



University of
Salford
MANCHESTER

Global knowledge capitalism, self-woven safety nets, and the crisis of employability

Moore, P

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13600820600929812>

Title	Global knowledge capitalism, self-woven safety nets, and the crisis of employability
Authors	Moore, P
Type	Article
URL	This version is available at: http://usir.salford.ac.uk/id/eprint/17611/
Published Date	2006

USIR is a digital collection of the research output of the University of Salford. Where copyright permits, full text material held in the repository is made freely available online and can be read, downloaded and copied for non-commercial private study or research purposes. Please check the manuscript for any further copyright restrictions.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: usir@salford.ac.uk.

Global Knowledge Capitalism, Self-woven Safety Nets, and the Crisis of Employability

Phoebe Moore¹

Global Society, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 453 – 473.

Abstract:

In the global economy, workers are increasingly expected to cultivate an unprecedented repertoire of abilities in an immaterial world of work. This signifies a limited shift in capitalist expansion in the post-Fordist world in relation to workers' employability therein. A model of worker subjectivity was introduced into Western management and psychology discourse surrounding employability in the 1960s and 1970s. In a developed, post-industrial global economy, management has begun to view workers less as cogs in the wheel, and less as rational and predictable entities than dynamic individuals with the capacity for symbolic reasoning, intelligence, independently generated ideas, and even the desire to work for the sake of self-fulfilment! The Fordist workplace was expected to become a distant memory and organisations were to become "learning organisations" rather than hierarchical, Dickensian workflows of the manufacturing age. Nevertheless, rather than offering freedom from the iron cage of capitalism, workers face a contemporary form of coercion that substitutes political representation with a set of expectations and limitations; ironically intended to result in workplace emancipation. Emphasis on employability of individuals through workers' creation of self-woven safety nets demonstrates an elite-led project to reduce government responsibility for employment welfare. In order to make this claim, the article looks at the case of education policy in South Korea after the economic crisis of 1997.

With the rapid advancement of information technology and the commodification of the intangible, nations now compete for recognition as knowledge driven societies and economies and are committed to preparing their workforces for the new world. The Republic of Korea (hereafter referred to as 'Korea') aims to standardise worker training methods in partnership with international organisations in response to

¹ The author would like to acknowledge the continuing support from fellow members of the International Political Economy Group (IPEG), a working group of the British International Studies Association. These individuals include Louise Amoore, Andreas Bieler, Paul Cammack, Phil Cerny

unprecedented and international pressures in this regard. Policymaking around education and training for learning and skills acquisition as a set of internationalised norms in this country thus seeks to prepare workers for technological advancements and the global economy. The new workplace appears to require a certain kind of worker who will be educated into certain skills, and I am interested in how elite forces in the shape of management and government have begun to internationalise a criteria for employability in a tone that ironically promises worker autonomy, but simultaneously captures and controls this same thing.

This article deals with the topic of skills and education for employability in Korea and in particular, flexibility and a concept of ongoing, self-directed learning, which require certain intuitions and workers' adoption of specific learning frameworks. These elements are crucial for workers' sustained or renewed employability after the economic crisis of 1997 stole thousands of jobs from the labour force. The Korean government has taken this very seriously with the restructuring of vocational education and training (VET) since crisis reform. No data has been produced to adequately assess the final impact changes have had upon workers' lives, but this article begins a critical investigation into this important factor of production in the Information Age.

Aggarwal claims that the "major ideological event"¹ of globalisation of business and the spread of communications and technology has resulted in universally improved living standards and health. These arguments emerge from an ontological commitment to progress and modernisation which is inseparable from assumptions regarding implementation strategies and the resulting impact on societies. Aggarwal argues that access to information and the advancements of technology reduce the

and Nicola Phillips, whose comments and advice have made the writing and publishing of this piece

appearance of hierarchical systems in businesses.² This should, then, result in workers' empowerment. The literature of corporate culture gurus such as Peters and Waterman³ is committed to the idea that the right kind of corporate environment provides autonomy for workers. While these authors note that autonomy is "a product of the discipline provided by culture", they give no relevance to varieties of cultures in the organic or the potentially fabricated senses and are thus inapplicable to an international or crosscultural understanding of management and the impact of development on a more generalised quota of analyses or for specific case studies such as a study of Korea.^{4,5}

Because these gurus are not a particularly academic breed, they are often not critiqued despite their prominent role in workplace transformations over time.⁶ These individuals often behave as though changes can occur within a monocultural remit that forbids critical thought, and aim to show that corporations and management want both flexibility and dependability from workers. However, corporate "excellence" reveals an emerging corporate culture which is in fact tightly controlled, while it simultaneously advocates encourage worker autonomy, entrepreneurship, innovation and empowerment. Thrift⁷ cautions us that the "cultural circuit" of capitalism is a kind of discursive operator which has emerged out of the influential language used by business schools, management gurus and consultants to understand the new economy⁸ within which we live, and the voice of the media universalises, normalises, and consolidates the tenets of capitalism via a powerful "apparatus" of discourse.

A model of worker subjectivity was introduced into Western management and psychology discourse in the 1960s and 1970s. In a developed, post-industrial world, management began to view workers less as cogs in the wheel, and less as rational and

possible.

predictable entities than dynamic individuals with the capacity for symbolic reasoning, intelligence, independently generated ideas, and even the desire to work for the sake of self-fulfilment! The Fordist workplace was soon to become a distant memory and organisations were to become “learning organisations” rather than hierarchical, Dickensian workfloors of the manufacturing age. Rose⁹ describes the reconfiguration of national insurance systems as a result of the Wars, and an eventual acceptance that the subjects who compose manpower and thus labour markets, can be granted “native impulses”.¹⁰ This shift has come to represent the transformation of the concept of work, wherein work is “an essential element in the path to self-fulfilment”.¹¹ The organisation itself, thus, must be designed as a space for the cultivation of subjectivity in alignment with “the aspirations of the enterprise, now construed in terms of innovation, flexibility and competitiveness.”¹² Interestingly, it has taken only a few decades for this movement to arrive in the Eastern hemisphere and in Korea is manifest by a government-led project of Skills Revolution and democratic integration.

I argue in this piece that hierarchies within the Korean workplace have not been reduced, but are camouflaged through placing increased responsibility for self management on workers through the nationwide lifelong learning (LLL) campaign. In flexible, knowledge oriented workplaces, learning and innovation are now perceived as *necessary* skills for survival in the workplace and wider job market, which has affected approaches to development and cultivation of an appropriate workforce. So stability has become a thing of the past for all but a select few within the upper echelons of the workplace. Technology migrates “quickly”¹³ and workers are required to learn how to adapt to this migration by accepting new ways of thinking and learning within the workplace.¹⁴ As is noted below, policies reflect this phenomenon

but overlook aspects of cultural change and transformation that accompany this project.

The emphasis on employability of individuals through what I call self-woven safety nets demonstrates an “attempt to shift the responsibility for jobs, training and careers onto the individual”¹⁵ and the conquering of class struggle.¹⁶ This phenomenon is a contemporary form of coercion that substitutes workers’ political representation with what is ironically intended to result in workplace emancipation. The replacement of responsibility for training of the self, *to* the self, is a manifestation of the re-articulations of coercion inherent to ongoing capitalist expansion. Within the contemporary age, knowledge itself has become an asset, and in this case, the knowledge regarding how to make oneself employable through certain types of more employable learning, is understood as a form of training of the self. LLL is touted as an emancipatory strategy that is accessible to all workers, but in practice excludes more people from the workforce than it includes, simultaneous to saving governments across the global political economy from taking a welfare oriented role.

Korea has joined the international community¹⁷ in saying that the most important challenge workers face in the age of technology is to achieve LLL. This small nation’s annual LLL budget stands at approximately 8 billion won, which is US\$7 million.¹⁸ While this figure is low compared to other advanced nations, very little research has been conducted to document and understand what exactly is *meant* by LLL, despite claims for workers’ competitive advantage in a knowledge economy.¹⁹ Nor has research sought to understand the effects that the restructuring of education in this light have had on people’s lives. In response to this gap in research, I look at the impact of this global transition on one nation’s workforce with reference to leaders’ consolidated partnerships with international organisations. The question is

asked whether LLL and workers' autonomy actually empowers workers in a sustainable and politically significant context, or whether this project is simply the continuation of power relations equating elite domination over the workplace?

The article is divided into the following sections. The first section provides a brief overview of the impact of the 1997+ Asian economic crisis on Korea, because it represents a shift in a development model that emphasises flexibility of the workforce. Reemployability of workers became crucial for reform, and international pressures to achieve competitive levels of VET programmes mounted. The second section looks at the Korean state's international cooperation in this respect, which seemed imperative for economic recovery. UNESCO's Project on Technical and Vocational Education (UNEVOC) merged with the nascent Korea Research Institute for Vocational Education and Training (KVRIVET) to achieve this goal. The LLL campaign required unprecedented learning styles within the workforce, and the third section further identifies how the acquisition of learning abilities point to self directed, andragogical knowledge in the context of production and changes to the workforce. If training strategies for specific skills intend to fully prepare the worker for this age of information without completely uprooting the norms of the workplace and potentially fuelling already unstable politics of labour relations, several factors have yet to be addressed. While there is insufficient space here to address every postcrisis training programme and workers' responses, in conclusion the article questions whether rapid changes to workers' and the wider societies' education systems contain a sub clause of political emancipation as well as the claimed individual empowerment that contemporary campaigns for essential skills are believed to provide.

After the Crisis: Teaching workers to be flexible

The 1980s saw a Research and Development (R&D) transformation in terms of ownership of knowledge and a higher level of skills were expected from the workforce in Korea. In the 1990s, the Framework Act on “Informatisation” Promotion was enacted, followed by the establishment of a Planning Office and a Promotion Fund for the same. This campaign inspired the Korean government to present a series of visions and strategies for workers in the information society, demonstrating also Korea’s choices to move toward the production models that encourage innovation. But notably, over time, specific skills were taught at the private level, and in partnership with the private sector, the government introduced macrolevel training programmes for essential skills. Now, essential skills are different from specific skills. During an interview I held with Dr. Jae-Boon Lee, Director General of the Centre for Lifelong Education, Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI),²⁰ Dr. Lee discussed the ideas of “job specific skills” and “lifelong learning”. The first are compatible with respective workplaces, and many abilities are needed, whereas lifelong, *essential* skills involve similar capabilities that social situations require such as cooperation, problem solving abilities, and creativity. The nature of swiftly moving technology means that workers are increasingly expected to become flexible to an unpredictable market, and to become lifelong learners in what at first was an unspecified objective.

The ambiguity of workers’ job security and the skills needed for employment became very clear in December 1997, when the economic crisis in East Asia struck Korea. At this time, the IMF provided the new President Kim, Dae Jung (DJ Kim) with a USD57 thousand million bailout package, complete with a programme of

restructuring requirements that would immediately and directly affect workers' job stability. The programme included three broad categories of reform: "Macro economic Policies", "Financial Sector Restructure", and "Other Structural Measures".²¹ The latter category included extensive labour market reforms for the ease of accelerated inward foreign direct investment (FDI), which has been heavily located in the Information Communications and Technology (ICT) sector. R&D was once again prioritised within this sector. This investment was linked to the construction of a LLL society and "Edutopia" in the mid 1990s.²² The ICT sector in particular requires flexible workers, due to the unreliability and velocity of this market's movement.

The package's "Other Structural Measures" states that for "labour market reform... further steps [will be taken] to improve labour market flexibility". Labour laws had not provided for "flexibility in the labour market"²³ and would need revamping. DJ Kim declared in his inaugural address that "intangible knowledge and information will be the driving power for economic development".²⁴ The allusion here is that intangible commodities result in intangible jobs. In the context of corporate restructuring around FDI, workers were faced with the conditions of "flexibility" meaning that if a business was not fit for survival in what had become a flexible corporate environment, jobs simply disappeared, often overnight.

Korean economists stressed that "we cannot avoid unemployment... what we have to do is to make Korean companies competitive internationally".²⁵

They [foreign investors] would like to confirm whether it is safe to invest in Korea and if it would be profitable... they would like to know if Korean workers will be cooperative with foreign firms and will allow them to accommodate layoffs.²⁶

In 1998, analysts proposed that the IMF restructuring plan, which involved intensified opening to foreign investment, would result in 1 million layoffs of workers. The National Assembly in early 1998 passed laws to “make layoffs easier”, and President Kim stated in a televised speech during the heat of crisis reform that “if foreign investors take over a local company, about 10% - 20% of workers may be laid off. But, their corporate activities would contribute to the national economy”.²⁷

Unemployment, or the final impact of labour flexibility in this context, increased dramatically as a result of the 1997 crisis. The International Secretary of the Korean Confederation of Trade Unions (KCTU) warned that “Mergers and acquisitions (M&As) by foreigners [which] the law is encouraging will lead to mass dismissals”.²⁸ Unemployment was 2% in 1995, but dropped to 2.6% in 1997, and to 8.4% in early 1998 when 1.7 million Koreans lost jobs. The jobless rate hit a 33 year high of 8.7% in February 1998 and the number of jobless was tallied at 1.78 million in the same month. A drop in new hires occurred too, with a 5.3% decrease in 1998. The economically inactive population increased by 5.5% the same year.²⁹ Workers began to interpret the word “flexible” to mean “fired” and took to the streets in protest when in July 1998, serious layoffs began to take effect. By June 1999, 8.4% of Koreans were unemployed, meaning 1,356,000 people were affected dramatically by the restructuring of material aspects of Korean society.

The primary reason for layoffs was to overcome the “crisis of the company” (see Table 1). In the majority of cases, employees were compelled to relinquish employment under the honorary retirement programme due to the severity of business downturns and lack of contracts.³⁰ The number of honourable retirees exceeded those dismissed. Before 1989, Koreans enjoyed lifetime employment. It was part of the

communitarian consciousness of Korean society. Workers suddenly faced the Stygian depths of unemployment.

Table 1: Main reasons for employment adjustment

	(Firms)	(%)
To make vacancy for promotion	7	2.9
To reduce excess of employees generated by automation	13	5.4
Corporate restructuring and downsizing	39	16.3
To reduce wage costs	31	12.9
To overcome crisis of the company	136	56.7
Merger and acquisition with other company	3	1.3
Others	11	4.6
Total	240	100.0

Source: D. J. Park, J. Park, and G.-C. Yu, "Assessment of Labour Market Response to the Labour Law Changes Introduced in 1998", in F. Park, Y.-B. Park, G. Betcherman, and A. Dar (eds.) *Labour Market Reforms in Korea: Policy Options for the Future* (Seoul: World Bank and Korea Labour Institute), pp. 125-150.

35% of firms used "honourable retirement" to shed workers, which is considerably higher than the percentage of firms using straight dismissals. But attrition was the most widely used method of reducing employment. In 1998, 80% of firms used this method, affecting on average 103 employees per company.³¹ President DJ Kim pleaded with workers to understand that the disappearance of jobs and resulting "honorary/early retirement" would be *necessary* for the revitalisation of the economy. In many M&A cases, "early retirement" was the term used to describe the disappearance of a great number of employees at the merged plants. But labour flexibility would not immediately and naturally mesh with a Korean understanding of job security, although the government began to provide limited social safety nets. The phenomenon of such high levels of layoffs would not only disturb people's livelihood

and families, but would interrupt a pattern of what labour leaders I interviewed called “cultural norms”³² like the lifelong payment system.

By August 1999, unemployment was above 1.4 million, for a total of 6.8 % of the labour force, compared to 2.6 % in 1997. Wage cuts were offered in exchange for job stability, meaning that wage levels reached a 10.3 decrease. Bluecollar, whitecollar and managerial positions alike were threatened by the serious measures taken by companies at the direction of a global minded government, and pressures escalated. Safety nets in the form of renovated VET programmes were presented as concessions offered to workers. But despite this nation’s 1987 democratic transition, few workers were allowed job retention rights.³³

In 1999, the Korean International Labour Foundation (KOILAF) recommended a more flexible wage system, and development of education and training to produce and develop HR to finally “achieve” labour market flexibility.³⁴ As a safety net to appease the worst affects of the crisis, the *Unemployment Measure Training Programme* was drafted, and significant changes were applied to VET across the country. This Programme aimed to provide VET for the newly unemployed, focusing on reskilling and what were quickly seen to be core skills, such as selfdirected LLL. The Department of Labour (DOL) terminated old VET programmes and invested an unprecedented level of funding into Polytechnics and training institutes, expanding the size of available instruction.³⁵ New private-public partnerships between education institutions also emerged, predominantly in the areas of computer, English language, and vocational technical training. Increasingly, responsibility for this restructuring was delegated to the Department of Education (DOE).

Traditionally, VET was headed by the DOL whilst the DOE headed vocational education, which was offered in schools. After the economic crisis “efforts have been made to integrate vocational education and training in order to deliver more effective vocational education and training to the users”.³⁶ “Users” however, had no choice but to take part in training and were therefore confined to these choices, and were expected to passively accept their only alternative for survival in the changing economy. New requirements were framed as beneficial, but this claim is redundant because of the absence of negotiation regarding how employability would emerge in the era of recovery and onward. Though tripartite discussions and social dialogue were consistently attempted, the success rate of these trials was not evident.³⁷

Public, inplant and authorised training centres were required to accommodate the influx of unemployed. The DOL announced plans to provide training programmes for 50,000 people in 1998 that would begin the process of “inclusion”. That number increased to 162,000 when unemployment skyrocketed. Ihm suggests that post crisis training is a strategy of the Korean state to avoid taking an extensive welfare provision role.³⁸ The status of many OECD states has changed from “enabling” to “productive welfare”, providing minimum welfare, focussing on education and retraining to formulate a self reliant workforce, and Korea has been advised to follow this lead.³⁹ Training programmes were framed as a means to prepare the labour force for reemployment, armed with the new skills intended to carry Korea into the next phase of global ready development.

The restructuring of VET programmes to create a labour market better equipped for the crisis and global change demonstrates that a restructuring of the Korean economy was activated with an inclusive strategy of knowledge management and best practices, as a strategy to promote the nations’ economic competitiveness.

Sklair shows that a growing number of globalizing political and business leaders have begun to promote knowledge and ideology within “knowledge institutions [which are] research centres, universities, business colleges”.⁴⁰ Korea’s knowledge institutions became heavily populated after the economic crisis left thousands of workers unemployed, as people sought to reeducate and reequip themselves for the post crisis economy. Education norms were associated with world’s best practice (WBP), which is a global standard upon which national competitiveness depends. This label refers to the gauging of nations’ performance in the global economy, whose scores are designated by globalizing professionals likewise.

Korean leaders created the legal space for the expansion of capital and for the ideology of national competitiveness in a global world economy pegged to IMF norms. The IMF is the worlds’ most powerful economic agency and plays a part in setting the rules for guiding neoliberal development plans, and generally, for how globalisation operates. This international “machinery of surveillance”⁴¹ works closely with states to ensure sustained development through economic assistance, contingent upon norms integration. This background of human resources transformations and skills requirements in conjunction with IMF structural adjustment was a precursor to Korea’s competitiveness in the new economy. Further international cooperation toward these ends was quickly evident, as the next section demonstrates.

Human Resource Reform and International Cooperation

In 1994, the Korean Presidential Commission on Education Reform (PCER) started the Education for All (EFA) initiative and gradually extended its reach across the education sector to provide training and retraining to both skilled and unskilled

workers. In the crisis year 1997, the PCER envisioned an Edutopia or a “society of open and lifelong education to allow each and every individual equal and easy access to education at any time and place.”⁴² The World Education Forum provided a platform for the assessment of these initiatives, at the direction of UNESCO. Korean education experts from several Korean Universities and research institutes worked with UNESCO on the report, which identified the following obstacle to educational modernisation:

Korean education in recent decades has focused on a quick adoption of advanced knowledge and skills from developed countries. However, the period when Korea blindly mimics the developed countries is over and Korea should now adopt a creative and independent problem solving approach to meet her particular and unique needs.⁴³

But elsewhere, the same international organisation also notes that Korea cannot forget “international standards”, despite the intention to forget “quick adoption... from developed countries”:

Globalization is compelling the leading sectors of national economies to compete in rapidly changing resources and to achieve international standards of quality and productivity. Every country will therefore be obliged to enable citizens to acquire the education and skills necessary to survive...⁴⁴

So despite limited admission and the advice to harness the pressures of external forces, the nation was advised to take “international standards” very seriously. Obstacles to reform could be placed on workers as well as government and management, who were all expected to pay heed to calls for reform. In this regard international rules began to penetrate individuals’ life experiences.

In 2001, Chung Tae Sung, Secretary General of the Federation of Korean Industries (FKI) warned the nation that in a time of declining employment of young college graduates, only increased labour market flexibility could aid for a revival of industrial competitiveness and increase employment. Korea would have to revise corporate regulations on items such as “days off” and “special leave” and bring them into line with “international standards, prior to the full scale implementation of a five-day workweek system”.⁴⁵ What else would it take to convince the international business community of Korea’s competitiveness and durability during the emerging Knowledge Economy? Even in 2005, the Korean Minister of Labour Kim, Dae Hwan, apologized to foreign CEOs for Korea’s inability to offer a fully flexible labour market.⁴⁶ The Minister stressed that CEOs should not hold the Ministry fully accountable for this flaw, but that management and workers should also be critiqued.

Perhaps the most important evidence of attempts to reorganise according to supposedly immutable demands of the global economy and with international partnerships is seen in the formation of organic intellectuals armed with an understanding of the knowledge based development model and suggested widespread impact on VET. On 9th February 1996, the Korea Research Institute for Vocational Education and Training (KRIVET) was proposed as a part of the Educational Reform for the Construction of a New Vocational Education System. By the 27th March of the following year, the KRIVET Act (Act. No.5315) went into affect. The Institute was then founded on 10th September 1997 as a government funded institution, just as the economic crisis erupted across Asia. Since 1997 KRIVET has controlled vocational education and HR, and composed curricula that complimented the government’s reform and recovery strategies.

Table 2 represents part of an OECD/World Bank report that would have informed UNEVOC's decisions in relation to training schemes.

KRIVET has acted as a type of consulting firm for the government.⁴⁷

KRIVET's first responsibility was to give guidelines for qualification and background for developing VET curriculum. Later, more responsibilities were placed on researchers having to do with comparative research projects and international performance standards analyses. Soon after its formation, KRIVET became involved in a cooperative OECD/ILO/ APEC/UNESCO project called the International Project on Technical and Vocational Education (UNEVOC). Since 1993, UNEVOC had established regional centres across the world in France, Australia, China and Saudi Arabia to form a network of technical and vocational convergence centres. In Korea the government invited UNEVOC to merge with KRIVET in 1997, and by 2000 this centre had become the Asia Pacific UNEVOC Regional Centre.

Table 2

Situation up to Crisis	Ongoing Reforms	Remaining Issues
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labour legislation, labour relations, and industrial and market structures contributed to rigidity in the Korean labour market, which reduced the speed with which Korea could adapt to changing competitive pressures. • Insufficient emphasis on firm-based training and labour retraining. • Significant employment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Korea has revised labour laws to legalise layoffs and increase flexibility of labour market. • The government has begun to focus on the need to provide retraining. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial relations, make worker benefits fully portable, reorient training schemes to meet demands of a more flexible economy, and ease restrictions on temporary workers. This requires greater awareness-raising and buy-in from labour. • Needs to redress the inequality of access in job opportunities and pay for women.

discrimination on women.		
--------------------------	--	--

Source: World Bank and OECD (2000) “Korea and the Knowledge-Based Economy: Making the Transition” (World Bank, New York), p. xii.

The Seoul UNEVOC Regional Centre declares the following modus operandi:

We are dedicated to research on technical and vocational education and training (TVET) and HR development (HRD), and supporting government policies to develop the vocational capacity of its citizens through TVET as part of LLL.⁴⁸

Dialogue between KRIVET and the international community was a primary factor of integration for Korea into the extensive networks that now exist for VET conformity across nations. UNEVOC’s primary aims are to challenge, improve, and reform traditional education and training programmes in response to changing demands within the world of work. So Korean researchers quickly became networked into an international institutional web of experts with global standards. Cox states that “...elite talent from peripheral countries is co-opted into international institutions in the manner of *trasformismo*”.⁴⁹

While this caricature of cooperation offers to benefit education institutions and uses progressive terminology, what is actually occurring in Korea does not match the humanitarian initiatives and the safety net objectives of these changes. The provision of education supporting a particular type of shared meaning intends to risk of social instability that mass layoffs can trigger. If this provision, however is the only option for basic survival, then is it a concession or part of a forced programme for

modernisation, and thus a rearticulation of hierarchies rather than the reduction of power dynamics that Aggarwal celebrates?⁵⁰

The World Bank and the UN joined forces to encourage the “entire development community” to recognise the centrality of knowledge production for continued economic competitiveness. The “development community” was challenged to create the international public goods necessary to help developing nations survive in the knowledge economy.⁵¹ Into the 21st century, on 20th December 2002, the General Assembly of the United Nations declared the UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development beginning on the 1st of January 2005 (resolution 57/254)⁵². UNESCO was given the responsibility to act as head agency for the promotion of this decade and was asked to draft an international implementation scheme. This scheme would include recommendations for VET across nations.

The World Bank 1998/99 World Development Report emphasises the role of knowledge for economic advancement and social wellbeing, and heralds knowledge as the ultimate goal for economic growth and sustainable development. But these reports overlook specific life changes simultaneous to ways of learning that are increasingly associated with the most valuable skills for corporate productivity. In 1999, UNESCO’s Deputy Director General for Education spoke for the international community stressing that “every country must adapt its technical and vocational education and training (TVET) programme to cater to the skills requirements of its workplace of the 21st century”. He emphasised that VET plays a prominent role in promoting the next generation of “individuals” who will manage nations’ “socio-economic development”. UNESCO aims to emphasise the “acquisition of entrepreneurial skills, creativity, team and communication skills as part of TVET”.⁵³

Lee points out that “a new paradigm for vocational education and training is needed to enhance competitive power in the area of technology and to keep pace with changes in a knowledge and information based society”.⁵⁴ Professionals at the forum “Building the Knowledge Society” in 2004 in Seoul, which was a part of a series of meetings convening from 1997 of the UNESCO Korean National Commission’s 21st Century Dialogues, did not seem to recognise the power relations embedded within this dialogue. Knowledge becomes a desired commodity for workers’ own achievement status; but despite the authorship of desirable knowledge or the methods to acquire competitive forms of commodified knowledge are important aspects of the debate, these factors are not accounted for. This phenomenon is not restricted to ICT or its obvious home within education but has become an integral aspect for health and engineering sectors. It is becoming an increasingly important topic for the globalisation of employability in the contemporary age, but again, several aspects seem to have been forgotten in the dialogue, such as the origins for sought knowledge and work practices, and the impact that changes will have on workers and the political status of workers over time.

The Director of the Lifelong Education Policy Division, Ministry of Education and Human Resources delivered a paper at the 2004 Seoul forum entitled “Direction of Lifelong Education Policy for 2004 of the Ministry of Education and Human Resources”.⁵⁵ The objective of lifelong education, Mr. Kim stressed, is the realisation of a capability oriented LLL society, and LLL policy aims to increase employment opportunities and will improve the quality of individuals’ lives. LLL will encourage social integration, he claimed, as well as build a strong knowledge based country that can compete with advanced nations. Does this mean that individuals will not have to compete with one another, but that workers’ mutual goals toward the establishment of

a nationally based knowledge society will simply allow the nation to become competitive at the global level? Lee of KEDI seemed to directly associate the idea of competitiveness of individuals, enterprises and countries with goals for acquisition, contingent on abilities to “develop intangible resources and a knowledge base, such as ideas, insight and information which can commercialise the intangible resources, rather than on physical assets.”⁵⁶ So, all parties would be expected to work toward transformations of capabilities around these goals, which is crucial to consider for a wider perspective of the impacts that VET transformation in conjunction with international standards will have on workers’ lives.

From Pedagogy to Andragogy: Learning to Know, Knowing to Learn?

This section looks further at the changes to control forms and the camouflage of hierarchies in the workplace amidst the shift from manufacturing to service industries in post-industrial economies.⁵⁷ Strategies for management control have deemphasised specific types of labour power and physical behaviour, and increasingly investigate the “mind-power and subjectivities of employees”⁵⁸ which, if managed correctly, will result in corporate “excellence”.⁵⁹ But Schiller reminds us that the value of information only exists as a result of social reorganisation and accumulation.⁶⁰

To periodise the commodification for societies’ competition to achieve valuable production characteristics over time, and the conditions within which they have occurred such as impact on workers’ lives, Jessop⁶¹ shows that within agricultural economies land was a tradable commodity, and during the industrialisation of economies, capital and manufacture labour took the place of land. On the other hand, the Information Age requires workers to demonstrate the cultivation of assets including skills, knowledge, and innovation for their participation in nations’ economic successes. Jessop claims that analyses which distinguish between

historicised periods in the described manner often overlook specific factors of production, including the conditions and criteria by which these assets become part of the economic process. They also overlook the means by which actors reach a place within certain economic systems via class relations and educational reform. During Korean industrialisation, social learning was managed by “restricted formality”, wherein knowledge was codified and restricted to specifically demarcated disciplines that promoted a certain active discipline.⁶²

At the World Conference on Science in 1999, UNESCO experts declared that “...the future of humankind will become more dependent on the equitable production, distribution, and use of knowledge than ever before.”⁶³ Cox reminds us that in the contemporary ages, production includes the production of knowledge as well as material goods.⁶⁴ Workers’ knowledge and capabilities have become important for the competitiveness of Korea’s production, and this section discusses the conditions within which Korea has aimed to introduce the commodification of knowledge at every class stratum of worker to enhance production. These moves are part of the initiative to “strengthen the vocational training system, in order to produce skilled manpower to meet changing industrial demands”.⁶⁵

Knowledge based development goals challenge the Fordist development model through creating ambiguity between physical and mental labour, and place knowledge squarely within the process of production. Cogburn, Director of the Centre for Information Society Development in Africa and Africa Regional Director of the Global Information Infrastructure Commission claims that *all* OECD nations are adapting to this production model through strategic shifts in private and public sector projects.⁶⁶ Education systems must globalise for survival in the contemporary age. Technological innovations at the sectoral level spread rapidly due to globalisation and

a workforce educated into the understanding of this phenomenon is needed to manage this expansion. But how will nations prepare their workforces for this kind of transformation? What will cultivate the manpower needed for the knowledge economy?

The pedagogical model of instruction was soon discounted as a method for worker training in knowledge economies of merit, though it has pervaded education for centuries and was relied upon during Korean industrialisation for the creation of manpower. Pedagogical methods originated in the monastic schools of Europe in the Middle Ages and formulate the foundation for Western learning and teaching styles, which are reflected in Confucian teaching and learning in the East. The word *pedagogy* is a derivative of a Greek word that means *child*, which is added to the suffix *agogos* meaning *leading*.⁶⁷ In the Middle Ages, monks instructed young men to play the “right” role of students to the church. Roles are thus defined; instructors formulated all knowledge that is necessary for students. The Calvinist conviction was that knowledge is fundamentally evil and must be channelled to children in an appropriately restricted and regulated way, a belief that may have played a role in the perpetuation of this accepted teaching arrangement.⁶⁸ In Confucian Korea, education involved a similar relationship between the teacher and the taught.

The pedagogical model assumes that learners are dependent upon an instructor, and readiness to learn revolves around specific, subject based examinations and assessment, and motivation emerges from material, external pressures.⁶⁹ Knowles introduced the idea of andragogy to worker training, and compares the traditional “Pedagogical Model” to a contrasting “Andragogical Model”. With the post-modernization of education, “andragogy” is becoming an increasingly accepted teaching/learning style. This style of learning infers expanded student involvement,

requiring several unprecedented qualities of the learner: “voluntariness; readiness to learn... self directed learning activities that are based on their own wants, needs and styles; and the opportunity to decide which life situations or challenges the adult(s) will centre their learning quest on.”⁷⁰

The andragogical model works for learners who are usually considered to be self directing adults who have a different impetus to learn than that of children. Learners learn when they “need” to learn for life purposes.⁷¹ A debate surrounding Knowles’ introduction of andragogy to the management discourse ensued his polemical claims, and scholars began to question whether a distinction between the ages and learning styles was appropriate. Dr. Lee of KEDI was critical of the endless association of LLL with adult education, which the andragogical model implies; she stated that this kind of education should begin much younger for the learning style to be effective.⁷² But what has not been fully assessed is the link between this style of education and training and corporate cultural reform.

Knowledge based economies require a technologically driven highly skilled labour force, but workers are increasingly expected to be capable of individually producing knowledge and working toward unprecedented innovations. While innovation once simply meant “doing something new”,⁷³ it has come to include “softer” innovations within flexible and ever changing industries.⁷⁴ The difference between information and knowledge lies in these products’ (sic) accumulation processes. *Information* simply refers to data, while *knowledge* requires cognitive structures that process and contextualises information.⁷⁵ Knowledge is shared or transferred, and workers in a learning society should learn how to acquire tacit, as well as traditionally learned, explicit knowledge. In post-industrial economies, where

knowledge is a competitive asset, explicit knowledge is codified and involves know how, and can be transferred through documentation and specific training.

Tacit knowledge on the other hand, is acquired through “direct experience”⁷⁶ of informal practices, and cannot be codified or taught in the same way as explicit knowledge. Polanyi emphasised that knowledge can never be separate from the tacit form, and so individuals’ subjectivity is the most important criteria for aggressive knowledge creation and transfer, but this point is often misinterpreted. Increasingly, workers are told to adopt both explicit and tacit abilities for knowledge acquisition, as though they are mutually exclusive. While Koreans have been exposed to flexibility in the material sense, the softer innovations and knowledge acquisition discussed here involve unprecedented, essential skills.

The ILO advocates a style of learning in the post-industrial age that “enhances ‘trainability’ [and] thus employability”.⁷⁷ The emphasis has shifted toward VET programmes that are directed toward a new type of learner who is to become involved in self-directed acquisition of tacit knowledge, which the andragogical model invites. “Learning for employability” means, in practice, that the individual worker must become capable of finding, changing, keeping, or generating employment over a lifetime. Contu (et al) challenge the assumption of the inherent virtue of learning in the global knowledge economy, stating that “the promotion of an enquiring mind and love for learning, social inclusion and personal development does not necessarily have much to do with an adaptable labour force and economic competitiveness”.^{78, 79} The Korean government believes that “learning” plays an important role in post-industrial development, and its “Goals and Strategies of the National Human Resources Policy” advocate the strength and “capacity of individuals”⁸⁰ to “learn”, in conjunction with the creation of new sources for economic growth.⁸¹

Pedagogical learning is championed within universities, but this unidirectional model is gradually losing status in the knowledge economy. Knowledge is increasingly produced via a new set of exchanges.⁸² So for employability, workers need to acquire “life skills adaptable to new evolving contexts”.⁸³ UNEVOC authors claim that: “Knowledge management is the tool to efficiently connect those who know with those who need to know” and recommends a group of “prerequisites” to encourage knowledge sharing and management. “We”, this international organisation emphasised, “must convince those who know to share their knowledge with those who need to know”. Within the workplace, the manifesto recognises, an unprecedented culture of information and communication must be created, and all existing knowledge must be converted to digital format and made globally available. This idealistic logic does not make specific suggestions for achievement, but provides a foundation for knowledge management, production, exchange, and ultimately, the commodification of knowledge.

KRIVET made the following recommendations for educational reforms in response to a growing need for an educated, highly skilled workforce within the technology industry. These publicly funded researchers emphasise that basic education for essential skills should become a priority for training, within integrated schools. LLL should “be expanded” in order to help every citizen, which blurs the line of responsibility for education. Overall, though, workers have been encouraged to take on new learning styles that are andragogical rather than pedagogical, to become self motivated lifelong learners, and to become subjective individuals with the ability to acquire both tacit and explicit knowledge. So responsibility has shifted; workers are required to become masters’ of their own capabilities in what appears at first reading, to hold the potential for autonomy and empowerment.

A history of antagonistic labour relations in Korea however adds another dimension to this optimistic aim. The top down relationship between the state and workers, even after the official declaration of democracy in 1987, allowed the state to implement institutions facilitating its neoliberal internationalisation economic drive and to propagate elite and externally led accumulation strategies without consensus. Even since the transition to democracy, the legacy of authoritarian leadership has not subsided significantly.⁸⁴

Conclusion

Training programmes in Korea thus have begun to prompt new forms of consolidation and convergence that would dissolve any left over knowledge of cultural norms and practices, and could ultimately fragment any terrain for resistance or negotiation with the state-led and internationally informed internationalisation strategies. New forms of knowledge and learning have become commodified assets in the international environment, and were translated into Korea's VET programmes in order to train workers into global norms of competitive, post-industrial economies. The LLL movement is, in both Korea and globally, a rearticulation of the basic exploitative elements of capitalism, which amount to class subordination and struggle. In this piece, I have highlighted an elite led project designed toward the removal of possibilities for resistance and organisation through, in this case, a glossing over of authority figures through the removal of instructor (boss/manager) which in a "learning" scenario lends only one source of blame, or the subjects of workers/learners themselves. Self directed career goals and an andragogical learning framework in effect reduce stakeholders' liability for workers' job security in the knowledge-based workplace.⁸⁵ My interest for building a body of ongoing research is

to look more closely at the internationalisation of this movement and how it is becoming increasingly propagated globally.

Social relations of production include the formation of skills and the utility and applicability of those skills in the labour force. Cox reasons that the increase of adoption of similar processes of production relations at the national level to liberal world order have transpired via British and later American inspired global hegemony beginning in the early 19th century.⁸⁶ This process requires “tapping into” the national consciousness through ideological diffusion. The adoption of prioritised production relations in Korea has required more than a “natural” evolution of norms, but has required top-down strategies of inclusion. But without a voice for workers, restructuring initiated by transnational entities and government groups has not led to a case of hegemonic resolution. The government has adjusted VET through a prioritisation of transnational relationships and has neglected to consult with national Unions, the Employers’ Association, and any other possible participants. Corporate restructuring of Korean companies during the crisis recovery period following 1997 resulted in sudden demands upon the labour market: flexibility, and new skills requirements for ongoing, or renewed employability. Cultural work practices and the knowledge and ideas that have surrounded their evolution have traditionally been slow to change.⁸⁷ However, management in merged corporate environments very quickly placed unprecedented expectations on workers who struggled to reach the basic level of employability in a new phase of globalisation and development.

Thrift⁸⁸ provides a critical discussion of some actual management strategies to help workers become creative and selfdriven workers, including digital storytelling and the practice of applying modes of performance to business situations such as “Readers’ Theatres” which involve employees’ enactment of business scenarios, and

the commissioning of external artistic groups who brighten up training to instigate brainstorming and creative thinking toward solutions. He notes that a “new set of embodied resources” including knowledge itself are now available to firms that are designed to cultivate the space for innovation and the constant, accelerated creation of new products. In turn, businesses are intent on providing workers with the kinds of training needed to help workers adapt to the constantly moving business world that demands innovation and creation. But he asks whether the context for this world, which he calls “Land’s End” capitalism of niceties and community orientation, is in fact a manifestation of a new imperialism within which certain types of individuals become branded with evolutionary advantage. Rather than maps of climate change and skull types, “major airports and educational systems” could be our maps toward understanding *Homo Silicon Valleycus*⁸⁹ in this nascent business ecology.

Specific changes to expectations placed upon workers for learning and employability in Korea demonstrate the result of shifts made toward the knowledge economy model that are occurring within the context of a newly emerging brand of imperialism. No research venture has successfully calculated or monitored the outcome of changes that revolutionised VET has had on nations’ advancement in the global political economy,⁹⁰ but this increasingly transnational phenomenon will continue to affect pressures upon workers to become self directed and creative knowledge workers. The post-industrial network society⁹¹ requires workers who can adapt to new kinds of learning, or to the society that enhances “trainability” from a very different angle than pedagogical training implies. For workers, LLL means that they will have to learn to respond to changing markets and become competent in flexible skills that allow for job security and mobility within markets. Workers will have to master the transfer of core competencies rather than concentrate on job

specific skills alone. In response to changing technology, enterprises will alter work organization and expect workers to promote growth. For states with the goal of full employment, the responsibility to create labour markets with these capabilities is a continuing priority, and Korea is no exception.

Two paradoxes, however, are evident throughout the discussion here. First, how can workers be trained to train themselves and become more involved in their own acquisition of knowledge, and to take responsibility for their own employability, in a situation of forced corporate transformation and training requirements? The second paradox is that recent training toward employability intends to instigate workers' autonomy, but excludes any possibility for critical reflection or *Wertrationalitat*.⁹² Amoores⁹³ has written about worker resistance in various forms at the day-to-day company level. However, a philosophical revolution will need to occur, in order to challenge the pressures to reform individual employability both behaviourally and cognitively around recent development norms.

¹ Raj Aggarwal, "Technology and Globalization as mutual reinforcers in business: Reorienting strategic thinking for the new millennium" *Management International Review*, Vol. 39 (1999) pp. 83 – 104.

² *Ibid.*

³ Thomas Peters and Robert Waterman, *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies* (London: Harper and Row, 1982).

⁴ See, for example Jean-Claude Usunier, *International and Crosscultural Management Research* (London: Sage, 1998).

⁵ I will not comment extensively on discussions of the meaning of culture as applied to rapidly transforming business environment in conjunction with informationalisation movements, but these ideas are expanded in for example Paul du Gay and Michael Pryke (eds.) *Cultural Economy: Cultural Analysis and Commercial Life* (London: Sage, 2002). The culturalisation of economies' workers has also been documented by such authors as Manuel Castells, *The Rise of the Network Society second edition* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000); Scott M. Lash and John Urry, *Economies of Signs and Space* (London: Sage, 1994); Charles Leadbeater, *Living on Thin Air: The New Economy* (Harmondsworth: Viking, 1999); Paul du Gay (ed.), *Production of Culture/Cultures of Production* (London: Sage, 1997); and Laurence Ray and Andrew Sayer (eds.), *Culture and Economy after the Cultural Turn* (London: Sage, 1999).

⁶ Hugh Wilmott, "Strength is ignorance; slavery is freedom: Managing culture in modern organizations" *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (1993), pp. 515-552.

⁷ Nigel Thrift, *Knowing Capitalism* (London: Sage, 2005).

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 113-117. Thrift talks about the 'new economy', which was first defined in the 1980s and became a kind of brand in itself to describe a picture of restructuring based around the rapid escalation of information and technology-driven societies.

- ⁹ Nikolas Rose, *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self* (London: Free Association Books, 1999).
- ¹⁰ C. S. Myers, *Industrial Psychology in Great Britain* (London: Cape, 1927), quoted in *Ibid.*
- ¹¹ Rose, *op. cit.*, p. 119.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, p. 112.
- ¹³ UK Competitiveness White Paper, *Aims: Government and Business in the Knowledge Economy*, no. 1.5 (1998), available: http://www.dti.gov.uk/comp/competitive/wh_ch1_1.htm. Amoore writes that experts condone technology as a structure and an agent, and attempt to universalise a belief in the “Best” Technology, And Its Attainment As A Primary Goal. See Louise Amoore *Globalisation Contested: An International Political Economy of Work* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), and Louise Amoore “Globalisation, the Industrial Society and Labour Flexibility” *Global Society* Vol. 12, No. 1 (1998), pp. 49-74.
- ¹⁴ Alessia Contu, Christopher Grey and Anders Ortenblad, “Against Learning”, *Human Relations*, Vol. 56, No. 8 (2003), pp. 931-952.
- ¹⁵ Phil Brown, Ant Hesketh, and Sarah Williams “Employability in a Knowledge-Driven Economy”, *Journal of Education and Work*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (2003), pp. 107-26 (p. 114).
- ¹⁶ Michael Perelman, *Class Warfare in the Information Age* (New York: St Martins Press, 1998).
- ¹⁷ UNESCO and the ILO have been the leaders in this dialogue. As early as 1945, UNESCO’s member states declared that they believed in “full and equal opportunities for education for all, in the unrestricted pursuit of objective truth, and in the free exchange of ideas and knowledge”. Perhaps this is the basis for a renewed interest in workers’ knowledge management and self-directed knowledge acquisition. See for example ILO, *Changing Role of Government and Other Stakeholders in Vocational Education and Training*, Training Policies and Systems Branch, Employment and Training Department (ILO, 1999), available: <http://www.unesco.org/education/educprog/tve/nseoul/docse/rcrolgve.html>; Carolyn Medel-Añonuevo (ed.) *Integrating Lifelong Learning Perspectives* (UNESCO Institute for Education, 2002); World Education Forum held in Dakar, Senegal in 2000, Education for All (EFA), available: <http://www.unescobkk.org/index.php?id=365>.
- ¹⁸ Young-jun Kim, “Direction of Lifelong Education Policy for 2004 of the Ministry of Education and Human Resources” paper presented at UNESCO 21st Century Dialogue international forum “Building Knowledge Societies” (Seoul, Korea, July 2004).
- ¹⁹ Jae Boon Lee, “Strategy for Developing Lifelong Learning in Korea”, International Seminar on the *Lifelong Learning Society and Knowledge Revolution in the 21st Century* (Jeju, Korea September 2004).
- ²⁰ Interview held at the KEDI in Seoul, Korea, on 10/04/05.
- ²¹ International Monetary Fund (IMF), *Stand-By Arrangement: Summary of the Economic Program, Republic Of Korea* (December 5, 1997), available: <http://www.imf.org/external/np/oth/korea.htm>
- ²² K. H. Hong, “Lifelong Learning in the Knowledge-based Society: Issues and Lessons in Korea”, speech delivered at Making Lifelong Learning a Reality, *International Policy Seminar of IIEP/UNESCO and KRIVET* (UNESCO, 2003).
- ²³ F. K. Park and J. H. Lee, “The Social Impact of the Financial Crisis: Labour Market Outcomes and Policy Responses in Korea” (Korea Labour Institute, 1999).
- ²⁴ Kim Dae Jung, Inaugural Address, 1998. Quote from Dal Yong Jin, “Socioeconomic Implications of Broadband Services: Information Economy in Korea”, *Information, Communication, and Society*, Vol. 8, No. 4 (2005), pp. 503 – 523 (p. 508).
- ²⁵ Business Korea, “Facing the nation” (Business Korea Ltd., 1998), p. 7.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 7 – 8.
- ²⁷ Stephanie Strom, “Labour Cutbacks Pose Problem for South Korean Economic Recovery”, *New York Times*, February 24 (1998), p. 4.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*
- ²⁹ C. Rowley and J.S. Bae, “Globalization and Transformation of human resource management in South Korea”, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 13, No. 1, (2002) pp. 522-549; p. 534; I. Ledemel and E. Dahl “Public Works Programs in Korea: A Comparison to Active Labour Market Policies and Workfare in Europe and the USA”, in F. Park, Y-B Park, G. Betcherman, and A. Dar (eds) *Labour Market Reforms in Korea: Policy Options for the Future* (World Bank and Korea Labour Institute, 2001), pp. 196-214; p. 205.
- ³⁰ D. J. Park, J. Park, and G.-C. Yu, “Assessment of Labour Market Response to the Labour Law Changes Introduced in 1998”, in F. Park, Y.-B. Park, G. Betcherman, and A. Dar (eds.) *Labour Market Reforms in Korea: Policy Options for the Future* (Seoul: World Bank and Korea Labour Institute), pp. 125-150.

-
- ³¹ *Ibid.*
- ³² Author's interview with a Korean Federation of Metalworkers union leader, BASF Yosun site, Seoul, Korea, 14 August, 2002.
- ³³ Korea International Labour Foundation (KOILAF), "Changes in the Employment Structure: Recent Developments, Current Labour Situation in Korea" (KOILAF, 1999), available: <http://www.koilaf.org/publication/link16.htm#4>
- ³⁴ S. B. Uh, "Employment: Structure, Trends and New Issues", *Labour Relations in Korea* (KOILAF, 1999), pp. 50, 51. At a KOILAF-organised meeting for foreign CEOs on 15/04/05, attended by the present author, the Minister of Labour apologised for Korea's inability to have reached international standards for HR flexibility.
- ³⁵ This information was gathered from author's interview conducted with Dr. Ji Hee Choi, researcher at KRIVET in Seoul, Korea, August 9th 2002.
- ³⁶ KRIVET, *Technical and Vocational Education and Training in Korea* (Seoul: KRIVET, 2000), p. 8.
- ³⁷ See Phoebe Moore 'Revolutions from Above: Worker Training as Trasformismo in South Korea', *Capital and Class*, No. 86, (2005), pp. 39-72.
- ³⁸ C. S. Ihm, "VET Reform and Lifelong Learning in Korea", *Journal of Education and Work*, Vol. 12, No. 3 (1999), pp. 309-321.
- ³⁹ Tae-Dong Kim, "Challenges of Globalization to Korea", *Korea in the OECD Perspective: Shaping Up for Globalization* (Seoul: Korea Institute for International Economic Policy, 2000).
- ⁴⁰ Leslie Sklair, *The Transnational Capitalist Class* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), pp. 18 – 23.
- ⁴¹ Robert W. Cox, "Social forces, states and world orders: beyond international relations theory," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 2 (summer 1981), pp. 126-155.
- ⁴² UNESCO, "Country Report: Education for All, the Year 2000 Assessment", available: <http://www2.unesco.org/wef/countryreports/korea/contents.html#cont>
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁴ UNESCO, "Establishment of a Long Term Programme for the Development of TVET", *General Conference 30th Session*, Paris 1999, available at: <http://66.102.7.104/search?q=cache:tsYZI-3e0bwJ:www.unevoc.unesco.org/annex/30c17e.pdf+UNESCO+international+standards+korea+lifelong+learning&hl=en&client=safari>
- ⁴⁵ Min Hee Kim, "Employers and workers are partners: new labour culture seeks co-prosperity through coexistence (Ministry of Labour)", *The Korea Herald* (Wednesday, 34/11/99), p. 18.
- ⁴⁶ Dr. Kim, Dae Hwan, Korean Minister of Labour, "Labour Policy Directions 2005", KOILAF-organised breakfast meeting in Seoul, Korea, 15/04/05 (meeting attended by author).
- ⁴⁷ Since 1997, most government ministries in Korea organized supplementary research institutes of a similar calibre to KRIVET.
- ⁴⁸ Information available on KRIVET homepage, available: <http://www.krivet.re.kr/krivet-hm/eh/index.html>
- ⁴⁹ Robert W. Cox, "Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations: An Essay in Method", *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (Summer, 1983), pp. 162-75, p. 173. *Trasformismo* is a government strategy of assimilation of views or habits via conjunctural imposed changes. Gramsci wrote about this concept in the context of the Risorgimento and competing parties' process of amalgamation, but the concept also involves material projects which minimalise the chances for workers' revolution; see Moore 'Revolutions from Above: Worker Training as Trasformismo in South Korea', *op. cit.*
- ⁵⁰ Aggarwal, *op. cit.*
- ⁵¹ World Bank, *World Development Report* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998/99).
- ⁵² In October 2004, education experts to settle the agenda for this decade International Experts Meeting on Technical and Vocational Education and Training in Bonn, Germany called *Learning for Work, Citizenship and Sustainability*, available: <http://www.unevoc.unesco.org/sustainable/index.htm>.
- ⁵³ UNESCO (1999) *Final Report, Second International Conference on Technical and Vocational Education* (Paris: UNESCO), p. 29.
- ⁵⁴ K. Lee, "New direction of Korea's vocational education and training policy", paper presented at International Conference on TVET, Adelaide, Australia (2001).
- ⁵⁵ Young-jun Kim, "Direction of Lifelong Education Policy for 2004 of the Ministry of Education and Human Resources", *Focus IV: Colloquium on the Lifelong Learning Society, UNESCO and Korea*, Newsletter of Korean National Commission for UNESCO (2004), available: http://www.unesco.or.kr/unescokorea/past_no3/index.html
- ⁵⁶ Lee, "Strategy for Developing Lifelong Learning in Korea", *op. cit.*

⁵⁷ For a more specific discussion of what is expected of the worker in the Korean knowledge economy, such as individualism, flexibility and LLL, see Phoebe Moore, *Globalisation and Labour Struggle in Asia: A Neo-Gramscian Critique Of South Korea's Political Economy* (London: I.B. Tauris, forthcoming January 2007). Another good overview of the specific changes to the culture of the Korean workplace is found in Lin Bao Yun's "Labour, Capital, and the Globalisation of the Korean Economy" in James Lewis and Amadu Sesay (eds.) *Korea and Globalization: Politics, Economics and Culture* (London, Routledge Curzon, 2002) pp. 36-60; and for a historically contextualised series of events linking education and training policy with development goals see "South Korea" in David Ashton, Francis Green, Donna James and Johnny Sung, *Education and Training for Development in East Asia: The Political economy of skill formation in East Asian newly industrialised economies* pp. 53-77. For a discussion of Korean labour struggle as a result of industrialisation see Hagen Koo's *Korean Workers: The culture and politics of class formation* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2001), and for an excellent case study of management issues and labour uprising in one chaebol, see Seung-Ho Kwon and Michael O'Donnell's *The Chaebol and Labour in Korea: The development of management strategy in Hyundai* (London: Routledge, 2001).

⁵⁸ Mats Alvesson and Stanley Deetz, *Doing Critical Management Research* (London: Sage, 2000), p. 11.

⁵⁹ Thomas Peters and Robert Waterman, *op. cit.*

⁶⁰ Dan Schiller, "How to Think about Information", in Vincent Mosco and Jane Wasko, *The Political Economy of Information* (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988), pp. 27-44.

⁶¹ Bob Jessop, "The State and the Contradictions of the Knowledge-Driven Economy" in John R. Bryson, Peter W. Daniels, Nick Henry, and Jane Pollard (eds), *Knowledge, Space, Economy* (London: Routledge, 2001) pp. 63-78.

⁶² Soonghee Han, "Knowledge Revolution and the Emergence of Lifelong Learning: The Postmodern Condition", paper presented at International Seminar *Lifelong Learning Society and Knowledge Revolution in the 21st century* (Jeju, Korea, September 2004).

⁶³ UNESCO, "Declaration on Science and the use of Scientific Knowledge" at *Science for the 21st Century, a new commitment* World Conference on Science, Budapest, Hungary 26 June-1 July, available: http://www.unesco.org/science/wcs/eng/declaration_e.htm#knowledge

⁶⁴ Cox, "Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations: An Essay in Method", *op. cit.*, p. 39.

⁶⁵ KOILAF, *Labour Relations in Korea* (Seoul: KOILAF, 1999), p. 108.

⁶⁶ Derrick L. Cogburn, "Globalization, Knowledge, Education and Training in the Information Age", (Centre for Information Society Development in Africa, Working Paper 2005), available: http://www.unesco.org/webworld/infoethics_2/eng/papers/paper_23.htm

⁶⁷ Malcolm Knowles, *The adult learner: A neglected species* (3rd edition) (Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing, 1984), pp. 8, 9.

⁶⁸ Marcia L. Conner, "Andragogy and Pedagogy", *Ageless Learner* 1997-2004, available: <http://agelesslearner.com/intros/andragogy.html>

⁶⁹ Malcolm Knowles, *Andragogy in Action. Applying modern principles of adult education* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1984).

⁷⁰ Malcolm Knowles, *The Modern Practice of Adult Education. From pedagogy to andragogy* (2nd edition) (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Cambridge Adult Education 1980).

⁷¹ Knowles, pp. 9-12.

⁷² Information attained during author's interview with Dr. Lee, Jae-Boon, Director General of the Centre for Lifelong Education, KEDI, 19/04/05.

⁷³ Paul Stoneman, "Introduction" in Paul Stoneman (ed.), *Handbook of Economics of Innovation and Technological Change* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1995), pp. 1 – 13, p. 3.

⁷⁴ Jeremy Howells, "Knowledge, Innovation and Location", in John R. Bryson et al (eds), *Knowledge, Space, Economy, op. cit.*, pp. 50-62, p. 52.

⁷⁵ See Michael Polanyi, *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1958).

⁷⁶ Howells, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

⁷⁷ ILO, *op. cit.*, 1999.

⁷⁸ Contu *et al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 942.

⁷⁹ Other critiques of education reform for human resource initiatives include Soong-hee Han "Is the lifelong learning era emerging?", *Journal of Lifelong Education*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (2002); and Hee-su Lee, "Exploring the Meaning of the Transformation from Learning Society to Learning Economy", *Journal of Lifelong Education*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (2001).

-
- ⁸⁰ The concept of “individuality” is contested as a culturally appropriate subjectivity in every context. Rosenau states that individual power is often misunderstood because advocates have “equated skills with information... have thought in terms of individuals acting alone rather than collectively... have underestimated the extent of the authority crises that are part and parcel of the transformations presently sustaining global turbulence” (James N. Rosenau, “The Skills Revolution and Restless Publics in Globalized Space”, in Michel Girard (ed.) *Individualism and World Politics*, Basingstoke: Macmillan 1999, pp. 44-68).
- ⁸¹ Republic of Korea (ROK), “Human Resources Development Strategies for Korea: Human Resources Knowledge New Takeoff” (Seoul: ROK, 2001), p. 22.
- ⁸² OECD, *Knowledge Management in the Learning Society: Education and Skills* (Paris: OECD, 2000).
- ⁸³ UNEVOC “Restructuring TVET: Current Approaches” (2002), available: <http://www.unevoc.unesco.org/donors/background/restructvet.htm>
- ⁸⁴ Samuel S. Kim, “Korea’s Democratisation in the Global-Local Nexus” in Samuel S. Kim (ed.), *Korea’s Democratisation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 39.
- ⁸⁵ Martin Kenney and Richard Florida, *Beyond Mass Production: The Japanese System and its transfer to the U.S.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); Richard Florida, “Capitalism in an Age of Innovation-Mediated Production”, 4th Annual *International Symposium on the Management of Technology: Regional Development in a Global Environment*, Montreal (October 13-14, 1993).
- ⁸⁶ Robert W. Cox, *Production, Power, and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987), p. 123.
- ⁸⁷ This information was gathered from author’s interview conducted with Dr. Mee Sook Kim, researcher at KRIVET in Seoul, Korea, August 14th 2002.
- ⁸⁸ Nigel Thrift, “Performing Cultures in the New Economy”, in Paul du Gay and Michael Pryke (eds.), *op cit.*, pp. 201-233.
- ⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 225.
- ⁹⁰ UNEVOC, “Learning for Work, Citizenship and Sustainability”, website of International Experts Meeting on Technical and Vocational Education and Training in Bonn, Germany, 25-28 October 2004, available: http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.phpURL_ID=30498&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html
- ⁹¹ Castells, *op. cit.*
- ⁹² Max Weber, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology* (3 Volumes) (New York: Bedminster Press, 1968).
- ⁹³ Amore, *Globalisation Contested*, *op. cit.*