

South Korea

Toward a Collective Public Sociology of Labor

Soon-Kyoung Cho

Ewha Womans University, Seoul, South Korea

Third-wave marketization in South Korea has changed the social structure of academic knowledge production, revealing the dilemmas and limitations of both traditional and organic public sociology. The emergence of collective intellectuals during the candlelight movement points to an alternative relationship between the researcher and the researched. The candlelight vigils that recently rocked Korean society have pointed to new possibilities for a public sociology of labor. This article discusses the conditions for public labor sociology as a *new paradigm* based on collective knowledge and argues that when facing increasing professionalization of public sociology, the “crisis of labor” calls for a collective public sociology.

Keywords: *labor studies; collective public sociology; South Korea*

Are You an Educated Woman (*Baeoon Yuja*)?” read the flags held by hundreds of young women participating in the candlelight rallies that lasted for more than 50 days in downtown Seoul, South Korea. For these women, the term *educated* has nothing to do with a college degree, one’s educational background, or how much one knows. To them, *an educated woman* means one who shares what she knows with others for public interest and act to bring about changes to help make the world a better place to live. This question is also a criticism of the pedagogy that “knowing” and “living” or “doing” are disconnected. The rhetorical question “Are You an Educated Woman?” is a claim that knowledge should be used to help people live better lives; it should be used in the interest of the public.

Public sociology in labor studies in South Korea is not free from this challenging question. Over the past two decades, theories and knowledge in the sociology of labor have accumulated, yet this academic knowledge in the area of labor has increasingly been separated from the concrete lives of the general public. For example, although extensive studies have been

conducted on the question of contingent workers, their situation has been little improved. The number of contingent workers continues to increase; the contingent workforce is fast being impoverished and replenished with an increasing number of women workers, whereas union density continues to decrease.

Public sociology in labor studies has a long tradition in South Korea. However, neoliberalism's impact on workers' lives, its offensive against labor, and its complexities pose greater problems than in the previous periods. The situation in South Korea attests to the fact that public sociology as a response to problems stemming from what Michael Burawoy (2005) called "third-wave marketization" (or neoliberalism) is not possible if we confine the definition of public sociology to *a style* or *a type* of knowledge. It needs to be conceptualized as *a new paradigm* of knowledge production.

In South Korea, public sociology of labor has been increasingly professionalized in the wake of research universities competing to become more market oriented. As a result, academic knowledge and expertise have been increasingly set apart from the concrete experiences of labor. However, the candlelight vigils that recently rocked Korean society have pointed to new possibilities for a public sociology of labor. In this article, on the basis of the experiences of Korean society, I would like to discuss public sociology as a new paradigm based on collective knowledge,¹ which I call "collective public sociology." And I argue that when facing increasing professionalization of public sociology of labor, the "crisis of labor" under neoliberalism calls for a collective public sociology in South Korea.

Cold War, Marketization, and Labor Studies

Since industrialization, labor studies in Korea have been led by public sociology. Based on the scale and scope of marketization, public sociology in labor in South Korea can be divided into three major periods: (a) under the authoritarian regimes before 1987, (b) after the democratization movements and the Great Labor Uprising in 1987, and (c) after the 1997 economic crisis.

Labor movements under the authoritarian regimes grew out of the solidarity between workers and intellectuals. Labor studies during this period concentrated on exposing poor working conditions and infringements of workers' rights. The low-wage-based, labor-intensive, and export-led industrialization in the 1970s did not require the creation of domestic purchasing power. It was not necessary to expand the market and seek profits through expanding the workers' purchasing power.

These conditions made the state's repressive low-wage policy possible. This was the reason why the South Korean labor regime at the time was defined as a "bloody Taylorism" (Lipietz, 1987) rather than the Fordist model of accumulation. College students and intellectuals who participated in the democratization movements played an important role in exposing the workers' labor conditions and their life situations. Labor issues at the time were relatively simple. Major agendas included state repression against workers and the deterioration of working conditions.

As mentioned above, labor movements under the authoritarian regimes were driven by workers and intellectuals working in union. Exposing the poor working conditions of the workers to society was part of the efforts of the intellectuals; another part was to educate the workers about their rights. College students and graduates took jobs at factories to experience actual labor and to meet and organize workers. Students prepared materials for the education of workers and collaborated with them.

Colleges and universities under the authoritarian regimes were regulated in a very systematic way, and sociologists based in universities were not able to play a significant role. Major research at the time drew on notes by workers of their experiences and on fact-finding surveys conducted by college students. Faculty members who were engaged in antigovernment activities and expressed opposition to government policy were dismissed.

Since World War II, the Korean peninsula has been a terrain of contest of the Cold War. South Korea was the arena of competition between U.S. capitalism and Soviet communism. The Cold War framework shaped labor studies and labor movements in South Korea. The United States occupied South Korea in 1945 with two objectives in mind: removal of the Japanese from power and the building of an ideological bulwark against communism. One of the purposes of the United States Army Military Government in Korea (USAMGIK) was to vitalize nonpolitical labor unions based on the principles of American business unionism (S. K. Cho & Lee, 1995). USAMGIK concentrated its efforts on introducing American capitalism into South Korea. Regarding workers' activities, USAMGIK was very sensitive about the influence of certain political groups on the movement. Their primary concern lay in how many "communist agitators" were involved in the movement and in what way. Anticommunism was used as an important means of controlling labor in South Korea. State control based on the Cold War ideology continued for a long time, not only for labor movements but also for labor studies.

The massacre in Gwangju in 1980 and the democratization movement against those who masterminded the tragedy posed new questions. Under the extremely repressive military government, democratization activists

and progressive intellectuals asked who the agent of social change should be. The bloodbath in Gwangju and more generally state repression led people to believe that radical social change, and not simple reform, was required. Matters of policy were hardly discussed. During this period, discussions were mainly led by intellectuals who were involved in democratization and student movements, dissident figures, and researchers. Debates on labor problems at universities were still taboo. Labor was a topic that was shunned in academic establishments.

The “fall” of socialism in East Europe in 1989 played a critical role in making labor activists and progressives do an about-face in their position toward social change. Their concerns and research agendas began to focus on reforms, institutional changes, and policy within the existing system.

The 1987 Great Labor Uprising was an eruption of worker unrest, which the state had kept under its control for the previous 20 years. “Democratic” labor movements took place centering on blue-collar workers in heavy industrial sectors, where male workers dominated, and white-collar workers in financial service sectors. The unorganized began to be organized, especially at large firms. The so-called progressive Korean Confederation of Trade Unions was formed against the conservative Federation of Korean Trade Unions.

The active labor movements turned the attention of many dissident intellectuals to labor problems. Many labor studies with traits of public sociology were conducted by intellectuals outside the campuses (mostly graduate students in social sciences, junior scholars, and intellectuals who participated in the democratization movements) so that the period involved a “renaissance of labor studies by nonacademics” (Chang, 1984; Y. R. Cho, 1983; Christian Institute for the Study of Justice and Development, 1986; T. H. Lee, 1986). Specific themes ranged from the lived realities of workers in many different industries to the strategies of labor movements to counter corporate strategies for controlling labor. The major theme through them all, however, was labor movements as a vehicle of social change.

Many workplaces proceeded with research projects at the request of the trade unions of large firms who wanted to know how to confront corporate measures to streamline management. Labor sociologists carried out these research projects in the interest of labor unions.

“Third-Wave Marketization” and State-Led Knowledge Production

Following the 1997 economic crisis, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank urged the Korean government to implement

policies that would make the South Korean labor market more flexible. As the financial markets were pried open, the labor force was to be more flexible. Temporary-help employment, which had been legally banned for the reason of intermediary exploitation, was now legitimate. The number of contingent workers subjected to discriminatory treatment (i.e., the workers who actually work full-time but are paid less than regular workers for the reason that they are nominally part-time workers) rose sharply. As of 2007, the contingent workers accounted for a half of all wage workers and about 70% of women workers in South Korea.

The time when South Korea started to implement neoliberal policy in earnest coincided with the time when democratization launched the “civilian government.” The government claimed that the cause of the financial crisis, which led to the IMF-imposed conditionality on the Korean economy, at the end of the 1990s, lay in the state-led industrialization. As a response, the government attempted to promote market competition, but it also strove to raise social wages (OECD, 2000). The Anti-Discrimination Law was enacted, and policies were devised to protect the rights of subaltern classes. At the same time that policies for labor market flexibility were passed, the government also attempted to introduce welfare policies to “protect” marginal workers who fell behind in labor market competition.

In the process, new research agendas came to the fore. It became necessary to conduct policy research in response to the increasing organizational power of trade unions and militant labor movements, which grew under the authoritarian regime. Research on labor movements, industrial relations, unemployment insurance, wage policy, industrial accidents, and occupational diseases was conducted at the state-financed Korea Labor Institute. The research, however, could hardly be free from government policy, in that the Ministry of Labor was the major client of most of the research projects and the President appointed its director.

Meeting the demand of the growing labor movement, a group of progressive social scientists organized research associations and published journals. For example, scholars of economics, politics, law, women’s studies, and business administration as well as sociologists organized the Korean Association of Labor Studies in 1994. They found it necessary to conduct research in response to corporate restructuring, labor flexibility, changes in the wage system, the introduction of new means of labor controls at the level of individual companies, and the attempted revision of the labor law at the state level. They regarded it as part of their role to develop policy and theoretical discussions for labor movements against the offensive from the capital and the state (Korea Association of Labor Studies, 1994).

However, these studies with traits of public sociology gradually turned toward professional sociology. The primary purpose of the studies turned from labor movements or the improvement of the workers' life to the publication of research articles in professional journals. The researchers also tried to conform to the standards of professional sociology based on "objectivity" and positivistic "science." More important, the "academic research topics" often originated from academic circles in the West.

The projects undertaken by the public sociology of labor were not very far from the "academic agendas" of the institutionalized academic world. Most of the topics—workplace democracy, labor control, industrial relations, and the issues of trade unions—had been discussed in Western academic communities.

Universities Go to Market: Professionalization of Public Sociology in Labor Studies

Since the 1997 economic crisis, South Korea has witnessed a growing perversion of neoliberal discourses and logics of the market economy across every area of society. "Competition" and "efficiency" have emerged as the supreme values. Universities have increasingly been modeled after business corporations. The discourses on globalization and neoliberal ideology have been wielding a systematic influence over the campuses. Increasing numbers of universities have implemented restructuring as proposed by multinational consulting companies such as McKinsey. Jobs that were traditionally done by the low-wage, marginal labor force, such as cleaning and restaurant chores, have been outsourced. As a consequence, the job security and low wages of these workers have deteriorated. Large corporations have acquired universities: Samsung Group, the largest conglomerate in South Korea, has acquired Sung Kyun Kwan University in 1997, and the Doosan Group acquired Chung-Ang University in 2008 (Song, 2008).

As establishing world-class universities has become an important policy agenda, there has been an all-out effort to raise standards to an "international" level. To become "world-class," research universities have prioritized the strengthening of faculty research capabilities, recruiting foreign professors, and increasing the number of courses taught in English. Universities are introducing the tenure system, a new merit system, and strict performance evaluations for promotions.

The initiatives are coming not just from the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. Since 1994, *Joong Ang Daily*, which the Samsung Group effectively controls, has conducted an evaluation of domestic universities every year and has announced the results as a public ranking, thereby exercising a powerful influence of university restructuring. As its major indices, the evaluation includes the number of papers written by faculty that have been published in professional journals (especially international ones), courses that are provided in English, foreign professors who work there, and students who are in foreign exchange programs (*Jung Ang Daily*, 2007). These criteria for globalization are often American. For many major universities in Korea, gaining good scores in these evaluations conducted by the ministry and the daily newspaper has become an important focus of their operation. The control of the state and capital over universities has now been in existence for more than 15 years with little resistance.

This environment has made it more difficult for researchers at universities to produce knowledge that labor so urgently needs. The number of articles carried in journals with wider readership has fallen significantly. The articles published in popular magazines are not regarded as having academic merit. For reappointment and promotion, professors have to publish their articles in academic journals rather than journals for the public, and in international journals rather than domestic journals. Magazines published for mass circulation, which had an important influence on labor and democratization movements until the mid-1990s, experience difficulties because of a lack of contributors. The increasingly market orientation of universities has led to a crisis of public sociology, especially with regard to labor issues.

The changes in universities have substantially affected the constitution of research topics and agendas in labor studies. Meeting global standards often meant meeting the U.S. academic standards and organizing researchers' questions according to the theories and research agendas of U.S. academia.

Even when a topic does not contribute to the understanding of labor problems in South Korea, such as theories of "flexible specialization," it nevertheless frames a lot of research. In contrast, issues important in Korea may have difficulty in being adopted as part of a research agenda. For example, systemic discrimination based on educational background *in the labor market* is seldom dealt with as a research topic in labor sociology. It is because in the West, where discrimination based on educational background does not supposedly exist or, if it does, is hardly noticeable, it is hard to find appropriate concepts and theories. Because most Korean researchers rely on Western theories, such issues may never be investigated in South Korea.

What to Ask: The Question of Research Questions

“Made in the West theories” have shaped not only the research questions but also the realities and experiences of labor in South Korea. The realities and experiences do not exist “out there”; they are not an object “to be discovered.” The realities are *made* by those who examine them and by their language, standpoints, values, and knowledge. For example, without the concept and theories of “indirect discrimination” at work, it is hard for us to perceive that such discriminatory realities exist. In this sense, the understanding of realities is theory laden.

If theories and methodologies of the West can best solve the labor problems of Korea, then we do not necessarily have to try to find new theories and methodologies based on Korean realities. Many of the institutions and policies prevailing in Korea have come from the West and, together with third-wave marketization, could require Korean public sociology to embrace more Western theories than ever before. Indeed, Western theories of labor market flexibility, sexual harassment at work, and discriminations in the labor market may offer the best framework to analyze the realities of South Korea.

Relying on Western theories, however, limits our understanding. For example, theoretical discussions of labor market flexibility (Jung, 2006), gender equality at work and the labor movement (Choi, 2000; K. H. Kim, 2004), labor process and production system (H. J. Cho, 2005), labor movements (J. H. Lee, 2002; Oh-Chang, 2003; Shin, 1994), industrial relations and social corporatism (No, 2008), working class formation (D. M. Cho, 2004; Koo, 2000), and discrimination in employment have dominated sociological research. In contrast, discussions of everyday lives of those who have not even been able to enter the labor market are few and far between. Researchers do not even know what questions they should ask and how. Dependency on Western theories has undermined the researchers’ abilities to formulate questions on their own. Public sociology in labor studies is no exception.

The Limits of Public Sociology *as a Style*: The South Korean Experience

Burawoy (2005) contrasts public sociology with professional sociology. It is a new style of sociology that emphasizes new writing for a larger readership; that highly values human rights, peace, and the environment;

and that is dedicated to supporting the subalterns who are marginalized by neoliberalism.

Following such a definition of public sociology, it is no overstatement to say that public sociology has dominated Korean sociology of labor.² Especially in research on labor, public sociology has played a larger role than professional sociology. The Korean experience indicates that public sociology, if it is only a new style, cannot achieve what it sets out to accomplish. Whether traditional or organic, public sociology cannot address the swiftness and complexities of the neoliberal assault on labor.

Labor sociologists have continued to state their opinions in print media, such as newspapers, and broadcast media. However, the problems that labor faces in the age of neoliberalism are no longer simple. Newspapers and broadcast media are not sufficient means of communication for discussing labor issues and dispelling the myths of the neoliberal dogma (discourse on the labor market flexibility, for example). Newspapers have limited space; broadcasting media have limited time (Herman & Chomsky, 1988). As employment takes more diverse forms and the labor market becomes more complicated, more space and time are required to reveal the falsehood of neoliberal discourses and policies that place the highest priority on efficiency. However, it is difficult to be compelling in an opinion piece with a 500-word limitation or in a broadcasting program with less than 1 minute to speak. This fact indicates that public sociology needs to turn its attention to the Internet, which is free of these problems.

The limitations of organic public sociology are also visible in many of its aspects. Participatory action research is possible only when the concerned researcher has the courage to risk the stigma of his work being called “political activism” rather than “academic scholarship.” Junior faculty members who have not been tenured find it difficult to conduct such participatory action research for fear of losing their position at the university. In addition, participatory action research demands a more time-consuming as well as stressful research process than any other research method. Under the current structure where a researcher’s achievements are evaluated by the number of articles published in journals, researchers tend to shrink from such “inefficient” action research.

Neoliberalism has created a more heterogeneous labor force with regard to form of employment, region, gender, nationality, among others. The increasingly complex and diversified labor problems have underlined the limitation of labor studies as conducted by a limited number of “expert” intellectuals. The candlelight movement in the first half of 2008 in South Korea points to a new way to conduct public sociology and expand its horizons.

Candlelight Movement and the Possibilities of Collective Public Sociology of Labor

The collective intelligence whose power was felt unmistakably at the candlelight rallies shows the possibilities for a new paradigm of knowledge.³ The candlelight vigils began as a protest against the Korean government's decision to import U.S. beef, possibly infected with mad cow disease, to facilitate the signing of the free trade agreement between the two countries. On the Internet, a high school student proposed a candlelight vigil, and hundreds of mostly female middle and high school students participated in it, which would lead to rallies with nearly 800,000 people marching in the major cities.⁴

The rallies, which started in early May, lasted for almost 3 months and were held simultaneously in different cities across the country. According to a report by the Korea National Police Agency (2008), there were more than 1,700 rallies during May and June 2008. The protests, which were jump-started by mostly middle and high school girls, flared up into massive candlelight rallies with people from all walks of life, transcending age, gender, social strata, and nationality. The demonstrations began with people's concerns about food safety and were first led by women. However, the demand for safe food quickly turned into opposition to key government policies, such as the planned privatization of national health insurance and public enterprises; the plans for the Grand Canal construction, which threatened to create an environmental disaster; and neoliberal education policies. These demands were joined to movements to thwart the government's attempt to control KBS (the public broadcasting company) and boycotts to pressure companies not to advertise in newspapers accused of false reports.

Through cyberspace, citizens communicated with one another, gathered information, produced new knowledge, and developed new action plans. The candlelight movement in South Korea has pioneered the ways to create a democratic and horizontal mode of knowledge production using the Internet and other telecommunication technologies. The Internet, wireless notebook, and video technology made it possible to follow online TV coverage of the candlelight vigils and the ensuing debate in real time. In the process of protesting, citizens reached a more systematic understanding of the social structure of Korean society, how neoliberal globalization has turned Korean society into a risk society and how the endless profit-seeking of capital threatens human life. In trying to change society, citizens enhanced their understanding of the realities surrounding them. When they saw that protesters participating in peaceful demonstrations were arrested,

people recognized the illegality of the state's law enforcement. They had a more direct and clear understanding of some conservative media that depicted peaceful rallies as "violent demonstrations by leftists." The prosecutors who ruled as illegal the boycott campaign against companies advertising in those conservative newspapers with fabricated stories demonstrated just how unfair and unjust is the application of the law and that judiciary system is dependent on political power.

The candlelight vigils point to the possibilities of a new collective mode of knowledge production. They demonstrated that people's collective intelligence can challenge the knowledge of the experts. Observing the candlelight movement, even scholars have recognized the power of this socialized production of knowledge. Citizens learned the human causes, such as the labor process in U.S. meat plants, that lay behind the possible spreading of the mad cow disease. With the decision of trade unions not to engage in the transportation of the imported U.S. beef, citizens also came to understand how their health and food safety could relate to labor movements. The "collective eyes" learned how limited and biased was the professional knowledge of the so-called experts and academics who appeared on panels on TV debate programs and other media during the 2 months of protest.

Need for a Reconceptualization of "Labor"

The candlelight rallies provide another important insight for public sociology. So many citizens, regardless of social class, occupation, status, or gender, actively participated in the protests because the question of food safety triggered people's immediate interests.

Here we come to a question: If "work" or "labor" is as essential a part of living as food, then why do labor issues not command as much attention as food issues? Why do almost all people regard labor issues as something that has little to do with them? Why are labor issues perceived as left-wing agenda? In part this low level of public interest may be because of labor's association with the image of a violent labor movement or business unionism. In addition, part of the problem is the sociology's focus on formal wage labor. Feminists, such as Ko (2000), have criticized the conceptualization of labor that marginalizes women both in the economic and political arenas. Most attention is directed to the concerns of permanent, full-time workers in large corporations or to matters of labor law and state regulation, at the expense of those outside the official labor market, whether unpaid family members or the unemployed.

Academics have hardly tried to get involved with *the concrete experience* of labor. Academics can discuss theories of subalterns without meeting any subaltern. The tragedy of academic professionalism today stems from the fact that an academic who has never done care work can conduct “rigorous scientific research” and publish a “scientific” article on care work in a prestigious academic journal. However, *knowing about the world* is different from *knowing the world*. As a consequence, academics do not know how to link the structural interests of working people to the immediate interests of the wider population.

Conditions for Collective Public Sociology of Labor

The South Korean case suggests that public sociology can be and needs to be conceptualized as a *new paradigm* of knowledge. Third-wave marketization in South Korea has changed the social structure of academic knowledge production, revealing the dilemmas and limitations of both traditional and organic public sociology. The emergence of collective intellectuals during the candlelight movement points to an alternative relationship between the researcher and the researched. The motivating question of public sociology should be changed from “Should researchers participate in public life and, if so, how?” (Wieviorka, 2008, p. 381) to “Should the public participate in research and, if so, how?”

First, a collective public sociology is possible only when we, academic sociologists, give up on our monopoly over knowledge production. Although professional sociology disempowers people through its *secret language*⁵ and through its claims to expertise, collective public sociology empowers others through demystifying expertise. A good example of this claim to expertise is expressed by Brint (2005) when he argues that “only professors and doctorate-level researchers have the accumulated knowledge and research of an academic discipline to offer. They alone have the rigorous methods to prove or disprove ideas that have gained currency” (p. 48). Yet neither the history of labor studies in South Korea nor the history of (social) science supports his assertion. As long as we persist in our monopoly of professional knowledge, it will be difficult to embrace the people as knowledge producers.

In this context, sociologists should first of all study themselves: How we have monopolized knowledge, how our monopoly of knowledge has contributed to the intellectual disempowerment of workers and wider publics, and how such a monopoly has hindered the growth of knowledge.

More specifically, labor sociologists need to study the labor process, keeping a critical distance from themselves. In conducting research, what reasons, what concerns, and what interests drove us to choose our projects? What factors play a role in making us choose the specific topics? We need to undergo a process of self-reflection by objectifying ourselves and our own work. As Alvin Gouldner (1971) stated, sociologists cannot know others unless they also know their intentions toward and their effects upon them; they cannot know others without first knowing themselves, their place in the world, and the forces—in society and in themselves—to which they are subjected.

We also need to reconsider the value and objective of public sociology. In this age, with the Internet overflowing with all kinds of information and knowledge, the role of public sociology should not be limited to delivering “correct” knowledge. The candlelight vigils in Korea vividly show that citizens can produce knowledge as significant as that produced by academics or experts when they have the intellectual desire and the interest in a particular issue.

Today, the crisis of labor in Korea stems not so much from poverty of theories or knowledge but from lack of interest and motivation to develop new types of knowledge that could come from fostering sensitivity to the labor activities we routinely perform in our daily lives. For this, changes in the pedagogy of labor sociology are essential. Education should be transformed into a process of internalizing the knowledge learned from labor experience, not the delivery of ossified knowledge. We need to reflect on the separation between knowledge and reality. For example, let us ask ourselves, “What is the point of beautiful theories and lectures on contingent work or gender discrimination at work, if we ignore the reality in which women cleaning the classroom are fired without due cause?” Only through integrating knowledge into real life can we produce “educated people” who are able to use knowledge in the public interest. The recent candlelight vigil suggests that Korean society is ready for a new pedagogy, for a collective public sociology. We must turn our theories onto ourselves to explore the conditions for closing the gap between “knowing” and “doing.” A public sociology for South Korean labor will flourish again only when labor sociologists become “the educated” (*Baeoon Saram*).

Notes

1. The idea of collective knowledge comes from works on collective intelligence (Levy, 1999) and collective wisdom (Surowiecki, 2004). In his book, *The Wisdom of Crowds*, Surowiecki explains how the aggregation of information in groups could result in better decisions than any individual.

2. A recent example of organic public sociology of labor is the participatory action research by the Korean Professors for Fair Employment. Since March 2006, approximately 400 women who work as train attendants on the KTX "bullet train" waged a sit-in strike demanding the end of gender discrimination and illegal outsourcing practices of the Korea Railroad Corporation, the largest public enterprise in South Korea. The struggle of the KTX workers has continued for more than 1,000 days, the longest in South Korean history. It has been a symbolic case, protesting the use of contingent employment in South Korea. Professors in the fields of sociology, women's studies, law, political science, transportation, engineering, business administration, and economics have conducted in-depth research on the issues under dispute and have informed the public about the findings of their investigations through holding symposia and press conferences, writing columns in newspapers and journals, and being interviewed with broadcast media.

3. The candlelight movement has facilitated the debate on the possibility of collective intelligence in South Korea.

4. This is a conservative estimation by the Korea National Police Agency (*Moonwha Ilbo*, July 18, 2008).

5. This is a term used by Charlotte Ryan (2004).

References

- Brint, S. (2005). Guide for the perplexed: On Michael Burawoy's "public sociology." *The American Sociologist*, 36, 46-65.
- Burawoy, M. (2005). For public sociology. *American Sociological Review*, 70, 4-28.
- Chang, M. K. (1984). *Nodong Johap ui Ilsang Whaldong* [Daily activities of trade union]. Seoul, South Korea: Suktap.
- Cho, D. M. (2004). *Nodong Gaekup ui Hyungsung* [The formation of working class]. Seoul, South Korea: Han-Ul.
- Cho, H. J. (2005). *Hankookjuk Saengsan Bangshik un Ganunghanga?* [Is Korean style production system possible?]. Seoul, South Korea: Han-Ul.
- Cho, S. K., & Lee, S. J. (1995). *Naegjun Cheje wa Saengsan ui Jungchi* [The Cold War and the politics of production]. Seoul, South Korea: Ewha Womans University Press.
- Cho, Y. R. (1983). *Chun Ta-il Pyungjun* [A biography of Chun Ta-il]. Seoul, South Korea: Dolbegae.
- Choi, S. A. (2000). Nodong Johap gwa Sung ui Jungchihak [Labor union and gender politics]. In Cho, S. K. (Ed.), *Nodong gwa Feminism* (pp. 268-296). Seoul, South Korea: Ewha Womans University Press.
- Christian Institute for the Study of Justice and Development. (Ed.). (1986). *Busan Jiyuk Shiltae wa Nodong Undong* [The reality and labor movement in Busan]. Seoul, South Korea: Minjungsa.
- Gouldner, A. (1971). *The coming crisis of western sociology*. New York: Avon.
- Herman, E., & Chomsky, N. (1988). *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media*. New York: Pantheon.
- Jung, I. H. (2006). *Hyundae Nodong Shijang ui Jungchi Sawhihak* [Political sociology of modern labor market]. Seoul, South Korea: Humanitas.
- Jung Ang Daily*. (2007). Daehak pyungga jipyo [University evaluation indicators]. Retrieved from http://univ.joins.com/support/yearly_index.asp?y=2007

- Kim, K. H. (2004). *Yangsung Pyungdeung gwa Junkgeukjuk Jochi* [Gender equality and affirmative action]. Seoul, South Korea: Pureunsasang.
- Ko, M. (2000). *Nodong Geanyum Saero Bogi* [Towards a reconceptualization of labor]. In Cho, S. K. (Ed.), *Nodong gwa Feminism* (pp. 13-14). Seoul, South Korea: Ewha Womans University Press.
- Koo, H. (2000). *Korean workers: The culture and politics of class formation*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Korea Association of Labor Studies. (1994). *A prospectus of KALS* (mimeo). Seoul, South Korea: Author.
- Korea National Police Agency. (2008, July 18). *An analysis of recent rallies and demonstrations* (press release).
- Lee, J. H. (2002). *21saegi Hanguk Nodong Undong ui Hyunshil gwa Junmang* [The reality and future of Korean labor movement in 21st century]. Seoul, South Korea: Han-Ul.
- Lee, T. H. (1986). *Chaegun Nodong Undong Girok* [A report of recent labor movement]. Seoul, South Korea: Chungsa.
- Levy, P. (1999). *Collective intelligence: Mankind's emerging world in cyberspace*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lipietz, A. (1987). *Mirages and miracles: The crisis of global Fordism*. London: Verso.
- No, J. K. (2008). *Hanguk ui Nodong Chejae wa Sawoijuk Hapui* [Labor regime and social corporatism in South Korea]. Seoul, South Korea: Humanitas.
- OECD. (2000). *Pushing ahead with reform in Korea: Labour market and social safety net policies*. Paris: Author.
- Oh-Chang, M. K. (2003). *Yusung Nodong Undong gwa Shimingwon ui Jungchi* [Women's labor movement and the politics of citizenship]. Seoul, South Korea: Arke.
- Ryan, C. (2004). Can we be compañeros? *Social Problems*, 51, 110-113.
- Shin, K. Y. (1994). *Gaegeup gwa Nodong Undong ui Sahoihak* [Class and sociology of labor movement]. Seoul, South Korea: Nanam.
- Song, K. W. (2008, May 8). Doosan Group, Chung-Ang daehak insoo [Doosan Group acquire Chung-Ang University]. *Hankyurae*. Retrieved from <http://www.hani.co.kr/arti/society/campus/286586.html>
- Surowiecki, J. (2004). *The wisdom of crowds: Why the many are smarter than the few and how collective wisdom shapes business, economies, societies and nations*. New York: Little, Brown.
- Wieviorka, M. (2008). Some considerations after reading Michael Burawoy's article: "What is to be done? Theses on the degradation of social existence in a globalizing world." *Current Sociology*, 56, 381-388.

Soon-Kyoung Cho is a professor at the Department of Women's Studies, Ewha Womans University in Seoul, South Korea. Her recent publications include *Gendered Work and Indirect Discrimination* (2007) and *Beyond Labor Market Flexibility* (forthcoming).