

The 'Chameleon' Korean welfare regime

Powell, Martin; Kim, Ki-tae

DOI:

[10.1111/spol.12088](https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12088)

License:

Other (please specify with Rights Statement)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Powell, M & Kim, K 2014, 'The 'Chameleon' Korean welfare regime', *Social Policy and Administration*, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 626-646. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12088>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

Eligibility for repository : checked 3/11/2014

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Appendix

| | Author's residing region (language) | Cases | Data | Conceptual/theoretical framework | Approach/Methods | Conclusion (Classification) |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| West-based authors | | | | | | |
| Jones (1990) | UK (English) | Korea, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore | Not applicable (conceptual study) | Confucianism , Oikonomic welfare state | Historical account of East Asian welfare state and institutions | Oikonomic welfare state/ (fourth regime) |
| Kuhnle (2004) | Norway (English) | Korea | Not applicable (conceptual study) | Esping-Andersen's welfare regime and Ferrera's (2000) welfare state type | Examination of Kim Dae-jung government's 'Productive Welfare' | Korea is developmental-universalist productivist welfare state (distinct world) |
| Wilding (2008) | UK (English) | Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore | Not applicable (conceptual study) | Productivist Welfare Capitalism , East Asian Welfare Model | review of recent developments in social policy in four nations | Korea now seems more of a welfare hybrid than a clear example of productivism (hybrid) |
| Rudra 2007 | US (English) | 32 less developed countries | Rama & Artecona (2002) World Bank (1990, 2003, 2004) | Decommodification | cluster analysis | Korea belongs to productive welfare regime out of three (productive, protective and dual) regimes (fourth regime) |
| Hudson & Kühner (2009) | UK (English) | 23 OECD nations | OECD data (94, 98, 03) | Productive, protective or hybrid welfare state types | fuzzy set ideal type analysis | Korea is weak productive-protective type (hybrid) |
| Abu Sharkh and Gough (2010) | US, UK (English) | 65 developing nations | World Bank (2005) World Development Indicators | Additional welfare regimes for developing nations as combinations of institutions and welfare outcomes | cluster analysis | Korea belongs to 'successful informal security regime' out of four new welfare regimes (fourth regime -Successful Informal Security Regime) |
| Hudson & Kühner (2012) | UK (English) | 55 high and middle income countries | IMF's Government Financial Statistics, ILO (2010) | Productive, protective or hybrid welfare state types | fuzzy set ideal type analysis | Korea in productive-protective ideal type (hybrid) |
| Asia-based authors in English | | | | | | |
| Kwon (1997) | Korea (English) | Korea, Japan | Not applicable (conceptual study) | Examination of whether Japan and Korea can be placed in Esping-Andersen's typology | Cross-sectional analysis, analysis of Korean & Japanese welfare state history and institutions | East Asian welfare regime type does exist. (distinct world) |
| Holliday (2000) | Hong Kong (English) | Japan, Taiwan, Korea, Hong Kong, Singapore | Not applicable (conceptual study) | Productivist Welfare Capitalism | Analysis of East Asian welfare in comparison with Esping-Andersen's three ideal types | East Asia belongs to the productivist welfare capitalism/ Korea and Japan developmental universal group (fourth regime) |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| Holliday (2005) | Hong Kong (English) | Taiwan, Korea, Hong Kong, Singapore | Not applicable (conceptual study) | Transformations of East Asian productivist welfare regime | Analysis of East Asian welfare change by reviewing their content of social rights | Still productivist welfare regime (fourth regime) |
| Kwon (2005) | Korea (English) | Korea, Taiwan | Not applicable (conceptual study) | Developmental welfare state | Examination of changes in economy, politics and social policy | Two nations moving from selectivist- to inclusive-welfare developmentalism (distinct world) |
| Aspalter (2006) | Korea (English) | Korea, Japan, Taiwan, Singapore, Hong Kong | Not applicable (conceptual study) | Esping-Andersen's welfare regime, East Asian Welfare Model | Description of paths of welfare state development in five nations | East Asian welfare state system exists as 'ideal typical' (fourth regime) |
| Lee & Ku (2007) | Taiwan (English) | Taiwan, Korea, Japan + 17 rich Western nations | 15 indicators from IMF, ILO, OECD et al | Examination if Korea, Japan and Taiwan belong to any of three regimes or form another regime | factor & cluster analysis | Taiwan & Korea form forth regime - East Asian developmental regime (fourth regime) |
| Park & Jung (2008) | Korea (English) | 9 Asian & 17 European nations | Social Security Administration (2006, 2007a, 2007b), OECD social expenditure database | Esping-Andersen's welfare regime and Korpi & Palme's (1998) institutional types of welfare states | cluster analysis | Asian welfare states form different typology from that of Western welfare states, but cluster analysis shows Western and Asian nations are mixed in clusters (ambiguous) |
| Yang (2011) | Korea (English) | Korea | Not applicable (conceptual study) | Institutional power resource model, | Analysis of Korean welfare development and comparison with US and Japanese model | Korea's small welfare state on the path to the US and Japan. (immature) |
| Kam (2012) | Hong Kong (English) | OECD + Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore, South Korea | OECD health data | Health decommmodification | Cluster analysis | lack of sufficient conditions for the development of an all-encompassing EA welfare regime (No evidence that East Asian model exists) |
| Korea-based authors in Korean | | | | | | |
| Cho (2001) | Korea (Korean) | Korea | Not applicable (conceptual study) | Esping-Andersen's typology | cross-sectional analysis, comparing social welfare expenditure, public assistance, social insurance expenditure of Korea and other nations | Korean welfare belongs to liberal welfare regime (liberal) |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Y.B. Kim (2002) | Korea (Korean) | Korea | Not applicable (conceptual study) | Liberal & Conservative welfare regime, Confucian welfare regime | Critically review contentions that Korea belongs to any of conservative, liberal, hybrid or 4th model | Korean welfare immature (immature) |
| Nam (2002) | Korea (Korean) | Korea | Korean government's data including KIHASA (2000) | Esping-Andersen's decommodification and stratification indices | Esping-Andersen's indices applied to Korean data | Korean welfare system close to conservative welfare regime (conservative) |
| Choi (2003) | Korea (Korean) | 28 OECD member nations | OECD social indicators 1990~1997; Castles' (2002) measure of 'percentage shares of different types of social expenditure' | Esping-Andersen's three welfare regime plus quasi liberal regime and quasi conservative regime | cluster analysis | Korea classified as liberal regime (liberal) |
| Shim (2003) | Korea (Korean) | Korea, Japan, Taiwan, Singapore | Social Security Administration (2002) et al | Development of Esping-Andersen's concepts of state-market mix, stratification and family influence | Empirical comparison with East Asian nations and other three regimes | Four Asian nations similar to but generally different from conservative model (fourth regime) |
| J.W. Kim (2005) | Korea (Korean) | Korea | Korea's official data including the Statistics Korea's national census (2000) (mainly on expenditure) | Welfare mix | Analysis of expenditure | Korean welfare regime classified as conservative (conservative) |
| Baek and Ahn (2009) | Korea (Korean) | 20 OECD nations | comparative welfare state dataset (Huber et al, 2004) (data generally on expenditure) | Esping-Andersen's welfare regime, Jessop's (1993) Schumpeterian Welfare state | hierarchical cluster analysis based on Korea's welfare expenditure data decomposed by the authors | Korea has not structurally developed into welfare state yet (immature) |
| K. Kim (2009) | Korea (Korean) | 18 OECD nations | OECD social expenditure database | Test if Korea's welfare is categorized as welfare state | Cluster analysis | Korea's welfare state underdeveloped (immature) |
| Na (2010) | Korea (Korean) | Korea | Not applicable (conceptual study) | Authoritarian developmental state | Review of historical and institutional differences between Korean and Western welfare | Characteristics of Korean welfare could be explained only within the concept of authoritative developmental state (distinct world) |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|-------|--|--|---|--|
| Y.M. Kim (2011) | Korea (Korean) | Korea | Not applicable (conceptual study) | Exceptionalism of East Asian welfare model | Review of four East Asian nations historical and institutional backgrounds | East Asian model's exceptionality could be fading in the future (distinct world) |
|-----------------------|-------------------|-------|--|--|---|--|