

THE NATIONAL BAR EXAMINATION IN KOREA

CHANG ROK KIM*

I. INTRODUCTION

Since 1995, numerous debates over reforming the legal education and training system in the Republic of Korea have occurred.¹ After ten years of debates, another fierce conflict of opinions over the introduction of the “Professional Graduate Law School System” (法學專門大學院) is ongoing as of September of 2005.²

Efforts to solve the problems of the National Bar Examination (司法試驗) lie at the core of all debates over legal education. What are its problems, and what efforts have been made to reform the exam? This Article will present a few answers to these questions.

Part II of this Article will analyze the National Bar Examination. Part III considers its problems, and Part IV seeks to unravel the proposals for reform. Part V examines the draft bill of the Presidential Committee on Judicial Reform. Part VI concludes the Article.

II. THE NATIONAL BAR EXAMINATION

In Korea, those who want to become judges, prosecutors, or private practitioners must pass the National Bar Examination and then complete two years of training at the Judicial Research and Training Institute (司法研修院; “JRTI”).³ However, fewer

* Associate Professor of Law, Kyungpook National University College of Law. He may be reached at: kcr0622@hanafos.com.

¹ For an explanation of the Korean legal profession and the legal education and training system in general, see JAMES M. WEST, EDUCATION OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION IN KOREA (1991); Sang-Hyun Song, *Legal Education in Korea and the Asian Region*, 51 J. LEGAL EDUC. 398 (2001); Chang Soo Yang, *The Judiciary in Contemporary Society: Korea*, 25 CASE W. RES. J. INT’L L. 303 (1993).

² See Jae Won Kim, *The Ideal and the Reality of the Korean Legal Profession*, 2 ASIAN-PAC. L. & POL’Y J. 45, 65-68 (2001); Hoyoon Nam, *U.S.-Style Law School (“Law School”) System in Korea: Mistake or Accomplishment?*, 28 FORDHAM INT’L L. J. 879 *passim* (2005).

³ Beopweonjojikbeop [Court Organization Act], Law No. 7402, Mar. 24, 2005, art. 42; Byeonhosabeop [Lawyer Act], Law No. 7428, Mar. 31, 2005, art. 4; Geomchalcheongbeop [Public Prosecutor’s Office Act], Law No. 3882, Dec. 31,

than 1 percent of entrants fail to graduate from the JRTI.⁴ Therefore, the most important hurdle to becoming a lawyer is passage of the National Bar Examination.

According to the National Bar Examination Act, the examination tests the knowledge and abilities needed by judges, prosecutors, and private practitioners.⁵ It is held more than once a year under the supervision of the Minister of Justice.⁶

The National Bar Examination consists of three stages: (1) a multiple choice examination covering four areas of substantive law (constitutional law, civil law, criminal law, and one elective) as well as competency in English; (2) an essay examination covering seven areas of substantive and procedural law (constitutional law, administrative law, civil law, commercial law, civil procedure, criminal law, and criminal procedure); and (3) an interview evaluating applicants in five categories (ethical view, specialized knowledge and ability to apply knowledge, communication skills, manner and attitude, and creativity and perseverance).⁷

An applicant must pass the three stages in sequence to gain admission into the JRTI. Only those who passed the first- or second-stage examination, or those who are exempted from it, may take the second- or third-stage examination, respectively.⁸ Those who passed the first- or second-stage examination are exempted from it only in the following examination (Art. 10).⁹

There are no limits on eligibility to take the examination. Anyone can apply, regardless of age, nationality, or academic background. While a three- or four-year university education was formerly required,¹⁰ this limitation was abolished in 1972.¹¹

1986; The Judicial Research & Training Institute, About JTRI, http://jrti.scourt.go.kr/english/about_jrti.asp?flag=0 (last visited Mar. 22, 2006); The Judicial Research & Training Institute, Curriculum, http://jrti.scourt.go.kr/english/curriculum_01.asp?flag=1 (last visited Mar. 22, 2006).

⁴ See The Judicial Research & Training Institute, Suryoja Hyeonhwang [Trainees Information], <http://jrti.scourt.go.kr/intro/situation.asp?flag=6>, (last visited Mar. 22, 2006).

⁵ Suryoja Hyeonhwang [Trainees Information], Law 6436 of Mar. 28, 2001, art. 1.

⁶ *Id.* arts. 2, 3.

⁷ *Id.* arts. 8, 9.

⁸ *Id.* art. 7.

⁹ *Id.* art. 10.

¹⁰ See Sabeopshiheomryeong [Presidential Decree on National Bar Examination], Decree No. 4979, May 5, 1970, art. 4.

Starting in 2006, however, only those who have taken more than thirty-five credits of law-related college-level classes are able to apply for the examination.¹²

There is also no limitation on the number of times applicants may take the exam. A 1996 rule required applicants who had failed the first stage four times to wait four years before reapplying.¹³ However, this requirement was found unconstitutional and abolished in 2001.¹⁴

In contrast to the lack of restrictions on those who may take the exam, the legal profession imposes substantial limits on the number of successful applicants. The number of successful applicants of the examination is determined in advance by the Minister of Justice, after receiving advice from the Supreme Court and the Korean Bar Association.¹⁵ This number limit was introduced in 1970, on the grounds that the number of successful applicants had been too small.¹⁶

III. PROBLEMS OF THE NATIONAL BAR EXAMINATION

Generally, observers have noted two distinctive features of the National Bar Examination. First, the exam has a strict number limit of successful applicants, and second, the exam has no limitation on either qualifications or the number of times of application. These distinctive features cause many closely inter-linked problems.

Because the number of successful applicants is limited, the legal professional community is extremely small. The number of successful applicants remained under one hundred until 1978, and at about three hundred from 1981 to 1994.¹⁷ Even though it has been increased by degrees from 1995, it still remains at about

¹¹ See Presidential Decree on National Bar Examination, Decree No. 6373, Dec. 30, 1972.

¹² See National Bar Examination Act, art. 5.

¹³ See Presidential Decree on National Bar Examination, Decree No. 15144, Aug. 31, 1996, art. 4.

¹⁴ See National Bar Examination Act, arts. 5, 6.

¹⁵ *Id.* art. 4.

¹⁶ See SABEOP GAEHYEOK CHUJIN WIWEONHOE [PRESIDENTIAL COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL REFORM], MINJU SAHOE REUL WIHAN SABEOP GAEHYEOK [JUDICIAL REFORM FOR DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY] 394 (2000).

¹⁷ See *infra* Table 1.

one thousand.¹⁸ The total number of Korean lawyers who have cleared this tight entry barrier is only 10,768 as of August of 2005.¹⁹ Thus, Korea, with a population of forty-eight million, has only one lawyer for every 4,484 people.²⁰ This ratio is seventeen times larger than that of the United States, eight times those of England and Germany, and three times that of France.²¹

Second, the quality of the legal profession is not as high as it might be. Because it has no qualifications for application, and has a very strict number limit for passage, the National Bar Examination cannot help but be an examination testing memorization rather than problem-solving ability, based upon the thesis that the applicants have gotten a certain amount of substantial education. This suggests that Korean lawyers may be unprepared to serve as legal professionals in settings that are becoming increasingly complex, diversified, and international.

Furthermore, while legal education at law colleges is skewed, bar prep schools thrive.²² On the one hand, law students find legal-reasoning-oriented law classes unattractive, because the shortcut to passing the examination is to enhance the power of memory. On the other hand, legal education at law colleges has inclined toward “teaching to the test,” because law school rankings are determined by the number of successful applicants

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ *See infra* Table 2.

²⁰ Korea’s population for 2006 is projected at 48,497,166. Korea National Statistical Office, Population Projections, http://kosis.nso.go.kr/cgi-bin/sws_888.cgi (last visited Mar. 22, 2006).

²¹ *See* DAEBEOPWEON [SUPREME COURT], BEOPJOIN YANGSEONG, GEU SAEROUN JEOPGEUN [A NEW APPROACH TO JUDICIAL REFORM] 239-41 (2003).

²² There are about six major prep schools in Korea. Interview with a staff member of one of the major prep schools, in Seoul, S. Korea (Aug. 31, 2005). They are located in Shinlim-dong near Seoul National University. *Id.* Each prep school has about 33-38 teachers. *Id.* All teachers have experience in applying for the examination, and some are private practitioners. *Id.* The classes apply the intensive course method, in which students have to take tests everyday. *Id.* Prep school students, most of whom are law college students/graduates (about 80 percent) or non-law majors (about 20 percent), pay about 300,000 won a month for tuition. *Id.* Those who come from outside of the Seoul area have to pay more than 900,000 won to cover the cost of living in the city. *Id.* In spite of this great expense, the would-be lawyers rush to prep schools, because it is a prerequisite for passing the examination under the current system. *Id.*

of the examination.²³ In instruction of examination technique, however, prep schools still have the competitive edge over law colleges. As a result, the would-be lawyers rush to prep schools.

In addition, enormous human resources are wasted. The small size of the legal profession makes lawyers the most privileged class in Korean society. Moreover, there is no limitation on the qualification and the number of times of application. Therefore, not only law students but also non-law majors rush to the examination.²⁴ However, it is very difficult to pass the examination because of the tight entry barrier. As a result, many young people spend years attempting to pass the examination, without success. Only 2.54 percent of applicants eventually passed the examination from 1963 to 2004,²⁵ and the average age is 28.89 for those who passed from 1983 to 2005.²⁶ What is worse, after the long and drawn-out preparation for the examination, the unsuccessful applicants have lost the opportunity to enter into a different career field.

IV. REFORM PROPOSALS

The reform of the National Bar Examination has long been a demand in Korean society. Especially in the face of growing legalization since the latter half of the 1980s and the opening of the legal service market beginning in 2007, Korean society needs a legal profession that is rich both in quality and quantity.

In efforts for reform, both the 1995 Presidential Commission on the Promotion of Globalization (世界化推進委員會) of the Kim Young Sam government and the 1998-1999 Presidential Commission on Education Reform (新教育共同體委員會) of the

²³ As of April 1, 2002, there are ninety-one law departments with 63,370 students and 921 full-time professors in Korea. SUPREME COURT, *supra* note 21, at 222. Among them, only thirty-three law departments produced more than one successful applicant, and only twenty-one law departments produced more than five successful applicants for the National Bar Examination in 2002. *Id.* at 213. More than sixty-three percent of 976 successful applicants were students or graduates of Seoul National University (39.55 percent), Korea University (15.88 percent), and Yonsei University (7.89 percent). *Id.*

²⁴ For example, 274 out of 972 persons who entered JRTI in 2003 were non-law majors. SUPREME COURT, *supra* note 21, at 211.

²⁵ See *infra* Table 1.

²⁶ See *infra* Table 3.

Kim Dae Jung government proposed the adoption of the graduate law school system.²⁷ The proposals garnered wide support from the Korean people;²⁸ however, they ended in failure due to strong opposition from the legal profession, which feared the “hasty” increase in the number of lawyers.²⁹ Satisfied with defeating the graduate law school plans, the legal profession agreed on an increased annual quota for new lawyers, which made the gradual increase of lawyers, beginning in 1995, possible.³⁰

New momentum for reform arose in 2004. On October 4, 2004, the Judicial Reform Committee (司法改革委員會; “JRC”; October 2003 – December 2004),³¹ which had been established as an advisory committee to the chief justice of the Supreme Court, passed a proposal for the introduction of the graduate law school system.³² In addition, on May 16, 2005, the Presidential Committee on Judicial Reform (司法制度改革推進委員會; “PCJR”; January 2005 - present),³³ which had been established as an advisory committee to the President, released a draft bill giving shape to the proposal.

The PCJR’s draft bill, the Act on the Establishment and Management of Professional Graduate Law School,³⁴ provides details of the proposed Korean law school system.

²⁷ See SEGAEHWA CHUJIN WIWEONHOE [PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON THE PROMOTION OF GLOBALIZATION], BEOPRYUL SERVICE MIT BEOPHAK GYOYUK EUI SEGAEHWA JUYO JARYOJIP [MATERIALS ON THE GLOBALIZATION OF LEGAL SERVICE AND LEGAL EDUCATION] (1995); PRESIDENTIAL COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL REFORM, *supra* note 16.

²⁸ According to a public opinion survey conducted by the Public Information Bureau in March 1995, 67.8 percent of those questioned were in favor of the introduction of the law school system, as opposed to 15.5 percent against it. See *Sabeop Gaehyeok Chanseong 83% [83% Support the Judicial Reform]*, DONG-A ILBO [DONG-A DAILY], Mar. 17, 1995, available at <http://www.donga.com/fbin/output?sfrm=4&n=199503170560>.

²⁹ See Kim, *supra* note 2, at 66.

³⁰ For an explanation of the reform proposals in the 1990s, see *id.* at 64-68.

³¹ Judicial Reform Committee, http://www.scourt.go.kr/information/jud_rfrm_comm/mtng_status/index.html (last visited Apr. 10, 2006).

³² For an explanation of the JRC’s proposal, see Nam, *supra* note 2, at 893-917.

³³ Presidential Committee on Judicial Reform, <http://www.pcsr.go.kr> (last visited Mar. 22, 2006).

³⁴ See Bon Wiweonhoe Je 3 Cha Hoeuei Gyeolgwa [The Result of Third Meeting of the Committee], http://www.pcsr.go.kr/data_view.asp?tablename=home_data&

A. PURPOSE

The purpose of the law school system is to educate and train lawyers equipped with such basics as broad education and expertise; insight into society and human relationships; inclination for freedom, equality, and justice; a sense of responsibility and morals as legal professionals; and expert knowledge and ability to solve various legal disputes efficiently.³⁵

B. ESTABLISHMENT

A university wishing to establish a law school must gain approval from the Minister of Education and Human Resources Development.³⁶

C. ESTABLISHMENT STANDARDS

The student-faculty ratio should be twelve to one or lower.³⁷ Law schools must have at least twenty full-time professors,³⁸ and at least one-fifth of full-time professors should be practitioner-teachers who hold the title of lawyer and have more than five years of legal experience.³⁹ Law schools should be equipped with appropriate facilities such as a law library.⁴⁰ In addition, the universities must have sufficient finances and provide sufficient financial aid programs for students.⁴¹ Further, no university establishing a law school should have an undergraduate law degree course.⁴²

idx=85&gubun=01&major_gubun=&page=7&strtype1=&strtype2= (last visited Mar. 22, 2006).

³⁵ PCJR's Draft Bill on the Establishment and Management of Professional Graduate Law School, art. 2 [hereinafter PCJR's Draft Bill].

³⁶ *Id.* art. 5.

³⁷ *Id.* art. 16 § 1; PCJR's Draft Presidential Decree on the Establishment and Management of Professional Graduate Law School, art. 8 § 1 [hereinafter PCJR's Draft Presidential Decree].

³⁸ PCJR's Draft Bill, *supra* note 35, art. 16 § 3.

³⁹ *Id.* art. 16 § 4.

⁴⁰ *Id.* art. 17 § 1.

⁴¹ *Id.* art. 17, § 2.

⁴² *Id.* art. 8.

D. LEGAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

The Legal Education Committee should be organized under the Minister of Education and Human Resources Development, to oversee the approval process.⁴³ The Committee is comprised of four law professors, a judge, a prosecutor, two private practitioners, a government official, and two civic activists.⁴⁴

E. SELECTION OF STUDENTS

All applicants for law school admission should possess a bachelor's degree.⁴⁵ Law school admissions committees should consider the applicant's undergraduate academic record and score on a Law School aptitude examination, and they can consider an applicant's foreign language ability and relevant work and/or community service experience.⁴⁶ However, they should not use the score on any examination to test knowledge of law.⁴⁷

To expand diversity in the student bodies, students from faculties other than law and from other universities, respectively, should be admitted in a number that exceeds one-third of the total number of enrollees.⁴⁸

F. NUMBER LIMIT OF STUDENTS

The Minister of Education and Human Resources Development determines the total number of all law school students after deliberation with the Director of Registry Bureau of the Ministry of Court Administration, the Minister of Justice, the President of the Korean Bar Association, and the President of the Korea Law Professors Association.⁴⁹

The admission quota of each law school must be set at 150 or less, and the specific number is determined by the Minister of

⁴³ *Id.* art. 10.

⁴⁴ *Id.* art. 11.

⁴⁵ *Id.* art. 22.

⁴⁶ *Id.* art. 23.

⁴⁷ *Id.*

⁴⁸ *Id.* art. 25.

⁴⁹ *Id.* art. 7, §§ 1, 2.

Education and Human Resources Development with the deliberation of the Legal Education Committee.⁵⁰

G. EVALUATION

The Evaluation Committee, established by the Korean Bar Association and supported by government funding and staff, will periodically evaluate the law schools.⁵¹ The Evaluation Committee may advise the Minister of Education and Human Resources Development on sanctions based upon the results of law school evaluations.⁵²

V. EVALUATION OF PCJR'S DRAFT BILL⁵³

The PCJR thus seeks to reform the Korean legal education and training system. Korean law professors, however, are skeptical of its ability to reform the system and, in particular, to eliminate the problems of the National Bar Examination.

Korean law professors have insisted on the introduction of the law school system as a means for reform of the legal education and training system.⁵⁴ For them, the law school system is necessary to secure competent lawyers through granting qualification as legal professionals only to those who have acquired a substantial education at universities,⁵⁵ and this substantial university education can only be accomplished under the principle of "autonomy and competition."⁵⁶ In that sense, the introduction of the law school system in Korea should change the

⁵⁰ *Id.* arts. 10, 7 § 3; PCJR's Draft Presidential Decree, *supra* note 37, art. 5.

⁵¹ PCJR's Draft Bill, *supra* note 35, arts. 26, 36.

⁵² *Id.* art. 35.

⁵³ For a more detailed discussion, see Chang Rok Kim, *Beophak Jeonmun Daehakweon, Eoteoke Mandeul Geotinga?* [How Can We Make the Professional Graduate Law School?], 10 HEONBEOPHAK YEONGU [J. CONST. L.] 81 (2004); Chang Rok Kim, *Sagaechuwi Choan eui Gujojeok Munjejeom* [Structural Defect of the Draft for Law School System of Presidential Committee on Judicial Reform], 28 BEOP GWA SAHOE [LAW & SOC'Y] 9 (2005) [hereinafter Kim, *Structural Defect*].

⁵⁴ The members of Beop Gwa Sahoe Iron Hakhoe [Korean Law & Society Association] are the representative supporters of the law school system, as listed in volumes 8, 9, 11, 18, 24, 26, and 28 of LAW & SOC'Y.

⁵⁵ See, e.g., Kim, *Structural Defect*, *supra* note 53, at 12.

⁵⁶ *Id.* at 13.

principle of legal education and training from one of “control and supervision” by the government and legal profession to “autonomy and competition” at universities.

However, the PCJR’s draft bill sets up multiple controls on the Korean law school system. Most distinctive is the control by the legal profession over the number of total law school students and the number admitted to individual law schools. Korean newspapers have reported that the total number of law school students will be 1,200-1,300, and the total number of law schools only 8-10.⁵⁷

Under this “super” standard of number control, even the establishment standards stricter than those of the United States and Japan become meaningless. For example, under the standards for professors proposed by the PCJR’s draft bill, only 12 of 183 American law schools accredited by ABA as of August 2003, and only 21 of 68 Japanese law schools approved by the Ministry of Education as of April 2004, could gain approval in Korea.⁵⁸ However, Korean universities may not get approval even if they satisfy these strict standards in cases where the total number of students of would-be law schools satisfying the standards exceeds the number limit determined in advance.

Why are these controls needed in Korea? All of them have one goal: the control over the number of lawyers. To meet this goal, Korean universities should not get approval unless they satisfy much stricter standards. The control over the total number of all law school students is needed to provide for the worst. The control over the number of individual law school students is needed to divide the pie among as many universities as possible.

These controls are unique inventions of the Korean legal profession, emerging in the proposal submitted by the Supreme

⁵⁷ See, e.g., *Law School 10 Got, 1,200 Myeong Kaji [Up to 10 Law Schools, 1,200 Students]*, DONG-A DAILY, Apr. 22, 2005, available at <http://www.donga.com/fbin/output?sfrm=2&n=200504210342>.

⁵⁸ See SUPREME COURT, *supra* note 21, at 263-75; Chang Rok Kim, *Ilbon Sabeop Gaehyeok Noneui eui Gyeongwa Wa Hyeonhwang [Progress and the Present Situation of Japanese Judicial Reform]*, in SABEOP GAEHYEOK GWA SEGAE EUI SABEOP JEDO [JUDICIAL REFORM AND JUDICIAL SYSTEMS IN THE WORLD] 464, 464-67 (Sabeop Jedo Bigyo Yeonguhoe [Association for the Comparative Studies of Judicial Systems] ed., 2004).

Court to the JRC on September 6, 2004.⁵⁹ They were accepted by the JRC, in which the legal profession held a majority.⁶⁰ They then were solidified in the PCJR's draft bill by the judges and private practitioners who took initiative in the PCJR's working group for drafting bills.⁶¹

In this process, the Korean legal profession recreated itself as a reform element, but did not allow for real change. During the past years, it has opposed the law school system to maintain the power of control of the exit, i.e., the number of successful applicants of the National Bar Examination.⁶² Now, alleging the introduction of the "law school" system, it is trying to ensure the power of control of the entrance, that is, the total number of all law school students.

Needless to say, the "professional graduate law school with many controls," as envisioned in the PCJR's draft bill, is not the "law school" needed for true reform. It is contrary to the essence of the law school system, the principle of which is "autonomy and competition." If the Korean "law school" system is implemented as proposed in the PCJR's draft bill, entrance exams to law schools will replace the National Bar Examination as the method of control for entry to the legal profession, and prep schools will fill with college students aiming at law schools. No existing problem would be solved.⁶³ Moreover, a new problem would emerge: the impingement on university autonomy.

⁵⁹ Judicial Reform Committee, Status of Meetings Held, Beopjoi Yangseong Mit Seonbal Jedo Gaeseonan [Proposal for the Reform of Legal Education and Training System], http://www.scourt.go.kr/information/jud_rfrm_comm/mtng_status/1172658_667.html (last visited Mar. 2, 2006).

⁶⁰ See Judicial Reform Committee, Committee Members, http://www.scourt.go.kr/information/jud_rfrm_comm/org/comm/index.html (last visited Mar. 22, 2006).

⁶¹ See Presidential Committee on Judicial Reform, *supra* note 33.

⁶² See Kim, *supra* note 2, at 83-86.

⁶³ See Tom Ginsburg, *Transforming Legal Education in Japan and Korea*, 22 PENN ST. INT'L. L. REV. 433, 439 (2004) (claiming that as long as there is a quota system or a quota approach for admission to the legal profession, there will be great pressure on legal education, of whatever form, to serve primarily as a kind of bar preparation course, rather than as a truly professional education that emphasizes skills).

VI. CONCLUSION

It is difficult to ascertain at this moment whether the “law school” system will or will not be introduced in Korea, and what the system would be, if it were, in fact, introduced. However, it is clear that the legislative process of the National Assembly, which will begin in October 2005, will be a significant turning point for the Korean legal education and training system, including the National Bar Examination and the prep schools.

TABLE 1: NUMBER OF SUCCESSFUL APPLICANTS⁶⁴

Year	Applicants	Multiple Choice Exam				Essay Exam		Final Successful Applicants (%)
		Examinee	Successful Examinee	%	Examinee	Successful Examinee	%	
1963	4,176	3,450	1,471	42.64	2,115	41	1.94	41 (0.98)
1963	3,732	2,318	1,205	51.98	2,530	45	1.78	45 (1.21)
1964	4,969	3,770	781	20.72	1,848	10	0.54	10 (0.20)
1964	4,214	3,251	461	14.18	1,186	22	1.85	22 (0.52)
1965	2,141	2,141	475	22.19	408	16	3.92	16 (0.75)
1966	2,370	1,858	470	25.30	756	19	2.51	19 (0.80)
1967	2,820	2,304	491	21.31	835	5	0.60	5 (0.18)
1967	2,466	1,837	473	25.75	779	83	10.65	83 (3.37)
1968	2,599	2,070	447	21.59	736	37	5.03	37 (1.42)
1969	2,363	2,363	629	26.62	750	34	4.53	34 (1.44)
1970	2,561	2,326	520	22.36	930	33	3.55	33 (1.29)
1970	2,786	2,531	762	30.11	944	50	5.30	49 (1.76)
1971	2,776	2,629	420	15.98	962	80	8.32	81 (2.92)
1972	3,514	3,215	577	17.95	829	80	9.65	80 (2.28)
1973	4,072	3,614	430	11.90	787	60	7.62	60 (1.47)

⁶⁴ See SUPREME COURT, *supra* note 21, at 204.

Year	Applicants	Multiple Choice Exam			Essay Exam			Final Successful Applicants (%)
		Examinee	Successful Examinee	%	Examinee	Successful Examinee	%	
1974	4,010	3,311	498	15.04	705	60	8.51	60 (1.50)
1975	4,119	3,344	424	12.68	747	60	8.03	59 (1.43)
1976	4,498	3,625	405	11.17	653	60	9.19	61 (1.36)
1977	4,119	4,011	541	13.49	801	80	9.99	80 (1.94)
1978	5,387	4,153	521	12.55	912	100	10.96	100 (1.86)
1979	5,788	4,506	564	12.52	929	120	12.92	120 (2.07)
1980	6,658	4,868	575	11.81	986	141	14.30	141 (2.12)
1981	7,983	6,805	785	11.54	1,227	316	25.75	289 (3.62)
1982	9,272	7,386	830	11.24	1,350	307	22.74	300 (3.24)
1983	9,785	8,450	722	8.54	1,353	306	22.62	300 (3.07)
1984	11,600	9,870	816	8.27	1,365	353	25.86	303 (2.61)
1985	11,743	10,089	755	7.48	1,401	312	22.27	298 (2.54)
1986	13,635	11,708	791	6.76	1,373	309	22.50	300 (2.20)
1987	14,252	11,973	732	6.11	1,381	311	22.52	300 (2.10)
1988	13,568	11,209	818	7.30	1,419	310	21.85	300 (2.21)
1989	13,429	11,237	714	6.35	1,417	311	21.95	300 (2.23)
1990	14,365	11,697	830	7.10	1,425	298	20.91	298 (2.07)

Year	Applicants	Multiple Choice Exam			Essay Exam			Final Successful Applicants (%)
		Examinee	Successful Examinee	%	Examinee	Successful Examinee	%	
1991	15,540	12,925	741	5.73	1,468	287	19.55	287 (1.85)
1992	16,424	13,958	821	5.88	1,488	288	19.35	288 (1.75)
1993	18,232	15,516	777	5.01	1,492	288	19.30	288 (1.58)
1994	19,006	16,390	850	5.19	1,530	290	18.95	290 (1.53)
1995	20,737	16,879	1,052	6.23	1,856	308	16.59	308 (1.49)
1996	22,771	18,572	1,250	6.73	2,198	502	22.84	502 (2.20)
1997	20,551	15,568	1,865	11.98	2,949	604	20.48	604 (2.94)
1998	20,755	15,670	1,876	11.97	3,558	700	19.67	700 (3.37)
1999	22,964	17,301	1,842	10.65	3,554	709	19.95	709 (3.09)
2000	23,249	16,218	1,897	11.70	3,762	801	21.29	801 (3.45)
2001	27,625	22,365	2,406	10.76	4,578	991	21.65	991 (3.59)
2002	30,024	24,707	2,640	10.69	4,764	999	20.97	998 (3.32)
2003	30,146	24,491	2,598	10.61	5,012	905	18.06	906 (3.01)
2004	18,894	15,446	2,692	17.43	5,028	1,009	20.07	1,009 (5.34)
TOTAL	508,688	413,925	44,240	10.69	79,076	13,050	16.50	12,905 (2.54)

TABLE 2: NUMBER OF LAWYERS (AUGUST 4, 2005)⁶⁵

Year	Judges	Prosecutors	Private Practitioners
1956	301	190	303
1957	301	190	364
1958	301	190	361
1959	312	190	384
1960	301	190	456
1961	361	190	491
1962	350	220	581
1963	350	220	594
1964	389	243	635
1965	389	243	662
1966	468	300	679
1967	468	300	687
1968	468	300	679
1969	471	300	702
1970	471	300	719
1971	471	343	748
1972	471	343	745
1973	471	360	785
1974	515	377	812
1975	533	377	809
1976	550	417	819
1977	580	417	811
1978	610	437	832
1979	640	437	890
1980	640	437	940
1981	687	467	1,060
1982	737	497	1,058
1983	787	527	1,098
1984	837	557	1,166

⁶⁵ See *id.* at 218.

Year	Judges	Prosecutors	Private Practitioners
1985	887	587	1,320
1986	887	587	1,414
1987	987	667	1,513
1988	1,038	707	1,666
1989	1,088	747	1,803
1990	1,138	827	1,924
1991	1,188	827	2,258
1992	1,238	907	2,450
1993	1,288	907	2,685
1994	1,338	947	2,852
1995	1,388	987	3,079
1996	1,388	1,037	3,188
1997	1,508	1,087	3,364
1998	1,578	1,137	3,493
1999	1,658	1,207	3,887
2000	1,738	1,287	4,228
2001	1,738	1,287	4,618
2002	1,808	1,357	5,073
2003	1,888	1,514	6,127
2004	1,988	1,592	
2005	2,088	1,673	7,007

TABLE 3: AGE OF JRTI FRESHMEN TRAINEES⁶⁶

Year	Age				Total	Average Age
	Below 24	25-27	28-30	Over 31		
1983	43(13.8)	110(35.4)	71(22.8)	87(28.0)	311	28.45
1984	57(19.1)	107(35.8)	56(18.7)	79(26.4)	299	28.01
1985	71(23.1)	100(32.6)	76(24.8)	60(19.5)	307	27.61
1986	147(47.6)	86(27.8)	54(17.5)	22(7.1)	309	25.63
1987	131(44.3)	83(28.0)	49(16.6)	33(11.1)	296	25.71
1988	119(39.3)	81(26.7)	56(18.5)	47(15.5)	303	26.31
1989	74(24.3)	110(36.2)	61(20.1)	59(19.4)	304	27.31
1990	79(26.3)	105(35.0)	60(20.0)	56(18.7)	300	25.72
1991	57(19.2)	127(42.8)	53(17.8)	60(20.2)	297	27.52
1992	72(24.9)	94(32.5)	69(23.9)	54(18.7)	289	27.35
1993	39(13.3)	92(31.4)	80(27.3)	82(28.0)	293	28.35
1994	53(18.7)	101(35.6)	80(28.2)	50(17.6)	284	27.37
1995	34(11.7)	95(32.6)	90(30.9)	72(24.7)	291	28.18
1996	30(9.5)	105(33.3)	100(31.7)	80(25.4)	315	28.48
1997	39(7.9)	143(28.8)	142(28.6)	172(34.7)	496	29.20
1998	50(8.4)	151(25.5)	163(27.5)	228(38.5)	592	29.58
1999	57(8.2)	200(28.8)	208(30.0)	229(33.0)	694	29.25
2000	44(6.1)	217(30.3)	223(31.1)	233(32.5)	717	29.29
2001	70(8.8)	219(27.4)	237(29.6)	274(34.3)	800	29.22
2002	44(4.5)	210(21.5)	293(30.0)	429(44.0)	976	31.21
2003	51(5.2)	239(24.6)	301(31.0)	381(39.2)	972	29.95
2004					887	30.17
2005					987	29.88
TOTAL					11,319	28.89

⁶⁶ See *id.* at 208.