



EMES CONFERENCES

SELECTED PAPERS SERIES

2nd EMES International Conference on Social Enterprise
Trento (Italy) - July 1-4, 2009

THE DYNAMIC OF MEANING CONSTRUCTION IN THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION PROCESS OF THE NEW SOCIAL ECONOMY IN SOUTH KOREA

Hyungsik Eum
Centre d'Economie Sociale, University of Liege, Belgium

Copyright © 2009 Hyungsik Eum (hseom73@hanmail.net)

Any portion of these materials is freely available for information and educational purposes, but cannot be re-published in any format that may entail fees or royalties without the express permission of the copyright holders.

ABOUT THE EMES CONFERENCES SELECTED PAPERS SERIES:

This series aims to ensure that selected papers from conferences in which EMES has been involved will be accessible to a larger community interested in the third sector and social enterprise.

EMES Conferences Selected Papers have not undergone any editing process.

All the papers of the series are available for download at www.emes.net.

CONTENTS

Abstract	3
Introduction	4
1. Analytical frame	5
1.1. Meaning construction of movement and master frame	5
1.2. Arena of meaning construction – Multi-organizational field	6
1.3. Review of previous studies	7
2. Operational definitions of actors in multi-organizational field	8
3. Master frame changes in multi-organizational field – the NSE movement in South Korea	10
3.1. Origin of the NSE movement – the poverty movement before 1990s	10
3.2. Producers’ Community – 1990~1996	10
3.3. Self-sufficiency and social job – 1996~2000	11
3.4. Change of meaning by institutionalization – 2000~2004	12
3.5. Social enterprise – 2004~2006	15
3.6. Social economy and local community – since 2006	16
4. Defining factors in dynamic of meaning construction in the institutionalization process of the NSE movement	17
Conclusion	20
References	21

ABSTRACT

As a preparatory work for qualitative comparative analysis, I tried to define principal factors which function in the institutionalization process of new social economy. In this case study on master frame changes of the new social economy movement in Korea from 1990 to nowadays, I examined the dynamics of meaning construction occurred in a multi-organizational field composed of actors of alliance system and conflict system.

By this study, I suppose three categories of factors. As factors in the alliance system, the existence of previous movement, the strategy of movement and the involvement of other social movements have played roles in shaping meaning of the movement. As factors in the conflict system, the political position of ruling party, the autonomy and competence of bureaucracy and the involvement of private enterprises have had impact on the meaning construction. In addition, structural factors which color and constrain the agency factors also have influenced on the process indirectly. In such structural factors, socio-economic factors, international modeling and diffusion and existing regimes could be included.

INTRODUCTION

Since mid-1970s, new civil initiatives have emerged to respond to unmet needs caused by unemployment, social marginalization and the crisis of the welfare state. These new initiatives have developed their activities in various domains, such as work integration, provision of social services and local development. Their roles and values have been gradually recognized by the public and public authorities. In result, since early 90s, beginning with the Social Cooperative Law in Italy in 1991, a series of institutionalizations which aimed at providing these initiatives with appropriate legal status have taken place, mainly in the industrialized countries. Even though these initiatives have been called variously, such as social economy (*l'économie sociale*, Vienney 1994), solidarity-based economy (*l'économie solidaire*, Laville 1994), or social-solidarity economy (*l'économie social et solidaire*, Demoustier 2001), I would call them new social economy (NSE) in order to emphasize its continuity with the social economy and, at the same time, its difference from the traditional social economy (Defourny et al. 2000; Lévesques et al. 2000).

As the NSE has been more and more institutionalized in various countries, we could find that there are considerable differences in the contents and applications of the institutionalizations. Particularly, even though the NSE is principally considered as civil initiatives, we could often observe that its own identity and values are not sufficiently recognized in the contents and applications of the institutionalization and that the NSE became a political instrument of public authorities. Why do these different results of institutionalizations appear?

To understand dynamics in the institutionalization process of the NSE, I would use social movement theories. Because emergence, development and institutionalization of the NSE were not natural evolutionary processes, but in most cases, rather well-organized collective actions of social movement actors, social movement theories seem to be appropriate for understanding them. Although the purpose of the entire research is to examine which conditional combinations might bring different contents and applications of the institutionalizations, in this paper as a preparatory work, I would like to examine which factors (or conditions) would function in the institutionalization process of the NSE. In this study, I suppose that the NSE would be realized by the concrete movement called the NSE movement.

For this purpose, I will make a case study on the institutionalization process of the NSE movement in South Korea in the light of "master frame" concept (Snow et al. 1986; Snow & Benford 1992; Benford 1997; Benford & Snow 2000). First, I will examine social movement theories, particularly the social constructionist school's ones, in order to focus on the dynamics of meaning construction in the institutionalization process. To form an analytical frame, I will also use "multi-organizational field" concept as an arena of alliances and conflicts among movement and countermovement actors (Klandermans 1992). Second, in focusing on the master frame changes, I will describe short history of the institutionalization of the NSE movement in South Korea. Finally, I will try to examine various factors which have influenced on the meaning construction in the institutionalization process. In next step of research, I plan to define different outcomes of institutionalizations of the NSE movements in various countries, in terms of meaning construction. And with the results of this and next studies, I plan to make comparative study using qualitative comparative approach (QCA).

1. ANALYTICAL FRAME

1.1. Meaning construction of movement and master frame

The NSE movement seems to share many characters with new social movements. In new social movement theories, identities and values are recognized as one of most important characters of the new social movement (Melucci 1994). Of course, the NSMs don't ignore resources. However, usually, they don't demand resources themselves, but rather emphasize alternative ways of resource distribution, based on values. In this perspective, while traditional social movements have regarded public sector or private sector as sources of resources or as target of contentions, in realizing their own identities, the new social movements seem to feel free to use diverse sources of resources in order to realize their identities and values.

The NSE movements could be considered as being rooted in the new social movements, or at least, much influenced by them. Even if the NSE movement has tried to get proper resources, it should be noted that their main priorities have been always social values in their activities. Using the concept of solidarity-based economy, Laville (1994, 2000) explains that the NSE is not a sector composed of specific types of organizations, but an alternative way of organizing various resources such as market economy, non-market economy and non-monetary economy. Therefore, the institutionalization of the NSE means not only that the NSE organizations could get resources through institutionalized procedure, but also that their identities, their values, and their specific way of organizing resources would be recognized and institutionalized. It means that the institutionalization of the NSE should be understood primarily in the light of movement's "meaning".

In social movement theories, meaning construction has been treated merely descriptively (before Resource Mobilization Theory) or as non-problematic constants (Resource Mobilization Theories). Even when these theories treated problems of meaning, they viewed these problems mainly as a tool for political action, not as major issues (Snow & Benford 1992; Diani 1996). However, new social movement theories saw struggles over meaning construction as a major conflictual issue in postindustrial society. Furthermore, the social constructionist school that became very popular in recent social movement theories has principally focused on the meaning construction in social movements (Snow et al. 1986; Snow & Benford 1992; Benford 1993; Swart 1995; Diani 1996; Mooney & Hunt 1996; Benford 1997; Evans 1997; Cornfield & Fletcher 1998; Cress & Snow 2000; Benford & Snow 2000). I would like to depend on the studies of the social constructionist school to make an analytical frame which enable to focus on the meaning construction of social movements. In order to fully understand the dynamic of institutionalization process of the NSE movement, I would use the concept of "master frame (Snow and Benford 1992)" and "multi-organizational field (Klandermans, 1992)".

Initially, the frame or framing concept was introduced to understand individual participation process which happened through the interpretation of grievances and other ideational elements, such as values and supportive beliefs. This concept was "borrowed from Goffman to denote schemata of interpretation that enable individuals to locate, perceive, identify and label occurrences within their life space and the world at large. By rendering events or occurrences meaningful, frames function to organize experience and guide action, whether individual or collective." (Snow et al 1986).

Being rooted in the frame concept, master frames, however, perform the same functions as movement-specific collective action frames, but they do so, on a larger scale. By doing so,

specific master frames color and constraint the orientations and activities of other movements associated with it ecologically and temporally (Snow & Benford 1992). Snow and Benford used the master frame concept to mention a grand movement frame which prevailed in specific period such as "the civil right master frame" in 1960s. However, as many other scholars have employed this term differently, the master frame concept became more flexible one which is not always absolutely predominant, but also concerned about specific fields of movements (Benford 1997; Swart 1995; Mooney & Hunt 1996). We can find that the master frame concept is used in two different ways. On one hand, master frames are used to denote specific discourses of movements, such as inclusion frame, realignment frame, revitalization frame, anti-systemic frame (Diani 1996), agrarian fundamentalism frame, free market frame, producer frame (Mooney & Hunt 1996), British Prussian frame (Swart 1995) and etc. These studies focus on the contents of master frame and their influences on other factors. So, the master frames work as independent factor to account for dynamics of movements (Swart 1995; Mooney & Hunt 1996; Benford 1997). On the other hand, master frames could be considered as a structure in which meaning is contained and conveyed by the relationships among various factors in the movements (Benford 1997). In this paper, I would employ the latter approach to understand dynamics of the NSE movements and other actors around the meaning construction in the institutionalization process of the NSE. We could also call this dynamics symbolic politics (Klandermans 1992) or frame dispute (Benford 1993).

1.2. Arena of meaning construction – Multi-organizational field

According to Benford's suggestions (1997) to overcome the static and descriptive bias in frame studies, I would employ the concept of multi-organizational field in which disputes on meaning of movement take place (Curtis & Zurcher 1973; Klandermans 1992). Multi-organizational field means a community setting of organizations in which the career of a social movement organization is determined by the dynamics of its field (Curtis & Zurcher 1973; Klandermans 1992). And "it is there that grievances are interpreted, means and opportunities are defined, opponents are appointed, strategies are chosen and justified, and outcomes are evaluated (Klandermans 1992)". "Since beliefs can and will be disputed, the social construction of protest is a struggle among various actors to determine whose definition of the situation will prevail. In the clashes and confrontations between competing or opposing schemes, meaning is constructed. The various meanings that emerge represent the multiple sectors in a multi-organizational field: those that support a movement organization, those that oppose it and those that are indifferent to the issue in question" (Klandermans 1992).

As Klandermans (1992) explains, a multi-organizational field contains social movement's alliance systems which consist of groups and organizations that support it, and conflict systems which consist of representatives and allies of the challenged political systems, including countermovement organizations. The boundaries between two systems remain fluid and may change in the course of events. Parts of the political system (parties, elites and governmental institutions) can coalesce with social movement organizations and join the alliance system. Coalitions can fall apart, and former allies can become part of the conflict system. Cornfield and Fletcher's study (1998) shows that a multi-organizational field could be a useful tool for conceiving and operationalizing the institutional environment of a social movement.

In the institutionalization process of the NSE movement, I would posit that there are two camps. The alliance system is composed of the NSE movement itself and other social movements which are favorable to the NSE movement. In this alliance system, social movements as bystander who

could potentially become supporters would be also included. The other camp is the conflict system composed of government and private enterprises. Even though they seem to be favorable to the NSE movement, because the NSE movement's essential values ultimately go beyond the existing capitalist economy system, the government and private enterprises could not fully accept the NSE movement's values. In this sense, the government and private enterprises try to restrict the movement's values within institutionalized environment. I would try to find which factors in each system function in the process. These factors could be interpreted as agency factors.

Furthermore, I would like to add some structural factors which affect and constrain these two systems. Although the alliance and conflict systems involve directly the institutionalization process, they are not free from their own structural constraints in which they are embedded. In social movement theories, we can find the approaches which emphasize structural factors on social movements mainly in the political opportunity studies (Tilly 1978; McAdam 1982; Kreisi et al 1995; Gamson and Meyer 1996; Tarrow 1998). The original ideas of political opportunity sought to explain the emergence of a particular social movement on the basis of changes in the institutional structure or informal power relations of a given national political system (McAdam 1982; McAdam et al. 1996). However, Kreisi et al (1995) and Tarrow (1998) focused more on the structural aspects of political opportunities, such as strength and weakness of the state and the forms of repression. They also explain that political opportunity is not merely opportunity, but also constraint which limited social movements. In order to distinguish structural factors from more variable factors, Gamson and Meyer (1996) use a continuum in which one extreme end means "stable" and the other means "volatile". With this continuum, they show many political opportunities studied so far according to their degree of stable and structural influence.

We can also find similar approach in the institutional politics theory (Amenta & Poulsen 1996). Amenta and Poulsen examine variables which explain the difference of social spending among states in the U.S. In distinguishing institutional variables and political variables, they show that interactions of institutional-structural factors and political agency factors account for the outcomes better than using them separately. In a more methodological discussion, Schneider and Wagemanns (2005) use also similar approach. In distinguishing remote and proximate factors, they explain that remote factors are relatively stable over time. And their origin is often also remote on the time and/or space dimension from the outcome to be explained in most of the cases. As consequence, remote factors are completely outside the reach of the conscious influence of present actors, thus, contexts and historical legacies are treated as exogenously given to the actors. Thus, the idea of "remoteness" is not only related to space and time, but, first and foremost, to the causal impact that is assumed. In contrast, proximate factors vary over time and are subject to changes introduced by actors. Proximate factors do not originate far in the past, but they are the products of actions of human agency, if not human action itself (Schneider & Wagemann 2005).

Following these approaches, I would like to add structural factors which influence both the alliance system and the conflict system in a multi-organizational field. I posit that these structural factors would affect meaning construction through coloring and constraining both systems.

1.3. Review of previous studies

When we examine previous studies on dynamics of master frame/framing, we can find several different viewpoints. First one is the studies that focus on the changes of master frames. These studies observe mainly the strategies of social movement actors which try to change master

frames for attracting potential supporters and to make their master frames more resonate with changed environment. Evans (1997) analyzes the changes in the religious pro-choice movement from 1967 to 1992 in the U.S. He suggests a multi-target perspective of the frame construction of SMO as an important factor which accounts for the changes. It means that "the framing needs of the different targets may be different, or even contradictory, and constrain and shape the framing effort toward potential participants". Cornfield & Fletcher (1998) are also interested in the changes of frames. In their study on the shifts in the legislative agenda of the American Federation of Labor, they show the importance of the institutional environment of the focal social movement in shaping its frame-extension actions. They explain how the American Federation of Labor extended its frame among potential adherents, according to the changes of its institutional environment. We can also find similar approach in Swart's study on the Irish independent movement (Swart 1995).

On the contrary, Diani (1996) emphasize on the determinant function of structural effects on the outcomes of master framing. By examining the case of the Northern League in Italy, he explains that specific types of master frames correspond to specific types of political opportunities. Although he recognizes the importance of movement actors' strategies and effort, he emphasizes that more important determinant is the consistency between master frames and political opportunities.

In another way, in order to analyze determinant factors on the outcome of social movement, Cress and Snow (2000) use framing work as one of variables. In their comparative study on the outcome of homeless mobilizations in eight U.S. cities, they define organizational viability, tactics, political mediation and framing as the potential variables which could function in influencing the outcome.

In the whole plan of this research, my ultimate concern is to find which conditional combinations make social movement succeed or fail in the struggle over meaning construction. Focusing on the importance of meaning construction itself especially in certain social movements like the NSE movement, I would like to see master frame as movement's outcome. But how can we evaluate whether certain frames succeeded to become "master frame" or not? I suppose that the actual contents and applications of the legislation and its legal regime could represent an actually recognized master frame of movement. Therefore, I suppose that by examining the contents and applications of the legislation and its legal regime, we could evaluate to what extent the focal movement succeeded in meaning construction through realizing its own values in them. However, this operationalization will be treated in next step of this research project. For a while, at least in this paper, I will use master frame concept such the way used in studies on master frame changes which are mentioned above (Swart 1995; Mooney & Hunt 1996; Evans 1997; Cornfield & Fletcher 1998). By examining master frame changes, I would define which factors functioned in the institutionalization process.

2. OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF ACTORS IN MULTI-ORGANIZATIONAL FIELD

In this paper, the NSE movement in South Korea designates a cluster of movement organizations which gathered together in the actual Korean Solidarity of Social Economy. Among these organizations, I will concentrate on several organizations and groups that have engaged in worker cooperatives, Self-sufficiency Promotion program, Social Job program and Social enterprises since 1990s. As we will see later on, whereas "social economy" and "social enterprise" concepts

are actually being used by many other social movement organizations, I would like to distinguish these core groups of the NSE movement from others through examining their trajectory of formation. In these organizations, there are the Korea Association of Self-sufficiency Promotion Centers (KASPC, former Korea Association of Self-sufficiency Promotion Agencies, KASPA) and its member centers, the People's Solidarity against Unemployment (PSAU) and its member organizations, the Korea Association of Social Economy Enterprise¹ (KASEE, former Korea Federation of Worker Cooperative, KFWC) and its member organizations, several foundations such as the Working Together Foundation (WTF, former National Movement for Overcoming Unemployment, NMOU), the Korea Foundation for Social Investment (KFSI) and the Social Solidarity Bank (SSB), several associations such as the Social Enterprise Support Center (SESC), and several individual researchers. These organizations have been closely associated each other through various formal and informal networks and communications among activists. On the occasion of the legislation of the Social Enterprise Promotion Law, they initially organized the Solidarity for Social Enterprise Development (SSED) in 2006 which thereafter has developed into the Korean Solidarity of Social Economy (KSSE) in 2008.

Centering around the NSE movement, the alliance system could be described as being composed of different parts. First, there are favorable social movements. Mainly, the citizen's movement organizations rooted in local community and several communitarian movements including consumer cooperative movements have been favorable to the NSE movement. Recently, with social economy and social enterprise concept, they have tended to identify themselves with the NSE movement. Second, there are social movements as bystander. Several national-wide citizens' movements which play mainly advocacy role, and the people's movement including the trade-union movement and the peasants' movement, have usually had bystander's position. Even though they have partially cooperated with the NSE movement, they preferred reinforcing state's role in solving social problems. In the trade-union movement, some have worried that by producing precarious jobs, the NSE movement might cooperate involuntarily with the government's neoliberal policies and reduce working conditions. However, generally speaking, these movements have maintained bystander's position. Thirdly, there are certain politicians and scholars who have functioned as mediator between the NSE movement and the conflict system. Usually, they have favorable attitude toward the NSE movement, and have often played considerable role in the institutionalization process. We can consider them as overlapping part with the conflict system.

In the conflict system, the government has been always main countermovement in terms of meaning construction. When we examine the government, it seems to be necessary to distinguish the government in a political sense from the government as bureaucratic apparatus. The President and his ruling party in such a strong presidential system like South Korea could take strong position in policy process. However, it should be noted that autonomous bureaucratic apparatus also has had typical power in policy process in South Korea (Skocpol & Amenta 1986). In South Korea, the civil bureaucrats have played essential role in the economic development during the military dictatorship regime periods. Even after democratization, these bureaucrats have maintained their own political positions which had been formed during the authoritarian regimes

¹ Its actual Korean name is the Korea Association of Alternative Enterprises. It's because when this organization transformed from former KFWC in 2007, the term of "alternative" were more familiar in Korea. However, considering international relationship, this organization uses the term of "social economy enterprise" in their English name.

and their typical elitism culture. During last three democratic governments, even relatively progressive President failed in controlling the bureaucrats in several policy domains. Concerning the institutionalization of the NSE movement, we can also find tendencies of competition among the bureaucrats for expanding their own competences and budgets. Finally, private enterprises must take their part in the conflict system as the potential competitors of the NSE movement organizations.

I would carry out this case study mainly based on each actor's documents. Principally, I used official documents which could represent organizations' opinion, such as documents for annual general assemblies, for official publications and for internal education. I also used some important documents used in debates on identity and values. Readers should be aware that I was one of activist in several NSE movement organizations. Although this may raise complicate epistemological questions for some readers, it has also given me an insider's knowledge not generally available to external scholars.

3. MASTER FRAME CHANGES IN MULTI-ORGANIZATIONAL FIELD – THE NSE MOVEMENT IN SOUTH KOREA

3.1. Origin of the NSE movement – the poverty movement before 1990s

As many documents state, the most important origin of the NSE movement is the poverty movement beginning in 1969. Based on the philosophies and methods of Alinsky and Freire, the poverty movement organizers who were often religious leaders or were protected under religions during authoritarian regimes have defined their own movement as "the social movement organizing people to make them resolve their common problems – housing, education, unemployment, welfare - in their own life place (Shin & Kim 2002)". Following their own philosophy and method, the poverty movement activists criticized bi-lateral and charitable relief programs for making the poor more dependent and believed that self-consciousness and unity of the poor were crucial for solving their own problems. This movement was closely associated with the Life movement which was more rooted in oriental monistic and communitarian philosophies, and worked as an important source of the democratization movement during 1970s together with the Life movement and religious movements. However, during 1980s, as the democratization movement became led by young activists from the student movement who were mainly interested in revolutionary strategy based on organized working class, the poverty movement became also considered as one of class movements which constituted broader revolutionary front. Therefore, since 1980s, the community-based approach and the state-centered approach have coexisted in the poverty movement.

3.2. Producers' Community – 1990~1996

Since the democratization in 1987, social movements which had gathered together in the name of the democratization movement began to diverge according to social classes or their own concerns. In this process, first worker cooperatives in poor urban areas, which could be considered as the early NSE movement organizations, appeared in early 1990s in the middle of the poverty movement. In fact, worker cooperatives often called Producers' Communities were one of various self-organizing economy projects in the local poverty movements. In organizing credit unions, consumer cooperatives, childcare centers and cultural activities for the youth and so on, the local poverty movement leaders and organizers organized worker cooperatives as a way for creating sustainable employment. These economy projects were, on one hand, inevitable reaction against the political ignorance and absence of the policies on poverty problems. On the

other hand, they were ambitious projects for building alternative economy beyond the actual capitalist economy. In this sense, the worker cooperatives attracted public attention as a symbol of experiments for the alternative economy. These worker cooperatives were composed of habitants in poor urban areas and movement activists. In competing with private enterprises without any public support, they worked in several sectors which were familiar with poor people, such as construction works for men and sewing works for women. Following the poverty movement's tradition, autonomy and people's self-organizing were emphasized as their important values. However, the NSE movement actors didn't pursue totally independent community from public intervention. To the contrary, as the early worker cooperatives had suffered various problems, the movement actors began to look for supports from outside, especially from the government.

I suppose that *Producers' Community* was the NSE movement's master frame in this phase. Even though the Producers' Community was to designate worker cooperative, its meaning involved more value-oriented and communitarian vision rather than mere organizational form.

Because of its experimental character and small scale, we could say that the multi-organizational field around these activities had been emerging, but not formed yet at that moment. Not only social movements, but also the government began to have an interest in these worker cooperatives. In social movement sector, some part of the trade-union movement regarded worker cooperative as an alternative organizational model of their own self-management and worker's buy-out experiences. In the government, several national research institutes examined worker cooperatives as a new instrument treating poverty problems.

3.3. Self-sufficiency and social job – 1996~2000

Responding to the NSE movement's demand, the government set about a pilot project for supporting the worker cooperatives in the frame of the existing but inactivated Self-sufficiency Promotion program (SSP program) in the public assistance system. Whereas the existing SSP program had included only job-training and loan for the poor, this pilot project was to set up the Self-sufficiency Promotion Centers (SPCs) and to subsidize them. The SPCs aimed at creating and supporting worker cooperatives. Interestingly, this pilot project was very extraordinary in the sense that most of demands from the NSE movement were accepted. Most of staffs in the SPCs were filled with movement activists, and there were only minimum regulations about the SPCs' operation.

While the SPCs had developed mainly from the poverty movement, other social movement organizations also began to have an interest in the NSE movement on the occasion of the economic crisis in 1997. Up to that time, although there were two contrast social movement tendencies such as more moderate citizen's movement and more radical people's movement, principal tactics of both social movements had commonly advocacy style. Whereas service provision still had been considered only as the role of Social Welfare Agencies and the public sector, most of social movement organizations defined their role as watching the public and the private sectors. However, as the economic crisis in 1997 touched the Korean society seriously, social movement organizations came to engage in organizing urgent reliefs and various direct services for the unemployed. Through these activities, the worker cooperative model and the NSE movement became known among local social movement organizations as a good model for self-organizing the unemployed and for overcoming unemployment.

At the similar time, these social movement organizations began to insist "Social Job" concept. Despite of its ambiguity, the Social Job concept could be defined as "the jobs financed by public sector for the disadvantaged" (Cheon et al., 2003). The original Social Job concept emphasized more on the responsibility of public sector rather than on the way of its realization. But many social movement organizations, especially local organizations which had engaged in the direct services, were more interested in so-called "the Third sector model" which was understood as a sector financed by the public sector, managed by civil society organizations and assigned exclusively for the disadvantaged in the activities still unexplored by market and public sector, such as environmental activities, social service provision and so on.

In this phase, we can suppose *reinterpreted Self-sufficiency* and *Social job* as master frames in the field of the NSE movement. Although the Self-sufficiency concept was came from an institutionalized term in the public assistance system, this was not so different from the people's self-organizing principle which was the essence of the poverty movement and the NSE movement. Therefore, in the course of the pilot project, in considerably maintaining their own values and autonomy, the NSE movement actors could positively reinterpret the Self-sufficiency concept. Many of the SPCs called themselves "the People's Self-sufficiency Promotion Center" in order to show their people-oriented value in spite of their public subsidies. Both to the movement actors and even to the government, it was clear that the SPCs' mission was to create and to support worker cooperatives, and that by doing so, they would contribute more communitarian local community in poor areas. Therefore, we could say that the *reinterpreted Self-sufficiency* was one of master frames in the NSE movement. On the other hand, the local social movement organizations directly engaging in provision of services defined themselves as the overcoming unemployment movement, and more and more became mixed with the poverty movement because there were few previous experiences of direct contact with the poor or the unemployed in social movement field except the poverty movement. However, they tended to prefer more structural solution for social problems, and demanded that the government should create the Social Jobs. Even though this request was not accepted by the government at that time, the *Social Job* became a symbol of social movement's opinion on the unemployment problem.

Still in this phase, it seems that the conflict system didn't appear yet. Although the government had began to intervene, its way of treating the NSE movement was extraordinarily favorable and respectful of the movement's experience and values. So I suppose that the government didn't appear yet as a countermovement in this phase. Moreover, the economic crisis and the democratic opposition party's winning in the presidential election in 1997 provided more favorable political opportunities for the NSE movement. In those environments, the NSE movement itself was extended over the traditional poverty movement. In constituting favorable part in the alliance system, most social movement organizations cooperated with the NSE movement or at least, recognized its' role and values.

3.4. Change of meaning by institutionalization – 2000~2004

As the result of the movement which had demanded strong social security net, the government came to reform public assistance system by enacting the National Basic Livelihood Guarantee Law in 2000. This law permitted poor people under certain income criteria to receive public assistance regardless of their working capacity. However, to legitimate qualification of the poor who had working capacity as beneficiary of the new system, the government introduced the clause of conditioned beneficiary. This clause imposed the poor with working capacity to participate compulsorily in working program suggested according to their degree of working

capacities. To provide them with various working places, the government reformed the existing SSP program. This system assigned the Self-sufficiency Promotion Agencies (SPAs, former SPCs) the role of providing the poor who had relatively less working capacity with working places. As outcome of the SPAs, the government prescribed Self-sufficiency Community (SSC) meaning previous producers' community or worker cooperative.

This change brought both positive and negative effects on the NSE movement. As the positive effect, the number of SPAs and their available resources (budget and competency) increased considerably and very rapidly. The number of SPAs increased to cover almost all cities and counties, from 20 SPAs in 1999 to 242 SPAs in 2005. In the process of this extension, many of the local social movement organizations that had undertaken provision of services for the unemployed could be designated as the SPA. However, their number was not enough to cover this rapid extension, and so about half of the SPAs were established by traditional Social Welfare Agencies, local public authorities and even individuals. Although by organizing their own umbrella organization (the Korea Association of Self-sufficiency Promotion Agency, KASPA), the NSE movement actors tried to apply their values and experiences over all SPAs and partially succeeded in it, the SPAs became rapidly institutionalized agencies rather than movement organizations. As one of negative effects, the government began to regulate and standardize the SPAs' operations by imposing standardized operation manuals and by introducing evaluation and incentive systems. Despite of the strong resistance of the SPAs, almost all efforts to regulate succeeded, because the operation budgets of SPAs totally depended on the public subsidy. Another more important negative effect was that the SPAs came to have to receive poor people who were entrusted by local public authorities and had weak working capacity and less motivation. In this situation, many SPAs judged that the creation of worker cooperatives with those people would be nearly impossible, and that case-management for caring them should be priority of the SPAs. Concerning employment, they demanded more stable and more protected works managed by the SPAs rather than the worker cooperative model which seemed not to be appropriate for such conditioned beneficiaries. Even though this opinion more and more became supported in the NSE movement, there was also another opinion which emphasized more on the worker cooperative model and the original vision toward alternative economy.

Another important change took place in the field of unemployment policy. As the economic crisis had been gradually solved and the official rate of unemployment had gone down, the government tried to transform existing "Public Work program" which had been urgent measure for the unemployed, into more productive program. For this purpose, in 2003, the government renamed the existing Public Work program as "the Social Job program", and decided to assign some of program budget to finance NGO's projects for creating employment. The Social Job program permitted various NGO to make projects for creating employment in the fields where social needs had existed but had not been explored by existing public or private sectors. According to the program, governmental financing might continue for maximum 3 years, and meantime, NGOs should try to transform their projects into independent enterprises called Social Enterprise. Compared to the SSP program managed by the Ministry of Health and Welfare as a part of public assistance system, the Social Job program was managed by the Ministry of Labor and was more flexible in terms of participation conditions and of operation. But, in demanding similar outcome with the SSP program, the general structure of system was not so different. Many NGOs including existing NSE movement actors and the SPAs participated in this program.

The important feature of master frame in this phase is the *change of meaning by institutionalization*. First of all, the meaning of Self-sufficiency became considerably changed. Differently from the period of the pilot project, the government actively tried to define the meaning of Self-sufficiency in emphasizing its individual and economic aspect rather than the collective and communitarian aspect. For many public officers in the fields, the SSP program was considered just as a tool for preventing moral hazard of beneficiaries in the new public assistance. While the government continued to emphasize the role and advantage of the civil society organizations in this program, it tried to more and more regulate these organizations as well. The institutionalization didn't bring change only in government's perspective. Faced to new environments, the NSE movement showed two contrast reactions. As the institutionalized system had proven difficult for creating worker cooperatives, many of the NSE movement activists, especially inside of the SPAs began to demand more protected work from competition in market place which might be financed by the public sector. On the other hand, some NSE movement activists tried to find a solution in reinforcing efforts for organizing worker cooperatives. For them, more essential problem was the institutionalized and banalized attitude of the SPAs rather than less capacity of participants. From this perspective, many staffs left the SPAs to participate in the SSCs as one of their members. These SSCs and some worker cooperatives which had continued from the early stage of the NSE movement came to organize the Korea Federation of Worker Cooperatives (KFWC) in 2003. Concerning on the *Social Job* master frame, because social movement's original opinion had been ambiguous, when government began the Social Job program, it seemed not to be so different from the original opinion of social movement.

Through the institutionalization, the multi-organizational field of meaning construction became more complicated. Above all, the NSE movement had grown and its composition became more heterogeneous. The poverty movement groups and the overcoming unemployment movement groups still had maintained their hegemony and responsibility in the SPAs. However, this position made them consider more members' and participants' opinion rather than act based on their original vision. This attitude enabled the NSE movement groups in the SPAs to get support from inside constituents, but made them have an image of a professional interest group. In contrast, some of the NSE movement actors looked for a new way for realizing the movement's initial vision even leaving the SSP program. By organizing the KFWC and the Social Enterprise Support Center (SESC), they tried to find another strategy for alternative economy beyond the institutionalized programs. They expected that alliance with other social movement organizations would be useful for reforming the NSE movement, and considered the Social Job program as an opportunity for extending the NSE movement.

In this phase, divergence between favorable part and bystander part appeared in the alliance system. By participating in the SSP program or the Social Job program, many NGOs and social movement organizations became new providers of social service and organizers of new job place. These NGOs and social movement organizations could be regarded as favorable part in the alliance system. However, they understood ambiguously the meaning of *Self-sufficiency* and *Social Job* master frames. Rather than distinguishing different interpretations between the government and the NSE movements, they understood the *Self-sufficiency* and the *Social job* merely as normatively good and usually accepted the institutionalized concepts. On the other hand, certain social movements that had been favorable to the NSE movement turned their position into bystander's one. They considered the institutionalized NSE movement as a professional interest group on the behalf of the SPAs rather than the poor themselves. They also

understood two master frames as institutionalized concepts. Through the SPA staff's trade-union, the trade-union movement sometimes criticized leaders of the SPAs.

After the institutionalizations, the government began to act as an active actor in this field. In mentioning that the government respected the role and importance of civil society, it actually tried to control and regulate whole process and the outcomes of the SSP program and the Social Job program. And since the organizations in these programs should considerably depend on governmental subsidies, the government could reinterpret the existing master frames with its own intention and impose them to the movement actors.

3.5. Social enterprise – 2004~2006

The social enterprise concept was introduced by the NSE movement and by the government in the almost same time. The NSE movement group that had focused on overcoming the institutionalized constrain of the SSP program came to have an interest on the social enterprise concept. In organizing informal networks of activists in the various NSE movement organizations, they tried to invent a new concept of organizational model encompassing worker cooperatives, SPCs and other experimental enterprises. They recognized that in order to restore the NSE movement's original values and vision, it was necessary to restore the relation with social movement and to pass over the institutionalized programs. Therefore, they proposed the social enterprise concept to account for various efforts for building alternative economy. In this proposal, they focused on social mission and democratic management including the multi-stakeholder governance of social enterprise in referring to the European experiences.

In the similar time, the Ministry of Labor that had been responsible for the Social Job program began to mention social enterprise concept as the expected organizational outcome of the Social Job program. However, it was when the government came to focus on social service sector as a new source of employment that the social enterprise concept became important issue. This "Creation of Employment in Social Service Sector policy" was accelerated since 2005. In this policy, the government tried to facilitate both demand and supply side of social service. In the demand side, in order to create new social service market, the government invested considerable amount of budget to raise consumers' purchasing capacity through various voucher systems and the Long-Term Care National Insurance system for the elderly. In the supply side, the government wanted that non-profit but entrepreneurial organizations would take important part of providers. Therefore, the government pushed on the enactment of the Social Enterprise Promotion Law in spite of worry of the NSE movement and concerning organizations. Finally, in the end of 2006, the Social Enterprise Promotion Law passed in the National Assembly, and the emerging discussion on social enterprise concept in the enlarged NSE movement actors became again confined within the institutionalized concept of social enterprise and social service.

In this phase, the *social enterprise* concept spread as a master frame very rapidly. From the beginning of discussion in the NSE movement actors around 2002~2003, the social enterprise concept attracted actors, at least as a concept enabling them to solve actual problems. However, before sufficient discussion and consensus on the social enterprise concept within the NSE movement actors and concerning actors, the government caught and led the meaning construction process resulting in narrowing down all debate to legislation. Even though the legislation process was carried out in the cooperation between the government and the concerning actors including the NSE movement, one symbolic clause of the law showed remarkable difference of meaning between them. The government wanted to prescribe a clause concerning private enterprises in

order to encourage the mobilization of private enterprises' resources. Based on the experiences in the U.S. social enterprises, the government expected that private enterprises could participate in supporting social enterprises to cover their lack of resources. However, the NSE movement actors were apparently against this clause because they worried that it could justify irresponsibility of the government and that the private enterprises might make bad use of this clause.

By proposing the social enterprise concept, the NSE movement actors could pass over the SSP program's boundary and make broader networks of various organizations which identified themselves with the NSE movement through participating in various programs such as Social Job program. For instance, medical consumer cooperatives which are one branch of consumer cooperatives participated in these networks. To negotiate with the government on the legislation, the NSE movement actors organized the Solidarity for Social Enterprise Development (SSED) composed of 12 organizations in 2006. In this phase, the scale and influence of the NSE movement became too big to be ignored. The favorable social movements came to be interested in strategic utility of the NSE movement and of the social enterprise concept rather than mere sympathetic support on them like in the previous time. The trade-union movement that had been in the position of bystander also began to have an interest on them, because the number of workers in this field had increased rapidly. In this process, trade-unions came to contact with the NSE movement more frequently, but their position on this movement still seems prudent.

In the conflict system, we can observe that the government had driven the meaning construction. It should be noted that the then President Rho and his group were a pro-social movement political group, and that at least in social policies, they tried to reinforce the role of civil society. However, constrained by neo-liberalism trend and by traditional bureaucratic elitism, their policies had been always distorted in practice, and had often raise movement actors' dependency on governmental support. In addition, competition within the government's agencies, particularly between the Ministry of Health and Welfare and the Ministry of Labor seems to strengthen governmental intervention in meaning construction. In the early phase of legislation, the Ministry of Labor didn't want to include the SSCs in the social enterprise concept in order to differentiate work integration image of the SSCs. To the contrary, for a moment after legislation, the Ministry of Health and Welfare didn't want the SSCs to apply for certification as social enterprise. Even that Ministry considered making a social service enterprise concept as a new certification for non-profit providers in the social service market which was mainly regulated by the Ministry of Health and Welfare.

Private companies also began to participate in the meaning construction process. Whereas they were not at all hostile to the social enterprise concept and even to the NSE movement, they tended to consider social enterprises as charitable actors employing the disadvantaged in limited market. This position seems to considerably influence the government actors' opinion.

3.6. Social economy and local community – since 2006

After the legislation of Social Enterprise Promotion Law, social enterprises have been focused as an all-purpose tool for social problems. The interests on social enterprises have been both from the alliance system and the conflict system. In constructing broader and more progressive meaning, the NSE movement and the various social movements have tried to make social enterprise a symbol of alternative enterprises even accepted by the trade-union movement and the progressive political movement. In the same time, in emphasizing its innovative and entrepreneurial aspect, the government tries to facilitate social enterprises as cheaper and more

efficient instrument for treating unemployment and various social problems. These conflicts around the social enterprise concept are ongoing issue. I would like to finish this part by mentioning recent efforts of the NSE movement.

During they examined the social enterprise concept; the NSE movement actors became interested in the social economy concept in Europe. Even though they had recognized that it would be necessary to understand social enterprise concept as embedded in broader social economy concept, they thought that the social enterprise concept would be easier to persuade the public rather than more complicate and abstract social economy concept. However, according as the government drove the meaning construction concerning social enterprise, some of NSE movement actors came to insist that the social enterprise concept should be understood as embedded in the social economy concept. And they also insisted that social enterprises should be embedded in local communities. These proposals meant formation of social economy block in the local level in which social enterprise could be controlled more social way. These proposals could get positive reaction from the consumer cooperative movement and from the certain social movement emphasizing grass-root feature. In fact, the movement which we have examined so far firstly began to call themselves the social economy movement at that moment. Symbolically, in order to encompass more various types of alternative enterprises, the KFWC transformed its name into the Korea Association of Social Economy Enterprises (KASEE) in 2007. Very recently, 26 organizations including the existing NSE movement actors, the consumer cooperative movement organizations, some citizen's movement organizations and local networks, formed the Korean Solidarity of Social Economy (KSSE) in 2008. In its vision statement, the KSSE defined social economy as "the economy based on solidarity spirit", and explains that social economy should be realized through both the strengthened redistribution policy of welfare state, and the growth of creative and innovative non-for-profit enterprises.

4. DEFINING FACTORS IN DYNAMIC OF MEANING CONSTRUCTION IN THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION PROCESS OF THE NSE MOVEMENT

In the institutionalization process of the NSE movement in South Korea, we can observe several characteristics. First of all, at least in South Korea, the government has played an active role in shaping and interpreting meaning of movement. This role of the government looks different traditional roles of the government in social movement studies. However, even if the government didn't repress the NSE movement neither did it disturb the movement, the meaning construction driven by the government resulted in confining movement's ambitious values and visions within actual social system and in banalizing them. Second, when the institutionalizations took place, the master frames and their interpretations have converged on the institutionalized ones. Even in the alliance system, actors came to understand the master frames according to the institutionalized interpretation. In this sense, institutionalization could be considered as the consolidation of master frames. Thirdly, even when the government shapes institutional environment of the NSE movement and tries to drive its meaning construction, all movement actors didn't follow the given situation. Instead, some movement actors have searched for making new master frames by various framing strategies. As they have changed master frames, we can find that the meaning has become more general and broader. These three tendencies showed that the institutionalization is neither mere result of social movement nor of governmental action, but rather the arena of dynamics around meaning construction.

To study which conditional combinations bring different contents and application of the institutionalization in next step of the research, I would like to define principal factors which

affected the dynamic of meaning construction in the institutionalization process of the NSE movement. By in-depth study on these factors in several countries, I will formulate more concrete conditions for QCA method. However, in this paper, I try to define which factors I should examine with theoretical explanation.

In the alliance system, I suppose that three factors mainly functioned. First one is the *existence of previous movements*. In this study, we observed that the poverty movement and the overcoming unemployment movement were crucial sources of meanings and resources for the NSE movement. The values and repertoires made during the previous movements affected actual movement's practices. In his study on the civil right movement in the U.S., McAdam (1982) called these factors "indigenous organizational strength" which brought members, established structure of solidarity incentives, communication network and leaders to new emerging movement. Regarding this factor, it seems to be necessary to examine whether the focal movement different from the previous movements was organized before the institutionalization.

Second factor is the *strategy of movement*. As we observed, during the institutionalization process, the NSE movement actors didn't stay as its passive object. On the contrary, they participated in negotiating with the government, and if the results of institutionalization were not proper to their own values and vision, they tried to search new solutions by changing themselves or by making new master frames. Frame studies suggest four types of framing strategies taken by movement actors: frame bridging, frame amplification, frame extension and frame transformation (Snow et al. 1986; Snow & Benford 1992). By examining the mechanism of strategies and their results in institutionalized environment, we could expect to find specific patterns of strategies.

Third factor is the *involvement of other social movements*. Although in this study, there were not much interaction between the NSE movement and other social movements, several theories suggest that it is worth examining roles of other social movements in institutionalization process. The power resource theory explained that the power of well-organized trade-unions and its political parties were important factor in development of welfare states (Korpi 1998). As other countries experiences show, traditional social economy movements could play a positive or negative role in institutionalization process of the NSE movement (Borzaga & Santuari 2001; Margado 2004; Favreau 2005). Skocpol and Amenta (1986) also explain that when working classes and other organized democratic forces lack access to regular institutional channels for affecting social policies, mass disruption could play an equivalent role.

In the conflict system, I would like to define three affecting factors. First, the *political position of ruling party* seems to be important. It has been said that specific political lines such as social democracy parties, catholic parties and more reform-oriented parties, have positive impact on social policies and expenditure (Skocpol & Amenta 1986; Amenta & Poulsen 1996). In this study, it seems that the successive appearance of democratic governments facilitated the institutionalization of the NSE movement.

Second, the *autonomy and competence of bureaucracy* also have considerably affected on the institutionalization. In the process of introducing the Self-sufficiency Promotion pilot project and the National Basic Livelihood Guarantee Law, bureaucrats were against these reforms, and they succeeded in delaying reforms for a while (Moon 2001; Shin & Kim 2002). On the contrary, in the courses of legislation of the Social Enterprise Promotion Law, bureaucrats actively participated in shaping meaning because of the internal competition between the concerning ministries for much more competences.

Third, we can expect that the *involvement of private enterprises* would influence on the institutionalization processes. In the Korean case, even though they have been favorable to support the NSE movement organizations, they have considered the activities carried out by those organizations as mere charitable ones. Moreover, based on the experiences of other countries, we could expect that if the NSE movement organizations come to have considerable market share in specific sectors, the private enterprises would try damaging their meanings in insisting unfair competition.

However, these agency factors in multi-organizational field seem to be colored and constrained by more structural factors. The behavioral extents of each agency factors are constrained by structural settings. Differently from agency factors which we could find more easily around focal phenomenon, it is more difficult to discern effective structural factors. I suppose several potentially effective structural factors. But their effectiveness should be evaluated by technical tools in next step of this research.

First of all, *socio-economic factors* should be considered. In this study, economic changes were important opportunities for the NSE movement. The economic crisis facilitated movement itself and stimulated the institutionalization of the Self-sufficiency Promotion program. In another sense, the recovery of economic situation brought an opportunity for launching the Social Job program. Demographical changes also played important role in the development of the NSE movement by legitimating new needs for social service provisions. In many studies on the NSE movement, these economic and demographical changes were considered as important factors for the emergence and development of the NSE (Defourny et al 2001).

Secondly, as globalization has evolved, *international modeling and diffusion* must become more important (Skocpol & Amenta 1986). Recently, in various ways, the international modeling constrains the autonomy of national states' policies. Furthermore, it often suggests and leads the directions of policies as if there is any worldwide level political group. After Korea's joining the OECD in 1996, many policies have been affected by so-called "global standard". During the economic crisis, the IMF also played a crucial role in making the neo-liberalism solidly rooted in policy-making processes. The reformist government emphasized the role of civil society in following "the Third way" strategy of the New Labor Party in the UK. Even in the process of legislation of the Social Enterprise Law, the government used the Italian Social Cooperative Law as a basic model. The NSE movement actors also developed their ideas in referring to foreign experiences and cooperating with movement actors in other countries. These phenomena show that the international modeling and diffusion become more important than ever. However, in analytical work, it seems to be necessary to examine these processes more carefully in considering different levels and ways.

Finally, even though they are not so rigid and remote factors like socio-economic factors, in the sense that they define the behavioral extents of institutional actors, various regimes should be examined. According to various *political (or electoral) regimes*, the extents of political capacity of ruling party, the degree of autonomy of bureaucrats and even the choice of the direction of movements could vary (Skocpol & Amenta 1986; Amenta & Poulsen 1996; Tarrow 1998; Amenta & Young 1999). Different levels of *social policy regime* also define the possibility of actors' choices. The social policy regimes function as like legacies of previous policies. Once policies are enacted and implemented, they change the public agendas and the patterns of group conflict through which subsequent policy changes occur. For instance, in the policy on social service development since 2005, it seems that there were few choices for the government to

develop sufficient social service provision except opening market to private enterprises and strong mobilizing of non-profit enterprises, because social service had hardly ever been developed. By examining social policy regime, we could expect the extents of available policies. Concerning the institutionalization of the NSE movement, I suppose that studies on social policy regime would be useful, such as welfare state regime (Esping-Andersen 1998), social service regime (Bahle 2003; Munday 2003), workfare regime (Trickey 2001) and social assistance regime (Eardley 1997). Also, *non-profit sector regime* could be useful to understand the behavioral extents of movement actors (Anheier & Salamon 1999).

CONCLUSION

As a preparatory work for qualitative comparative analysis, I tried to define principal factors which function in the institutionalization process of the NSE. In this case study on master frame changes of the NSE movement in Korea from 1990 to nowadays, I examined the dynamics of meaning construction occurred in a multi-organizational field composed of actors of alliance system and conflict system. By this study, I suppose three categories of factors. As factors in the alliance system, the existence of previous movement, the strategy of movement and the involvement of other social movements have played roles in shaping meaning of the movement. As factors in the conflict system, the political position of ruling party, the autonomy and competence of bureaucracy and the involvement of private enterprises have had impact on the meaning construction. In addition, structural factors which color and constrain the agency factors also have influenced on the process indirectly. In such structural factors, socio-economic factors, international modeling and diffusion and existing regimes could be included.

In next step of research, through examining the contents and application of actual legislation and concerning legal regime, I will try to define to what extent the NSE movement succeeded in realizing its own values and identity. With the results of this and next studies, I will formulate proper QCA model for comparison of 16 cases of institutionalizations of the NSE in industrialized countries.

REFERENCES

- Amenta, E. and Poulsen, J., 1996, "Social Politics in Context: The Institutional Politics Theory and Social Spending at the End of the New Deal", *Social Forces*, Vol. 75, No. 1, pp. 33-60
- Amenta, E. and Young, M., 1999, "Democratic States and Social Movements: Theoretical Arguments and Hypotheses", *Social Problems*, Vol. 46, No. 2, pp. 153-168
- Amenta, E. and Zylan, Y., 1991, "It Happened Here: Political Opportunity, the New Institutionalism, and the Townsend Movement", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 56, No. 2, pp. 250-265
- Anheier, H. and Salamon, L., 1999, "Volunteering in Cross-National Perspective: Initial Comparisons", *Law and Contemporary Problems*, Vol. 62, pp. 43-66
- Bahle, T., 2003, "The Changing Institutionalization of Social Services in England and Wales, France and Germany: Is the welfare state on the retreat?", *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 5-20
- Benford, R., 1997, "An Insider's Critique of the Social Movement Framing Perspective", *Sociological Inquiry*, Vol. 67, No. 4, November, pp. 409-430
- Benford, R. and Snow, D., 2000, "Framing Process and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 26, pp. 611-639
- Borzaga, C. and Santuari, A., 2001, "Italy: from traditional cooperatives to innovative social enterprises", in Borzaga, C. and Defourny, J. (eds.). *The Emergence of Social Enterprise*, London: Routledge
- Cheon, B.Y., Park, C.I., Chang, J.Y., Cheong, I.S., Hwang, D.S. and Hwang, S.K., 2003, *Research on Creation of Social Job*, Seoul: Korea Labor Institute (in Korean)
- Christine, E., Gautier, J., Gazier, B. and Morel, S., 1996, "Job opportunities for the Hard-to-place", In Schmid, G., O'Reilly, J., Schomann, K., (eds.), *International handbook of labor market policy and evaluation*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar
- Cornfield, D. and Fletcher, B., 1998, "Institutional Constraints on Social Movement "Frame Extension": Shifts in the Legislative Agenda of the American Federation of Labor, 1881-1955", *Social Forces*, Vol. 76, No. 4, pp. 1305-1321
- Cress, D. and Snow, D., 2000, "The Outcomes of Homeless Mobilization: The Influence of Organization, Disruption, Political Mediation, and Framing", *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 105, No. 4, pp. 1063-1104
- Curtis, R. and Zurcher, L., 1973, "Stable Resources of Protest Movements: The Multi-organizational Field", *Social Forces* Vol. 52, pp. 53-61
- Defourny, J. and Develtere, P., 2000, "The social economy : the worldwide making of a third sector", in Defourny, J. Develtere, P. & Fonteneau, B. (eds.), *Social Economy North and South*, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven. Hoger instituut voor de arbeid/Université de Liège. Centre d'Économie Sociale

- Demoustier, D., *L'économie sociale et solidaire : S'associer pour entreprendre autrement*, Paris: La Découverte, 2001
- Diani, M., 1996, "Linking Mobilization Frames and Political Opportunities: Insights from Regional Populism in Italy", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 61. No. 6. pp. 1053-1069
- Eardley, T., Bradshaw, J., Ditch, J., Gough, I. and Whiteford, P., 1997, *Social assistance in OECD countries. Vol 1. Synthesis Report*. Department of Social Security, Research Report 46. London: HMSO
- Esping-Andersen, G., 1998, "The Three Political Economics of the Welfare State", In O'Connor, J. and Olsen, G. (eds.), *Power Resources Theory and the Welfare State: A Critical Approach*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press
- Evans, J., 1997, "Multi-Organizational Fields and Social Movement Organization Frame Content: The Religious Pro-Choice Movement", *Sociological Inquiry*, Vol. 67, No. 4, pp. 451-469
- Favreau, L., 2005, "Les regroupement nationaux d'économie sociale au Québec : Essai d'analyse politique", *Cahier de CRISES*, Collection mouvements sociaux MS0505
- Gamson, W. and Meyer, D., 1996, "Framing political opportunity", in McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. and Zald, M. (eds.), *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements*, New York: Cambridge University Press
- Hay, C., 1995, "Structure and Agency", in Marsh, D. et Stoker, G. (eds.) *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, London: Macmillan Press
- Klandermans, B., 1992, "The Social Construction of Protest and Multiorganizational Fields", in A.D. Morris and C.M. Mueller (eds.), *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, New Haven: Yale University Press
- Korpi, W., 1998, "Power Resources Approach vs Action and Conflict: On Causal and International Explanations in the Study of Power", In O'Connor, J. and Olsen, G. (eds.), *Power Resources Theory and the Welfare State: A Critical Approach*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press
- Kriesi, H., Koopmans, R., Duyvendak, J.W. and Giugni, M., 1995, *The Politics of New Social Movements in Western Europe. A Comparative Analysis*, Minneapolis and St. Paul: University of Minnesota Press
- Laville, J.-L., (ed.), 1994, *L'économie solidaire, une perspective internationale*, Paris: Desclée de Brouwer
- Lavill, J.-L. And Roustang, G., 2000, "Developing a Partnership between the State and Civil society: Problems and Solutions", in Defourny, J. Develtere, P. & Fonteneau, B. (eds.), *Social Economy North and South*, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven. Hoger instituut voor de arbeid/Université de Liège. Centre d'Économie Sociale
- Lévesque, B., Malo, M.-C. and Girard, J.-P., 2000, "The Old and New Social Economy – The Quebec Experience", in Defourny, J. Develtere, P. & Fonteneau, B. (eds.), *Social Economy North and South*, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven. Hoger instituut voor de arbeid/Université de Liège. Centre d'Économie Sociale

- Margado, A., 2004, "A new co-operative form in France: Société Coopérative d'Intérêt Collectif (SCIC)", in Borzaga, C. and Spear, R. (eds.), *Trends and challenges for Co-operatives and Social Enterprises in developed and transition countries*, Trento: Edizioni31
- McAdam, D., 1982, *The Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency*, Chicago : University of Chicago Press
- McAdam, D., 1994, "Culture and Social Movements", in Larana, E., Johnston, H. and Gusfield, J. (eds.) *New Social Movements – From Ideology to Identity*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press
- McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. and Zald, M., 1996, "Introduction: Opportunities, mobilizing structures, and framing processes – toward a synthetic, comparative perspective on social movements", in McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. and Zald, M. (eds.), *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements*, New York: Cambridge University Press
- Melucci, A., 1994, "A Strange Kind of Newness: What's 'New' in New Social Movements", in Larana, E., Johnston, H. and Gusfield, J. (eds.) *New Social Movements – From Ideology to Identity*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press
- Moon, J.Y., 2001, "Social Welfare and NGO", in Cho, H.Y. (ed.) *NGO guide*, Seoul: Hankyeore Journal (in Korean)
- Mooney, P. and Hunt, S., 1996, "A Repertoire of Interpretations: Master Frames and Ideological Continuity in US Agrarian Mobilization", *The Sociological Quarterly*, Volume 37, No. 1, pp. 177-197
- Munday, B., 2003, *European Social Services: A Map of Characteristics and Trends*, Report for the Council of Europe, Brussels
- Rihoux, B. et Ragin, C. (eds.), 2009, *Configurational Comparative Methods : Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and Related Techniques*, Los Angeles : SAGE
- Schneider, C. and Wagemann, C., 2005, "Reducing Complexity in Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA): Remote and Proximate Factors and the Consolidation of Democracy", *Compass working paper 2005-35*
- Shin, M.H. and Kim, H.I., 2002, "History of Producers' Community and Self-sufficiency Promotion Program", *Trend and Perspective*, Vol. 53, pp. 6-37 (in Korean)
- Skocpol, T. and Amenta, E., 1986, "States and Social Policies", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 12, pp. 131-157
- Snow, D., Rochford, B., Worden, S and Benford, R., 1986, "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 51, No. 4, pp. 464-481
- Snow, D. and Benford, R., 1992, "Master Frame and Cycles of Protest." in Moris A. and Muller, C. (eds.) *Frontier in Social Movement Theory*, New Haven: Yale University Press
- Swart, W., 1995, "The League of Nations and the Irish Question: Master Frames, Cycles of Protest, and "Master Frame Alignment"", *The Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 36, No. 3, pp. 465-481

- Tarrow, S., 1998, *Power in Movement – Social Movements and Contentious Politics*, New York: Cambridge University Press
- Tilly, C., 1978, *From Mobilization to Revolution*,
- Trickey, H., 2001, "Comparing workfare programmes", In Lødemel, I. and Trickey, H. (eds.), *An offer you can't refuse: Workfare in international perspective*, London: The Policy Press
- Vienney, C., 1994, *L'économie sociale*, Paris: La Découverte