----------(1994), "Reflections on the non-economic factors in Korea's economic development." Pp. in Seung Yung Kwack (ed.) *The Korean Economy at a Crossroad.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Kim Song-Guk and Lim Hyun-Chin (1972), "Korean society and social science" In *Korean Journal of Sociology (Han'guksahoehak)* (in Korean).

Schwartz, Benjamin (1985), *The World of Thought in Ancient China.* Cambridge, MA: The Belkap Press.

Shin Yong-Ha (1994) "Proposals for the development of 'creative Korean sociology', pp. 15-30 in Korean Sociological Association (ed.) *Korean Sociology in the 21st Century.* Seoul: Munhak gwa Chisongsa (in Korean).

CHAPTER 6
WESTERN THEORY, EAST ASIAN REALITIES AND THE SOCIAL

Syed Farid Alatas
National University of Singapore

Introduction

This paper aims to present a concise account of attempts to create alternative social scientific traditions in East Asia. I begin with a note on the formative phase of the social sciences in the region and then proceed to a discussion of prescriptions to indigenise and nationalise the social sciences. Here I note that for the most part, these prescriptions have a vague conception of what would constitute the alternative social science theory, methods and practice they are seeking. In conclusion, I suggest that the quest for alternatives should look to the East Asian philosophical tradition as well as popular discourse as a source of original ideas for the social sciences.

The Western Origins of the Social Sciences and the Question of Relevance

Many social sciences were introduced in China in the last century. Sociology began its career in China in the form of a translation of two chapters of Spencer's *Principles of Sociology* by Yen Fu, with a complete translation appearing in 1902 (Hsu 1931, pp.284, Huang 1987 pp.111-112). Chinese sociology can be divided into its Marxist (Maoist) variant in the People's Republic of China and American sociology in Taiwan after the communist takeover (Huang 1987, Maykovich 1987, Schmutz, 1989, pp. 7).

The social sciences were implanted in Japan from the West during the Meiji period (1868-1912) (Watanuki 1984, pp. 283) and had been profoundly influenced by both German and American sociology. In fact, a persistent characteristic of Japanese sociology today is defined by *nihonjinron* (theories of Japanese people) which are constituted by essentialised views on Japan, emphasising cultural homogeneity and historical continuity. Such culturally deterministic theories of society continued the tradition of Western scholarship on Japan in the tradition of auto-Orientalism (Lie 1996, pp.5) so characteristic of non-Western social science. In Korea in the 1970s, scholars were "awakened" to the need to establish a more creative Korean sociology (Shin 1994) (1). Nevertheless, for all the justifiable attacks against the ethnocentrism

of Western scholars, we cannot yet speak of any modern Confucian, Korean, Chinese or Japanese school in, say, sociological theory.

It is not surprising, therefore, that many scholars of this century have questioned the relevance of the social sciences for the countries of Asia. For example, the Chinese sociologist, Fei Hsiao-t'ung, writing in the 1940s, described sociological debates in Chinese universities as being "between pedants showing off their knowledge" and noted that they were based on "facts and theories derived from Western sociology" (Fei 1979, pp. 25). Because these theoretical debates were divorced from Chinese social reality, arguments were grounded in logic rather than the appeal to facts and did not lead to new questions and new avenues for observation (Fei 1979, pp. 25-26).

In the contemporary social sciences numerous examples of irrelevancy have been cited or can be identified. Consider, for example, the misreading of the cultural context in which literature is produced. Modern Chinese literature studies have been described as part of the postmodernist debate in the West (Liu 1993, pp.14). Mu Ling, however, notes that this is a misrepresentation of Chinese literature and literary criticism of the 1980s because the cultural and political contexts within which Chinese writers and critics were writing differed from that of the West. They were less involved in postmodernist debates in the West than with political struggle within China (Ling 1995, pp.420). Mu Ling shows how Huang Ziping's rereading of Wang Anyi's novella, *Xiaobao Village*, appropriated postmodernist literary ideas for a different agenda, the interest in postmodernism being to undermine Maoist literary theory and practice but under the guise of an aesthetic quest which could get past government censors (Ling 1979, pp.434-435).

Korean sociologists have been questioning the relevance of sociology in terms of its impact on Korean society and have called for a revamping of the sociology curriculum (Yang 1994, pp.31-32, Lee & Jung 1994, pp. 57-63). The need for sociology to have its own identity, to be used to improve the quality of life, and to have a predictive value was felt (Yang 1994, pp.33-34). For Korean sociology, 1970 was a landmark in that a conference entitled "Contemporary Sociological Theory and Methodology: Relevance and Applicability to Korean Society" was held. It was in this decade that the trend of exploring the problem of the relevance and applicability of Western sociology to the Korean context was established (Kim 1985, pp. 101).

The Call for the Indigenization and Nationalization of the Social Sciences in East Asia

There have been several theoretical critiques of the social sciences in non-Western societies, including the theories of Orientalism and eurocentrism, mental captivity theory, academic dependency theory, postcolonial theory, modern colonial critique, and pedagogical theories of modernization. These

will not be detailed here as they have been discussed elsewhere (Alatas 1995, 1996).

Although these critiques of the social sciences did not originate in East Asia, prescriptive works pushing for the indigenization or nationalization of the social science have appeared in the region, as outlined below.

The Nationalization of the Social Sciences

The definition of the nationalization of the social sciences can best be brought out by outlining some prominent examples from China and Taiwan.

Sociology was introduced in China at the beginning of this century by way of the translation of Spencer's *Study of Sociology* in 1903 (Gransow 1985, pp. 140, Gipouloux 1989, pp. 52). It was abolished in 1952 with historical materialism becoming its substitute (Gipouloux 1989, pp. 55-56). Marxist theory was to account for all social psychological, economic and political phenomena (Lin 1987, pp.127). The discipline was reestablished in 1979 as a result of the perception that rapid economic growth forecast for the last two decades of the century, accompanied by fundamental changes in lifestyles, values and mentalities, necessitated the restoration of sociology (Gipouloux 1989, pp.56). The nationalization of sociology in China took the form of sinicisation.

Calls for a sinicised sociology had been heard in China since the 1930s, although the understanding of what sinicisation entailed varied greatly. For some, sinicisation meant social research directed towards social reform. For others it referred to comparative community research (Gransow 1993, pp. 101). A more theoretical approach saw sinicised sociology as rooted in a national Chinese culture (Gransow 1993, pp. 101-102). It is this understanding of sinicisation that corresponds to the nationalization of social science because it involves the "incorporation into sociology as a discipline of the distinctive characteristics of Chinese society" (Lin 1987, pp. 130). This is to be distinguished from Chinese sociology which refers to the intellectual and professional activities of sociologists in China.

For Lin, the sinicisation of sociology could be measured by the degree to which Chinese characteristics attained a level of generality and were introduced into sociology (Lin 1987, pp. 130). Lin's notion of sinicisation came under attack because it equated culture with traditional Chinese culture in neo-Confucianist terms. What was needed, it was argued, was a Chinese school of sociology, a national sociology, based on the whole range of the national culture of the People's Republic of China, which included traditional, modern, national and foreign elements (Gransow 1993, pp. 108). According to another line of thinking, the revival of sociology in China should be equated with the establishment of a sinicised Marxist sociology (Cheng & So 1983, pp.484). The sinicisation programme was seen to be legitimated by the demands of a Chinese flavoured socialism. Such a sociology was to be comprised of three

positions (Gipouloux 1989, pp. 60-61, Gransow 1985, pp. 145). The first was the sinicisation of the object and methods of sociological study, which meant the study of the laws of development of the social formation that constituted China as a nation. The second involved the unity of theory and practice on the basis of Marxism and foreign experiences.

A third position in China favoured the indigenization of sociology, but insisting on the necessity of internationalising the discipline as well. Chinese sociology had hardly begun to equip itself with an orientation that gave it specificity and knowledge of foreign sociology and Chinese society was still far too fragmented (Gipouloux 1989, pp. 61).

The indigenization of the social sciences debate made its way into Taiwan by the early 1980s. It is interesting to note that at this time the terms indigenization (*bentuhua*) and sinicisation (*zhongguohua*) were understood as being interchangeable by European observers. While most Taiwanese writers during this period used the term *sinicisation of social science (2)*, European commentaries on these works used the term indigenization (Schmutz, 1989; Gransow 1993) to describe the same movement (3).

In fact, the distinction is important to the Taiwanese. C. K. Hsu noted that sinicisation is the recontextualization of Western theory with China as the point of reference. Taiwan, having its own history and culture is in need of its own recontextualization, properly referred to as indigenization (Hsu 1991, pp. 35) (4). Hsu would lay emphasis on Taiwan as the subject-matter of indigenized social science. Hence the inapplicability of the term *sinicisation*. Symbolic of this stance was the recent formal change in name of the Chinese Sociological Association in Taipei to the Taiwanese Sociological Association (5).

The use of the term indigenization in all these cases is consistent with nationalization as the reference point is the nation-state.

The Indigenization of the Social Sciences

Nevertheless, other proponents of indigenization claim that theories and concepts can be derived from the historical experiences and cultural practices of the various non-Western cultures, whether culture is defined to be co-terminous with the nation-state or otherwise (Enriquez 1994, Fahim & Helmer 1980, Lee 1979, Alatas 1993). Indigenization, however, is an amorphous term. It refers neither to a theoretical perspective nor to an intellectual movement. Rather, it is a loose category that subsumes the works of various authors from a wide variety of disciplines in the human sciences, all of which are concerned with the problem of irrelevancy and the generation of alternative scientific traditions.

The indigenization project seeks to contribute to the universalization of the social sciences by not just acknowledging but insisting that all cultures, civilizations and historical experiences must be regarded as sources of ideas. This it does by being self-conscious of cultural dependency and ethnocentrism

(Kim 1996b). If we understand indigenization in this way, it becomes clear that it is the prerequisite to the universalization of the social sciences, to the maintenance of internationally recognised standards of scholarship. In fact, indigenization has been defined in precisely these terms. In Korea, for example, indigenization (*to-chak-hwa*) refers to proceeding from research on the historical development of Korean society to universal theory (Shin 1994,pp. 21) and to "the extent to which we can digest and profitably assimilate things foreign...against the specific cultural and social backgrounds of the country" (Kwon 1979, pp. 21). Without indigenization projects throughout the world, it is one set of indigenous (Western) discourse that dominates. Furthermore, the project of indigenization is to be carried out at the level of ontological assumptions, epistemology and axiology, and empirical theory (Kim 1996b) (6).

Philosophy and Popular Discourse as Sources for Original East Asian Social Science

What is clear from the preeding discussion is that there is a strong awareness of a lack of fit between Western theory and East Asian realities, but there has been little work that has been successful in creating indigenized, nationalized or distinctively East Asian schools of thought in the social sciences. The social sciences in East Asia continue to be Western dominated and this is partly due to the degree to which general theory has been valorised, thereby making classical and contemporary Western theory the focal points of theoretical debates (Lie 1996, pp. 65). As a result the prescriptions of indigenization and nationalization have vague conceptions of what would constitute the alternative social science theory, methods and practice they are seeking.

Nevertheless, there are some candidates for theory that is self-conscious about its relevance but these have to be seriously investigated. An example would Fe Hsiao-t'ung's concept of the "gradated network" which he developed to explain the prevalence of selfishness among peasants in pre-revolutionary China (Lee 1992, pp. 84).

In this regard, it would be important to itemise the sources of theories and concepts from within the domain of local historical experiences and cultural practices. Here it is vital to make a distinction that suggests two sources. This is a distinction made by Kim Kyong-Dong in the context of Korean social science between the classical tradition (Confucianism, philosophy, etc.) and the world of popular discourse (7). Examples of utilizing the former as a resource for theorising would be drawing upon the *ying-yang* dialectic (Kim 1994a) and developing a critical "Confucian ethic" mode of analysis (Kim 1996a, 1994b).

In this respect, Kim had made an important contribution by going beyond the use of Confucianism as a subject of study to Confucianism as a resource

for conceptualization. For example, he refers to the conscious and unconscious use of Confucian elements of statecraft by the ruling elite for rationalizing central authoritarian rule. But he also uses a framework of analysis based on the idea of *yin-yang* dialectics. In this framework, democratization and liberalization are viewed in terms of a "dialectical interaction between forces that attempt to retain the power to monopolize decision making and to influence others and forces that try to change the existing distribution of power and influence" (Kim 1991, pp. 138). The challenge here would be to develop a mode of dialectical analysis that is different from existing ones.

The world of popular discourse as a resource of social scientific theories and concepts refers to common sayings and terminologies in popular discourse and everyday language that not only reflect the cultural heritage but also reflect cultural perceptions of particular social phenomena (Kim 1995, pp.173). An example of work done by Kim along these lines is the study of cultural images of being old and of the aged in Korea with reference to Korean proverbs and common sayings (Kim 1995).

Another example is the notion of *min-joong*. This is a term that bears some resemblance to the Gramscian idea of *subaltern*.

The writings of postcolonial intellectuals as exemplified in the work of the *Subaltern Studies* scholars depart from modernization discourse in that they seek to challenge elitist perspectives in historiography and replace them with subaltern ones (Prakash 1992, pp. 8). In doing so, the "agency of change is located in the insurgent or `subaltern'" (Spivak 1987, pp. 197). Similarly, *min-joong* refers to those who are politically oppressed, economically exploited and socially discriminated against (Han 1992, pp. 439). This group does not fall neatly within the proletariat as it includes memebers of the middle class who are persecuted in various ways and who identify with the masses (Han 1996).

The call for original East Asian sociologies is not to suggest that East Asia is a culturally homogeneous entity and that there could be a peculiarly East Asian brand of sociology. What it does suggest, however, is that sociology, like other forms of knowledge, is social and historical in nature and that sociology in the various societies of East Asia must be made relevant to historical and social realities (Lee 1996). One way to achieve this is to draw upon the philosophical traditions as well as the popular discourses in these societies for relevant and original social scientific concepts and theories. This is part of the effort to create a social science free of cultural dependency and ethnocentrism, that is, one that is truly universal (Kim 1996b).

Notes

(1) I am indebted to Kwon Eun-Young for her help in translating some passages from this and other Korean works cited in this paper.

(2) The beginning of the sinicisation movement in Taiwanese social sciences was marked by the convening of a conference in 1982. See Yang & Wen (1982) and Sun (1993).

(3) On sinicisation see also Chan (1993, 1994).

(4) I am grateful to Dr Hsu for translating some passages in his article for me.

(5) This took place on 16 December 1995. I understand that beginning with issue no. 19, the *Chinese Journal of Sociology* will be known as the *Taiwanese Journal of Sociology* [communication with Dr Michael Hsiao Hsin-Huang].

(6) See Kim (1996b) for examples of indigenized social science at each of these levels based on concepts derived from the classical tradition of China and Korea and from practices found in the everyday life of the Korean people.

(7) Kim Kyong-Dong, personal communication, 21 June 1996. Prof Kim had also referred to this in a paper (Kim, 1996b).

Bibliography

Alatas, Syed Farid (1993), "On the Indigenization of Academic Discourse", *Alternatives* 18, 3, pp. 307-338.

Alatas, Syed Farid (1995), "The Theme of `Relevance' in Third World Human Sciences", *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 16, 2, pp. 123-140.

Alatas, Syed Farid (1996), "Western Theory and Asian Realities: A Critical Appraisal of the Indigenization Theme". Paper presented at the Asia Pacific Regional Conference of Sociology (APRCS), Philippine Social Science Centre, Quezon City, 28-31 May.

Chan, Hoiman (1993), "Some Metasociological Notes on the Sinicisation of Sociology", *International Sociology* 8, 1, pp.113-119.

Chan, Hoiman (1994), "Thoughts on the Building of a Chinese Sociological Tradition: Metasociological Notes II", *Hong Kong Journal of Social Science* 3, pp.36-78. <in Chinese>

Cheng, L & So, A. (1983), "The Reestablishment of Sociology in the PRC: Toward the Sinification of Marxian Sociology", *Annual Review of Sociology* 9, pp.471-498.

Enriquez, Virgilio G. (1994), "Towards Cross-Cultural Knowledge through Cross-Indigenous Methods and Perspective", in Teresita B. Obusan, Angelina R. Enriquez, eds., *Pamamaraan: Indigenous Knowledge and Evolving Research Paradigms*, Quezon City: Asian Center, University of the Philippines, pp. 19-31.

Fahim, Hussein & Helmer, Katherine (1980), "Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries: A Further Elaboration," *Current Anthropology* 21, 5, pp. 644-50.

Fei, Hsiao-t'ung (1979) , *The Dilemma of a Chinese Intellectual*, selected and translated by James P. McGough, White Plains, New York: M. E. Sharpe, p. 25.

Gipouloux, Francois (1989), "Sociologie et Reforme: La Renaissance de la Sociologie en Republique Populaire de Chine", *Revue Europeenne des Sciences Sociales* no. 84, pp.51-68.

Gransow, Bettina (1985), "Soziologie in China oder Chinesische Sozilogie? Einige Bemerkungen zum gegenwartigen Entwicklungsstand der Soziologie in der VR China", *Zeitschrift fur Soziologie* 14, 2, pp.140-151.

Gransow, Bettina (1993), "Chinese Sociology: Sinicisation and Globalisation", *International Sociology* 8, 1, pp.101-112.

Han, Sang-Jin (1996), "Modernization Deficits and the Quest for a Reflexive Sociology of East Asia". Paper presentd to Korean Sociological Association-International Sociological Association East Asian Regional Colloquium on "The Future of Sociology in East Asia", Seoul November 22-23.

Han, Wan-Seng (1992), *Korean Reality, Korean Sociology*, Seoul: Bum- Woo-Sa <in Korean>.

Hsu, C. K. (1991), "The Formation and Tranformation of a Research Paradigm: A Revisit of Prof. Chen Shao-Hsing's Article", *Chinese Journal of Sociology* 15, pp.29-40 <in Chinese>.

Hsu, Leonard Shih-Lien (1931), "The Sociological Movement in China", *Pacific Affairs* 4, 4, pp.283-307.

Huang, Lucy Jen (1987), "The Status of Sociology in People's Republic of China", *International Review of Modern Sociology* 17, pp.111-136.

Kim Kyong-Dong (1978), "Future of Social Science in Korea", *Korea Journal* May 1978, pp.22-32.

Kim Kyong-Dong (1985), "Republic of Korea", in *Sociology and Social Anthropology in Asia and the Pacific*, New Delhi: Wiley Eastern Limited & Paris: UNESCO, pp. 86-131.

Kim Kyong-Dong (1991), "Sociocultural Developments in the Republic of Korea", in Thomas W. Robinson, ed., *Democracy and Development in East Asia: Taiwan, South Korea, and the Philippines*, Washington, DC, pp. 137-154.

Kim Kyong-Dong (1994a), "Reflections on the Non-Economic Factors in Korea's Economic Development", in Sung Yeung Kwack, ed., *The Korean Economy at a Crossroads*, Westport, CT: Praeger, pp. 41-56.

Kim Kyong-Dong (1994b), "Confucianism and Capitalist Development in East Asia", in Leslie Sklair, *Capitalism and Development*, London: Routledge, pp. 87-106.

Kim Kyong-Dong (1995), "The Korean Images of Old Age: A Glimpse of Verbal Culture", *Korean Journal of Population and Development* 24, 2, 1995, pp.173-179.

Kim Kyong-Dong (1996a), "Confucianism and Modernization in East Asia: Theoretical Exploration", in Josef Kreiner, ed., *The Impact of a Traditional Thought on Present-Day Japan*, Munchen: Ludicium Verlag, 1996, pp. 49-69.

Kim Kyong-Dong (1996b), "Toward Culturally `Independent' Social Science: Illustrations of Indigenization in East Asia". Paper presented to Korean Sociological Association-International Sociological Association East Asian Regional Colloquium on "The Future of Sociology in East Asia", Seoul November 22-23.

Kwon T'ae-Hwan (1979), "Seminar on Koreanizing Western Approaches to Social Science", *Korea Journal* 19, 11, pp.20-25.

Lee, Rance P. L. (1992), "Formulation of Relevant Concepts and Propositions for Sociological Research in Chinese Society", in Chie Nakane & Chien Chao, ed., *Home Bound: Studies in East Asian Society*, Tokyo: Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies, pp. 81-98.

Lee. Chong-Bum (1979), "Prolegomenon to the Indigenization of Public Administration", *Social Science Journal* 6, 1979, pp.7-26.

Lee, Jae-Yeol & Jung Jin-Seong (1994), "The Task of Education in Korean Sociology in Preparing for the 21st Century", in Korean Sociological Association, *Korean Sociology in the 21st Century*, Seoul: Moon-Hak-Kwa Ji-Seong-Sa, 1994, pp. 39-66: 57-63. <in Korean>

Lee, Su-Hoon (1996), "Wither Sociology in Korea? History, Reality, and World-System". Paper presentd to Korean Sociological Association-International Sociological Association East Asian Regional Colloquium on "The Future of Sociology in East Asia", Seoul November 22-23.

Lie, John (1996), "Sociology of Contemporary Japan", *Current Sociology* 44, 1, pp.1-95.

Lin, Nan (1987), "Sinisation de la Sociologie: L'étape suivante", *Revue Européenne des Sciences Sociales* 76, pp.127-139.

Liu Kang (1993), "Politics, Critical Paradigms: Reflections on Modern Chinese Literature Studies", *Modern China* 19, 1, pp.13-40.

Ling, Mu (1995), "Beyond the Theory of `Language Games': Huang Ziping and Chinese Literary Criticism in the 1980s", *Modern China* 12, 4, pp.420-449.

Maykovich, Minako K. (1987), "Sociology in Taiwan", *International Review of Modern Sociology* 17, pp.139-162.

Prakash, Gyan (1992), "Postcolonial Criticism and Indian Historiography", *Social Text* 31/32, pp.8-19.

Schmutz, Georges M. (1989), "Sociologie de la Chine ou Sociologie Chinoise?" *Revue Europeene des Sciences Sociales* 27, 84, pp.5-17.

Shin Yong-Ha (1994), "Suggestions for the Development of a Creative Korean Sociology", in Korean Sociological Association, *Korean Sociology in the 21st Century*, Seoul: Moon-Hak-Kwa Ji-Seong-Sa, 1994, pp. 15-30. <in Korean>

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1987), "Subaltern Studies:Deconstructing Historiography", in *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*, New York & London: Routledge, pp. 197-221.

Sun Chung-Hsing, "Aspects of `Sinicisation' and `Globalisation'", *International Sociology* 8, 1, pp.121-122.

Watanuki, Joji (1984), "Japan", in *Social Sciences in Asia and the Pacific*. Paris: UNESCO. pp. 281-295.

Yang Choon (1994), "21st Century Korean Society and Sociology Education", in Korean Sociological Association, *Korean Sociology in the 21st Century*, Seoul: Moon-Hak-Kwa Ji-Seong-Sa, pp.31-38: 31-32. <in Korean>.

Yang Kuo-Shu & Wen Chung-I (1982), *The Sinicization of Social and Behavioral Science Research in China*, Institute of Ethnology Monograph Series B. No. 10, Taipei: Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica. <in Chinese>

CHAPTER 7
SOCIOLOGY IN KOREA AND GENDER ISSUES

Chin Sung Chung
Seoul National University, Korea

As in other non-western countries, sociology, which is a science formed in western society had been imported in the process of modernization in Korea. It was in the end of 19th century when Korea was trying to modernize itself in the midst of invasions of other countries, the major ones being China and Japan. At that time sociology was introduced with the names of Kun-Hak through China and sociology through Japan. Korea became a colony of Japan, and western sociology was introduced through Japan for a while. (Chung 1985)

Although there were serious conflicts between modernization and colonization during the colonial period, and modernization and state control during the post-colonial period, there have been significant improvements in women's status during Korea's modernization process. The expansion of women's education, the increase in female labor participation, the formation of women's movement organizations, and other changes demonstrate this. The institutionalization of sociology, however, has, severely excluded women.

I will examine the situation of exclusion of women durig the process of institutionalizing sociology by examining the female faculty mumbers, female students, the gender of the presidents of the Korean Sociological Association and the number of gender-related subjects at the universities.

Gender in the Institutionalization of Sociology

The trend of women's participation in the development of sociology did not change, following the overall process of institutionalization of sociology.(1) I will divide the process of development related to gender issues in Korean sociology into the following four periods: 1) The period of time extending from the beginning of sociology until 1957 when female participation was practically non-existent; 2) The period starting from 1958 until the early 1970s when sociology departments were built at several women's universities and some female scholars began to work; 3) The period of time starting from the latter part of the 1970s until the end of the 1980s when many sociology and women's studies departments were established; 4) And the 1990s when feminism in Korean society has some influence on the gender situation of Korean sociology.