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Ji Young Choi, “The change of Social assistance in China: the case of the Minimum Living Standard Scheme (MLSS)”
China has been undergoing large-scale socio-economic transformation in the past three decades. China’s market-oriented economic reforms have been accompanied by various social problems. Especially, economic reforms have resulted in large-scale unemployment and poverty in urban and rural areas. Almost 3.8 million workers in urban areas and more than 200 million workers in rural areas became unemployed and their life became worse off. This kind of people made new poor class in China. The Chinese government recognized this social problem, and in the late 1990s, to pacify the vulnerable social groups consisting of laid-off workers, the unemployed, retirees and poor farmers, started to reform its public assistance policy. In other words, the Chinese government established a social assistance system with the minimum living standard scheme (MLSS) as its core. Focusing on the MLSS in urban and rural China, this paper analyzes the MLSS background and the institutional development process.

How does growth ideology become internalized in even those who have not benefited from economic growth? This paper pays special attention to the fact that the growth ideology was formed in strained relationship with the discourse on welfare or redistribution. In the process of economic development, Korean political elites manipulated the symbol of welfare and fragmentized it into four categories; welfare-state as sacred ideals, state-welfare as dangerous reality, welfare-donation as ethical deeds, and workfare as contested achievement. They praised sublimity of welfare-state as the future ‘imagined community’ to unify and to mobilize diverse social groups into one nation. Regarding the demands of state-welfare, which emphasized the needs and rights of immediate redistribution, the political elites, however, denounced it as premature, dangerous, and tainted, stigmatizing those who claimed it as spoiled. Instead, the political elites exalted and encouraged welfare-donation, which was done through reciprocal relationships among individuals, dumping the dirty work on the private sphere. Furthermore, in more tacit dimension, they embedded the concept of workfare in the everyday lives of people. The New Village Movement policies implemented in rural villages, factories and cities are particularly important in this sense; individuals in these areas experienced betterment of their living standards only in exchange for their own contribution and fierce competition with other social groups. Consequently, there had been a discrepancy
between the concepts of welfare between ones that were exalted in the sphere of “words” and ones that were experienced in the sphere of “practice”. Glorified in terms of the future but belittled in terms of the present, public welfare was represented as something that should be delayed whereas conception of pro-growth and targeted welfare became dominant in everyday lives. It was this discrepancy that gave the growth ideology priority over its counterpart.

Paul O'Connor, “Why Skateboarders Don’t Wear Helmets: Managing Risk at Hong Kong’s Public Skateparks”

Skateboarding has a global reach and has been shortlisted for inclusion in the 2020 Olympic Games. How can we make sense of the fact that this risky pursuit is commonly performed without helmets? This research looks at attitudes to helmet use by applying Lyng’s (1990) concept of edgework. It focuses on the introduction of a mandatory helmet rule in a skatepark in Hong Kong and contrasts the practices and opinions of users with content of skateboard media. It finds that choice and competence is an important component of attitudes to helmet use. It argues that the valorisation of skateboarding is part of a larger process of the confused neoliberal appropriation and sanitising of risk taking activities. Helmet use represents a swing between two poles, one of the anarchy of edgework, and one of conformity to the self-interests of neoliberalism.

Kang, Sou Hwan, “The Cause and Effect of the Entrepreneurship in Organizations: Focus on Organizational Members”

As today’s society is hyper-competitive, many researchers have recognized the ‘entrepreneurship’ as a very important element in the organizational management for survival and growth. In turn this research explores “What are the conditions for formation of entrepreneurship and the effects of entrepreneurship in organization?” However, the prior researches for entrepreneurship have neglected ‘the members within organizations’ when they analyzed the cause and effect of entrepreneurship. The conditions of formation from previous studies are focused on ‘external environment’ of organizations, such as rules, culture, and norms in their society. Organizational members have been completely ignored, even researchers consider the actors in organization, because the earlier studies only analyzed personal propensity and characteristics of entrepreneurs and manager. And the results of entrepreneurship from conventional researches are limited to economic profit, return on investment, and productivity. Eventually, past researches have not examined how entrepreneurship impacted on the members who are working within organizations. The reason why organizational members are important to consider as a research object
is that they are directly involved in the execution of corporation. Because if they did not move to fulfill business strategies, the strategies are a chip in porridge. In addition, the degree of organizational performance is depending upon how actively and aggressively organizational members work at their job. This study deals with the ‘institutional characteristics within organizations’ which constitute an internal organizational atmosphere as the conditions for formation of entrepreneurship. These are the organizational ‘rule’, ‘cognitive-culture’, and ‘norm.’ And this study treats ‘organizational commitment’ as the result of entrepreneurship. These supplementary works in this study are ‘bringing the organizational members back in’ entrepreneurship researches. This study proposes that entrepreneurship has two dimensions: ‘risk-taking’ and ‘innovativeness.’ And organizational commitment is dealt with three dimensions: ‘affective’, ‘normative’, and ‘continuance.’ They are ‘identification’, ‘dedication’, and ‘loyalty.’ This study uses Human Capital Corporate Panel Data (2013) to analyze the formation process of entrepreneurship through Structural Equation Modeling (SEM).