

URBAN-RURAL DISPARITY IN SOCIOECONOMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGES IN KOREA, 1960-1970*

Seung Gyu Moon**

On the basis of 1960, 1966 and 1970 censuses and other available survey data, this study compares the state of urban and rural development over the ten-year period 1960-1970 with respect to the following seven selected areas: demographic characteristics, employment status, industrial composition of labor force, income and consumption, educational level, housing and its environments, and health and nutrition.

The data show that although the disparities between urban and rural areas as measured by various development indicators continued to exist in 1970 as they did in 1960, the gap was narrowed to some extent for most of the indicators. Some of the noted gains for the rural areas were educational level and literacy rate while the dependency ratio was adversely affected in the rural area by heavy out-migration of active work force. Over all, however, the rural Korea appeared to have adjusted itself well to the rapid urbanization and industrialization taking place in the nation during the decade.

I. INTRODUCTION

During the decade of 1960-1970, Korean society emerged from its earlier economic stagnation and moved along the road of rapid economic development, largely due to the success of the First and Second Five Year Economic Plans. As a result, profound socio-economic and demographic changes took place in both urban and rural areas, at a rate hitherto unknown in the history of Korea. Such changes, however, seem to have widened the already existing urban-rural disparity in socioeconomic and demographic statuses, resulting in a general concern among academicians and policy makers alike (Korean Sociological Association, 1969). Accordingly, many Korean researchers have in recent years analyzed urban-rural differences in such areas as the family (Choi, 1966; Lee, 1971), social structure and mobility (Lee and Kim, 1966), population dynamics (Chang, *et. al.*, 1974; Kwon, *et. al.*, 1975), economy and occupations (Korean Economic Research Institute, 1968), values (Hong, 1966), and voting behavior (Kim, *et. al.*, 1973; Kim and Koh, 1972). Most of these studies, however, dealt with urban-rural disparity either tangentially or without using longitudinal data.

Although theories of social change lead us to predict that the impact of industrialization and urbanization may vary from one subsystem to another (Levy, 1966; Moore, 1967), the

*The author wishes to acknowledge that this paper is a modified version of an earlier report made in connection with "the Comparative Study of the Relationships of Migration and Urbanization to Development in the ESCAP Region," which was supported by Division of Population and Social Affairs, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. He also wishes to express his gratitude for a travel and research grant provided by United Nations Development Program, Korea, and the Population and Development Studies Center, Seoul National University.

**Professor of Sociology, University of Manitoba, Canada, and Permanent Overseas Research Associate of the PDSC, Seoul National University.

direction as well as the degree of change over a period of time cannot be easily determined with a "one-shot" approach. Thus, the major purposes of the present study are: (1) to examine the degree of urban-rural disparity in socioeconomic and demographic statuses on the basis of longitudinal data, and (2) to identify the variations in the patterns of disparity. Quite obviously, the selected number of socioeconomic and demographic indicators are limited in this study, but it is hoped that the analysis will shed some light on the recent trends in urban-rural disparity.

II. PROCEDURES AND METHODS

In order to compare and contrast socioeconomic and demographic differences and disparities between urban and rural areas, the following six areas, each in turn consisting of three or more indicators, are selected: demographic characteristics, employment and industrial shares, income and consumption, educational level, housing and its environment, and health and nutrition. The units of comparison are urban and rural areas as defined by the Korean Census. Thus, all cities (*Shis*) including the two special cities of Seoul and Busan are categorized as urban area while all *Guns* are classified as rural area in this paper. The only exception in this regard is that a comparison of certain health indicators is made between Seoul and all other regions, since no data on the urban-rural dichotomy were available. Although most of the data were compiled from the 1960, 1965, and 1970 Censuses of Population and Housing, relevant survey data were also utilized to supplement the Census data.

In comparing rural-urban differences with respect to the selected indicators, percentages, ratios or rates were calculated for both the base year, generally either 1960 or 1966, and the terminal year, generally 1970. However, in order to measure the degree of increase or decrease in urban-rural disparity over the two different points, between 1960-1970 or 1966-1970, an index of change in the differences (hereafter, referred to as *the disparity index*) was constructed for every variable. The disparity index is simply the difference between the urban and rural magnitudes of percent changes for each variable over the period under consideration. Since the resultant disparity index values ranged between ± 0.1 and ± 100.0 or more, the degree of increase (or decrease) in the urban-rural disparity was arbitrarily tetrachotomized as follows:

Degree of change in disparity	Range of the disparity index scores
Slight	0.1 ~ 20.0
Moderate	20.0 ~ 50.0
Substantial	50.0 ~ 100.0
Great	100.0 or higher

It should be emphasized here that the disparity index is concerned with the degree of change in urban-rural differences over a period of time rather than the degree of difference in any one year. Therefore, it is quite possible that the value of the disparity index on a particular variable may be high even though the actual difference between the raw values in any one year may be slight, if the extent of change on that variable is quite different between urban and rural areas.

III. ANALYSIS OF DATA

Demographic Characteristics

Six demographic indicators, i.e., rate of population growth, net migration rate, depen-

dependency ratio, use of contraceptive measures, abortion rate, and child-woman ratio are chosen for analysis and the results are presented in Tables 1 through 8.

As indicated in Table 1, although the annual growth rate of the nation declined to 1.9 percent during the intercensal period 1966–1970 from its previous rate of 2.7, the patterns of growth are different for urban and rural areas. During 1966–1970 the urban growth rate jumped to 8.5 percent, a 2.7 point increase from the previous intercensal growth rate, while the rural growth rate declined to –2.0 percent from the previous 1.3 percent. As a result, for the first time in the recent history of Korea, an absolute decrease in the size of the rural population was observed during the period of 1966–1970. The loss of rural people between 1966–1970 amounting to slightly more than 1.5 million is largely due to heavy out-migration from the rural areas. This heavy out-migration is shown in Table 2. As can be seen in the table, the exodus of the rural population to the urban areas was not unknown during 1955–1960, but the loss during 1960–1970 was particularly noteworthy. Needless to say, such a high out-migration from rural areas has resulted not only in a sharp rise in the rate of urban population growth but also in a higher dependency ratio in rural areas (Tables 1 and 2 about here).

As is shown in Table 3, while the urban areas experienced a drop in the total dependency ratio by –13.8 points on its percent change over the period 1960–70, the rural area has experienced an increase by 9.5 points, resulting in an increase in the disparity. Thus, with a disparity index score standing at –23.4, though not shown in the table, it was concluded that the urban-rural disparity in the total dependency ratio was moderately widened. The same procedure applied to the youth and aged dependency ratios also produced a similar conclusion, as is shown in Table 26 (Table 3 about here).

With respect to the child-woman ratio, Table 4 shows that although urban-rural differences still existed in 1970 as they did in 1966, the percent change is greater for rural areas, indicating a slightly lowered disparity. Such a change is consistent with the results shown in Tables 6, 7, and 8, where the use of contraceptive measures and induced abortion are compared. While wives in rural areas are still lagging behind their urban sisters in the adoption of both measures, the percent changes during the period of comparison were much more dramatic in rural areas. Thus, the urban-rural disparity in the area of family planning appears to have been greatly narrowed during the decade. On the other hand, when measured by abortion rates per 100 pregnancies as well as per 100 live births, the disparity results were moderate and slight, respectively.

The urban and rural sex ratios, which are very closely related to the net migration patterns of both sexes, are shown in Table 5. The data show that the urban-rural disparity in sex ratio seems to have been slightly narrowed during the decade, as the disparity index score was only 1.3 (Tables 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 about here).

Employment and Industrial Shares

Several indicators are selected to compare urban-rural differences in the area of employment and industrial shares, since change in this area is very sensitive to the processes of industrialization and urbanization.

The size of the economically active population, as shown in Table 9, steadily increased as the population of working age grew over the decade. Thus, the rate of economic participation in the nation increased from 49.0 percent in 1960 to 53.7 percent in 1966 and to 54.8 percent in 1970. The patterns of increase, however, differed between the urban and rural categories. In the urban areas, the participation rate jumped from 41.5 percent in 1960 to 49.4 percent in 1966, then declined slightly to 47.0 percent in 1970. In contrast, the rate for rural areas increased from 52.1 percent to 56.1 percent and to 60.9 percent for

the same three years of enumeration. Thus, the overall result shows that the disparity in the rate of economic participation was slightly narrowed. On the other hand, the employment rate in urban areas soared up to 95.4 in 1970 from the previous rate of 82.8, a percent change of 13.3, while in rural areas an increase from 93.3 to 99.3, or only 2.9 percent change occurred during the same period. Thus, even though rural areas had a higher employment rate, the disparity in employment rates was slightly widened over the decade (Table 9 about here).

Table 10 shows that with respect to the economically inactive population, the most predominant category for both urban and rural areas was "housekeeping" followed by the category of "attending school". The data show that while the disparity was narrowed slightly for the category of "housekeeping" and substantially for the category of "attending school", it was widened slightly in the "other" category (Table 10 about here).

During the 1966–1970 period, there has been a significant change in the picture of unemployment when age and sex are controlled as shown in Table 11. In 1966, because of unemployment, the age groups, 14–19, 20–24, of urban males suffered most followed by the groups of 25–29, 55–59, 50–54, 45–49, and 30–34, in that order, while the age groups, 14–24, and 25–29, of urban females also suffered. In rural areas, it is to be noted that the age groups of 14–24 males and the 14–19 females showed a lower rate of employment than the other age groups. However, the unemployment rates were drastically reduced over the 1966–1970 period for all age groups in both urban and rural areas. This was particularly true for young urban male and female workers. Overall, however, the disparity was narrowed only slightly or moderately in all age groups of both sexes except for the 14–19 age female group for which the disparity was slightly increased (Table 11 about here).

The effect of rapid industrialization during the decade of 1960–1970 is well reflected in the industrial shares of the employed population, as shown in Table 12. For the urban population in the manufacturing or secondary sector there was an increase to 28.1 percent in 1970, from 19.0 percent in 1960 while in the primary sector there was a decrease to 7.4 percent from 12.0 percent for the same period under consideration. In the tertiary sector, the share also decreased to 64.0 percent from its 1960 share of 67.9 percent. For the same period, the rural population also shared a gain from 4.3 to 7.7 percent for the manufacturing sector and a loss to 76.1 percent from 80.9 percent in the primary sector, and an increase to 16.0 percent from 14.1 percent in the tertiary sector. Thus, the urban-rural disparity over the decade increased moderately in primary sector, but decreased moderately in secondary sector, and slightly in tertiary sector (Table 12 about here).

Income and Consumption

The urban-rural difference in income is one of the great concerns which gave rise to a controversy among scholarly circles during the latter part of the 1960's (Korean Sociological Association, 1969). Thus, the present section compares the income and consumption patterns in both rural and urban areas.

As may be seen in Table 13, there was a substantial income gap between the urban salary and wage earner households and the rural farm households in 1961 in favor of the urbanites. The gap, however, was reversed in favor of the rural farmers in 1966 although the income difference was very slight. This situation was again reversed in 1970 in favor of the urbanites. On the other hand, the farmers have realized a favorable balance sheet throughout the decade by having spent less than their urban counterparts. The data also show that the balance between income and expenditure, which was either nil or in red ink in 1961, has been gradually improved over the decade, resulting in a substantial gain for both urban and rural areas. Overall, however, the degree of change in urban-rural disparity with

respect to income and balance was moderate, but substantial with respect to expenditure, substantiating the widely shared concern over the increasing urban-rural gap.

When the income and consumption patterns of all urban and rural households are compared (Table 14), the income disparity measured per capita and per household as well as the saving ratio were greatly widened over the decade. Except for housing, fuel and light, for which the disparity was slightly narrowed, in all other categories of consumption the disparity was widened from moderately to substantially in disadvantage of ruralites (Table 13 and 14 about here).

Educational Level

Perhaps it would be safe to say that the change in educational level, especially the reduction of illiteracy, was one of the most remarkable changes that has occurred in the decade of 1960–1970 (Table 15–a). This is especially true for the rural areas as the illiteracy rate for those of 15 years and over decreased to 17.8 percent in 1970 from 44.1 percent in 1960. The significant gain of literacy was made during the first part of the 1960's as the illiteracy rate in 1966 was reduced to 19.7 percent in rural areas and 8.5 percent in urban areas. Considering the high aspirations for education among the general population, this illiteracy rate appears to be fairly high, but this is largely due to sex and age factors. As may be seen in Table 16, females, especially aged rural females, are the most handicapped in educational attainment. Thus, in 1970 the illiteracy rate of rural females stood at 26.6 while their male counterparts' rate was only 8.5, which is even lower than that of urban females by 0.8. In fact, except for the three age groups in the younger generation, 15–19, 20–24, and 25–29, every age group of rural males has a lower illiteracy rate than their female urban counterparts for both 1966 and 1970. But, when the degree of change in the disparity was examined (Table 15–b), except for the 15–29 age female group in which the disparity was slightly narrowed, in all other age groups for both sexes the urban-rural gap was widened either slightly or moderately, indicating a greater reduction of the illiteracy rate in urban areas during the decade (Table 15–a and 15–b about here).

On the other hand, when the attained level of education for those aged six or more years is compared (Table 16), both rural males and females have narrowed the gap relative to their urban counterparts substantially or moderately, with the exception of the female group at the secondary school level as both sexes at the level of no schooling, for which the disparity increased moderately and slightly, in that order. Similarly, when enrolment ratios at the different educational levels are examined, there are also sex and residence differences in favor of urbanites and males. Thus, in 1970 the college enrolment rate of the urban males for the 18–21 age group was 12.5 while the comparable figure for their rural counterparts was only 2.2. In the same year, however, the enrolment rate of the 6–11 year old boys and girls in rural areas were higher than their urban brothers and sisters, respectively. Nevertheless, when attention is paid to the change in the degree of urban-rural disparity, the rural males and females at all school levels have narrowed the gap in varying degrees of change. The only one exception was the secondary school female group for which the disparity was moderately widened (Table 16 and 17 about here).

Housing and its Environment

The housing problem as measured by owner-occupancy rate has generally become worse during the decade, as a result of rapid urbanization. But the situation was the worst in Seoul, followed by other cities, as shown in Table 18. In 1970, only 48.4 percent of houses in urban areas were owner-occupied, while the comparable figure for 1960 was 62 percent.

During the same period, the occupancy of rented houses increased to 43.5 percent from 34.2 percent. Although the housing situation in rural areas was not so bad as in urban areas, the owner-occupancy rate there decreased from 86.0 percent to 84.3 percent while the occupancy of rented houses increased from 7.1 percent to 10.7 percent. The data also show that the urban-rural disparity index score increased slightly to the disadvantage of the urban areas, giving the rural areas their only measure of advantage.

But when we pay our attention to the quality of houses, the rural housing situation may not be regarded either as better or as good as the urban situation, as can be seen in Tables 19-a and 19-b. Rural houses are much older and smaller, and hence much more crowded. Thus, the disparity index score calculated on the basis of proportion of houses aged nine or less shows a moderate increase in the disparity in favor of the urban areas (Table 19-c).

The poor quality of rural housing situation is well reflected in the lack of such facilities as electric lighting, piped water, and flush toilets. As shown in Table 20, while more than 94 percent of urban homes had electric lighting in 1970, only 26.3 percent of rural homes enjoyed this facility. However, the rural electrification program has rapidly expanded during the decade. The data show that the number of rural homes with electric lighting has tripled during the 1960-70, and as of 1977 the proportion is more than 90 percent. With respect to piped water, 56.9 percent of urban homes had piped water in 1970, which is a gain of about five percent over the decade. On the other hand, only 1.5 percent of rural homes had piped water in 1970. Flush toilets are really a new facility for both urban and rural homes. Thus, in urban areas, the ratio of installation was only 3.7 in 1970, which is a gain of 3.2 percent over the decade. Only 0.2 percent of rural homes had flush toilets in that year. Overall, the urban-rural disparity was greatly narrowed with respect to electric lighting and piped water, while the opposite was true for flush toilets (Table 20 about here).

Health and Nutrition

Infant mortality rates are considered to be quite sensitive to socioeconomic conditions in any country. Due to the paucity of data, however, we will compare the rate between Seoul and a few rural areas in this section. As presented in Table 21, Seoul has enjoyed a lower infant mortality rate than rural areas, but the disparity appears to have been moderately narrowed over the decade (Table 21 about here).

The distribution of medical facilities and personnel and board specialists is also included in the examination. Due to the lack of urban-rural categories in the published data, however, the comparison is made between Seoul and all other regions. Considering the fact that about 20 percent of the total population are residing in Seoul, all medical facilities are heavily concentrated in the capital city. Furthermore, with the exception of hospitals, all medical facilities in Seoul have increased in the proportion during the decade, revealing an ever-increasing concentration of such facilities in the capital city. This is particularly true for dental hospitals and clinics, which increased in Seoul to 52.1 percent in 1970 from 36.3 percent in 1960. No doubt, the medical facilities have substantially increased in number for both rural and urban areas, but the increase in proportion has been in favor of Seoul during the decade. Thus, the disparity increased over a range from moderately to greatly, except with regard to hospitals where a moderate decrease in the disparity occurred (Table 22, 23-a, 23-b, and 24 about here).

Similarly, medical personnel in all categories has been heavily concentrated in Seoul over the decade, not only in terms of sheer numbers but even more so in terms of per 100,000 population. On the other hand, the disparity between Seoul and the other regions appears to have been narrowed in most indicators. In terms of numbers, the disparity has increased in such categories as dentist, midwife, and herb doctor in varying degrees from

slight to moderate, while the disparity decreased substantially in the case of physicians and nurses. When a comparison in the ratios of medical personnel-population is made, the disparity between Seoul and the other regions has been reduced in all categories in degrees ranging from moderate to great. The heavy concentration of medical board specialists of all categories in Seoul is no exception. Nevertheless, the disparity between Seoul and other regions has decreased in varying degrees from moderate to great.

In the area of nutrition, the data presented in Table 25 show that an average Korean takes in daily about 1,800–2,450 calories. The calory intake of the urban population is slightly lower than that of the rural population, but the former consumes more animal protein and less vegetable protein than the latter. The data also show that the rural diet contains less fat and more carbohydrate than the urban diet. Overall, it would be safe to say that the intake of calories seems to be adequate for both rural and urban areas. On the other hand, consumption of the various nutritional foods especially by the rural population, has not changed much over the years (Kim, 1978). Thus, the urban-rural disparity in the area was not examined (Table 25 about here).

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The present study shows that although substantial socioeconomic and demographic changes have occurred, urban-rural differences as measured by various indicators continue to exist in almost all areas in 1970 as they did in 1960. However, the disparity seems to have been narrowed in certain areas while the opposite is true in others. The findings of the present study on changes in urban-rural disparity are summarized in Table 26 (Table 26 about here).

In the demographic area, the urban-rural disparity was reduced in degrees varying from slight to great in all the indicators except for the dependency ratio where a moderate increase in the disparity was revealed. It is particularly noteworthy that during the decade under study, rural wives have greatly narrowed the gap in the use of contraceptives, and induced abortions, resulting in a rapid decline in their fertility rate. The increase in the disparity with regard to the dependency ratio is attributable to a heavy out-migration of working age people from rural areas during the decade.

With respect to the area of employment and industrial shares, the urban-rural disparity was narrowed in the majority of the selected indicators. But there was a slight increase in the urban-rural disparity with respect to employment rates, especially the 14–19 age female group, as in the share of primary industry.

The greatest disparity between urban and rural areas to the farmer's disadvantage occurred, however, in income. The disparity was moderate to substantial when farmers and urban salary-and-wageearners were compared on income, expenditure, and balance, but when all farmers and all urban dwellers were compared, the disparity turned out to be great both in income and savings. Similarly, in consumption as measured by the proportion of total expenditures, the disparity was widened in such categories as food, clothing, and miscellaneous items, while a slight decrease in the disparity was achieved in housing and fuel and light.

Perhaps the most significant gains for the rural population over the decade have been made at the educational level. Although the disparity in illiteracy ratios showed slight to moderate increase, depending upon sex and age, in almost all levels of educational attainment, rural areas reduced the disparity either substantially or moderately. Such a decrease in the disparity was even more pronounced when enrollment ratios at different levels of the educational systems were compared.

The housing situation has particularly deteriorated in urban areas when measured by

owner-occupancy ratio, but the urban situation has improved much more than the rural, when measured by the quality of house and its facilities. Except for the installation of electricity, the housing situation in the rural areas does not seem to have greatly improved, although the disparity in regard to piped water was also greatly decreased.

Finally, the urban-rural gap in the area of health as measured by infant mortality rates appears to have been greatly reduced, although urban areas fare far better than rural ones in terms of medical facilities and personnel. Even though the medical situation has been improved slightly over the decade, more than 20 percent of *Myon* population have to seek medical services outside their own administrative boundaries.

With respect to nutrition, it would appear that the intake of calories is adequate for both rural and urban areas, although their diet and eating habits are different.

On the basis of the above findings, it may be concluded that there has been some narrowing of the urban-rural disparity to varying degrees in the areas of demographic characteristics, unemployment, educational attainment, improvement of home environment through electric lighting and piped water, and in health as measured by the rates of medical personnel to population. On the other hand, over the decade the urban-rural gap in income and consumption patterns was greatly widened, while the disparity in employment rates also increased slightly. Indeed, these latter disparities led to heavy out-migration by people from the rural areas, accelerating the urbanization process during the decade.

Thus, although the degrees and patterns of urban-rural disparity varied from one area to another, it appears that the disparities in income and occupation outweighed some of the gains in other areas in rural sectors. Furthermore, even if Korean society as a whole, and rural Korea in particular, appears to have adjusted itself well to rapid urbanization and industrialization, it would take much time and effort to eliminate the current socioeconomic and demographic differences existing between urban and rural areas.

Table 1 Rates of Population Growth: Urban and Rural Areas, 1960-70 (Unit: 1000)

	1960	1966	1970	Percent change 1960-70
Population (in thousand)				
Urban	6,997	9,805	13,609	94.5
Rural	17,992	19,388	17,860	-11.8
Total	24,989	29,193	31,469	25.9
Rate of Growth(%)				
Urban		5.8	8.5	46.6
Rural		1.3	-2.0	-53.8
Total		2.7	1.9	-29.6

Source: Censuses of 1960-70.

Table 2 Net Internal Migration Rates, Urban and Rural Areas, 1955-70

	1955-60		1960-65		1965-70		Percent change 1960-70	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Male	7.56	-2.84	10.07	-4.89	19.75	-13.78	96.1	-181.8
Female	9.56	-3.64	10.35	-5.11	19.27	-13.47	86.2	-163.6

Source: *Bulletin of the Population and Development Studies Center*, Vol. IV, pp. 60-61, in Kwon (1975).

Table 3 Youth, Aged and Total Dependency Ratios, Urban and Rural Areas, 1960-70

	1960		1966		1970		Percent change 1960-70	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Youth	75.5	85.8	71.5	92.5	64.9	93.4	-14.1	8.8
Aged	6.8	12.2	6.4	12.3	6.1	13.9	-10.3	13.9
Total	82.3	98.0	77.9	104.8	71.0	107.3	-13.8	9.5

Source: Censuses of 1960-70.

Table 4 Child-Woman Ratios, Urban and Rural Areas, 1966-70

	1966		1970		Percent change 1966-70	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Population of Age Group 0-4 (in 1,000)	1,280	3,154	1,650	2,667	28.9	-15.5
Female Population of Age Group 15-49 (in 1,000)	2,515	4,069	3,467	3,830	37.9	-5.9
Child-Woman Ratio	50.9	77.5	47.6	69.6	-6.5	-10.2

Source: Censuses of 1966-70

Table 5 Sex Ratios, Urban and Rural Areas, 1960-70

	1960		1966		1970		Percent change 1960-70	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Male Population (in 1,000)	3,494	9,050	4,911	9,790	6,486	9,292	85.6	2.7
Female Population (in 1,000)	3,503	8,943	4,899	9,608	6,443	9,212	83.9	3.0
Sex Ratio	99.7	101.2	100.2	101.9	100.7	100.9	1.0	-0.3

Source: Censuses of 1960-70.

Table 6 Percent of Married Women Through Age 44 Currently Using
Contraceptives by Residence

Year	Urban	Rural	Total	Percent Change 1964-73		
				Urban	Rural	Total
1964	19	6	9	105.3	466.6	300.0
1965	21	14	16			
1966	26	18	20			
1967	26	17	20			
1971	27	23	25			
1973	39	34	36			

Source: Ross and Smith (1969), Kim (1972), and Song and Han(1974).

Table 7 **Percent of Currently Married Korean Women 20-44 Ever Having an Abortion, 1964-1971**

Residence	Year						Early 1971 KIRBS	Fall 1971 F-As	Percent change 1964-Fall 1971 F-As
	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1970			
Seoul only	25*		30		40*	43*	34	42	68.0
All cities	15	23	27	28	26		30	39	160.0
Small towns	9**						23	29****	222.2
Rural	4	5***	7	7	10		16	20	400.0
National	7	11	13	14	16		22	29	314.3

(Weighted)

*Sungdong-Gu area only

**Ichon Eup only

***Both national and local survey

****Based upon 4 EDs in only two towns (Eup's) in national sample.

Source: Hong and Watson (1976).

Table 8 **Lifetime Induced Abortion Rates for Ever Married Women Aged 20-44 in 1971 by Residence**

	1965 before	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	Percent change 1966-71
Seoul								
Per 100 Pregnancies	16.0	40.7	35.5	32.7	34.6	31.2	33.5	-17.7
Per 100 Live Births	39.8	10.7	9.5	9.5	10.2	10.4	11.4	6.5
Other Urban								
Per 100 Pregnancies	7.5	23.3	30.2	29.8	33.3	34.7	31.0	33.0
Per 100 Live Births	24.4	6.1	8.5	8.3	12.7	11.0	11.3	85.2
Rural								
Per 100 Pregnancies	3.6	10.8	13.5	13.8	17.0	20.0	19.0	75.9
Per 100 Live Births	11.4	3.3	3.6	4.1	5.1	5.8	6.4	93.9
Total (National, Weighted)								
Per 100 Pregnancies	7.1	19.1	22.1	21.3	24.9	26.2	24.5	28.3
Per 100 Live Births	20.4	5.5	6.0	6.2	8.0	8.0	8.4	52.7

Source: Hong and Watson, 1976.

Table 9 **State of Employment, Urban and Rural Areas, 1960-70**

Employment State	1960*		1966		1970		Percent change 1960-70	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Population at Age 14 or over (in 1,000)	4,445	10,946	5,731	10,378	8,350	10,592	87.9	-3.2
Economically Active Population (in 1,000)	1,843	5,700	2,833	5,821	3,923	6,455	112.9	13.2
Number of the Employed (in 1,000)	1,526	5,502	2,364	5,599	3,742	6,411	145.2	16.5
Economic Participation Rate	41.5	52.1	49.4	56.1	47.0	60.9	13.3	16.9
Rate of Employment	82.8	96.5	83.4	96.2	95.4	99.3	15.2	2.9

*Population at age 13 or over is counted in case of the year 1960.

Source: Censuses of 1960-70.

Table 10 Economically Inactive Population Categorized, Urban and Rural Areas, 1966-70
Number (in 1,000)

Category	Housekeeping		Attending School		Others		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1966								
Urban	2,038	70.3	651	22.5	208	7.2	2,897	100.0
Rural	3,604	79.1	380	8.3	573	12.6	4,557	100.0
1970								
Urban	2,563	61.5	1,052	25.2	554	13.3	4,169	100.0
Rural	2,414	63.8	565	14.9	807	21.3	3,785	100.0
1966-70	Percent Change in Number							
Urban		25.8		61.6		166.3		43.9
Rural		-33.1		48.7		40.8		-16.9

Source: Census of 1966-70.

Table 11 Rates of Unemployment by Age and Sex, Urban and Rural Areas, 1966-70

Age	1966				1970			
	Urban		Rural		Urban		Rural	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
14-19	37.1	22.6	10.7	7.0	12.6	6.2	2.3	1.3
20-24	34.8	20.0	11.0	3.4	11.4	5.2	2.6	0.8
25-29	18.3	12.3	5.6	0.9	5.4	3.2	1.3	0.2
30-34	10.2	5.2	2.7	0.5	2.4	1.6	0.6	0.1
35-39	8.8	3.6	2.4	0.6	2.2	1.0	0.5	0.0
40-44	8.8	3.5	2.1	0.6	2.4	0.7	0.3	0.1
45-49	10.2	3.6	2.3	0.7	2.4	0.7	0.3	0.0
50-54	13.8	4.9	2.4	1.1	2.4	0.8	0.2	0.1
55-59	15.7	6.6	2.4	1.7	2.4	0.8	0.2	0.1
60-64	7.8	4.4	1.4	1.7	1.5	0.7	0.1	0.1
65+	5.8	8.5	1.2	2.3	1.5	1.3	0.1	0.1
Percent change: 1960-70								
14-19		-67.0		-73.6		-78.5		-71.4
20-24		67.8		-74.0		-76.4		-76.5
25-29		-70.5		-74.0		-76.8		-77.8
30-34		-76.5		-69.2		-76.8		-80.0
35-39		-75.0		-72.2		-79.2		-100.0
40-44		-72.7		-80.0		-85.7		-84.3
45-49		-76.5		-81.0		-87.0		-100.0
50-54		-82.6		-83.7		-91.7		-90.0
55-59		-85.7		-87.9		-91.7		-94.1
60-64		-81.8		-84.1		-92.7		-94.1
65+		-74.1		-77.6		-91.7		-96.7

Source: Censuses of 1966-70.

Table 12 Industrial Shares of the Employed Population, Urban and Rural Areas, 1960-70

Sector	1960		1966		1970		Percent change 1960-70	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Primary	12.0	80.9	10.9	76.7	7.4	76.1	-38.3	-6.9
Secondary	19.0	4.3	26.4	7.6	28.1	7.7	47.9	79.1
Tertiary	67.9	14.1	62.7	15.7	64.0	16.0	-6.7	13.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	-

Source: Censuses of 1960-70

Table 13 Average Incomes and Expenditures Per Household, Urban Salary and Wage Earners and Rural Farmers, 1961-1970. (in 1,000 Won)

	1961		1966		1970		Percent change 1961-70	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Income	84.5	70.2	162	167	381	317	135.2	89.8
Expenditure	90.2	70.2	157	154	364	279	131.8	81.2
Balance	-5.7	0.0	5	13	17	38	240.0	192.3

Source: Korea Statistical Yearbook, 1972.

Table 14 Urban and Farm Income and Consumption Patterns, 1965-1970
(In current Won)

	Farm		
	1965	1970	1965-70 Percent change
Average Income			
Per household	105,685	235,155	122.5
Per capita	16,802	38,033	126.4
Saving ratios	4.91	7.72	47.0
Food (%)	53.1	45.9	-13.6
Housing (%)	3.8	4.2	10.5
Fuel and light (%)	7.8	7.9	1.3
Clothing (%)	8.0	8.4	5.0
Miscellaneous (%)	27.2	33.6	23.5
	Urban		
	1965	1970	1965-70 Percent change
Average Income			
Per household	115,200	387,240	236.2
Per capita	20,719	70,664	241.0
Saving ratios	-1.88	7.19	382.4
Food (%)	56.8	40.5	-28.7
Housing (%)	13.8	10.4	-24.6
Fuel and light (%)	5.6	5.5	-1.8
Clothing (%)	6.4	10.1	57.8
Miscellaneous (%)	17.2	25.6	48.8

Table 14 Continued

	Seoul		
	1965	1970	1965-70 Percent change
Average Income			
Per household	135,480	462,000	241.0
Per capita	24,108	86,196	257.5
Saving ratios	-3.01	6.10	202.3
Food (%)	53.7	38.4	-28.5
Housing (%)	15.0	18.9	26.0
Fuel and light (%)	5.4	4.7	-13.0
Clothing (%)	6.1	10.0	63.9
Miscellaneous (%)	19.8	27.9	40.9

Source: Economic Planning Board/Bureau of Statistics, Annual Report of Family Income and Expenditure Survey, 1965-1970, and Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Report on the Results of Farm Household Survey, 1965-1970.

Table 15-a. Illiteracy Rates by Age, Sex, and Residence, 1960-70.

Age Group	Sex	1960	
		Urban	Rural
15-19	Male	12,700 (3.2)	87,200 (10.2)
	Female	39,900(10.6)	174,000 (23.1)
20-24	Male	10,000 (2.9)	95,900 (11.5)
	Female	37,600(11.2)	251,500 (32.9)
25-29	Male	8,900 (3.5)	96,600 (14.7)
	Female	51,300(16.4)	314,000 (45.8)
30-34	Male	35,500 (7.9)	323,400 (33.6)
*30-39	Female	153,000(30.9)	734,400 (69.0)
35-39	Male		
	Female		
40-44	Male	67,000(20.0)	485,200 (78.2)
*40-49	Female	154,600(52.4)	708,100 (87.7)
45-49	Male		
	Female		
50-54	Male	70,000(37.3)	457,200 (78.2)
*50-59	Female	130,500(72.2)	566,400 (95.1)
55-59	Male		
	Female		
60+	Male	74,800(68.0)	494,300 (92.3)
	Female	161,600(91.7)	666,400 (98.3)
Total	Male	279,400(13.4)	2,041,900 (32.1)
	Female	729,500(35.6)	3,512,600 (56.3)
Grand Total		1,008,800(24.4)	5,554,500 (44.1)

Table 15-a Continued

Age Group	Sex	1966	
		Urban	Rural
15-19	Male	2,900 (0.5)	13,400 (1.6)
	Female	8,000 (1.5)	20,200 (2.6)
20-24	Male	2,300 (0.5)	13,300 (1.7)
	Female	7,300 (1.6)	29,300 (4.6)
25-29	Male	2,600 (0.6)	15,300 (2.2)
	Female	13,500 (3.1)	62,700 (9.1)
30-34	Male	3,100 (0.9)	18,300 (3.0)
*30-39	Female	20,400 (5.6)	98,600(15.9)
35-39	Male	4,200 (1.5)	24,100 (5.3)
	Female	29,800(10.0)	133,100(25.6)
40-44	Male	7,200 (3.0)	39,200 (9.4)
*40-49	Female	38,400(16.3)	158,600(35.2)
45-49	Male	10,300 (5.3)	52,500(14.3)
	Female	40,400(32.5)	171,500(44.7)
50-54	Male	12,000 (8.5)	63,300(19.5)
*50-59	Female	45,400(32.5)	183,600(53.7)
55-59	Male	13,500(13.0)	70,200(25.8)
	Female	49,900(44.0)	190,000(63.6)
60+	Male	35,700(27.3)	199,900(40.3)
	Female	148,500(66.9)	533,400(80.3)
Total	Male	93,800 (3.3)	509,500 (9.7)
	Female	401,700(13.5)	1,581,200(29.4)
Grand Total		495,500 (8.5)	2,090,700(19.7)

Age Group	Sex	1970	
		Urban	Rural
15-19	Male	2,300 (0.3)	7,900 (1.0)
	Female	5,500 (0.9)	8,700 (1.2)
20-24	Male	2,200 (0.4)	8,200 (1.2)
	Female	5,100 (0.8)	13,300 (2.4)
25-29	Male	2,700 (0.5)	10,300 (2.0)
	Female	9,200 (1.6)	30,900 (5.8)
30-34	Male	2,900 (0.5)	13,400 (2.3)
*30-39	Female	14,700 (3.0)	60,900(10.3)
35-39	Male	3,200 (0.8)	17,400 (3.4)
	Female	20,900 (5.4)	97,300(17.7)
40-44	Male	4,300 (1.5)	24,000 (6.1)
*40-49	Female	30,000 (9.8)	130,300(28.0)
45-49	Male	7,400 (3.0)	39,900(10.5)
	Female	38,300(15.9)	155,400(37.5)
50-54	Male	9,500 (5.4)	51,300(15.6)
*50-59	Female	43,800(25.1)	165,500(48.2)
55-59	Male	10,500 (8.2)	59,000(21.1)
	Female	49,200(34.1)	174,100(57.5)
60+	Male	32,600(18.9)	191,000(36.2)
	Female	164,200(56.6)	546,400(76.5)
Total	Male	77,800 (2.0)	422,400 (8.5)
	Female	381,000 (9.3)	1,382,600(26.6)
Grand Total		458,800 (5.7)	1,805,000(17.8)

Source: Census of 1960-70.

*In 1960 the age interval for 30 years or older was 10 instead of five.

Table 15-b: **Percent Change in Illiteracy Rate, 1966-70.**

Age Group	Urban		Rural	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
15-19	-40.0	-40.0	-37.5	-53.8
20-24	-20.0	-50.0	-29.5	-47.8
25-29	-16.7	-48.4	-19.1	-36.3
30-34	-44.6	-46.4	-23.7	-35.2
35-39	-46.7	46.0	35.8	-31.9
40-44	-50.0	-51.1	35.1	-21.5
45-49	-43.4	-51.1	-26.6	-16.1
50-54	-36.5	-22.8	-20.0	-11.2
55-59	-36.9	-22.5	-19.2	-19.6
60+	-31.8	-15.4	-10.2	-4.7
Total	-39.4	-31.1	-12.4	-9.5
Grand Total		Urban		Rural
1966-70		-32.9		-9.6
1960-66		-65.2		-55.3
1960-70		-76.6		-59.6

Table 16: **Educational Level of Population Aged Six Years or Older by Sex and Residence, 1960~1970**

Unit: %

Level	Urban			Rural		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1960:						
Never attended	15.3	31.5	23.6	35.3	56.4	45.4
Primary	43.3	48.7	46.4	47.9	35.6	43.1
Secondary	32.4	17.4	25.0	14.5	7.1	10.7
College	8.3	1.5	4.9	1.4	0.1	0.8
1966:						
Never attended	5.8	18.6	13.4	23.7	40.0	31.8
Primary	41.7	52.5	47.1	55.3	53.2	54.2
Secondary	38.14	25.8	32.1	19.0	6.6	12.8
College	11.8	3.1	7.4	2.0	0.2	1.1
1970:						
Never attended	6.2	14.2	10.2	19.1	33.3	26.2
Primary	38.6	50.6	44.6	55.5	56.5	56.0
Secondary	43.4	31.6	37.5	23.0	9.9	16.5
College	11.9	3.6	7.7	2.3	0.3	1.3
Percent Change (1960-70):						
Never attended	-59.5	-54.9	-56.8	-46.2	-41.0	-42.3
Primary	-10.9	3.9	-3.9	15.9	58.7	29.9
Secondary	34.0	81.6	50.0	58.6	39.4	54.2
College	43.4	140.0	57.1	64.2	200.0	62.5

Source: Censuses 1960-1970

Table 17: **Percent Enrolment of Pupils by Sex and Different Levels of Education, Urban and Rural Areas, 1966—70.**

Level	1966		1970		Percent change (1966—70)	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Primary (6—11)						
Male	88.4	86.3	87.3	89.8	-1.2	4.1
Female	86.6	82.4	86.1	86.8	-0.6	5.3
Secondary(12—17)						
Male	54.6	30.0	56.6	39.6	3.7	32.0
Female	41.2	15.0	44.9	28.0	9.0	86.7
College(18—21)						
Male	16.8	2.2	12.5	2.2	-25.6	0
Female	9.0	0.4	7.6	0.6	-15.6	50.0

Source: Censuses of 1966—70

Table 18: **Housing Tenure** Unit: %

	1960		1970		Percent change 1960—70	
	Owner Occupied	Rented	Owner Occupied	Rented	Owner Occupancy rate	
Whole Country	79.1	14.9	69.0	24.7		-12.8
Urban	62.0	34.2	48.4	43.5		-21.9
Rural	86.0	7.1	84.3	10.7		-2.0
Seoul	56.5	39.8	48.1	51.9		-14.9

Source: Censuses of 1960—1970.

Table 19—a: **Percent of Urban and Rural Housing by Age and Residence, 1960.**

Age of House	Urban	Rural	Whole Country
Less than 1 year	6.9	2.8	3.8
1—9	38.8	22.0	26.9
10—14	16.1	14.1	14.6
15—23	19.1	15.2	17.7
24—49	15.2	24.8	22.0
50 years and over	3.7	18.6	14.3
Not known	0.8	0.6	0.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N in 1,000)	(1,291)	(3,155)	(4,446)

Source: Economic Planning Board, 1960 Population and Housing Census of Korea, Vol. 1 (11-1 Whole Country).

Table 19-b: Per Cent of Urban and Rural Housing by Age and Residence, 1970

Age of House	Urban	Rural	Whole Country
Less than 5 years	24.6	5.2	11.8
5-9	14.2	6.8	9.3
10-19	22.6	24.8	21.1
20-24	15.0	18.3	17.2
25 years or older	21.3	48.6	39.2
Total (N in 1,000)	100.0 (1,398)	100.0 (2,962)	100.0 (4,360)

Source: Economic Planning Board, Report on Population and Housing Survey, Vol. 2 (10% Sample Survey, 4~4, Housing), 1970.

Table 19-c: Per Cent of Houses Nine or Less Years Old

Year	Urban	Rural	Whole Country
1960	45.7	24.8	30.7
1970	38.8	12.0	21.1
Percent change 1960-70	-15.1	-51.6	-31.3

Source: Tables 19-a and 19b above.

Table 20: Selected Household Facilities, 1960-1970 Unit: %

	Electric lighting		Piped water		Flush toilet	
	1960	1970	1960	1970	1960	1970
Whole Country	28.4	59.6	13.6	26.5	0.2	1.8
Urban	67.3	94.3	42.0	56.9	0.5	3.7
Town	40.6	71.8	10.3	15.4	0.1	0.4
Rural	8.2	26.3	0.6	1.5	0.1	0.2
Percent Change: 1960-70						
Whole Country	109.9		94.5		800.0	
Urban	40.1		35.5		640.0	
Town	76.8		49.5		300.0	
Rural	220.7		150.0		100.0	

Source: Censuses of 1960-70.

Table 21: Infant Mortality Rate, 1962-1971

Surveyor	Sample Area	Year	Infant mortality rate (in 1,000)
Urban area:			
Eui Hyuek Kwon	Sungdong-ku, Seoul	1962-64	35.5
Jae Mo Yang	Yenseiarea, Seoul	1964-67	35.9
Eui Hyuek Kwon	Sungdong-ku, Seoul	1966-67	32.2
Rural area:			
Jung Huh	Kyong-gi Province	1952-57	125.0
Hyong Jong Park	Whole rural area	1954-59	82.0
Duck Jin Yoon	Kae Jung, Jeonbuk	1958-61	63.9
Sang Jae Lee	Namwon, Jeonbuk	1961-65	59.6
Sung Kwan Lee	Kyongsan, Kyongbuk	1970-71	42.2

Source: Hyong Jong Park, "Population and Public Health." p.129.

Table 22: **Distribution of Selected Medical Facilities, 1960-1970.**

	Seoul (%)	Other Region (%)	Whole Country (%)
1960:			
Hospital	51 (34.0)	99 (66.0)	150 (100.0)
Beds in hospital	3,857 (38.8)	6,094 (61.2)	9,951 (100.0)
Clinic	1,231 (31.9)	2,632 (68.1)	3,863 (100.0)
Dental hospital and clinic	275 (36.3)	482 (63.7)	757 (100.0)
Herb clinic	517 (29.1)	1,262 (70.9)	1,779 (100.0)
1970:			
Hospital	68 (28.9)	167 (71.1)	235 (100.0)
Beds in hospital	7,321 (44.3)	9,217 (55.7)	16,538 (100.0)
Clinic	2,133 (39.5)	3,269 (60.5)	5,402 (100.0)
Dental hospital and clinic	698 (52.1)	643 (47.9)	1,341 (100.0)
Herb clinic	1,044 (42.7)	1,399 (57.3)	2,443 (100.0)
Percent change, 1960-1970:			
Hospital	33.3	68.7	56.7
Beds in hospital	89.8	51.2	66.2
Clinic	73.3	24.2	39.8
Dental hospital and clinic	153.8	33.4	77.1
Herb clinic	101.9	10.9	37.3

Source: Yearbook of Public Health and Social Statistics, 1960-1970.

Table 23-a: **Distribution of Selected Medical Personnel By Residence, 1960-1970**

	1960			1970		
	N	(%)	N per 100,000 population	N	(%)	N per 100,000 population
Physician:						
Seoul	3,617	(46.6)	148.0	5,275	(35.3)	95.3
Other region	4,418	(53.4)	18.4	9,657	(64.7)	37.2
Whole country	7,765	(100.0)	31.1	14,932	(100.0)	47.4
Dentist:						
Seoul	521	(38.1)	21.3	936	(44.1)	16.9
Other region	848	(61.9)	3.8	1,186	(55.9)	4.6
Whole country	1,369	(100.0)	5.5	2,122	(100.0)	6.7
Nurse:						
Seoul	1,120	(23.2)	45.8	3,192	(22.0)	57.7
Other region	3,716	(76.8)	16.5	11,314	(78.0)	43.6
Whole country	4,836	(100.0)	19.3	14,506	(100.0)	46.1
Midwife:						
Seoul	949	(23.0)	38.8	1,465	(23.7)	26.5
Other region	3,185	(77.0)	14.1	4,717	(76.3)	18.2
Whole country	4,134	(100.0)	16.5	6,182	(100.0)	19.6
Herb doctor:						
Seoul	700	(24.0)	28.6	705	(24.9)	12.7
Other region	2,222	(76.0)	9.9	2,123	(75.1)	8.2
Whole country	2,922	(100.0)	12.0	2,828	(100.0)	9.0

Source: Yearbook of Public Health and Social Statistics, 1960, 1970.

Table 23-b: Percent Changes of Distribution of Selected Medical Personnel, 1960-1970

	N	N per 100,000 population
Physician:		
Seoul	45.8	-35.6
Other region	118.6	102.1
Whole country	92.3	52.4
Dentist:		
Seoul	79.7	-21.7
Other region	39.9	21.1
Whole country	55.0	21.8
Nurse:		
Seoul	185.0	25.9
Other region	204.5	164.2
Whole country	200.0	138.9
Midwife:		
Seoul	54.35	-31.7
Other region	48.1	29.1
Whole country	49.5	18.8
Herb doctor:		
Seoul	0.7	-55.6
Other region	-4.5	-17.2
Whole country	-5.5	-25.0

Source: Table 23-a, above.

Table 24: Distribution of Board Specialists, 1960-1970.

	Seoul		Other region		Whole country (N)
	N	(%)	N	(%)	Total
1960:					
Internal Medicine	231	(55.7)	184	(44.3)	415
Surgery	219	(51.3)	208	(48.7)	427
Obstetric & Gynaecology	146	(58.9)	102	(41.1)	248
Pediatrics	123	(54.7)	102	(45.3)	225
Orthopedic Surgery	13	(72.2)	5	(27.8)	18
Psychiatry	12	(60.0)	8	(40.0)	20
All Others	155	(54.0)	132	(46.0)	287
Total (%)	800	(54.8)	741	(45.2)	1,640
1970:					
Internal Medicine	349	(49.2)	360	(50.8)	709
Surgery	371	(43.3)	490	(56.7)	861
Obstetric & Gynaecology	295	(49.9)	296	(50.1)	591
Pediatrics	207	(48.8)	215	(51.2)	422
Orthopedic Surgery	86	(49.1)	89	(50.9)	175
Psychiatry	44	(43.1)	58	(56.9)	102
All Others	669	(49.6)	677	(50.4)	1,346
Total (%)	2,021	(48.1)	2,185	(51.9)	4,206
Percent Change, 1960-1970 (N)					
Internal Medicine	51.4		95.7		70.8
Surgery	69.4		135.6		101.6
Obstetric & Gynaecology	102.1		190.2		138.3
Pediatrics	68.3		110.8		70.2
Orthopedic Surgery	561.5		1680.0		872.2
Psychiatry	266.7		625.0		410.0
All Others	331.6		412.9		369.0
Total	124.8		194.9		156.5

Source: Yearbook of Public Health and Social Statistics, 1960, 1970.

Table 25: Average Daily Nutrient Intake Per Person Based on Survey Data, 1969-73

Type of Household	Calories	Protein			Fat	Carbo- hydrate	Survey Size	
		Animal	Vegetable	Total			House- hold	People
		(g)	(g)	(g)	(g)	(g)	(number)	
City/Urban								
1969	1946	10.9	51.9	62.8	19.5	378.9	313	2085
1970	2286	21.0	55.2	76.2	27.2	434.1	368	2122
1971	1967	15.3	50.4	65.7	18.5	384.5	148	1113
1972	1839	16.8	47.1	63.9	20.2	350.4	260	1514
1973	1846	14.4	42.8	57.2	22.4	354.0	377	2264
Agriculture/Rural								
1969	2218	4.6	63.2	67.8	15.7	451.3	531	3521
1970	1949	3.7	47.4	51.1	9.9	413.7	80	510
1971	2027	5.6	59.1	64.7	12.3	414.4	214	1411
1972	1968	14.2	51.2	65.4	18.2	385.6	340	1913
1973	2445	4.5	60.9	65.4	12.0	518.9	200	1270
Fishery								
1969	1886	15.7	47.3	63.0	16.7	370.8	48	301
1970	2547	8.1	70.1	78.2	18.8	516.4	40	265
1971	2211	6.3	65.2	71.5	11.4	455.7	60	365
Mountainous								
1969	2111	1.4	60.2	61.6	12.4	438.3	30	189
1970	1917	6.7	51.5	58.2	14.8	387.9	61	361
1971	2204	4.7	64.9	69.6	13.9	450.0	101	619
Mining								
1969	2050	2.0	60.0	62.0	18.8	408.3	30	221
1970	2050	8.1	51.2	59.3	15.2	419.0	40	210
1971	1949	7.2	56.1	63.3	9.2	403.2	20	104
Total								
1969	2105	6.8	58.8	65.6	16.9	422.5	952	6218
1970	2150	9.5	55.1	64.4	17.2	434.2	589	3468
1971	2072	7.8	59.1	67.0	13.1	421.6	543	3612
1972	1904	15.5	49.2	64.7	19.2	368.0	600	3427
1973	2059	11.4	53.0	64.4	19.2	407.1	577	3534

Source: Thodey (1976), p.204.

Table 26: Summary of Findings

Socioeconomic and Demographic Indicator	Change in Urban-Rural Disparity, 1960-70	
	Degree of Increase*	Degree of Decrease*
Demographic Characteristics:		
Dependency Ratios	Moderate (Youth, Aged, and Total)	—
Child-Woman Ratio	—	Slight
Sex Ratio	—	Slight
Use of Contraceptives	—	Great
Abortion Experience	—	Great
Abortion Rate/100 Pregnancies	—	Moderate
Abortion Rate/100 Live Births	—	Slight

Socioeconomic and Demographic Indicator	Change in Urban-Rural Disparity, 1960-70	
	Degree of Increase*	Degree of Decrease*
Employment and Industrial Shares:		
Economic Participation Rate	—	Slight
Employment Rate	Slight	—
Economically Inactive Population:		
Housekeeping	—	Slight
Attending School	—	Substantial
Others	Slight	—
Unemployment Rate:		
14-19 Age Female	Slight	—
35-39 Age Female	—	Moderate
All Other Age, Both Sexes	—	Slight
Industrial Shares:		
Primary	Moderate	—
Secondary	—	Moderate
Tertiary	—	Slight
Income and Consumption:		
Farmer vs. Salary and Wage Earner:		
Income	Moderate	—
Expenditure	Substantial	—
Balance	Moderate	—
Farm vs. Urban (All Households)		
Income per Households	Great	—
Income per Capita	Great	—
Saving Ratio	Great	—
Food	Slight	—
Housing	—	Slight
Fuel and Light	—	Slight
Clothing	Substantial	—
Miscellaneous	Moderate	—
Educational Level:		
Illiteracy Ratio:		
Female: 15-29 Age	—	Slight
: 40-49 Age	Moderate	—
: All others	Slight	—
Male : 30-35; 60+ Age	Moderate	—
: All others	Slight	—
Total :	Slight	—
Attained Educational Level:		
Never Attended	Slight	—
Primary : Male	—	Moderate
Female	—	Substantial
Secondary: Male	—	Moderate
: Female	Moderate	—
College : Male	—	Moderate
: Female	—	Substantial
Enrollment Rate:		
Never Attended	—	Slight (both sexes)
Primary : Male	—	Moderate
: Female	—	Substantial
Secondary: Male	—	Moderate
: Female	Moderate	—

Socioeconomic and Demographic Indicator	Change in Urban-Rural Disparity, 1960-70.	
	Degree of Increase*	Degree of Decrease*
College : Male	—	Moderate
: Female	—	Substantial
Housing and Its Environment:		
Owner Occupancy Ratio	Slight (in disfavor of urban area)	
Proportion of Houses Aged 9 or less	Moderate	—
Electric Lighting	—	Great
Piped Water	—	Great
Flush Toilet	Great	—
Health:		
Infant Mortality Rate	—	Moderate
Medical Facilities (in terms of %):		
Hospital	—	Moderate
Hospital Bed	Moderate	—
Clinic	Moderate	—
Dental Hospital & Clinic	Great	—
Herb Clinic	Substantial	—
Medical Personnel:		
Physician: Number (N)	—	Substantial
: N/100,000 population	—	Great
Dentist : N	Moderate	—
: N/100,000 population	—	Moderate
Nurse : N	—	Substantial
: N/100,000 population	—	Great
Midwife : N	Substantial	—
: N/100,000 population	—	Substantial
Herb Doctor: N	Slight	—
: N/100,000 population	—	Moderate
Board Specialists:		
All Categories	—	Moderate to Great

*Degree of increase (decrease) was operationally defined as follows:

<u>Range of the Urban-Rural difference in percent changes (1960-70)</u>	<u>Degree</u>
± (0.1~ 20.0)	Slight
±(20.0~ 50.0)	Moderate
±(50.0~100.0)	Substantial
±(100.0 or higher)	Great

都市와 農村的 隔差 : 1960年代의 人口 및 社會經濟的
變動을 中心으로

文 丞 珪

이 研究는 1960年 1965年 및 1970年の 國勢調査 및 現地調査 資料等を 使用하여 1960 年代에 있어서의 都市와 農村的 隔差가 人口, 雇傭, 産業別 勞動力의 構造, 家計收支, 教育, 住居 및 保健衛生 等の 分野에서 果然 어떻게 變化하였는가를 檢討하기 爲하여 이루어진 것인바 그 分析結果를 要約하면 아래와 같다.

- (1) 人口分野에 있어서 家族計劃의 實踐率, 出産力 및 性比等에는 都鄙의 隔差가 多少 減少되었음이 事實이나, 離村 特히 生産年齡層의 急激한 離村現象의 結果로 年少者 및 年老者의 生産年齡層에 對한 扶養依存度は 오히려 그 隔差가 深化되었다.
- (2) 經濟參與率 및 雇傭率에 있어서는 그 隔差가 減少되었고 産業別 勞動力 構造에 있어서는 一次産業에 있어서는 多少 增加된 反面 二次 및 三次産業에 있어서는 若干 減少되었다.
- (3) 家計收支, 貯蓄, 消費等に 있어서 家口當으로나 或은 一人當으로 比較하여 볼 때 都農의 隔差가 가장 두드러지게 深化되었음을 알 수 있었다.
- (4) 都鄙의 隔差가 가장 顯著하게 減少된 것이 教育分野였으며 비록 文盲率은 그 隔差가 若干 增大하였으나 各級學校別로 본 既得教育程度 및 現就學率에 있어서는 大體로 그 隔差가 크게 減少하였다.
- (5) 自家居住率로 본 住居狀態는 都市事情의 惡化로 오히려 農村에 有利한 方向으로 都鄙의 隔差가 若干 벌어지고 있었으나, 住居老化率에 있어서는 農村에 不利한 方向으로 그 隔差가 增加하고 있다. 한편 電化率 및 水道施設率에 있어서는 그 隔差가 減少되었음을 알 수 있었다.
- (6) 諸般 醫療施設 및 醫療要員들의 都市集中 特히 서울市에로의 集中이 事實이나 서울과 地方을 比較하여 볼 때 一般病院을 除外한 其他 醫療施設 即 病床 個人醫院 齒科病醫院 漢醫院 等은 그 數的 增加率에 있어서 서울 地方間의 隔差가 增大하였으며 다만 病院만은 그 隔差가 多少 減少하였다. 한편 專門醫를 包含한 諸般醫療要員의 人口對比率에 있어서는 그 隔差가 모두 減少하였음을

알 수 있었다. 그리고 嬰兒死亡率 또한 그 隔差가 減少하고 있었다.

以上으로 1960年代에 急速하게 進行되었던 都市化 및 工業化 過程에서 所得 및 消費分野만을 除外하고는 諸般分野에 있어서 大體로 都市와 農村의 隔差가 어느 程度 減少하였음이 事實이나 1970年 現在로 存在하고 있는 隔差度를 比較할 때 이를 完全히 除去하기 爲하여서는 長久한 時日과 政策的 配慮가 要請되고 있음 또한 看過할 수 없다고 하겠다.