, and awareness-increasing activities toward the general public. NPO/NGOs at this stage often participate in the preliminary decision-making as experts of specific public policy areas. If the roles of NPO/NGOs occur in the policy implementation stage, the roles would generally be service providers. In the case of policy implementation stage involvement, the roles of NPO/NGOs can be interpreted from two

different approaches: top-down or bottom-up (Hjern & Hull, 1982; Pressman & Wildavsky, 1973; Sabatier, 1986). These two different approaches may affect how policymakers and implementers treat and regard civil society organizations and citizens. The top-down approach suggests the following as necessary conditions for the effective implementation (Sabatier, 1986): clear and consistent objectives, adequate causal theory, legally-structured implementation process, skillful implementing officials, and the maintenance of political support of interest groups. On the other hand, the bottom-up approach allows local implementation structures (network) involved in a policy area. In this approach, evaluation criteria are less clear, and even goals are not sometimes clear in public policy issues. The overall focus is on how multiple actors strategically interact with each other in a policy network. Therefore, to examine how nonprofit organizations are portrayed in public policy implementation in PA higher education curriculum would be a significant observation point.

Methodology

Data Collection

The primary data in this study targeted PA courses containing NPO/NGO components in PA degree programs that are offered in the PA department of South Korean universities. In this study, we employed three stages to collect data.

In the first stage, regarding the selection of PA education in universities, the authors identified the top 50 universities in South Korea using international and national resources for university rankings including U.S. News Best Global University in South Korea, World University Rankings 2019, and QS World University Ranking–South Korean universities. Furthermore, the 2018–2019 JoongAng Ilbo National University Rankings was utilized, which is the most frequently cited list of university rankings in South Korea. We cross-checked these four national and international lists to determine the top 50 South Korean universities.

In the second stage, we identified universities that offer at least one or more nonprofit or nonprofit-related courses in their PA school or department based on the listed top 50 universities. Finally, all NPO/NGO related courses and their course descriptions and objectives were collected in the PA discipline based upon elected PA programs with three or more NPO/NGO courses. The courses were cross-checked by the two authors and one more external expert in the nonprofit field. As a result, the authors identified 27 PA schools that have provided three or more NPO/NGO courses in South Korea. From the identified 27 PA schools, 59 NPO/NGO-related courses were collected. The stand-alone NPO/NGO degree programs from PA programs are excluded in this study, because the stand-alone NPO/NGO degree programs not only have developed their own educational agenda and framework, but also they have been analyzed in separate pedagogical research (Mirabella & Wish, 2007; Mirabella et al., 2007; Mirabella et al., 2019; Jeong & Kim, 2019).

Data Analysis

Regarding assigning the collected NPO/NGO courses in the provided analytical framework, the authors used the course title and description for assessing the focus of the respective courses. The authors examined the existence of keywords that characterize the main aspects of civil society's roles in public administration as well as the public policy process. First, this study checked whether the respective course highlights aggregated civil society as a whole and its characteristics (macro), or individual civil society organizations and their inter-sectoral interactions (micro). When a course mainly focuses on the former theme with exemplified keywords, it was classified as macro-view-centered. Those keywords include an overview of sectors (e.g., the third sector), over-time trend of social change (e.g., social

movement, globalization, and national development), and characteristics of system/regime (e.g., democracy) (Denhardt et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2014; Oh, 2016).

For identifying a micro-view of the course, the following keywords were checked in the title and course description: governance, citizen participation, coproduction, privatization, and contracting out. The authors specified whether those courses involve decision-making and ownership by civil society and citizens through their participatory governance, such as coproduction, community action, and leadership roles (Kettl, 2017; Ostrom, 2010; Renz, 2006; Whitaker, 1980). Additionally, the authors checked whether the course addressed civil society and nonprofits as a transactional relationship in service delivery processes such as contractual service provision through social enterprises or nonprofit agencies (Savas, 2000; Smith & Lipsky,2009).

For the public policy aspect, the authors checked whether a course focuses on nonprofits' role in public policy agenda setting via advocacy activities (public policy formation) or service delivery roles via service activities (public policy implementation). If both activities appear, the authors assigned them to both categories (Kim, 2006; Sabatier & Mazmanian, 1980; Sabatier, 1986).

Results

As noted in the data collection discussion, this study observed 27 PA schools or departments and their NPO/NGO-related courses. Yonsei University provided the largest number of NPO/NGO courses in their PA program (10 courses), followed by Chungang University (8 courses) and Seoul National University (5 courses). Most of the other universities provided one or two NPO/NGO courses in their PA programs.

In addition to counting the number of NPO/NGO-related courses, course description and course objectives were examined. For example, the purposes of the Government and Non-Governmental Organizations Course and the Civil Participation Course from Seoul National University are stated as follows:

> *The purpose of this course is to examine the various roles of NGOs in democracy and market economy and to deal with the policy issues generated by the activation of NGOs. This course will examine the performance and incentives of NGOs and the political, economic and social roles of NGOs from the perspective of political economy; discussion topics include the relations of NGOs with the government, market and civil society. This course will acquaint students with the academical approach to the functions and roles ofNGOs and the relations between the government and NGOs (Government and Non-Governmental Organizations Course, Seoul National University's Public Administration Department, n.d.).*[5]

In this example, democracy and the market economy seem to be the contextual foundation for the NPO/NGOs' roles in society. The political, economic, and social roles in the political economy were covered from the perspective of the course. The performance and incentives from institutional, managerial, or organizational behavioral perspectives on NPO/NGOs were incorporated. It is also noteworthy that the NGO-government relationship was included as one of the main focuses of the course, showing the uniqueness of the PA discipline. In the government and nonprofit relationship courses, democracy and the market

Table 1. NPO/NGO-Related Courses Offered in PA Departments

No.	University	Course Title
1	Ajou University	Citizen Participation
2	Chonbuk National University	Government & Civil Society
3	Chonnam National University	NGO Case Studies Government and NGOs
4	Chosun University	Civil Society and Public Policy Government and NGO
5	Chungang University	Social Economy and Public Administration Government and NGO Social Economy Policy Civil Society Government and NGO Citizen Participation Comparative Social Enterprises Social Economy & Seminar of Public Administration Governance & NGO
6	Chungnam National University	Public Administration and Citizen Participation
7	Ewha Womans University	Nonprofit Organizations
8	Gachon University	State and Civil Society
9	Gyeongsang National University	Theory and Practice of Public Organization
10	Incheon National University	Civil Society
11	Inha University	NGO & Government Volunteerism
12	Jeju National University	NGO and Government (closed since 2017) Government & NGO
13	Kookmin University	NGO Management
14	Korea University	Government and Civil Society
15	Korea Maritime and Ocean University	Government and NGO
16	Kyungpook National University	Social Capital Government and NGO
17	Myongji University	Civil Society & Public Administration Public Administration & NGO
18	Pukyong National University	Bureaucracy and Civil Society
19	Sejong University	Public Governance and Network NGO and Citizen Participation
20	Seoul National University	Citizen Participation Government and Non-Governmental Organization Governance and Public Leadership Citizen Participation Research Global Governance and National Development
21	Seoul National University of Science & Technology	Government and Society
22	Sogang University	Non-Profit Organization & Administration Government and NGOs
23	Sookmyung Women's University	Studies in State and Civil Society Government and NGO
24	Soonchunhyang University	The Third Sector

25	Sungkyunkwan University	Civil Society and Governance Understanding Governance
26	University of Seoul	Citizen Participation Citizen Participation Research Government and Non-profit Organization Nonprofit Organization Seminar Globalization and Governance Globalization & International Organization
27	Yonsei University	NPOs Management Voluntarism Theories of Social Movement Global Leadership Civil Society and NGO Social Movements in Korea

economy were the contextual foundation, and political economy was the perspective for the course and textbook. It also mentioned multiple themes such as performance, NGO-government relationships, and roles of civil society as its main focuses.

In the case of Civic Participation or Government and Civil Society courses, the following components of civic participation were emphasized. These courses highlighted democracy theories and micro-level components such as technical skills, methods, and behavioral factors. Itwas noteworthy that environmental, as well as structural factors, were equivalently emphasized. The course was designed with the assumption that citizen participation can be enhanced with the advancement of methods and technologies (e.g., e-government and e-participation).

> *This course concentrates on civil participation. Based on the understanding of various theories of democracy, concept, and method of civil participation, the attitude of civil services toward civil participation, and environment and governance structure for promoting civil participation are dealt with in this class. Besides, students will discuss e-participation, civil politics and the relationship between power and participation as important topics on civil participation (Civil Participation Course, Seoul National University's Public Administration Department, n.d.).*[6]

A close look into the curriculum design of PA programs may offer a comprehensive insight into how the curriculum is structured and where the NPO/NGO components fit in the knowledge system of PA. For example, in the case of Korea University's PA curriculum, civil society, alongwith law, politics, economy, and international society, were categorized as part of the knowledgeto understand a complex society. This implies that civil society serves as the background and contextual knowledge for the management of public organizations.[7] This is consistent with one of the most widely-adopted PA textbooks' indications of civil society as a contextual environment for PA process and structure (Oh, 2016; Rainey, 2009).

As shown in Table 2, classification of the contents in the listed NPO/NGO-related courses was analyzed based on two standpoints: public administration and public policy. The public administration standpoint was analyzed with two main perspectives: micro- and macro-view. In the micro-view, the inter-organizational interactions of individual NPO/NGO actors were analyzed in governance or contracting-out in the public sector, whereas, in the macro-

Table 2. Classification of NPO/NGO-Related Courses in Public Administration and Policy

Standpoint	Main Aspects	Educational Contents	Course Title (Examples)
Public administration standpoint	Civil society as environmental context (Macro-view)	The environment for promoting citizen participation; democratization; civil society as the contextual environment for public administration; civil society in a globalized context	Civil Society & Democracy; Government & Civil Society; Social Economy Policy; The Third Sector; Theories of a Social Movement; Social Movement in South Korea; Civil Society & Public Administration; Globalization and Governance; Global Governance and National Development
	NPO/NGOs in participatory governance (Micro-view)	Theories of democracy; Governance structure for citizen participation; civil society and citizen participation; and coproduction.	Citizen Participation; Civil Society & Governance; Governance & NGOs; Governance and Public Leadership; Understanding Governance; Globalization and Governance; Global Governance and National Development; Social Capital and Public Policy; Global Leadership; Volunteerism
	NPO/NGOs in contracting out (Micro-view)	Theories of privatization; contracting-out.	Comparative Social Enterprises; Social Economy & Seminar of Public Administration Public Governance and Network; Civil Society, Market, & Governance
Public policy standpoint	Public policy formation	Policy agenda setting by NPO/NGOs; advocacy roles of nonprofits; Policy issues generated by the activities of NPO/NGOs	NGO & Public Policy; Civil society & Public Policy
	Public policy implementation	Social service provision by NPO/NGOs; mobilization of social capital as public policy resources	Social Capital and Public Policy; NGO & Public Policy; Civil Society & Public Policy

view, the civil society is understood in the overall structure and system of PA. The macro-perspective perceives civil society as the environmental context, which is a pre-condition for PA, whereas the micro-perspective perceives NPO/NGOs through the angle of inter-agency interaction, either as participatory governance or a contracting-out partnership (John et al., 1994; Kettl, 1993, 2017; Kim, 2006; Lee et al., 2014; Milward et al., 1993; Milward et al., 1994; Oh, 2016; Rainey, 2009; Smith & Lipsky, 2009; Whitaker, 1980).

These two microscopic views underscore NPO/NGOs' proactive roles as an actor, compared to the passive perception of civil society in the macroscopic view. In other words, in the macro-view, civil society is understood in the overall structure and system of PA. Whereas, in the micro-view, the inter-organizational interactions of individual NPO/NGO actors are analyzed in governance or contracting-out in the public sector.

The overarching theme of civil society vis-à-vis the environmental context is that NPO/NGOs constitute the condition for PA process, rather than highlighting the internal management or decision-making of key actors inside the government or public agencies (Oh, 2016; Rainey, 2009). One cautious note regarding this interpretation is necessary. The idea of civil society as the environmental context does not indicate that civil society is a subsidiary in terms of its significance in PA. Rather, it may imply that civil society's contribution is a facilitating factor for PA and government agencies to function and operate effectively in an accountable way to its stakeholders in a complex environment. In other words, civil society and its participation may serve as the watchdog for the government to operate to the expectations and demands of involved and interested stakeholders, which is a fundamental rationale of democratic government and its existence (Behn, 2001; Jeong & Kearns, 2015; Kearns, 1996; Romzek & Dubnick, 1987).

The exemplary courses addressing civil society as the environmental context were as follows: Civil Society & Democracy; Government and Civil Society; Social Economy Policy; The Third Sector, Theories of Social Movement; Social Movement in South Korea. Educational contents falling under the civil society as environmental context include, but are not limited to, socio-economic condition for promoting the citizen participation, democratization as a condition for citizen participation, social capital as an intermediate condition for facilitating citizen participation, the overall civil society and its maturity as a condition for PA's consideration in its process, and civil society in the globalized context.

The microscopic view of the interactions between government and the NPO/NGOs can be divided into two lenses: partners in public sector decision-making (participatory governance) or implementers in public service provision (contracting-out). The first micro-viewunderlines the proactive contribution of NPO/NGOs in public sector decision-making as well as a collaborative partnership in governance (John et al., 1994; Kettl, 1993; Kettl, 2017).

This view puts the stress on democratic accountability through the collaboration between public agencies and NPO/NGOs in the era of globalization and devolution (Kettl, 2000). The key concern in this view is how to coordinate diverse interests, give representation and voices to all stakeholders including under-represented groups, and embrace values that are often conflicting among different actors in public-sector decisions. Exemplary courses that embrace the theme of civil society in participatory governance are as follows: Citizen Participation; Civil Society & Governance; Governance & NGOs; Governance & Public Leadership; and Understanding Governance. Educational contents classified into the civil society in participatory governance are as follows: theories of democracy affecting the governance in PA, the governance structure for citizen participation, civil politics describing the actual interactions in the PA process, coproduction, and the mutual interaction between civil society and citizen participation in participatory governance.

The second micro-view pays attention to the NPO/NGOs' roles as service providers through contracting-out. These roles were interpreted in the context of hollow-state or shadow-state, or new-street-level bureaucrats (Milward et al., 1993; Milward et al., 1994; Smith & Lipsky, 2009). The main interest of this view is how and to what extent the NPO/NGOs conduct privatized service provision through contracting-out. This viewpoint calls attention to the separation of government from the services they provide (Milward et al., 1993). The contracting regime incorporates the structures, rules, and actions of the state and voluntary organizations outside of the political system of the state (Smith & Lipsky, 2009). In this view, the key concern is how to manage networks of service providers in the most effective manner in the decentralized PA system. Exemplary courses that embrace the theme of civil society in contracting out and coproduction are as follows: Comparative Social Enterprises and Civil Society, Market, & Governance. Educational contents classified into this category are as follows: theories of privatization, hollow-state, and contracting-out.

From the public policy standpoint, NPO/NGO-related courses were broken down into public policy formation and public policy implementation toward citizen participation (Kim, 2006; Sabatier, 1986; Sabatier & Mazmanian, 1980). The public policy formation sub-theme highlights the leading roles of NPO/NGOs in public policy agenda-setting. In other words, this sub-theme features how NPO/NGOs get involved in identifying social problems and transforming identified social problems into the public policy agenda. This approach embraces abottom-up approach that allows more substantial and constructive contributions by NPO/NGOs in the decision-making process in the public sector. The public policy implementation aspect mainly focuses on social service provision by NPO/NGOs. Mobilization of social capital and NPO/NGOs as partners in this mobilization process reveal this top-down-style public policy implementation procedure. Exemplary courses that incorporate public policy process participation include: Social Capital & Public Policy, NGO & Public Policy, and Civil Society & Public Policy.

Summary and Discussion

This study investigated how NPO/NGO-related topics are reflected in Public Administration (PA) education in South Korea. This study analyzed NPO/NGO-related courses in PA schools or departments from selected top 50 universities in South Korea to break them down into major categories from the PA and public policy standpoints.

The main findings of this study lead us to the following discussion points. First, from a macro-level perspective, civil society and its collaborations or confrontations with PA were depicted in the context of economic development, democratization, and globalization in the PA curricula in South Korea. PA courses located civil society between market and government, reflecting potential concord and discord between them. The causal path, leading from economic development to increased roles of civil society, was an initial point of NPO/NGO-related courses' learning objectives in the PA discipline. The historical role of South Korean civil society for democratization portrayed as a social movement was remarked as another point of discussion in PA courses. These macro-level findings suggest a task to scan the changing landscape of the multi-stakeholder environment that defines the nature of the relationship between the three sectors—state, market, and civil society. It is necessary to scrutinize democratic accountability ofcivil society in meeting expectations and demands of varied stakeholders in multiple sectors (Jeong & Kearns, 2015; Kearns, 1996; Romzek & Dubnick, 1987).

Second, from a micro-level perspective, participatory governance was incorporated as the key term to describe NPO/NGOs in PA education in South Korea. The key concept of governance was addressed in many aspects of micro-level PA issues, such as governance structure for citizen participation, governance and public leadership, social capital and public policy, and global leadership. These observations resonate with the recent emphasis on the proactive contribution of civil society to PA and its interaction with its governance partners (Kettl, 2017; Ostrom, 2010). This study's findings also suggest future studies to examine the breadth, depth, and nature of NPO/NGO participation reflected in PA education to assess their comprehensive impact on society.

Third, from another side of the micro-level perspective, South Korean PA education has expanded its coverage to the phenomena of contracting-out, privatization, and coproduction. It was observed that the theoretical/historical background and empirical cases of contracting-out and privatization have been incorporated in PA education in South Korea. However, PA education may not have covered coproduction-based cases much in the curricula. The emerging phenomena of social economy and social enterprises allow authors to give them a careful examination in terms of their implications on the micro-level interaction between NPO/NGOs and public agencies.

Fourth, NPO/NGOs have been incorporated both in top-down and bottom-up public policy implementation as reflected in PA education in South Korea. While the advocacy function of NPO/NGOs was remarked in the public policy formation stage, in the public policy implementation stage, NPO/NGOs were highlighted by their roles in complementing public service delivery (Kim, 2006). PA education embraced the NPO/NGOs in the public policy implementation mainly from a top-down-style approach. These findings also suggest future studies to further examine the types and nature of the interactions between NPO/NGOs and government in the public policy formation and implementation processes.

Fifth, this study also found that the inter-departmental collaboration model works for NPO/NGO education in South Korean higher education. It seems that PA education, as well as other departments, share their roles and specialize in their strengths in terms of delivering coordinated curricula to cover comprehensive theories, histories, and cases of NPO/NGO education. Especially, PA education seems to have focused on citizen participation, governance, and contracting out as the main phenomena in the PA field and mobilized their contribution to public policy processes. Lastly, due to the historical mission conducted by NPO/NGOs in the establishment of South Korean democracy, it is evaluated that South Korean PA education has focused more on macro-level transformation in terms of the dynamics between state, market, and civil society. More recent courses seem to have expanded their focus to the micro-level themes of NPO/NGOs including citizen participation, governance, network, contracting-out, and social enterprises.

This observation suggests future studies might examine how the focus of PA education has changed over time in terms of the macro- and micro-level aspects of NPO/NGOs' roles in PA and public policy.

This study also has pedagogical and practical implications. For pedagogical implications, this study contributes to increasing the relevance of NPO/NGO education for PA practice by aligning NPO/NGOs and their roles within the purview of PA. In particular, this study offers insights into how South Korean PA programs have incorporated NPO/NGOs as actors in the practice of public administration and the processes of public policy formation and implementation. This study also has implications in terms of NASPAA's core competency enhancement. Leading and managing in public governance (competency 1), participating in and contributing to the public policy process (competency 2), and communicating and interacting productively with a diverse and changing workforce and citizenry (competency 5) are reflected in this study's suggested analytical framework. Therefore, this study's findings may exhibit whether and how South Korean public administration programs and courses are aligned with this globally expanding accreditation system and its focuses. For practitioners in public management, this extended purview of PA education will help identify the space for NPO/NGOs either as service providers or as collaborative partners in the public sector. For scholars in PA and NPO/NGO areas, this study may suggest an overarching framework that integrates NPO/NGO research into the PA field from the standpoint of higher education.

For future studies, this research can be extended to a regional comparative study from the Eastern and Western perspectives. Comparing how the different development histories of respective eastern and western countries have affected their model of collaboration between government agencies and NPO/NGOs in public administration will contribute to the understanding of the nature of governance and management in the public sector. For example, it would be interesting to contemplate whether the "state-led" or "state-superior" tradition of South Korea has affected the way and extent of incorporation of NPO/NGO components into PA education curriculum. The tradition of associational life in the U.S. has been interpreted as demonstrating the superiority of a decentralized society and the counterbalance to the centralization of state power (De Toqueville, 1948). In contrast, the East Asian development model is characterized by the intent and capacity of the state in policy formulation and implementation and the historical path of government-led economic growth (Johnson, 1982; Woo-Cumings, 1999).

In spite of its contribution and implications, this study has some limitations. The analysis of course descriptions reveals some limitations in fully showing the actual teaching of each course. The course descriptions sometimes do not provide full descriptions of courses' perspectives and do not provide actual examples and their applications. Therefore, the analysis of the approach or perspectives of certain courses on NPO/NGOs could not reach an in-depth level, other than describing the relative proportion of respective perspectives in PA courses.

Notes

1. The Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs, and Administration (NASPAA) accreditation standards suggest that MPA programs adopt the following five required competencies: 1) to lead and manage in public governance; 2) to participate in and contribute to public process; 3) to analyze, synthesize, think critically, solve problems and make decisions; 4) to articulate and apply public service perspectives; 5) to communicate and interact productively with a diverse and changing workforce and citizenry (NASPAA, 2014).
2. According to Kim & Myeong (2014), The International Cooperation Agency (ICA) made a contract with the University of Minnesota to provide educational and technical support to teach engineering, medicine, agriculture, and PA to Seoul National University in September 1954, which was called the Minnesota Project.
3. Civil society has been defined in various ways and it has diverse images in it (Edwards, 2004; Howell & Pearce, 2001). One aspect of civil society is an associational life as part of the society of diverse actors having their interests and goals based on liberal roots of civil society thinking. Another aspect of civil society is a type of society characterized as having institutionalized civility in classical republicanism thoughts (Edwards, 2004). In this study, civil society is defined as a public sphere in which inclusive associational life and public deliberation coexist through the process of participation and engagement of citizens and associations in society.
4. Roughly characterized, the term "nonprofit" highlights the management aspect of non-distribution constraints, tax-exempt status, and public/mutual benefits nature, whereas the term "non-governmental" stresses the independent nature of civil society either simply as the counterpart of government or as the force for social movement. In South Korea, the term nonprofit and nongovernmental organizations have been used interchangeably. Although some scholarly discussions differentiate these two terms in South Korea, the scope of these two organizational entities is substantially overlapping (Kim, 2006). NPOs and NGOs were conceptually perceived as a self-governing, private, non-governmental organization for civil society in South Korea, covering all kinds of nonprofit organizations with various public purposes such as human services, arts and culture, education, health, and others. In this sense, the terms NGOs and NPOs were interchangeably used in South Korea despite their differentiated conceptual definition and origins. In this study, the term NPO/NGO education will be used to discuss nonprofit education programs unless specified otherwise such as in the official title of the education program (e.g., Sungkonghoe University Graduate School of NGO).
5. Masters of Public Administration Curricula, Seoul National University, Retrieved from http://gspa.snu.ac.kr/master_administration (February 15, 2019)
6. Masters of Public Administration Curricula, Seoul National University, Retrieved from http://gspa.snu.ac.kr/master_administration (February 15, 2019)
7. Public Administration Curriculum Outline, Korea University, https://kupa.korea.edu/kupaeng/info/faculty/curriculum.do

Disclosure Statement

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest that relate to the research, authorship,or publication of this article.

References

Alexander, J. (2017). Accreditation of nonprofit certificate and degree program. *Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership, Special Issue 1*, 52–58. https://doi.org/10.18666/jnel-2017-v7-si1-8239

Behn, R. D. (2001). *Rethinking democratic accountability*. Brookings Institution Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/798293

Brudney, J. L., & England, R. E. (1983). Toward a definition of the coproduction concept. *Public Administration* Review, *43*(1), 59–65.

Cho, D. (2007). *Social movement & non-governmental organizations in South Korea*. Arche Inc.

Cho, D., & Kim, C. (2007). *The structure and dynamics of South Korean civic movement*. Jipmoon-dang.

Cho, M. (2006). *Challenge for professionalism for Korea public administration in the matureperiod: The vision of public administration as a life*. Paper presented at the Korean Association of Public Administration Conference Proceedings, Seoul, South Korea.

Choi, S., & Lee, H. (2009). A study on educational trends in Korean public administration. *Korean Society and Public Administration Study, 19*(4), 163–185.

Cleary, R. E., (1990). What do public administration masters program look like? Do they do what is needed? *Public Administration Review, 50*(6), 663–673. https://doi.org/10.2307/976977

Commission on Peer Review and Accreditation (COPRA), (2019). *The roster of accredited programs 2018-2019 (NASPAA)*. https://naspaaaccreditation.files.wordpress.com/2019/01/annual-roster-of-accredited-programs-01.09.2019.pdf

Denhardt, R. B., Denhardt, J. V., & Blanc, T. A. (2013). *Public administration: An action orientation*. Cengage Learning.

De Toqueville, A. (1948). *Democracy in America*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.

Edwards, M. (2004). *Civil society* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.

Eikenberry, A. M., & Kluver, J. D. (2004). The marketization of the nonprofit sector: Civil society at risk?. *Public Administration Review, 64*(2), 132–140. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2004.00355.x

Farazmand, A., & Pinkowski, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of globalization, governance, and public administration*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1201/b13629

Frederickson, H. G. (1980). *New public administration*. University Alabama Press.

Haupt, B., Kapucu, N., & Hu, G. (2018). Core competencies in the master of public administration programs: Perspectives from local government managers. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 23*(1), 611–624. https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2017.12002272

Hjern, B., & Hull, C. (1982). Implementation research as empirical constitutionalism. *European Journal of Political Research, 10*(2), 105–115. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.1982.tb00011

Howell, J., & Pearce, J. (2001). *Civil society & development: A critical exploration*. L. Rienner Publisher.

John, D., Kettl, D. F., Dyer, B., & Lovan, W. R. (1994). What will new governance mean for the federal government? *Public Administration Review, 54*(2), 170–175. https://doi.org/10.2307/976526

Jeong, B. G. (2013). *Accountability in South Korean nonprofit organizations: Stakeholder expectations as perceived by nonprofit leaders* [Doctoral dissertation, University of

Pittsburgh].
Jeong, B. G., & Kearns, K. (2015). Accountability in Korean NPOs: Perceptions and strategies of NPO leaders. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 26*(5), 1975–2001. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-014-9492-8
Jeong, B. G., & Kim, S. J. (2019). NPO/NGO higher education programs in South Korea. *Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership, 9*(1), 39–62. https://doi.org/10.18666/JNEL-2019-V9-I1-9597
Johnson, C. A. (1982). *MITI and the Japanese miracle: The growth of industrial policy, 1925–1975*. Stanford University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/20041333
Kearns, K. P. (1996). *Managing for accountability: Preserving public trust in public and nonprofit organizations* (1st ed.). Jossey-Bass Publishers.
Kettl, D. F. (2017). *Politics of the administrative process*. CQ Press.
Kettl, D. F.(1993). *Sharing power: Public governance and private markets*. The Brookings Institution. https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.31-1791
Kettl, D. F. (2000). The transformation of governance: Globalization, devolution, and the role of government. *Public Administration Review, 60*(6), 488–497. https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-3352.00112
Kim, J. (2006). *Government and NGO*. Pakyoungsa.
Kim, P. (2012). A historical overview of Korean public administration: Discipline, education, association, international cooperation and beyond indigenization. *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 78*(2), 217–238. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852312438043
Kim, P. S., & Myeong, S. (2014). Public administration education in South Korea: Developed but still evolving. *International Journal of Public Administration, 37*(10), 678–684. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2014.907308
Kim, S. J. & Jeong, B. G. (2018). *Comparing curricula of the nonprofit management and philanthropic sector programs (NMPS) in South Korea and the U.S.* Paper presented at the Association of Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA) 47th Annual Conference, Austin, TX, USA.
Kim, W.(2002). *The current status and trend in NGO education in Korea*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Korea Association of Public Administration.
Lee. S., & Arrington, C. (2008). The politics of NGOs and democratic governance in S. Korea and Japan, *Pacific Focus, 23*(1), 75–96. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1976-5118.2008.00005.x
Lee, J., Yoo, Y., Kwak, C., & Lee, J. (2014). *New public administration, 2.0*. Daeyoung Munhwa.
Network for Schools of Public Policy, Affairs, and Administration. (2014). *Accreditation standards for master's degree programs, commission on peer review and accreditation*. https://www.naspaa.org/sites/default/files/docs/2019-01/NASPAA%20Accreditation%20Standards.pdf
Milward, H. B., Provan, K. G., & Else, B. A. (1993). What does the hollow state look like? In B. Bozeman (Ed.), *Public management theory: The state of the art* (pp. 312–326). Jossey Bass.
Milward, H. B., Provan, K. G., & Smith, L. J. (1994). Human service contracting and coordination: The market for mental health services. *Research in Public Administration, 3*, 231–279.
Mirabella, R. M. (2015). Nonprofit management education. In D. A. Bearfield & M. J. Dubnick (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of public administration and public policy* (pp. 1–7). Routledge.
Mirabella, R. M., Hoffman, T., Teo, T. K., & McDonald, M. (2019). The evolution of nonprofit management and philanthropic studies in the United States. *Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership*, *9*(1), 63–84. https://doi.org/10.18666/JNEL-2019-V9-I1-9598
Mirabella, R. M., Gemelli, G., Malcolm, M., & Berger, G. (2007). Nonprofit and philanthropic studies: International overview of the field in Africa, Canada, Latin American, Asia,

the Pacific, and Europe. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *36*(4), 110s–135s. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764007305052

Mirabella, R. M., & Wish, N. B. (2007). University-based educational programs in the management of nonprofit organizations. *Public Performance & Management Review, 25*(1), 30–41. https://doi.org/10.2307/3381167

Mirabella, R. M., & Wish, N. B. (2000). The "best place" debate: A comparison of graduate programs for nonprofit managers. *Public Administration Review, 60*(3), 219–229. https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-3352.00082

Moon, M. J., Kim. G., & Lee, M. J. (2014). Korean public administration research 1999–2009: Research themes, methodologies, and scholarship. *American Review of Public Administration, 44*(2), 151–167. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074013492996

Ministry of Education (2019). 2019 University information disclosure analysis report. https://moe.go.kr/boardCnts/view.do?boardID=294&boardSeq=77450&lev=0&searchType=null&statusYN=W&page=1&s=moe&m=020402&opType=N

Oh, S. (2016). *Public Administration* (7th ed). Parkyoungsa.

O'Neill, M. (2007). The future of nonprofit management education, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 36*(4), 169S–176S. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764007305043

Ostrom, E. (2010). Beyond markets and states: Polycentric governance of complex economic systems. *Transnational Corporations Review, 2*(2), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/19186444.2010.11658229

Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2004). *Public management reform: A comparative analysis*. Oxford University Press.

Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. B. (1973). *Implementation: How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland.* University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/2148170

Raffel, K. A., Maser, S. M., & Calarusse, C. (2011). Accreditation and competencies in education for leadership in public service. In D. C. Menzel & H. L. White (Eds.), *The state of public administration: Issues, challenges, and opportunities* (pp. 70–88). M. E. Sharpe.

Rainey, H. G. (2009). *Accreditation and competencies in education for leadership in public service*. John Wiley & Sons.

Renz, D. O. (2006). Reframing governance. *The Nonprofit Quarterly, 13*(4), 17–26.

Romzek, B. S., & Dubnick, M. J. (1987). Accountability in the public sector: Lessons from the Challenger tragedy. *Public Administration Review, 47*(3), 227–238. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429501036-13

Sabatier, P., & Mazmanian, D. (1980). The implementation of public policy: A framework of analysis. *Policy Studies Journal, 8*(4), 538–560. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.1980.tb01266.x

Sabatier, P. A. (1986). Top-down and bottom-up approaches to implementation research: A critical analysis and suggested synthesis. *Journal of Public* Policy, *6*(1), 21–48. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00003846

Salamon, L. M. (1999). Nonprofit management education: A field whose time has passed? In M. O'Neil & K. Fletcher (Eds.), *Nonprofit management education: U.S. and world perspectives* (pp. 137–145). Praeger.

Savas, E. (2000). *Privatization and public-private partnerships*. Chatham House.

Smith, S. R. (2012). Changing government policy and its implications for nonprofit management education. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 23*(1), 29–41. https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21054

Smith, S. R. (2017). An integrated approach to nonprofit management curriculum: Implications for accreditation. *Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership, Special Issue 1*, 41–46. https://doi.org/10.18666/jnel-2017-v7-si1-8237

Smith, S. R., & Lipsky, M. (2009). *Nonprofits for hire: The welfare state in the age of contracting*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.18666/jnel-2017-v7-si1-8237

Stone, D., & Moloney, K. (Ed.). (2019). *The Oxford handbook of global policy and*

transnational administration. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198758648.001.0001

U.S. Department of Education. (2018). *Number of degree-granting postsecondary institutions*. National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d18/tables/dt18_317.40.asp

Whitaker, G. P. (1980). Coproduction: Citizen participation in service delivery. *Public Administration Review, 40*(3), 240–246. https://doi.org/10.2307/975377

Woo-Cumings, M. (1999). *The developmental state*. Cornell University Press.

Young, D. (1998). Commercialism in nonprofit social service associations. In B. A. Weisbrod (Ed.), *To profit or not to profit: The commercial transformation of the nonprofit sector* (pp.195–216). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511625947.012

Young, D. (1999). Nonprofit management studies in the United States: Current developments and future prospects, *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 5*(1), 13–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.1999.12022049

Author Biographies

Bok Gyo Jeong is an Assistant Professor of Public Administration at Kean University in New Jersey in the United States. His research interests include nonprofit management, nonprofit higher education, social entrepreneurship, comparative public administration, inter-organizational collaboration, and international development. His research has been published in scholarly journals, including *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, Social Enterprise Journal, Voluntary Sector Review, Journal of Health and Human Services Administration, Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership, Asian Survey, Korea Observer,* and *Contemporary Politics*.

Sung-Ju Kim is an Assistant Professor in the School of Social Work at North Carolina State University. His research explores global generosity studies, Asian nonprofit education, nonprofit management and leadership issues, and Asian immigrants' life experiences. His research has been published in scholarly journals, including *Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership, Journal of Nonprofit Management, Voluntaristics Review: Brill Research Perspectives, Advances in Social Work,* and *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*.