

APPLYING U.S. RESEARCH ON LABOR UNION MEMBERSHIP PARTICIPATION TO SOUTH KOREAN UNIONS: AN ASSESSMENT*

DANIEL B. CORNFIELD
Vanderbilt University

The dynamic and organizationally complex, South Korean labor movement presents a unique opportunity for studying union membership participation. The uniqueness of this opportunity suggests that research designs which are adopted from U.S. research for researching South Korean labor unions should be consistent with the organizational complexities of unions, the labor law, and the culture of employment relations in South Korea. The "dual image" of South Korean labor union organization which is developed in this paper helps to reconceive U.S. concepts of "union membership participation," "union democracy" and "union bureaucracy" for the South Korean labor movement. The "dual image" of South Korean labor union organization is also helpful for developing hypotheses about the determinants of membership participation inside South Korean labor unions. In light of the unique attributes of the "dual image" of South Korean labor union organization, U.S. research designs should be modified in order to pursue several enduring, interdisciplinary research themes about the character and determinants of union membership participation in South Korea. These themes conceive of the labor union as a "socializing institution," as an "opportunity structure," as a "community," and as a "stratified working class organization." Developing research designs which capture the unique attributes of the South Korean labor movement will enhance the theoretical and policy implications of the research results, as well as facilitate cross-national, comparative research on labor union membership participation.

Labor unions have played a strategic role in promoting societal democratization, economic development, and wealth redistribution during the twentieth century in several world regions. In light of this strategic role, the forces which motivate and facilitate individual union members to participate in the governance and operations of their unions constitute an enduring issue of social science research. Growing unions have often become oligarchical bureaucracies which are removed from their inert member ships, as posited in Robert Michels's "iron law of oligarchy." Therefore, researchers have studied the conditions which promote union membership participation in order to discern the forces which erode union

*Originally prepared for the project on "Determinants of Union Membership Participation: comparative Studies of the Cases of Korea and the USA" of the Research Center of the Federation of Korean Trade Unions.

oligarchy, increase union leadership responsiveness to rank-and-file interests and issues, and, thereby, strengthen the union.

Much of the research on union membership participation has been conducted among North American, British, and Australian union members. Consequently, little is known about the generalizability of these research findings and insights to Asian labor movements. Kuruvilla et al (1990), in their pioneering U.S.-Japanese comparison of the determinants of union membership participation, found few differences in these determinants. Their study, however, examined only factors with known effects in Western research. It did not examine factors that might be uniquely Japanese, such as cultural values whose content and effects may vary cross-nationally. Also, the Japanese labor movement has enjoyed greater autonomy from the state and is more institutionalized than those of other Asian nations. As such, the Japanese case may not be fully illustrative of other Asian societies, such as South Korea, which have recently witnessed tremendous growth and dynamic organizational development of their labor movements.

In this paper, I develop a strategy for assessing the applicability of U.S. research on union membership participation to the contemporary South Korean labor movement. The strategy consists of highlighting the unique traits of South Korean labor and business organization and employment patterns—compared to that in the U.S.—and their implications for the design of research on South Korean union membership participation. I apply this strategy first to the meaning of union membership participation, and then to the determinants of individual differences in participation levels.

MEANINGS OF UNION MEMBERSHIP PARTICIPATION

Researchers have conceived of and operationalized union membership participation (UMP) in several ways. The utilization of diverse UMP concepts, in turn, has led to the development of diverse methods for operationalizing these concepts.

UMP Concepts

In an industrialized or industrializing society, the set of possible individual actions which constitute UMP are determined by the national system of industrial relations and the unique character of labor organizations in that society. In the pluralist, U.S. system of industrial relations, U.S. labor unions are relatively autonomous of the state and

employer. Under U.S. labor law (1935 Wagner Act) which bans “company unions,” employers are prohibited from involvement in the internal operations of labor unions. U.S. labor law (1959 Landrum-Griffin Act), however, regulates the internal political process of unions in order to limit oligarchical tendencies and to promote internal “union democracy.”

Consequently, the dominant organizational image of unions in U.S. UMP research is that of a bureaucratic, voluntary membership association, with a formal, representative-democratic, governance and administrative structure, which engages in collective bargaining and contract enforcement. Indeed, most U.S. unions have a written constitution which defines elective offices and terms, eligibility criteria for serving in elective office and for voting in union officer elections, formal authority relations, officer-member rights and duties, rights and duties of appointive (non-elective), salaried union staff members, etc.

Furthermore, U.S. union membership boundaries correspond to worker group identities that arise from the structure of U.S. employers. U.S. union membership boundaries are typically defined by craft or industry. Craft unions, whose group identities correspond to the late nineteenth and early twentieth century craft division of labor in U.S. workplaces, distinguish themselves by their occupation. In contrast, industrial unions, which emerged with Taylorist, Fordist mass production during the twentieth century, distinguish themselves by the product made, or the service rendered, by their members.

In U.S. UMP research, UMP refers in part to individual member participation in the relatively autonomous, internal, formally democratic, union governance and administrative process. UMP includes holding elective union office, voting in officer elections, attending union meetings, serving on committees, recruiting new members, reading union publications, and fundraising.

As in organizational sociology generally, U.S. UMP research has conceived of the union not only as a bureaucracy, but also as an informal community. As an informal community, a union may promote, deliberately or spontaneously, friendships and build solidarity among its members. Based on this imagery, UMP includes individual member participation in union social, cultural and recreational activities.

South Korean and U.S. labor organization differ in four ways which suggest that the autonomous, bureaucratic-democratic, associational image of U.S. unions is not fully applicable to South Korean unions. First, Park (1993: 324-326) characterizes the South Korean industrial relations system as “authoritarian corporatism,” in contrast to U.S. pluralism (also, see Lee

1991). Until the 1987 democratic reforms in South Korea, this industrial relations system afforded South Korean unions little autonomy from the state, which played a strong role in selecting union leaders, settling employment disputes, and limiting union finances. Despite the growing autonomy of Korean unions, the future direction of the South Korean industrial relations system apparently is uncertain at this time.

Second, following the 1987 democratic reforms, new labor unions proliferated in South Korea. Between 1986 and 1990, the number of local unions in South Korea increased from 2,675 to 7,698 (Jung 1993: 27; Kim 1993: 141). Consequently, South Korean labor unions vary widely by organizational age, possibly by size, and may exist in a bimodal, organizational age and size distribution.

Third, South Korean labor unions are associated with three labor federations with different relations with the state. First, the Federation of Korean Trade Unions (FKTU) has been linked closely to the South Korean government for over thirty years and its union affiliates tend to be controlled by, registered with, and recognized by the government. The second federation—the name is variously translated as the National Alliance of Trade Unions (Kim 1993:145) and Korean Trade Union Congress (Song 1994:160) and I refer to it hereinafter as the NATU—established in 1990, has arisen in a grass-roots, democratic insurgency in peripheral manufacturing independent of the government and in support of political unionism. Its affiliates may not to be registered and recognized by the government, which has taken a repressive stance toward them (Song 1994: 160-161). Third, and related to the NATU, is the Korean Congress of Independent Industrial Trade Union Federations (KCIIF), consisting of several unions in service industries, which, as of December 1994, had only begun to receive government recognition (Song 1994: 160-161).

Fourth, most South Korean local unions are enterprise unions, in contrast to U.S. craft and industrial unions. It is estimated that 90% of Korean local unions are enterprise unions (Kim 1993: 141-142). Moreover, in light of the tradition of both state and employer domination of South Korean enterprise unions, these unions tend to perform a narrower range of functions than U.S. unions. The chief functions of South Korean enterprise unions at the plant level are collective bargaining, especially to control dismissals and layoffs (Jung 1993: 35), processing grievances, addressing unfair labor practices, and providing cultural and recreational activities (Song 1994: 173). In light of past government restrictions on, and the recency of, collective bargaining, South Korean unions have been more successful in gaining provisions for union security than improvements in pay and working

conditions and tend to be excluded from decisionmaking on employment, layoff, and other managerial issues (Kim 1993: 148; Song 1994: 172). Kim (1993: 144) argues that South Korean enterprise unions have begun to develop regional, industrial, and occupational councils of local enterprise unions. Less common are enterprise-wide councils of local enterprise unions. South Korean unions have recently become politicized, as expressed in their pressuring the government to amend labor laws (Kim 1993: 153).

These South Korean-U.S. differences in labor organization argue for a unique, dual image of South Korean unions. Given the sharp, organizational age differentiation and variation in autonomy from the state among South Korean unions, Weberian sociological theory of bureaucracy suggests that South Korean unions may vary between two ideal types. I refer to the first type as the *bureaucratic union*. The bureaucratic union performs a limited range of institutionalized functions and consists of formal roles and lines of authority, a centralized authority structure, and a cooperative or submissive relationship with the employer. The second type is the *movement union*, corresponding to Max Weber's charismatic social organization. As the institutional manifestation of an insurgent social movement, the movement union performs a wide range of shifting functions. It consists of diffusely defined informal roles and personal lines of authority between leaders and members, a decentralized authority structure or a centralized authority structure focussed on a charismatic leader or leadership group, and takes a militant stance toward the employer.

Sociological theory of bureaucracy implies that South Korean labor unions vary between the two ideal types, depending on their organizational age and federation affiliation. Theoretically, new movement organizations, which are often small, interpersonally cohesive, lacking in resources, and inexperienced, are less bureaucratized and more fluid than older movement organizations (Cornfield 1993). This implies that *the more recently established a South Korean union is, the more likely it will approximate the movement type and the less likely it will approximate the bureaucratic type; and vice versa*. Furthermore, sociological theory suggests that birth cohorts of movement organizations are often imprinted with enduring structures that derive from societal social, political, and economic conditions at the time of the founding (Cornfield 1993). In South Korea, the three federations tend to represent different union birth cohorts with divergent founding conditions. The FKTU unions bear the imprint of government and employer domination; the NATU and KCIIF unions bear the imprint of grass-roots, democratic, insurgent founding conditions. This suggests that *FKTU-affiliated unions will approximate more the bureaucratic type than the movement type, and NATU- and*

KCIIF-affiliated unions will approximate more the movement type than the bureaucratic type.

The nature and degree of union democracy, in theory, in the the two types of unions in South Korea are unclear. In light of their tradition of domination by the government, FKTU unions may have the least developed democratic governance structures of South Korean unions. Among South Korean unions of all three federations, and especially the NATU and KCIIF federations which have been somewhat independent of the government, democratic governance structures may vary between a U.S.-style representative-democratic structure and a consensual, direct-democratic structure. In the latter, all members, rather than elected representatives, participate in decisionmaking with the goal of achieving group consensus. Sociological theory of bureaucracy and union democracy suggests that, *regardless of the federation to which a union is affiliated, a South Korean union may be more likely to have a representative-democratic governance structure than a direct-democratic structure, the greater its size and age* (Cornfield 1993).

The dual image of South Korean unions suggests that the meaning of UMP varies across diverse unions which consist of different configurations of the features of the two ideal types. The standard U.S. meaning of UMP may be more applicable to a South Korean union, the more it approximates the bureaucratic type and maintains a representative-democratic, internal governance structure. The bureaucratic South Korean union, however, may have only a nascent, representative-democratic governance structure and may perform a smaller range of functions than that of its U.S. counterpart. Therefore, *the bureaucratic South Korean union may afford its members a narrower range of opportunities to participate in union governance and administration* than that of the typical U.S. union.

The U.S. meaning of UMP may be less applicable to South Korean unions which approximate the movement type. The informal, fluid, personalistic and possibly direct-democratic structure of movement unions suggests that the meaning of UMP in the movement union differs from that in the bureaucratic, representative-democratic union. *With few formal roles and functions in the movement union, UMP in a movement union may consist of an irregular sequence of different tasks performed by a member at the personal, spontaneous request of a leader or the group.*

Operationalizing UMP

UMP operationalization in U.S. research assumes that UMP is participation in one or more formal, recurrent, discrete tasks in a

bureaucratic, representative-democratic governance structure. Researchers have drawn several distinctions between types of UMP in order to operationalize UMP in research. The first is the distinction between a unidimensional and multidimensional construct. The unidimensional approach consists of a single, composite index of multiple items measuring different acts of UMP. Its simplicity is an advantage but it may obscure different dimensions of UMP, each of which may have, as Chun (1996) and others have found, unique determinants. The multidimensional approach, in contrast, consists of multiple indices of UMP that may be developed deductively from an a priori theoretical analysis or empirically through, for example, an exploratory factor analysis.

A second distinction is in terms of the time- and commitment-intensity of an act of UMP. Active forms of UMP, such as serving in leadership roles, require much time and commitment; passive forms of UMP, such as voting in an officer election, require little time and commitment to perform.

Third, UMP acts are distinguished in terms of their formality. Formal UMP acts refer to participation in the formal, representative-democratic governance structure (eg. office-holding); informal UMP acts refer to participation in the informal union community such as helping others file a grievance.

Fourth, researchers have operationalized UMP retrospectively or prospectively. The retrospective approach refers to past UMP during a specific period; the prospective approach is the individual member's expectation of participating in a specified future period (eg. Kelly and Kelly 1994).

The usefulness of these distinctions of UMP in South Korean research may depend on the degree to which the union consists of characteristics of the bureaucratic and movement types. These distinctions may be most relevant to the bureaucratic union because it is in such unions where UMP actions are discrete, additive, and recurrent. In the movement union, however, where UMP may be more dynamic, spontaneous, fluid, idiosyncratic and personalistic, a retrospective and multidimensional construction of informal actions may be the most feasible operationalization of UMP. *In light of the dual image of South Korean unions, a study should use the widest range of possible types of UMP to capture the diverse organizational realities in the South Korean labor movement.*

Furthermore, Western research is flawed in its neglect of the *degree* of participation in any single act. That is, most research has not observed *the amount of time* an individual member devotes to any one UMP action.

DETERMINANTS OF INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN UMP LEVELS

U.S. research has emphasized four themes about the determinants of individual differences in UMP levels—that is, why some union members are more active than other members. Each of the four themes constitutes a unique organizational perspective of the labor union: 1) the union as a socializing institution; 2) the union as an opportunity structure; 3) the union as a community; and 4) the union as a stratified working class organization. Each organizational perspective highlights an organizational problem which the union must solve in order to increase UMP. The applicability of these themes depends largely on similarities and differences between U.S. and South Korean systems of social stratification and labor and business organization.

The Union as a Socializing Institution

In this research tradition, the individual member attitude of “union commitment” is an important direct determinant of individual UMP level (see, for example, Barling et al 1992; Fullagar et al 1995; Gallagher and Strauss 1991; Heshizer et al 1991; and Kelloway and Barling 1993). Generating commitment of members to the union is the chief organizational problem for the union which is highlighted by this perspective. Union commitment, often operationalized with the Gordon composite index, refers to the degree to which an individual union member is loyal to, feels responsibility toward, and is willing to work for, the union. The working hypothesis is that UMP level will be higher, the more committed an individual member is to the union. The research goal is to discover the union-organizational and individual background factors which influence union commitment and union instrumentality. In terms of union organization, some studies indicate that the effectiveness of formal and informal, union-operated member orientation programs influence the development of commitment and instrumentality attitudes. Features of a union member’s background, such as their political beliefs, have also been shown to influence the development of union commitment.

In order to apply this research tradition to South Korean unions, the union commitment scale must consist of items that correspond to the most salient tasks and functions performed by South Korean *enterprise* unions. Furthermore, the scales may need to be sensitized to the dual image of South Korean unions because unions approximating either the bureaucratic

or movement types may perform different tasks and functions.

The Union as an Opportunity Structure

The central working hypothesis is that the more democratic a formal union governance structure is, the more opportunity it affords union members to participate and the higher is the UMP level. The chief organizational problem the union faces, in this perspective, is developing a governance structure which affords union members opportunities to participate in union governance and operations. This line of research has compared the UMP levels of unions with different formal organizational structures. Research has operationalized formal democratic structure with multiple indicators of organizational structure from union constitutions, including number of hierarchical levels, election by referendum, provisions for automatic succession, etc. (Cornfield 1989: 14; Cornfield 1993). Leicht (1989) used union member perception of union democracy and found a positive effect of this perception on UMP.

This organizational research tradition is applicable to South Korean unions to the extent representative-democratic structures exist within South Korean unions. For unions lacking representative-democratic governance structures, South Korean research must customize the operationalization of union organizational structure in ways which capture South Korean union organizational realities. Such customizing must focus on the features of South Korean union organizational structure which afford members the most and least opportunity to participate in union activities. The formal features of bureaucratic unions—eg, centralization of authority, adherence to parliamentary rules, etc.—can be obtained from written descriptions of union organizational structure. In the movement unions, in contrast, informal structure and consensual decisionmaking processes can be discerned through network analyses of interpersonal influence among members and leaders. A comprehensive analysis, however, would attempt to discern both the formal and informal structure in all types of unions.

The Union as a Community

The central focus of research on this theme is the union as an institution to which the individual member may derive a sense of belongingness. The chief working hypothesis is the greater is the union member's sense of belongingness to the union, the higher is the member's UMP level. From this perspective, the main organizational problem for the union is the creation of an inclusive, integrative internal community among its

members. This theme has been examined in two ways. First, Cornfield and Hodson (1993) found a positive effect of "social integration"—i.e. a composite scale of items about attending union social functions (eg. parties) and be friending union members—on UMP. Social integration, in turn, was found to be a partial function of the original reasons for why the member joined the union: the more the member joined for ideological and social reasons, as opposed to instrumental and material reasons, the more integrated and active the member became in the union.

The second way in which researchers have explored this theme is through the analysis of multiple (non-union) organizational roles on UMP. The research question is whether individual participation in multiple roles—eg. parent, worker, church member, etc.—enhances or detracts from the ability of the union member to become involved in his or her union. Chun's (1996) research is the most comprehensive analysis of this question. She found that the effect of multiple role involvement on UMP is contingent not only on the time-intensity of the specific act of UMP, but also on the religion and gender of the union member. For liberal Protestants, but not conservative Protestants, church involvement increased UMP, especially the less time-intensive forms of UMP such as voting in an officer election. She also found a negative effect of household involvement on UMP for women, and a positive effect for men, suggesting that the family adjusts to the man's schedule, and not to the woman's schedule.

This theme is applicable to South Korean research but it must be sensitized to the functions of South Korean labor unions and to the unique configuration of solidarity-enhancing institutions which compete for the allegiances of individuals. As Song (1994: 171-172) has argued, South Korean unions may perform social and recreational functions that generate variations in social integration across unions and across members within unions.

Furthermore, who becomes socially integrated in a South Korean enterprise union may depend on which social ties or networks were used to hire workers into the enterprise itself. According to Kim (1995: 221), regional and school-based ties are important hiring mechanisms in South Korea. Chang and Chang (1994: 52, 91) refer to these ties and hiring criteria as "family, alumni, and regionalism," or FAR. These ties may become the basis of factionalism inside unions (Song 1994: 171) and, depending on which faction dominates the union community, may differentially integrate individual members into the union community. Also, given that South Korean employers often transfer employees between different organizational units rather than hire temporary workers (Jung 1993: 31-39),

a worker may be more socially integrated into the local enterprise union, the longer he or she has been employed in that organizational unit (eg. department). Similarly, given the high volume of rural-to-urban migration and its impact on social mobility in South Korea (Kwon and Jun 1990), duration of urban residence and urbanism of personal life styles may effectively integrate or disintegrate union members from the union community. This may depend in part on the ratio of recent migrants to long-term residents in a union membership and the receptivity of the union to recent migrants.

In order to examine the impact of multiple, organizational role involvements on UMP, South Korean research should be sensitized to the uniquely South Korean configuration of organizations and institutions which may compete for individual allegiances. Voluntary associations, for example, which abound in the U.S. may not be as prevalent in South Korea. For those institutions which exist in both nations, such as the family, South Korean research must be sensitized to the unique South Korean variations in that institution. For example, research on South Korean demographic trends and gender role attitudes suggests that attitudes and family organization vary between "Westernized" nuclear families in which women are economically significant family actors and traditional rural patriarchal extended families (Chin 1995; Kim 1992; Kim, D-S 1994).

The Union as a Stratified Working Class Organization

This research tradition has focused on the impact of working class stratification on UMP. The dominant finding is that the higher the socioeconomic status and job satisfaction of the union member, the higher is his or her UMP level (Barling et al 1992: 101; Cornfield 1991: 34). This finding tends to obtain in studies which define socioeconomic status in terms of education level, income, occupational prestige, and race. The main organizational problem for the union is to reconcile conflicting interests between different strata within the union membership. The findings for gender effects on UMP level are ambiguous (Cornfield et al 1990). The chief interpretation of the finding is, consistent with resource mobilization theory, that individuals with higher socioeconomic status tend to have more discretionary time and a stronger sense of personal efficacy than others and, therefore, possess requisite personal resources for engaging in collective action.

A few studies suggest that the *determinants* of UMP level vary by the socioeconomic status of the union member. Occupationally, a few studies

suggest that extrinsic job satisfaction (satisfaction with pay and economic features of employment) is negatively associated with UMP for blue-collar workers; and that, for white-collar workers, intrinsic job satisfaction (satisfaction with job content) is positively associated with UMP level (Barling et al 1992: 104). Gender, as discussed above, influences the impact of family constraints on UMP level (Cornfield et al 1990; Chun 1996). Racially, Hoyman and Stallworth (1987) found that the UMP level of black union members was more sensitive to their length of union membership than was that of white union members; and the white UMP level was more sensitive to socioeconomic status, union friendships and personal sense of efficacy.

In order to apply this theme to South Korean unions, research designs must be sensitized to the unique features of South Korean social stratification. Assuming higher socioeconomic status is associated with higher UMP levels in both the U.S. and South Korea, the dimensions of socioeconomic status must be customized to reflect the bases of differentiation and hierarchy within South Korea. South Korean cultural traditions may influence worker views about workplace authority and the compensation systems in internal labor markets (Chang and Chang 1994). For example, a study of job satisfaction among South Korean hospital workers indicated that the more deeply a worker believed in traditional Korean values of "familism," the higher was the worker's job satisfaction (Kim, JS 1994). Familism, as conceived in this study, was a composite index of indicators of respect and deference for managerial authority and was used to reflect traditions of strict role division, sex and age hierarchy, patriarchy, authoritarianism, and group orientation. This suggests that, in contrast to U.S. findings, job satisfaction in South Korea may have an inverse relationship with UMP level.

Studies of South Korean class stratification and internal labor markets indicate that the South Korean system of stratification differs from the U.S. system. The most obvious difference concerns the racial and ethnic composition of the two societies. South Korea is substantially more homogeneous racially and ethnically than the U.S..

Research on wage determination and promotions in South Korea indicates that seniority, skill level, gender and marital status are important wage and job assignment determinants, and that age, education level, and previous employment experience may be less important determinants (Bae and Form 1986; Chang and Chang 1994: ch. 7; Jung 1993; Kim 1995: 224-228). Koo and Hong (1980) found, in a study of a South Korean sample, that the income returns to education for higher social classes and white-collar

workers significantly exceeded those for lower social classes and blue-collar workers.

The impact of economic and labor market segmentation on inter-firm and inter-industry variations in stratification systems is difficult to gauge from English-language publications about South Korean internal labor markets and systems of human resource management. Edwards (1979) argues that unevenness in capital accumulation in the U.S. segmented the labor market, generating multiple, labor control systems, each with its own set of criteria for allocating and compensating labor. In the U.S., hiring, compensation, layoff and dismissal, and intra-firm job assignment practices vary by firm size, the unionization status of the firm, industrial concentration, capital intensity of production processes, and the demographic composition of the firm workforce. U.S. firms, for example, vary in the emphasis they give to merit, seniority, affirmative action, and particularistic criteria in their human resource management practices. Seniority is utilized more commonly among large, unionized, and bureaucratic firms. Merit and particularistic criteria are most commonly found in small, non-union, labor-intensive, low-wage firms. In effect, labor market segmentation has spawned multiple, firm-and industry-specific social stratifications in the U.S..

English-language research on South Korea, in contrast, tends to present a monolithic image of Korean human resource management practices, i.e. a central tendency without reference to variations across economic and labor market segments. For example, that the rate of employee turnover in South Korean firms varies inversely with firm size suggests that seniority may be more commonly used by large employers than small employers in wage determination and job assignment decisions (Jung 1993). Research on South Korean unions, however, should examine the possibility of inter-firm and inter-industry variations in labor control systems and personnel reward criteria for three reasons. First, these criteria may constitute a firm-specific social stratification system which may socially differentiate and factionalize workers along lines that are not fully generalizable to all South Korean workplaces. Second, firm-specific social stratification systems ought to have important implications for the internal political process of unions because, under the system of South Korean *enterprise* unionism, union memberships are closely defined by and reflect employer managerial practices. Third, the dual image of South Korean unions, combined with the fact that each of the three South Korean labor federations has developed unevenly and uniquely across industrial segments of the South Korean economy (Song 1994), suggests that bureaucratic and movement unions may be exposed to different social stratification systems. The unique social stratification system

each labor federation faces, then, may pose distinct challenges to the internal solidarity and UMP level, as well as generate distinct determinants of individual UMP levels, for each federation and, possibly, each type of union in the dual image typology.

CONCLUSION

As a distinctive characteristic of the South Korean labor movement, the dual image of bureaucratic and movement unions implies that U.S. UMP research is only partly applicable to South Korea. Although the enduring themes of U.S. UMP research may be pursued in research on the South Korean labor movement, the research designs must be altered fundamentally to make them relevant to the unique organizational realities of the South Korean labor movement.

The dual image of South Korean unions raises four questions which also constitute important modifications of U.S. research designs for maximum applicability in the South Korean context. Regarding the dual image itself, the first question concerns its dimensionality and distribution in the population of South Korean unions. In terms of dimensionality, empirical research should discern whether it is best to conceive of union organizational structure unidimensionally or multidimensionally. A unidimensional conception would combine all organizational dimensions of the dual image—eg. centralization, formalization, militancy, etc.—into a single factor or composite index. A multidimensional conception would treat each dimension of organizational structure separately. The dual image, then, may be a unidimensional or multidimensional distinction between South Korean unions. In terms of distribution, and independent of dimensionality, empirical research should discern whether South Korean unions are distributed bimodally or normally in terms of organizational structure and, therefore, whether it is best to conceive of the dual image dichotomously, or as a continuum of union organizational structure.

Regardless of how the first question is resolved, the second question pertains to the implications of the dual image for the meaning of UMP. The meaning of UMP may vary by type of union. The more bureaucratic the union is, the more the meaning of UMP approximates a set of recurrent, discrete formally defined tasks; the more the union approximates the movement type, the more UMP may constitute an irregular sequence of non-recurrent tasks which are performed at the spontaneous, personal request of a leader.

The third question is the impact of the dual image on UMP level.

Empirical research should discover which type of union—the bureaucratic or movement union—if any, tends to have higher levels of UMP. A differential in UMP level between the two types of unions may depend on union-state relations, union size and age, the amount of opportunity to participate afforded by the union, internal union solidarity, the amount of union commitment generated by the union, and other factors.

The fourth question concerns the impact of the dual image on the determinants of UMP. Empirical research should discern the degree to which the determinants of individual UMP levels vary between bureaucratic and movement unions. The factors that distinguish active from non-active union members may vary by union type, depending, perhaps, on the type of organizational problem each type of union is likely to face. For a bureaucratic union, the chief organizational problem for the union may be low union commitment among its members. Individual union commitment level may distinguish active from non-active members in this type of union. In contrast, the chief organizational problem for a movement union may be internal factionalism. In this case, individual differences in integration into the union community may distinguish active from non-active members.

In conclusion, U.S. UMP research has raised enduring themes about the viability of labor organizations in industrial societies. The generalizability of these themes to the South Korean labor movement can be examined with empirical research which is designed to capture the organizational realities of South Korean labor unions, business enterprises, and state regulation of the economy.

REFERENCES

- Bae, Kyu Han, and William Form. 1986. "Payment Strategy in South Korea's Advanced Economic Sector." *American Sociological Review* 51 (February): 120-31.
- Barling, Julian, Clive Fullagar, and Kevin Kelloway. 1992. "Union Participation." Ch. 5 in their *The Union and Its Members*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chang, Chan Sup, and Chang, Nahn Joo. 1994. *The Korean Management System*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Chin, Soo Hee. 1995. "The Determinants and Patterns of Married Women's Labor Force Participation in Korea." *Korean Journal of Population and Development* 24 (July): 95-129.
- Chun, Bang Jee. 1996. *Solidarity or Conflict: The Impact of Organizational Involvement on Labor Union Participation*. Forthcoming on Garland Publishers, New York City.
- Cornfield, Daniel. 1989. *Becoming a Mighty Voice*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Cornfield, Daniel. 1991. "The US Labor Movement: Its Development and Impact on Social Inequality and Politics." *Annual Review of Sociology* 17: 27-49. Palo Alto:

Annual Reviews.

- Cornfield, Daniel. 1993. "Integrating U.S. Labor Leadership: Union Democracy and the Ascent of Ethnic and Racial Minorities and Women into National Union Offices." *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* 12, pp. 51-74. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Cornfield, Daniel, Hilquias Cavalcanti, and Bang Jee Chun. 1990. "Household, Work, and Labor Activism: Gender Differences in the Determinants of Union Membership Participation." *Work and Occupations* 17 (May): 131-51.
- Cornfield, Daniel, and Randy Hodson. 1993. "Labor Activism and Community: Causes and Consequences of Social Integration in Labor Unions." *Social Science Quarterly* 74 (September): 590-602.
- Edwards, Richard. 1979. *Contested Terrain*. New York: Basic Books.
- Fullagar, Clive, Daniel Gallagher, Michael Gordon, and Paul Clark. 1995. "Impact of Early Socialization on Union Commitment and Participation: A Longitudinal Study." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 80 (February): 147-57.
- Gallagher, Daniel, and George Strauss. 1991. "Union Membership Attitudes and Participation." Pp. 139-74 in George Strauss, Daniel Gallagher, and Jack Fiorito (eds.), *The State of the Unions*. Madison, WI: Industrial Relations Research Association.
- Heshizer, Brian, Harry Martin, and Yoash Wiener. 1991. "Normative Commitment and Instrumental Attachment as Intervening Variables in the Prediction of Union Participation." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 27 (December): 532-49.
- Jung, Ee-Hwan. 1993. "The Rise of the Labor Movement and the Development of Internal Labor Market in the Korean Manufacturing Industry." *Korean Journal of Population and Development* 22 (July): 23-41.
- Kelloway, E., and Julian Barling. 1993. "Members' Participation in Local Union Activities: Measurement, Prediction, and Replication." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 78 (April): 262-79.
- Kelly, Caroline, and John Kelly. 1994. "Who Gets Involved in Collective Action?: Social Psychological Determinants of Individual Participation in Trade Unions." *Human Relations* 47 (January): 63-88.
- Kim, Hyunju. 1992. "Gender Role Equity and Marital Satisfaction Among Korean Couples." *Korean Journal of Population and Development* 21 (December): 99-120.
- Kim, Hwang-Joe. 1993. "The Korean Union Movement in Transition." Pp. 133-61 in Stephen Frenkel (ed.), *Organized Labor in the Asia-Pacific Region*. Ithaca: ILR Press.
- Kim, Doo-Sub. 1994. "The Demographic Transition in the Korean Peninsula, 1910-1990: South and North Korea Compared." *Korean Journal of Population and Development* 23 (December): 131-55.
- Kim, Jung Sun. 1994. "The Informal Structure and Job Satisfaction in a Hospital Organization: A Case Study." *Korean Journal of Population and Development* 23 (July): 19-38.
- Kim, Taigi. 1995. "Human Resource Management for Production Workers in Large Korean Manufacturing Enterprises." Pp. 216-35 in Stephen Frenkel and Jeffrey Harrod (eds.), *Industrialization & Labor Relations*. Ithaca: ILR Press.
- Koo, Hagan, and Doo-Seung Hong. 1980. "Class and Income Inequality in Korea." *American Sociological Review* 45 (August): 610-26.
- Kuruvilla, Sarosh, Daniel Gallagher, Jack Fiorito, and Mitsuru Wakabayashi. 1990.

- "Union Participation in Japan: Do Western Theories Apply?" *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* (April): 374-89.
- Kwon, Tai-Hwan and Jun, Kwang Hee. 1990. "Rural-Urban Migration and the Social Mobility of Individuals in the Republic of Korea: An Analysis of Life History Data." *Korean Journal of Population and Development* 19 (December): 113-34.
- Lee, Sook-Jong. 1991. "Political Liberalization and Economic Development in South Korea." *Korean Journal of Population and Development* 20 (July): 77-100.
- Leicht, Kevin. 1989. "Unions, Plants, Jobs, and Workers: An Analysis of Union Satisfaction and Participation." *The Sociological Quarterly* 30 (Summer): 331-62.
- Park, Se-Il. 1993. "The Role of the State in Industrial Relations: The Case of Korea." *Comparative Labor Law Journal* 14 (Spring): 321-38.
- Song, Ho-Keun. 1994. "Working-Class Politics in Reform Democracy in South Korea." *Korean Journal of Population and Development* 23 (December): 157-77.

DANIEL B. CORNFIELD is Professor of Sociology and Chair, Department of Sociology, at Vanderbilt University. Also, he is editor of *WORK AND OCCUPATIONS*. His research on labor movements, employment relations, labor markets, and the sociology of work has been funded by the U.S. National Science Foundation and has appeared in several publications, including the *AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY*, *INDUSTRIAL AND LABOR RELATIONS REVIEW*, and *ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCE QUARTERLY*. He is presently compiling a collection of essays on the sociology of work by authors from some fifteen nations and is researching the decline and revitalization of the U.S. labor movement.