

Sport Development Policy Changes And Reforms In Korea Football Association

Kim, Nam-Su; Park, Seong-Hee; Lee, Seung Pil; Park, Yong Han

Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Republic of South Korea

E-mail: cowinmin@hotmail.com

Aim of the research

The late 1990 years were a very critical moment in Korea politics. After the end of the Cold War, more democratized parties and reformative politicians have won various national elections including all the presidential elections in 1997 and 2001. Many people believed that there would have been on-going reformative efforts to build a more developed society in Korea. Thus, the two civilian regimes existing from 1998 to 2007 were very different from those of the previous authoritarian regimes. In a similar vein, the Korea Football Association (KFA) had been changed rapidly since the takeover by political and economic power elite Mong-Jun Jeong in 1993. As a member of the National Congress and the chief executive of Hyundai Heavy Industries Co. Ltd., he was not affiliated with any political party. So, he could run the KFA with little intervention from other external forces, such as political parties or the KFA's sponsor companies. His takeover affected the management system of the KFA, since he hired his corporate management staffs into the KFA. After these change, Jeong and KFA won the bid in 1996 about co-hosting the 2002 FIFA World Cup and the Korean national soccer team advanced to the semi-finals in the World Cup 2002. This case is the one of representative examples that changing political characteristics of KFA affects their outcomes.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate policy changes and reforms in KFA over 30 years through sport development model (Houlihan & White, 2002; Kim, 2009) and policy legitimations (Chalip, Johnson, & Stachura, 1996).

Literature review and theoretical background

Sport development has long been concerned by sport policy researchers (Houlihan & White, 2002; Hylton, Bramham, Jackson, & Nesti, 2001). In spite of various research topics on sport development such as theory development (Green, 2005; Kim, 2009) and application to a real world (Chalip, Johnson, & Stachura, 1996; Houlihan & White, 2002), it appears to have two similar ideas. One is that a sport development system is concerned about increasing the number of sport participants in a hierarchy of sport system. The traditional pyramid model of sport development system has been applied to explain a sport development system (e.g., Green, 2005; Houlihan & White, 2002). Another is about the analysis of relationships between sport participants and context. Such relationships can be examined as to how sport participants' psychological factors (e.g., motives, commitment) are interacted with different types of environmental factors (e.g., family, coach, local, national level, facility, program, organization). Chalip and his colleagues (1996) found that many nation's sport policies have been justified by the five type of legitimations: national pride, health, social well-being, community development, and economic benefits. They argued that a nation's sport policies and sport development system can be analyzed as such five types of legitimations.

Given that there have been many debates on whether or not the KFA under the past two civilian regimes from 1998 to 2007 employed better policies in sport than those of the previous governments. Some people have argued that more authoritarian political regimes support sport better. Others insist that sport can be developed and advanced in a right direction in a more democratized civil society. While such a controversy has attracted enormous interest from students of sport policy, there is little research addressing the actual comparisons of the different types of political regimes in terms of sport policy.

Methodologies

This study attempted to compare the KFA policies between two different types of regimes in Korea. To compare the policies, we applied the sport development model and sport policy legitimation. In terms of sport development, we examined the four different stages of sport development system: Foundation (grass-roots system, regulations, soccer infrastructure, coaches and umpires), participation (support for regional clubs, regulations), performance (support for college or other amateur business teams), excellence (elite training, foreign national team head coach, play in other countries). With regard to sport policy legitimation the five different legitimation frames were applied. Most data were collected from the following sources: Korean Physical Activity White Paper (2002), the Korean Integrated News Database System (www.kinds.or.kr), websites of sport and government organizations, and the Korean Assembly Electronic Library.

Result, discussion and implication

The most critical finding of the study is that the KFA system had been changed from elite level of sport development model. Although there are little difference between the two regimes, the policies of the KFA

under democratic regimes includes more legitimations to sustain their soccer development system. Other findings and recommendations would be discussed through further analysis.

References

- Chalip, L., Johnson, A., & Stachura, L. (1996). *National sports policies: An international handbook*. CT, Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Green, B. C. (2005). Building sport programs to optimize athlete recruitment, retention, and transition: Toward a normative theory of sport development. *Journal of Sport Management, 19*, 233–253.
- Houlihan, B., & While, A. (2002). *The politics of sports development: Development sport or development through sport?* London: Routledge.
- Hylton, K., Bramham, P., Jackson., & Nesti, M. (2001). *Sports development: Policy, process and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Kim, N. S. (2009). Conceptual framework, theories, and strategies for sport development. *ICHPER-SD Asia journal of research, 1*(1), 51–58.