Regionalism in South Korean National Assembly Elections:

A Vote Components Analysis of Electoral Change*

Eric C. Browne and Sunwoong Kim
Department of Political Science Department of Economics
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee University of Wisconsin- Milwaukee
browne@uwm.edu kim@uwm.edu

July 2003

* This paper was originally presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, 29 August – 2 September, 2001. We acknowledge useful comments and suggestions by the session participants, Ronald Weber and anonymous referees.

Abstract

We analyze emerging regionalism in South Korean electoral politics by developing a "Vote Components Analysis" and applying this technique to data from the eleven South Korean National Assembly elections held between 1963 and 2000. This methodology allows us to decompose the change in voting support for a party into separate effects that include measurement of an idiosyncratic regional component. The analysis documents a pronounced and deepening regionalism in South Korean politics since 1988 when democratic reforms of the electoral system were fully implemented. However, our results also indicate that regional voters are quite responsive to changes in the coalitions formed by their political leaders but not to the apparent mistreatment of, or lack of resource allocations to, specific regions. Further, regionalism does not appear to stem from age-old rivalries between the regions but rather from the confidence of regional voters in the ability of their "favorite sons" to protect their interests and benefit their regions.

JEL Classification: N9, R5

Keywords: Regionalism, South Korea, Elections, Vote Components Analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

The history of a very large number of modern nation-states documents a cyclical pattern of territorial incorporation and disincorporation in their political development. In this process, smaller political units unite, either by force or compact, to create larger ones, or larger units fragment, either by rebellion or devolution, resulting in breakaway territories that become independent states or constituted as autonomous areas within the established borders of an existing state. Early development theorists, notably Lipset and Rokkan (1967), state the case that development proceeds typically toward the formation of increasingly large political units, as the people of *core* territories (those that are more "modernized") seek to extend political control over populations living on their *periphery* (those that are more "traditional"). This process of territorial expansion appears to confront natural limits when one expanding "core" butts up against another. In such cases, competing expansionary claims have often been resolved by interstate warfare.

The effectiveness of a state in pursuing an expansionary strategy (or simply maintaining its boundaries) is seen to depend, in part, on its ability to assimilate incorporated populations from the periphery into the dominant political, economic, and social systems of the core society, a process of forging a new national identity. While there are undoubtedly reciprocal influences at work here, the basic process is one that requires the traditional practices of peripheries to be given up in favor of those that are more modern. Thus, incorporation, particularly if forcible, carries with it the potential for jealousy, resentment, discord, and rivalry to characterize the relationship between core and periphery, and perhaps between distinctive peripheral populations as well. Where peripheral populations are concentrated geographically, the potential for resistance to attempts at assimilation can become more pronounced and, as is seen historically,

quite prolonged. (See Hechter 1975).

The concept of "regionalism" in the literature of political sociology is often used to denote an impediment to "modernization," where the incorporation of peripheries into a center is itself testimony to the general superiority of the social arrangements present in the latter. Breaking down the structures that support peripheral societies is thus able to be construed as "progress," and a continuing attachment to regionally distinctive practices and loyalties as nostalgia. In this vein, the persistence or reemergence of "regionalism" in a given country is viewed by many as retrograde and cause for alarm. Nowhere is this more evident than in the Republic of Korea, where in recent elections a pronounced trend to regional voting for party candidates has been observed. Here, the general argument has been that the unity of the nation is impeded, encouraging nepotism and cronyism at the highest levels of government to the detriment of the "modernist" requirements of economic efficiency and administrative regularity (neutrality).

While the normative content and polemical potential of this argument is evident, the empirical claims that issue from it (and also from rebuttal arguments) are not well established. In this paper, we examine the explanatory claim of the literature that the electoral behavior of South Korean voters is largely determined by their subjective identification with geographic regions. The base perception put forth in this hypothesis is that, in large part, South Korean electoral politics reduces to regional rivalries. To investigate this speculation, we shall present a longitudinal analysis of electoral data using a methodological variant of "Shift-Share Analysis," developed in regional economics to investigate similar problems. In our application, we attempt to decompose the vote cast in South Korean parliamentary elections into components that reflect geographically defined voter aggregates in order to detect over-time trends in concentrations of

the vote. Our results will provide an empirical base from which to evaluate various arguments pertaining to regionalism in South Korean politics. While in this paper we focus on the political experience of a single country, our approach is widely applicable elsewhere in the world,[1] and the South Korean case is particularly apt due to the intensity of debate the issue of regionalism has engendered among academic specialists and the public alike.

2. THE "REGIONALISM HYPOTHESIS" IN SOUTH KOREAN ELECTORAL POLITICS

For several decades, South Korean political parties are typically imprinted by the persona of their leaders, who may encourage voters to identify the leader with the traditions and *élan* of his region. Regionalism, then, engenders the expectation that voters will be receptive to appeals for support composed by political elites who share with them a common identification with a geographical region.[2] In this way, South Korean politics can become regionally "personalist," or "caesaristic," where political leaders are the "favorite sons" of regional voters, destined to be their protector and benefactor against unwarranted and unsettling claims from other regions (Morriss 1996).

For example, in the April 2000 election of the National Assembly, the ruling New Millennium Party, led by Kim Dae Joong, won 25 of 29 seats in his home region of Honam, while at the same time his party won none of the 65 seats contested in the rival provinces of Youngnam (Kim Hong Nack 2000, Horowitz and Kim 2002). Three years earlier, in his fourth bid for the presidency (1971, 1987, 1992, 1997), Kim Dae Joong captured 95 percent of the vote

[1] In the political Science literature, studies similar to ours have been conducted for several countries using a statistical technique, known as the *Variance Components Mode*l, pioneered by Donald Stokes (1965) and refined by Robert Jackman (1972) and Richard S. Katz (1973). In addition to Jackman's study of Canada, applications of the methodology in national contexts as diverse as the United States, West Germany, and India are presented by Stokes (1967), Mughan (1978), Bueno de Mesquita (1978), Graves (1978), and Browne and Vertz (1983).

[2] The term "regionalism" is used in a variety of ways in the literature. For example, it sometimes refers to cultural characteristics that distinguish regions while at other times it may refer to stereotyping and prejudices directed against people living in regions other than one's own (e.g., Yu 1990). In this paper we shall interpret the concept of regionalism more narrowly as referring to alignments of voters from particular geographical regions.

in Honam, having increased his share of the popular vote in his region at each succeeding election (from 62% to 88%, to 91%, to 95%). Thus, the trend toward regional voting as seen in results such as these serves to underscore the recent attention given to regional political competition.

There has been growing concern across a wide spectrum of Korean society, as well as among politicians and political scientists, over the implications of regionalism for sustainable democracy in South Korea (see for example Kang 1993, Lee 1998, Cho 1998, 2000, On 2001, Park 2000, 2001). A common argument in this literature is that, by responding to campaigns that accent appeals to regional loyalties, symbols, and stereotypes, voters are inhibited from developing attachments to parties with competing ideologies and policy positions, as is more evident among voters in older democracies. If politics based on regional interests persists, the argument concludes, there is little hope that South Korean political institutions will mature sufficiently to meet the political and economic requirements of a modern democratic society.

There are, however, divergent opinions regarding the explanation of, and prescriptions for, regional politics in South Korea, although they are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Some have argued that regionalism is due to the thousand-year rivalry among the various regions, dating to the period when Korea was divided into three Kingdoms. They tend to argue that it will be necessary to change the Korean people's cultural outlook to become more tolerant of people in regions other than their own (On 2000). Others argue that voters in Honam have rallied behind Kim Dae Joong and his party in order to redress several decades of mistreatment under previous administrations (Kim, Man Hum 1991).[3] The recommendation that generally

[3] Dating from 1961, all previous presidents have been from Youngnam (Park Chung Hee, 1961-1979; Chun Doo Hwan, 1980-1987; Roh Tae Woo, 1987-1992; and Kim Young Sam, 1992-1997). These regimes, particularly the first two, have been criticized for their favorable resource allocations to areas of Youngnam while ignoring Honam . Most industrial complexes under Park's economic development plan were located either in Seoul or Youngnam.

follows from this argument is for increased regional autonomy and a more balanced regional development policy. Finally, some have charged that politicians exploit and promote regional conflict to secure a base of loyal voters that will compensate for the constraints upon their ability to mobilize voters imposed by an institutionally centralized political system with weak ideological differentiation. Here, the recommendation is for increased democratic reform (Park 2001).

For an empirical evaluation of these arguments, ideally one would collect data on the determinants of party support, such as economic situations (e.g., unemployment rates and growth rates) and socio-economic variables of voters (e.g., education level, sex, income, and so on). This analysis would require data for each region and for each election over an extended time period, and the employment of statistical procedures, such as panel regression, to test such hypotheses.[4] Although socio-economic data on voters for each election do not exist, precluding this kind of analysis, extensive data on election results are available.

In this paper we attempt to evaluate these arguments empirically, albeit indirectly, by developing a methodology capable of providing descriptive information regarding the influence of such factors on observed changes in voter support for particular parties over time periods of any length. Our "Vote Components" model is similar to a measurement procedure used by regional economists, known as "shift-share analysis." (Hoover and Giarrantani, 398-401). What our model accomplishes is decomposition of the over-time vote change for candidates of a given

---

Also, several commentators have observed that high-level appointments in the military and government administration favor people from Youngnam (e.g., Kim, P.S. 1993).

[4] The prominent effect of regional affiliation of voters to political candidates and parties are well documented in several voter-level studies on recent Korean elections. For example, using regression analysis with regional affiliation dummy variables, Horowitz and Kim (2002a) and Kim and Cho (2003) find very strong regionalism in 2000 National Assembly elections. Horowitz and Kim (2000b) find similar results in 1997 presidential elections. Although these studies establish strong regionalism in a particular election, they are not able to answer the questions raised in this paper because they lack the ability to conduct a dynamic analysis across elections over an extended time period.

party into a set of theoretically defined and observable components, and it provides estimates of the relative importance of each component for the change in the vote that has occurred. In this way we may hope to gain an empirical understanding of the underlying factors that have structured the vote in South Korean elections and to locate, both spatially and temporally, changes in the patterns of partisan support over successive elections.

3. A METHOD FOR DECOMPOSING VOTE CHANGE

Our Vote Components Model posits that the vote for a given party in a province (region) in some election can be explained as some number of votes the party "retains" from a previous election and the change in the party's vote between a previous election and a current election, where the vote change is able to be decomposed into a number of constituent components. Thus, the provincial vote for the candidates of a given party can be attributed to the following five components:[5]

1. *carry-over vote component* - the magnitude of the vote at the provincial level received by the party in some base year (the earliest election of the pair),
2. *voter turnout component* - the magnitude of change in the number of voters in the province,
3. *national politics component* - the magnitude of change in voting support for candidates of the party across provinces,
4. *urban/rural mix component* - the magnitude of change in the mix of voting support for party candidates in the urban and rural constituencies of a province, and
5. *provincial component* - residual change in the provincial vote for party candidates, that

[5] Qualitatively, these five vote components are not of the same order. The last four are taken as factors that explain an observed *change* in the vote occurring between two elections; that is, they represent a decomposition of the vote change. The first factor, on the other hand, simply describes a system state, the size of the party's vote at the first election in a series.

cannot be attributed to the other factors just listed.[6]

To explain our methodology, we shall work through a hypothetical example of provincial vote change over a pair of elections (elections in Year 1 and Year 2) relying on the table below, where numerical cell entries could be considered as representing thousands (or ten thousands, etc.) of votes.

Table 1 about here

The two columns under the heading "Nation" report nation-wide voting results for all party candidates and also for those of the selected party, broken down by urban and rural constituencies and by results from the first and last elections in the chosen period. A similar breakdown is shown for a given province in the two columns under the heading "Province/Region." Note also that the first three rows present national and regional data pertaining to all party candidates while the last three present data for selected party candidates only.

To begin, our analysis intends to account for the vote received at the provincial level by a given party in a given election (the seven votes received in the election at Year 2) in terms of information available from past and current vote distributions, as reported in the table. We note first that the value of the fixed *carry-over vote component*, the number of votes received in the province by the selected party in the base election year (Year 1), is in this case five votes. This component represents the continuity of provincial voter support for the party and, unless shown otherwise, it is assumed (expected) to preserve the set of characteristics of party voters from one

[6] We emphasize here that our procedure is capable of providing vote components explanations of *two* results from the voting process, the magnitude of vote change over some pair of elections and the magnitude of the party vote in the last election of the series. While both results can be obtained for election periods of any length, (*i.e.*, encompassing any number of elections intervening between the first and last), as the number of intervening elections increases, interpretation of the contribution of the various change components to observed outcomes becomes more problematic because the longer the interval between the elections, the larger the structural differences in the electorates.

election year to the next.[7]

Next, we observe that at the election in Year 2, the party has increased its number of votes in the province from five to seven over the period. It is this increase of two votes that we wish to decompose into the last four components identified above. Looking first at the provincial voter turnout component we see that the total number of votes over all parties increased in the period from 10 to 13, or 30%. If we were to assume a uniform turnout effect across all parties in the province, then the expected vote for the selected party should have increased in Year 2 by 30%, or gone from 5 to 6.5 votes. As an estimate, then, we can attribute 1.5 votes of its two-vote increase to the increase in voter turnout in the region.[8]

Looking next to the selected party's performance across all provinces or regions of the country (*i.e.*, nationally), we see that the party vote increased from 45 to 48. In percentage terms, however, its share of the total vote actually decreased in the period, dropping from 45% (45 / 100) in Year 1 to 43.6% (48 / 110) in Year 2. Thus, if the change in the provincial vote for the party's candidates mirrored the change in party's vote nationally, its provincial vote should have been decreased in Year 2 by 1.4%. That the *national politics* component of the provincial vote change is negative indicates that the vote estimate derived from the combined effect of the *carry-over vote* and the *provincial voter turnout* components should be adjusted downward when the *national politics* component is added. Here, the expected Year 2 provincial vote from the

[7] That a portion of the Year 2 vote is attributed to a fixed carry-over effect from Year 1 does not mean, of course, that no change occurs in the voting population that supports the party in the province. Some voters will die, some will reach voting age after Year 1, some will move from rural to urban areas, and *vice versa*. What is not *expected* to change over the period, however, is the way in which the number of party voters identified by this component is distributed over the various measurement categories of our model. What is being carried over, then, is a provincial profile of the party's supporters *as it was at the election of Year 1*, and it provides the basis for assessing changes in that profile of party support observed at Year 2.

[8] We emphasize that the numerical value reported here (1.5 votes) is an *estimate* derived from the assumptions of our model, that is, a theoretical expectation and not an observed fact. Analytically, we could consider these to be new voters. As such, we should point out that, when considering the influence of a single factor, like the trend in voter turnout, the model could generate an estimate of the party vote for some election that exceeds the vote it actually obtained in the election. The method balances this excess by considering the influence of other factors in determining an actual voting outcome.

first two components, 6.5 votes, is multiplied by the percentage decrease in the nation-wide party vote from Year 1 to Year 2 (43.6 - .45.0 = - 1.4). This product is -0.091, which should be interpreted as the loss in votes in the province expected from the national politics component on the provincial vote in Year 2. Combining the effects of the *carry-over vote*, the *provincial voter turnout* and the *national politics* components of the vote change, then, we estimate the provincial vote for party candidates in Year 2 to be 5 + 1.5 – 0.091 = 6.409 of a total vote of 7.[9]

The fourth component of the change in the provincial vote for the selected party's candidates is determined by changes that occur in the mix of support they receive in urban and rural constituencies. Isolating this component and estimating its effect on the vote change is complicated by the fact that the urban/rural mix has two sub-components, the first is provincial, the second national. First, the change in the provincial vote could reflect a change in the levels of support party candidates received in the urban and rural districts of a province (what might be described as a "local impact" sub-component in the mix of urban and rural constituencies). Second, the vote change could be influenced by the effects on the urban and rural constituencies of a province due to a nation-wide demographic shift, say a general population migration toward (or away from) urban areas. This can be described as the "national impact" sub-component in the mix of provincial urban and rural constituencies.

To estimate these various components on the vote change for the party's candidates in both urban and rural provincial constituencies, we use the following calculation procedure. Looking at urban districts first, we note in the table that the number of votes for party candidates

[9]We note here that the national politics component of the change in the provincial party vote measures the additional effect contributed by factors operating nationally (across provinces) after the effect of the provincial voter turnout component has been removed from the calculation. Thus, for example, a new voter supporting the party in Year 2 (but having either abstained or been not registered in Year 1) is presumed, by the method, to follow the average provincial voting pattern established at Year 1. The national politics component, then, is the net change in the party's provincial vote that can be attributed to national level effects after or beyond consideration of the increase in voter turnout in the province.

has increased in the province from two to three. Given that the vote in urban districts for all parties in the province has increased from five to six, a consideration of only the first ("local impact") sub-component of the urban vote suggests that selected party candidates in these districts should have increased their vote from 2 to 2.4. That is, (2 x 6 / 5). When we consider also the "national impact" effect on the vote, however, we see that the party's candidates nation-wide increased their vote in urban constituencies from 50% (20 / 40) in Year 1 to 51.1% (23 / 45) in Year 2. Considered together, these two sub-components yield an expected Year 2 increase in the urban provincial vote of 0.0264, that is 2.4 x (0.511 - 0.500).

The calculation for the vote change in rural constituencies follows the same procedure. From the table, we see that the provincial vote for the selected party's candidates in rural constituencies increased from three votes in Year 1 to four votes in Year 2. Again, considering only the "local impact' sub-component, we should expect the party's vote in the rural constituencies of the province to rise to 4.2 votes (3 x 7 / 5) in Year 2. However, from the "national impact" sub-component, we see that over the period the party's candidates lost support in rural districts nation-wide, dropping from 41.7% (25 / 60) of the rural vote in Year 1 to 38.5% (25 / 65) in Year 2. Considered together, these two effects yield an expected Year 2 vote decrease in these provincial rural constituencies of - 0.1344, that is, 4.2 x (0.385 - 0.417).

To assess the combined effect of the mix of urban and rural influences on the provincial vote for the party in Year 2, we sum the expected increase (decrease) of the vote in urban constituencies (0.0264) and in rural constituencies (- 0.1344). This yields an expected overall decrease of 0.108 votes (0.0264 - 0.1344 = - 0.108), year over year, due to changes in the urban/rural mix of voters. The magnitude of this decrease in the party vote, however, cannot be considered a pure effect of the urban/rural mix component. This is because the (negative) value

representing the expected decrease in the party's provincial vote due to the *national vote component* (- 0.091) incorporates the effect of changes in the urban/rural mix averaged over all provinces. Thus, to observe the pure effect of the change in the provincial urban/rural mix, we should remove this national level contaminant from our calculation of the provincial component (0.108 – 0.091 = 0.017 votes).

To sum up, the results of our vote components analysis indicate that we can attribute the observed *change* in the provincial vote for a given party (here, two votes over two elections) to three components: 1) the change in the number of votes cast in the province (1.5 votes), 2) the nation-wide change in voting support for the party (- 0.091), and 3) the change in the urban/rural mix of support for party candidates at the provincial level (- 0.017). Together, these components can explain 1.392 of the 2.0 change in the party's vote from the election in Year 1 to Year 2. The residual of this vote increase (2.0 – 1.392 = 0.608 votes) can be attributed to a provincial (or regional) effect. To account for the actual magnitude of the party's vote in Year 2, *i.e.*, seven votes, we may simply add the fixed vote component of five votes (the *carry-over vote component*) to the four change components from our decomposition analysis.[10]

The calculation procedure just presented expresses the change components of the provincial vote for a party in units of actual votes. While it is accurate to do so, the interpretation of change results might be more immediately intelligible and meaningful if they were expressed as percentages. To accomplish this, we normalize the actual values (in votes)

[10] A note of caution should be sounded here regarding interpretation of the quantitative value estimates generated from the vote components analyses that we shall perform. While changes in the relative values of individual components observed across time and/or space provide the basis for valid comparisons, the magnitudes of the various components taken at any single point in time (any election) are highly sensitive to the order in which each component is considered in the analysis. Thus, as the effect of each component is calculated, the result reflects only *additional* influences on the vote distribution attributable to that component, given the cumulative influence of those components that had already been analyzed earlier in the sequence. Thus, direct comparisons across components should be performed very carefully. The actual sequence we use in our analysis is indicated above, and it is determined from theoretical considerations.

achieved by the components of the vote change, by dividing each of them by the total number of votes won in their province by all parties in Year 2. The five normalized components shall be called respective *effects*. Each effect represents the percentage of provincial turnout due to the specific components described above.

From the example used above we see that the party's vote share in the province has increased from 50% (5 / 10 votes) in Year 1 to 53.8% (7 / 13 votes) in Year 2, an increase of 3.8% year over year. We are interested in the decomposition of the party's vote share in Year 2 (53.8%). Decomposing the percentage vote change that can be attributed to the five components discussed above, we note first that, of the party's Year 2 share of the provincial vote (53.8%), 38.5% (or 5 / 13) is the vote share percentage the party would have won if it retained the same number of votes in Year 2 as it won in Year 1. That is, in year 1, the party obtained 50 % (5 / 10) of the provincial vote. However, since the total number of votes in the province increased to 13, retaining the same number of votes the party won in Year 1 would yield it only 38.5% of the votes cast in Year 2. This 38.5% of the votes shall be called the *carry-over vote effect.* Similarly, because the total number of votes in the region increased by 3, we calculated the party's proportionate share of the increase to be 1.5 votes, or 11.5% (or 1.5 / 13 votes) of the total provincial vote cast for the party in Year 2. This 11.5% shall be called the *provincial (or regional) voter turnout effect.* Additionally, the party would lose 0.7 % (or - 0.091 / 13 votes) to the pure effect of the national politics component of the vote change, and it would lose 0.1% (or - 0.017 / 13 votes) if the provincial urban-rural mix component is also considered. The 0.7% shall be called the *urban/rural mix effect.* The remaining increase of 4.6% (or the residual of 49.2% of the 53.8% of Year 2 votes that can be attributed to identified components of the vote) we identify as a change in the pattern of provincial voting support for the party. The 4.6% shall be called the

provincial (or regional) effect.

4. A BRIEF MODERN POLITICAL HISTORY OF SOUTH KOREA

Since independence in 1948, 16 general elections for the National Assembly have been held in South Korea, an historical description of which is presented in Table 2. Excepting the brief period between 1960 and 1961, during which time a parliamentary system was adopted, South Korea has used a presidential government structure. The first President, Syngman Rhee, was indirectly elected in 1950 by the First National Assembly to serve an interim term of two years. While the Korean Constitution specified that a President was not allowed to serve more than two terms, this provision was amended to allow Rhee to serve three terms. However, very strong public opposition to the amendment developed, particularly among university students, and eventually the civil disobedience movement forced President Rhee to resign. He left the country in 1960 for exile in Hawaii.

Table 2 about here

Rhee's resignation and departure left social unrest and economic turmoil in its wake. Politically, Rhee's party (the Liberty Party), which had been the largest party in the South Korean legislature, immediately lost all its support. Even though the country's second largest party during the Rhee regime (the Democratic Party), gained 75% of the seats in the National Assembly at the 1960 election, it could not manage the transition effectively because of an internal conflict between progressive and conservative factions in the Party. The country's descent into political chaos was finally checked a year later by a bloodless military coup led by General Park Chung Hee. Park's military junta dissolved the National Assembly immediately, and quickly took political control. Two years later in October 1963, under the provisions of a new Constitution that brought back Presidential government, Park was elected as the President.

A month later, the sixth general election of the National Assembly was held, and Park's party, the Democratic Republican Party, took 88 of 131 seats contested in local single member districts (See Table 3). The new Constitution also established 44 nationwide proportional representation seats in addition to the single-member district seats. The proportional seats were distributed only to the parties that won more than 2 seats in the local elections and obtained more than 5% of the nationwide vote.

Table 3 about here

Support for Park's Democratic Republican Party increased substantially between the sixth and seventh general elections to the National Assembly. Although the party won 86 seats in the seventh election, 2 seats fewer than in the sixth election, the Party's vote share increased from 37.1% to 54.1% nationwide (see Table 4). The increase in votes for the party was particularly strong in rural areas, where its vote share increased from 39.0% in 1963 to 59.3% in 1967. However, support for the party began to slip away after 1967, as is evidenced by the results of the eighth general National Assembly election in May 1971, and also by the Presidential election of April 1971, in which Park barely beat his main opponent, Kim Dae Joong (Kim, Eugine 1972, Kim, Jae-on 1972).

Table 4 about here

In 1972, President Park and his followers, with the backing of the military, imposed a new Constitution on the country, which included several provisions supportive of authoritarian rule. First, application of the requirement that set a maximum number of terms for President was waived for Park. Second, the new Constitution replaced election in single-member districts with two-member districts, a change that was calculated to have the effect of increasing the

number of legislative seats won by candidates of Park's party.[11] And finally, to ensure Park's political control, the new Constitution provided that the President and one third of the seats in the National Assembly were to be elected indirectly by an electoral college, dominated by Park's political cronies and followers (Kim, Yong-Ho 1989).

With the assertion of Park's dictatorship came civil unrest and public demonstrations against his regime, which intensified over time. Finally, in October 1979, President Park was assassinated by one of his confidants, Kim Jae Kyu, in a dramatic shootout. The prime minister, Choi Kyu Ha, succeeded to the presidency in an emergency election held in December 1979 in the midst of political crisis, but he was deposed in May 1980 by a military coup led by General Chun Doo Hwan. This began another era of military dictatorship. The National Assembly was once again dissolved by the new military rulers. Three months later, Chun was elected president and set about the task of formulating a new Constitution. Finished in 1980, its main electoral provisions kept the two-member district system adopted under Park's dictatorial Constitution. Also, the President would continue to be named by a hand-picked electoral college. The one-third of the seats that were previously selected by the President's cronies, however, were now to be allocated by a proportional representation election in a nation-wide constituency. And finally, Presidents were to be limited to serving one five-year term. With these new rules in effect, Chun ran again for the presidency in February 1981, winning easily.

To consolidate his political control, Chun dissolved the National Assembly shortly after his regime became installed in power. He took this opportunity to suppress the political

[11] The creation of two-member districts was a strategy designed to win more seats in urban areas where the Park regime was less popular. Since candidates of his party ran second in many urban constituencies, the first-past-the-post system ensured that the candidates of a more popular opposition party could sweep the field. When two candidates came to be elected in a constituency, however, for the opposition to sweep meant that two of its candidates had to be more popular in the district that was one of Park's candidates, which was not easily accomplished. The success of this strategy is seen most clearly in results for Seoul going from the election in 1971 to 1973 found Table 3.

activities of most known opponents of the defunct Park regime (*i.e.*, the democratic opposition). Even so, Chun's party, the Democratic Justice Party, could not capture a majority of the legislative seats (48.9%) openly contested in the 1981 National Assembly election. Faced with street demonstrations and mounting civil disobedience, Chun's government lifted the restrictions on political activity in 1984, in time for the opposition to organize for the 1985 legislative elections. Here, the candidates of Chun's party actually improved their result from 1981, winning 50% of the seats (but only 35.4% of the vote).

As the time for holding the next presidential election drew near (it was due in 1986), Chun, who would be term limited from holding office, named former General Roh Tae Woo as his successor and heir apparent. Discontented with the prospect of another General being elevated to the presidency by an undemocratic selection process, civil disobedience and street demonstrations escalated considerably. In consequence, the Presidential election was postponed until the next year (1987) and the rules were changed (by a declaration from Roh) to allow for the direct popular election of the president (Cotton 1989).

With the road to the presidency now open, a frenzy of activity ensued as Roh's political opponents organized to fight the 1987 election. Kim Jong Pil, a nephew of Mrs. Park Chung Hee, united what was remained of Park's Democratic Republican Party, although he was not a presidential candidate himself. In addition, the main opposition party during the Chun regime, the New Korea Democratic Party, split over the issue of which of its leaders would stand against Roh in the election. From this struggle there emerged two new parties, the Reunification Democratic Party, led by Kim Young Sam, and the Peace Democratic Party, with Kim Dae Joong at its head. Both party leaders ran against Roh in 1987, and Roh was the winner of the three-way race (Han 1992).

In anticipation of legislative elections scheduled for April 1988, the National Assembly reformed the laws governing election of its members, which were passed in March of that year. The reforms provided for the abolition of the two-member electoral districts in favor of creating 224 single-member constituencies. An additional 75 seats were to be allocated by proportional representation according the each party's share of the nation-wide vote. The outcome of the election must be considered a significant defeat for President Roh. While the vote for the candidates of Roh's Democratic Justice Party declined only from 35.4% in 1985 to 33.9% in 1988, its share of constituency seats decreased more dramatically from 50% to 40.2%, due mainly to the change from two-member to single-member districts (Brady and Mo 1992).

Then, in a surprising political maneuver, Roh's weak ruling party (the Democratic Justice Party) merged with two of its main opposing parties, the New Democratic Republican Party, led by Kim Jong Pil, and the Unification Democratic Party of Kim Young Sam. With Roh now term limited, Kim Young Sam emerged as the presidential candidate of the newly merged party (called Democratic Liberty Party) for the December 1992 presidential election. With these political allies, Kim Young Sam won the Presidency against the challenge mounted by the remaining opposition candidate, Kim Dae Joong. In the legislative elections that had been held earlier in 1992, the merged party's candidates won 50% of the seats while managing to attract only 38.4% of the vote (Wade and Kang 1990).

The new ruling group, however, could not sustain its unity and fell apart before the 1996 National Assembly elections. Kim Jong Pil deserted Democratic Liberty Party to form his own party, the Liberal Democratic Union. Kim Dae Joong, who had promised to retire from politics if he lost his presidential bid in 1992 returned from defeat anyway to form his party, the New Politics Peoples' Assembly. The two Kims (Dae Joong and Jong Pil) forged a strategic

coalition for the Presidential election of 1997 that chose the former as presidential candidate. Kim Dae Joong stood against Lee Hoe Chang who, as successor to the now term limited Kim Young Sam, ran under the standard of the New Korea Party, all that remained of the old Democratic Liberty Party. Kim Dae Joong emerged from the election victorious. (Steinberg 1998).

The coalition of Kim Dae Joong's New Millennium Democratic Party (the direct descendent of the New Politics Peoples' Assembly) and the Liberal Democratic Union failed to achieve a majority in the 2000 National Assembly election. However, the election results clearly show a strong regional partition, that is, the Grand National Party (the descendent of New Korea Party, which in turn is the descendent of the Democratic Liberty Party headed by Roh), took 64 out of 66 seats in Youngnam, and the New Millennium Party won 25 out of 29 seats in Honam, whereas the Liberal Democratic Union lost several seats in Choongbook and Choongnam Provinces where the party's support had been strongest.

5. THE EMERGENCE OF REGIONALISM IN SOUTH KOREAN POLITICS

The rules that structure South Korean elections have changed frequently since independence, affecting the method of vote counting, the size and number of election districts, and the number of candidates elected in an election district. These changes have made it difficult to establish geographical boundaries for individual districts that last for any long period of time. The most reliable (continuous) physical boundaries for assessments of Korean electoral behavior, then, are the Provinces. Although Seoul is a city and not a province as such, its status has come to be regarded as equal to that of the Provinces since the size of the former has become comparable to the latter. Over time, South Korea has created several other large cities, called Metropolitan Cities, that are distinguished from the Provinces of which they are a part. Since

these Metropolitan Cities are relatively small compared to Seoul, however, we shall consider them as integral to their home provinces rather than put them on a par with Seoul for purposes of analysis.

We begin our vote components analysis with the 1963 National Assembly election. The main reason for this is that before this time parties and party politics had not developed or consolidated sufficiently to structure meaningful electoral choices for the voters. Rhee's regime was personalist and he did not rely upon a party to ensure or safeguard his political power. This weakness of parties can also be seen in the fact that during the first three National Assembly elections, the percentage of the seats won by the largest party did not exceed 30%. Also, in the period before the military coup by Park there were major regime shifts (in 1960 and 1961) complicating our approach to analyzing Korean voting behavior. Hence, we shall focus our analysis upon all elections to the South Korean National Assembly held since 1963, observed at the level of the province. We further narrow our investigation to an examination of the vote received by the largest party contesting an election in a given year. For all election years in our dataset except the most recent (2000), this party is also the so-called "ruling party," the party that supports a sitting President.[12]

As stated earlier, the conventional wisdom regarding South Korean voting patterns is that during Park's regime the conflict between urban and rural areas was the most important determinant of vote choice whereas in the subsequent democratization period conflict has

[12] While such analyses could be conducted on the vote for parties other than the largest, we do not pursue this option here. For analytic purposes, it is important that the units structuring the behavior of voters, *i.e.*, parties, be stable over time. South Korean political parties, however, are often viewed as impermanent vehicles for the political aspirations of strong, personalist leaders. They are observed to be in more or less constant flux, as the support coalitions within them evolve and change. Commonly, these leadership parties are reconstituted with a new look and a new label. While such organizational instability surely impedes the development of partisan identity and attachment among voters (such loyalties devolve upon leaders instead), the main contenders for political power in South Korea are always supported by and identified with some party organization, no matter how internally unstable it might be over the long run.

centered upon regional rivalries, particularly between Honam and Youngnam. This view is supported by the observation that Park's regime consistently drew more rural votes than urban votes. For example, the difference in the rural to urban vote share won by the ruling Democratic Republican Party was as great as 13.3% in 1967 and still attained 10.6% in 1971. Similarly, the Party was able to win only about one of the 14 to 19 total seats allocated in Seoul in each of the elections held between 1963 and 1971.

To recognize the emergence of regionalism as the major determining factor influencing the vote, we should observe a change in the concentration of the vote for the largest party from the urban/rural pattern established during Park's presidency to a pattern where the concentration of the party's vote is distinguished by province, or region. By the 1985 National Assembly election, support for the ruling Democratic Justice Party was still evenly split at about 36% of the vote in both Honam and Youngnam. Four elections later, however, the largest party, the Grand National Party, which is more or less the successor of the Democratic Justice Party, obtained less than four per cent of the votes in Honam but gained more than 55% in Youngnam. Similarly, the number of seats won by the major parties has most recently become heavily skewed across regions (see Table 3).[13]

What is the major reason for the emergence of the great schism across regions? Is the regional schism a result of the age-old competition between Youngnam and Honam that dates all the way back to the Three-Kingdom Period between the first and the seventh century? Or is it due to a pattern of regional favoritism established during the dictatorial regimes of Park and Chun? Or might it even be due to the fact that politicians take advantage of the emotional

[13] The observation that regionalism has emerged since the 1988 elections is also confirmed by an analysis of variance (ANOVA) test. If the data from the period between 1963 and 2000 are used, the three variables (region, year, and the urbanization ratio) are all significant at 1% significance level. However, if we use the data only from the first four elections, region is not significant (p value is .94), whereas it is significant at .1% when the data from the last four elections are used instead.

baggage of the voters?

The methodology developed in this paper can assist understanding these issues by analyzing the provincial voting patterns of the South Korean electorate, in particular, by decomposing the vote into its various components. The five effects from these components of the vote that we identified earlier are now calculated for all South Korean National Assembly elections between 1963 and 2000.[14] In all, this period includes 11 general elections. These elections can be grouped further into four political eras. The first five elections (1963-1978) occurred under Park's regime, the last two of which were held under the dictatorial constitution that was forcibly imposed in 1972. The next two elections (1981-1985) were held under the new military dictatorship of Chun. The last four elections since then (1988-2000) can be called democratic elections, as most of the elements of the previous dictatorial regimes have disappeared since Roh's 1987 reform declaration.

Tables 5-9 report results from our decomposition of each province's vote for the largest party over all election pairs from 1967 to 2000, focusing seriatim on the relative effect of each component of the vote change observed in a given period. For example, in the 1967 election the largest party (the Democratic Republican Party) won 57.6% of the total vote in Kyeonggi province (from Table 3). Of this 57.6% vote share, 22.1% (from the second row, first column in Table 5) is the carry-over vote effect, 7.2% (from the second row, first column in Table 6) is the provincial voter turnout effect, 4.0% (from the second row, first column in Table 7) is the national politics effect, 0.2% (from the second row, first column in Table 8) is the urban/rural mix effect, and 23.1% (from the second row, first column in Table 9) is the provincial effect. In each of the Tables 5-9, the 1978-1981 election pair is shaded to indicate a major shift in party

[14] These effects, it will be recalled, are the influence on voting outcomes attributable to 1) the carry-over vote, 2) the change in provincial voter turnout, 3) a national politics effect, 4) an urban/rural mix effect, and 5) a provincial (or regional) effect.

configuration (1980) occurring when General Chun executed a military coup.

Tables 5-9 about here

Not surprisingly, the carry-over effect usually records the largest value of the five. The provincial voter turnout effect varies from election to election and from region to region. For example, comparing the total change of the turnout effect at the bottom of Table 6 across election pairs, we notice that it was relatively large in 1963-1967, 1973-1978, and 1981-1985. This result is also anticipated in Table 2, where both actual voter turnout and turnout rates increased substantially in each of these periods. However, there are also variations across the provinces for these three election pairs. For 1963-1967, the provincial voter turnout effect is large for all provinces. From 1973-1978 and again from 1981-1985, only Seoul, Kyeonggi, and Kyeongnam provinces recorded large components. Since 1985, the voter turnout effect has been reduced, apparently due to a slowing in the increase of the voting population and a recorded decrease in voter turnout during this period. Finally, in the 1960s and 1970s, Seoul experienced a large in-migration from the provinces contributing to the strength of the voter turnout effect in the elections of the period, as reflected in Table 6. Similarly, in the 1970s and 1980s, Kyeonggi province also recorded large turnout effects.

The national politics effects are shown in Table 7. The total values reported in the last two rows in the Table show a change due to nation-wide factors in voter support for the largest party across election pairs. Between the 1963 and 1967 elections, a significant increase in support for the ruling Democratic Republican Party occurred nationally, but this trend eroded rapidly in the next election period (1971-1973). In particular, these losses are substantial, and they coincide with Park's imposition of the dictatorial constitution on the electorate.

Later, during the democratic era (1988-2000), we see a substantial increase in the

national politics effect, particularly between 1988 and 1992. Presumably, this increase is due mainly to the merging of the ruling Democratic Justice Party with Kim Jong Pil's New Democratic Republican Party and the Unification Democratic Party, led by Kim Young Sam, to create the Democratic Liberty Party, which happened in 1990. A concomitant decrease of the national politics effect between 1992 and 1996 would seem to reflect the split in this new ruling party occasioned by the departure of Kim Jong Pil. In the 2000 election, the strength of this factor was restored to its 1992 level.

The portion of the change in vote share that is attributed to the urban/rural mix is presented in Table 8. In general, this effect is much smaller compared to other effects, even during Park's regime. This is not because there were no urban rural discrepancies in those elections (indeed there were large differences in voting behavior between urban and rural areas), but because the values derived from our procedure are measures of the ***net*** (or additional) urban/rural mix effect on the vote in each province. In other words, we observe from the Table that changes in the party vote share, which are due to the fact that the extent to which the provincial urban/rural mixes differ from the national average, are not very large.

The effects on vote share due to "regionalism" (manifested by province) are shown in Table 9. Here, the difference between Park's regime and the democratic era is quite noticeable. During Park's time, there are no systematic longer-term changes across provinces. Since the1985 elections, however, the provincial effects are quite prominent. Between the 1963 and 1967 elections, for example, there are large effects in all provinces except Youngnam (*i.e.*, Kyeongbook and Kyeongnam) and Jeju. In these provinces, the largest party's support levels in the first election we consider (1963) were already quite high. Then, in the 1967 election the effect for the rest of the nation "caught up" with these provinces. However, over the next three

election pairs the "regional" effect over all provinces is large and negative, indicating a decrease in voting support for the party over time that is general (*i.e.*, cross-regional).

In the 1978-1981 election pair, for example, the largest positive provincial effect was in Kyeongbook, Chun's home province. Another strong change in support for the party in that election cycle happened in Jeonbook and Kangwon. On the other hand, the result in Jeonnam shows a decline in support, - 4.4%, due probably to Chun's harsh crackdown in 1980 on the democratic movement in Kwang-ju (capital city of Jeonnam Province), which resulted in numerous deaths and injuries. Beyond this, Choongbook province is the only one to record a large provincial effect in the 1981-1985 pair.

For this pair, the provincial effect in Jeonnam, home province of Kim Dae Joong, is large and negative at - 15.9%, whereas that of Kyeongbook, Roh Tae Woo's home base, is highly positive at 11.7%. At this stage it appears that Kim Dae Joong is cast in the role of defining the opposition to Roh's claim to be successor to the Chun government. Here we begin to discern the regional polarization of the vote centered on the provinces of Youngnam and Honam. While the reforms associated with Roh's declaration did galvanize others in opposition to Roh (notably the formation of opposition parties by Kim Dae Joong, Kim Young Sam, and Kim Jong Pil), the regional effect on the vote in the 1988 election was only pronounced in Kim Dae Joong's province.

In the 1988-1992 pair, the Kyeongnam provincial effect kicks in with a big jump to 10.4%, after the tripartite merger of the parties headed by Roh Tae Woo, Kim Young Sam, and Kim Jong Pil. With Roh out of contention for another term as president, the standard bearer of the newly merged party became Kim Young Sam, accounting for the increase in the regional effect noted for his province. We also see a pronounced regional effect in Choongnam, the

home province of Kim Jong Pil, which also represents a reversal of support from opposition to the ruling party. By the next election period (1992-1996), the regional effect for this province reversed again to - 10.6%, probably in reaction to Kim Jong Pil's decision to withdraw from the merged (now ruling) party. Also in the 1992-1996 period, Kyeongbook, without its own presidential contender, now shows a very large negative effect of (-16.2%) indicating a great displeasure toward Kim Young Sam's regime.

In the 1997 presidential election, Kim Dae Joong formed a coalition with Kim Jong Pil and managed to win the office, although the seats their combined parties won in the National Assembly election of 2000 did not constitute a legislative majority. Again, for the 2000 election we see the polarizing effects of region as there are very large negative effects observed in Jeonbook and Jeonnam and a strong positive effect in Kyeongbook.[15]

Table 10 about here

The emergence of recent regionalism is most evident when we examine Table 10 in which cumulative provincial effects during Park's regime (1963-1978) and the democratic era (1985-2000) are presented. These two periods were chosen because of their relative institutional stability. Moreover, we are interested in finding out whether regionalism can be traced back to Park's regime, during which time an uneven allocation of resources between provinces is well documented. During Park's regime, there is virtually no cumulative provincial effect, in fact, our results point in the opposite direction. The electoral losses of the ruling party in Kyeongnam are quite evident in the last period of Park's regime. Since voter support for Park was stronger before our base year of 1963, these numbers can be discounted

[15] The regional effect in Jeonbook and Jeonnam is reported to be negative even though Kim Dae Joong was at the time the sitting president. This sign, which indicates an absence of support for the ruling party, reflects the fact that Kim Dae Joong's party did **not** gain the most seats in the 2000 National Assembly election, and is thus treated as an opposition party by the method we employ. Thus, the negative sign is an artifact of an anomaly.

somewhat. Even so, it is safe to conclude that there was no strong support for either the ruling party or the major opposition party based on the region. The picture is quite different during the democratic period, however. Here, changes recorded for the regional effect across election pairs appear to be quite sensitive changes in the patterns of political coalitions formed by the major party leaders, as evidenced by the fact that the ups and downs of support for the largest party directly reflect such coalitional shifts.

6. CONCLUSION

What does our analysis say about the questions we asked at the outset? First, our Vote Components analysis shows clearly the deepening of regionalism in South Korean politics during the era of democratic politics (1988-2000) and that deepening regionalism is relatively new, local, and quite flexible in the modern history of Korean politics. The voters seem to be quite responsive to the change of political coalitions formed by their political leaders. This observation does not lend strong support to the "alienation hypothesis" which holds that regional voting is a response (positive and negative) to regionally determined resource allocations (favoritism) from the ruling party. Also, the large swings in the strength and direction of the provincial effect on vote change, over time, refute the hypothesis that voting behavior is embedded in the age-old cultural particularities of regions. Most promising as an explanation of vote change, we believe, is the "favorite son" hypothesis. If a prominent politician is associated with a province, there is a tendency for provincial voters to rally around him and his party. It is not altogether clear, however, whether the causal explanation is that the voters, in effect, create their own protector and benefactor in the person of a political leader, or whether a strong leader manipulates regional voters by appealing to their cultural biases and symbols.

Also, the strength of the regional component of the vote may be more pronounced in periods of electoral history when competition for power is polarized among more or less evenly matched contenders, as in the period 1985-2000. Here, it appears natural for such politicians to seek an electoral base in their home regions. Once a politician begins to lose his "contender status," however, his provincial constituents seem to lose interest in him and his party very quickly. This effect is probably exacerbated by the term limit provisions of the law governing the election of South Korean presidents.

How long will this voting pattern continue? Although the recent electoral data show a deepening of regionalism over the last fifteen years, we believe it is doubtful that this pattern can be sustained indefinitely, or even over the "long haul." To this point, the strong regional leaders who have emerged in the democratic era represent what is essentially a politics of the past. That is, while the three Kims who dominate the contemporary political scene are clearly men of their regions, it does not appear that any of them heads a regional dynasty that can be sustained very far beyond themselves. To take the current Grand National Party as an example, it is a (more or less) lineal descendent of the Democratic Justice Party begun by Chun Doo Hwan and inherited by Roh Tae Woo, both of whom were from Kyeongbook. Roh's successor in the presidency was Kim Young Sam, who had been supported by both Roh and Kim Jong Pil. His party had incorporated, by merger, Roh's party. While Kim Young Sam can be considered a regional compatriot of Roh (and Chun), his province or origin is Kyeongnam, not Kyeongbook. Kim Young Sam's heir apparent and president of the latest incarnation of the party, the Grand National Party, Lee Hoe Chang, is said to be less identified with regional issues than his predecessors. This party history suggests that the effect of regional ties is being diluted over time.

Additionally, while one or another regional strongman can become president, it is quite another thing for him to be able to control the National Assembly. Simply, there are insufficient Assembly seats contributed by a province (or even a region) to make such a majority. Coalition building implies that the resources husbanded from gaining power must be dispersed among the winners, cutting into the benefaction available for the folks back home. The recent example of the party of Kim Dae Joong having to rely on support in the National Assembly from the party of Kim Jong Pil is instructive.

Finally, our analysis shows that strong regional support is evident in three or four provinces but is not much of a contributing factor in the others, where the vote is divided more evenly among contending party candidates. The key here is Seoul and Kyeonggi where a large number of voters and Assembly seats are concentrated. The weakness of the regional component of the vote here suggests that the voters of these provinces have yet to develop a common sense of themselves nor have they nurtured strong leaders. Most likely, many of these voters are first generation immigrants from more rural provinces who have not fully made the psychological transition to their altered circumstances. As the ties of these voters with their ancestral provinces recedes farther into the past, we expect that the dynamics of democratic politics in South Korea will replace the current regional politics model with one that is more nationally oriented.

References

Brady, David and Jongryun Mo. 1992. "Electoral Systems and Institutional Choice: A Case Study of the 1988 Korean Elections," *Comparative Political Studies*, 24 (4), 405-29.

Browne, Eric C. and Laura Vertz. 1983. "An Old People in a New State: The Problem of National Integration in West Germany," *Comparative Politics*, 16, 85-95.

Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce. 1978. "Redistricting and Political Integration in India," *Comparative Political Studies*, 11, 279-288.

Cho, Kisuk. 1998. "Regionalism in Korean Elections and Democratization: An Empirical Analysis," *Asian Perspective*, 22 (1), 135-156.

Cotton, James. 1989. "From Authoritarianism to Democracy in South Korea," *Political Studies*, 37, 244-259.

Graves, Daniel R. 1978. "Elections and National Mobilization in India," *Comparative Political Studies*, 11, 255-278.

Han, Sung-joo. 1992. "South Korea: Politics in Transition," in L. Diamond, J. Linz, and S. M. Lipset (eds.), *Politics in Developing Countries: Comparing Experiences with Democracy*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, pp. 314-350.

Hechter, Michael. 1975. *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development*. Berkeley: The University of California Press.

Hoover, Edgar M. and Frank Giarratani 1984. *An Introduction to Regional Economics: Third Edition.* New York: Alfred Knopf.

Horowitz, Shale and Sunwoong Kim. 2002a. "Public Interest Blackballing in South Korea's Elections," *Party Politics*, 8 (5), 541-562.

Horowitz, Shale and Sunwoong Kim. 2002b. "Electoral Response to International Financial

Crisis: South Korea's 1997 Presidential Election," *International Interactions*, forthcoming.

Jackman, Robert W. 1972. "Political Parties, Voting and National Integration: The Canadian Case," *Comparative Politics*, 4 (July), 512-536.

Katz, Richard S. 1973. "The Attribution of Variance in Electoral Returns: An Alternative Measurement Technique," *American Political Science Review*, 67 (September), 817-831.

Kim, Eugene C. I. 1972. "The Meaning of the 1971 Korean Election: A Pattern of Political Development," *Asian Survey*, 12 (3), 213-224.

Kim, Hong Nack. 2000. "The 2000 Parliamentary Election in South Korea," *Asian Survey*, 40 (6), 894-913.

Kim, Jae-on and B. C. Koh. 1972. "Electoral Behavior and Social Development in South Korea: An Aggregate Data Analysis of Presidential Elections," *The Journal of Politics*, 34 (3), 825-859.

Kim, Sunwoong and Kisuk Cho. 2003. "Political Cynicism, Public Interest Blackballing and Voter Turnout: The Case of South Korea's 2000 National Assembly Election," *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, forthcoming.

Kim, P. S. 1993. "Public Bureaucracy and Regionalism in South Korea," *Administration and Society*, 25 (2), 227-42.

Kim, Yong-Ho. 1989. "Authoritarian Leadership and Party Dynamics: The Rise and Fall of the Democratic Republican Party in South Korea, 1962-1980," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Lipset, S. M., and Stein Rokkan. 1967. *Party Systems and Voter Alignments*. New York: The Free Press.

Moore, Mick. 1984/1985. "Mobilization and Disillusion in Rural Korea: The Saemaul Movement in Retrospect," *Pacific Affairs* 57 (4), 577-98.

Morriss, P. 1996. "Electoral Politics in South Korea," *Electoral Studies*, 15 (4), 550-562.

Mughan, Anthony. 1978. "On Measuring National Integration in Regionally Divided Societies," *Quantity and Quality*, 12, 91-98.

Steinberg, D. I. 1998. "Korea: Triumph Amid Turmoil," *Journal of Democracy*, 9 (2), 76-90.

Stokes, Donald. 1965. "A Variance Components Model of Political Effects," in J.M. Claunch (ed.), *Mathematical Applications in Political Science.* Dallas: Arnold Foundation, pp. 61-85.

Stokes, Donald. 1967. "Parties and the Nationalization of Electoral Forces," in William N. Chambers and Walter D. Burnham (eds.), *The American Party System: Stages of Political Development*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wade, L. and S. Kang. 1990. "Economic Voting in South Korea: The 1988 Assembly Elections," *Journal of Northeast Asian Studies*, 9 (2), 46-58.

Yu, Eui-Young. 1990. "Regionalism in the South Korean Job Market: An Analysis of Regional-Origin Inequality among Migrants in Seoul," *Pacific Affairs*, 63 (1), 24-39.

Literature in Korean

Kang, Myung Koo. 1993. "Sunkeowa Jiyeog Galdeung" [Election and Regional Conflict], *Hanguk Jeongchi Hakhoebo [Korean Political Science Review]*, 27 (2), 77-98.

Cho, Kisuk. 2000. *Jiyeokjuui Seongeowa Hapnijeok Yukwonja [Regionalism and Rational Voters]*. Seoul: Nanam Press.

Choi, Young Jin. 2001. "Je 16dae Chongseonkwa Hankug Jiyeokjuui Seongkyeog" [The 16th

Korean National Assembly Elections and the Nature of Korean Regionalism], *Hanguk Jeongchi Hakhoebo [Korean Political Science Review]*, 35 (1), 149-65.

Kim, Man Hum. 1991. Hankugui Jeongchi Kyunyeole Kwanhan Yeonku: Jiyeok Kyunyeolei Jeongchikwajeonge Daehan Kujojeok Jeopkeun [A Study on Political Cleavage: A Structural Approach to Regional Cleavage in Political Process], Ph.D. dissertation, Seoul National University.

Lee, Kap Yun. 1998. *Hankugui Seonkeowa Jiyeokjuui [Korean Elections and Regionalism]*. Seoul: Orum Press.

On, Man Kum. 2000. "Yeokdae Seonkeo Kyeolkwae Natanan Jiyeokseongkwa Jeongchi Munhwa" [Regionalism and Political Culture in Election Outcomes], *Sahoe Yeonku [Social Research]*, 1, 41-64.

Park, Sang Hoon. 2001. "Hankugeui Yukwonjaneun Jiyeokjueuie Euihae Tupyohana? Je 16dae Chongseonui Sarye" [Do Korean Voters Vote Based on Regionalism? The Case of the 16th National Assembly Elections], *Hankug Jeongchi Haghoebo [Korean Political Science Review]*, 35 (2), 113-34.

Park, Sang Hoon. 2000. "Minjuhwa Ijeonui Seongeowa Jiyeokjuui" [Elections before Democratization and Regionalism]," *Ase Yeonku [Asia Research]*, 43 (2), 1-39.

Table 1

Hypothetical Vote Distribution in Nation and Province for All Parties and a Selected Party Over Some Pair of Elections, by Urban and Rural Constituencies

		Nation		Province/Region	
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 1	Year 2
Number of votes for all parties	Urban	40	45	5	6
	Rural	60	65	5	7
	Total	100	110	10	13
Number of votes for a given party	Urban	20	23	2	3
	Rural	25	25	3	4
	Total	45	48	5	7

Table 2

Electoral History of the South Korean National Assembly: 1948-2000

No.	Election Date	Governance System	Electoral System for NA	Sitting President	The Largest Party	Turnout (in 000s)	Turnout Rate (in percent)	Number of Total Seats	Number of Districts
1	05/10/1948	IE PS	SMD only	None	Korea Independence National	7488	95.5	200	200
2	05/30/1950	DE PS	SMD only	Rhee Sung Man	KoreanPeoples/DemocraticPeoples	no record	no record	210	210
3	05/20/1954	DE PS	SMD only	Rhee Sung Man	Liberty	7698	91.1	203	203
4	05/02/1958	DE PS	SMD only	Rhee Sung Man	Liberty	8924	91.1	233	233
Resignation and Exile of Rhee Sung Man in the aftermath of Student Civil Disobedience for Democracy									
5	07/29/1960	IE PAS	SMD only	Yoon Bo Sun	Democratic	9779	84.3	233	233
Military Coup de Etat by Park Chung Hee									
6	11/26/1963	DE PS	SMD and NP	Park Chung Hee	Democratic Republican	9622	72.1	175	131
7	06/08/1967	DE PS	SMD and NP	Park Chung Hee	Democratic Republican	11202	76.2	175	131
8	05/25/1971	DE PS	SMD and NP	Park Chung Hee	Democratic Republican	11430	73.2	204	153
Dictatorial Constitutional Change by Park Chung Hee									
9	02/27/1973	IE PS	2MD and IEEC	Park Chung Hee	Democratic Republican	11196	72.9	219	73
10	12/12/1978	IE PS	2MD and IEEC	Park Chung Hee	Democratic Republican	15023	77.1	231	77
Assassination of Park and Coup de Etat by Chun Doo Hwan									
11	03/25/1981	IE PS	2MD and NP	Chun Doo Hwan	Democratic Justice	16398	78.4	276	92
12	02/12/1985	IE PS	2MD and NP	Chun Doo Hwan	Democratic Justice	20286	84.6	276	92
Direct Election for President after Nationwide Civil Disobedience for Democracy									
13	04/26/1988	DE PS	SMD and NP	Roh Tae Woo	Democratic Justice	19851	75.8	299	224
14	03/24/1992	DE PS	SMD and NP	Roh Tae Woo	Democratic Liberty	20743	71.9	299	237
15	04/11/1996	DE PS	SMD and NP	Kim Young Sam	New Korea	20121	63.9	299	253
16	04/13/2000	DE PS	SMD and NP	Kim Dae Joong	Grand National	19152	57.2	273	227

Abbreviations: IE (Indirectly Elected), DE (Directly Elected), IEEC (Indirectly Elected Electoral Colleague)
PS (Presidential System), PAS (Parliamentary System), NA (National Assembly),
SMD (Single Member Districts), 2MD (Two Member Districts), NP (Nationwide Proportional Representation),

Table 3

Provincial Seat Share Won by the Largest Party in National Assembly Elections, 1963-2000

Province	1963			1967			1971			1973			1978		
	Total Seats	Seats Won	% Won	Total Seats	Seats Won	% Won	Total Seats	Seats Won	% Won	Total Seats	Seats Won	% Won	Total Seats	Seats Won	% Won
Seoul	14	2	14.3	14	1	7.1	19	1	5.3	16	7	43.8	22	9	40.9
Kyeonggi	13	7	53.8	13	10	76.9	16	11	68.8	16	9	56.3	16	8	50.0
Kangwon	9	7	77.8	9	8	88.9	9	8	88.9	10	5	50.0	10	5	50.0
Choongbook	8	6	75.0	8	8	100.0	8	6	75.0	8	5	62.5	8	3	37.5
Choongnam	13	8	61.5	13	12	92.3	15	11	73.3	14	6	42.9	14	7	50.0
Jeonbook	11	7	63.6	11	11	100.0	12	6	50.0	12	4	33.3	12	6	50.0
Jeonnam	19	12	63.2	19	16	84.2	22	15	68.2	20	10	50.0	20	8	40.0
Kyeongbook	20	19	95.0	20	18	90.0	24	15	62.5	22	12	54.5	22	9	40.9
Kyeongnam	22	18	81.8	22	16	72.7	26	11	42.3	26	14	53.8	28	12	42.9
Jeju	2	2	100.0	2	2	100.0	2	2	100.0	2	1	50.0	2	1	50.0
Total	131	88	67.2	131	86	77.9	153	86	56.2	146	73	50.0	154	68	48.9

Province	1981			1985			1988			1992			1996			2000		
	Total Seats	Seats Won	% Won	Total Seats	Seats Won	% Won	Total Seats	Seats Won	% Won	Total Seats	Seats Won	% Won	Total Seats	Seats Won	% Won	Total Seats	Seats Won	% Won
Seoul	28	14	50.0	28	13	46.4	42	10	23.8	44	16	36.4	47	27	57.4	45	17	37.8
Kyeonggi	24	12	50.0	24	12	50.0	35	22	62.9	38	23	60.5	49	27	55.1	52	23	44.2
Kangwon	12	6	50.0	12	6	50.0	14	8	57.1	14	8	57.1	13	9	69.2	9	3	33.3
Choongbook	8	4	50.0	8	4	50.0	9	7	77.8	9	6	66.7	8	2	25.0	7	3	42.9
Choongnam	16	8	50.0	16	8	50.0	18	5	27.8	19	8	42.1	20	1	5.0	17	1	5.9
Jeonbook	14	7	50.0	14	7	50.0	14	0	0.0	14	2	14.3	14	1	7.1	10	0	0.0
Jeonnam	22	10	45.5	22	11	50.0	23	0	0.0	25	0	0.0	23	0	0.0	19	0	0.0
Kyeongbook	26	13	50.0	26	12	46.2	29	25	86.2	32	22	68.8	32	13	40.6	27	27	100.0
Kyeongnam	32	16	50.0	22	13	59.1	37	13	35.1	38	33	86.8	44	38	86.4	38	37	97.4
Jeju	2	0	0.0	2	1	50.0	3	0	0.0	3	0	0.0	3	3	100.0	3	1	33.3
Total	184	90	48.9	174	87	50.0	224	90	40.2	236	118	50.0	253	121	47.8	227	112	49.3

Table 4

Percent Votes Won by the Largest Party in National Assembly Elections, 1963-2000: by Province and Urban and Rural Constituencies

Province	1963			1967			1971			1973			1978		
	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural
Seoul	23.6	23.6	NA	39.0	39.0	NA	39.8	39.8	NA	34.2	34.2	NA	29.5	29.5	NA
Kyeonggi	29.3	34.2	27.5	57.6	49.5	61.0	51.4	50.3	52.0	39.1	45.3	32.9	35.7	35.3	36.0
Kangwon	35.1	30.9	37.2	51.7	44.1	55.2	54.3	50.0	56.6	38.6	42.1	37.8	39.1	30.5	41.2
Choongbook	35.5	33.7	36.0	66.1	64.5	66.6	52.3	48.1	53.7	38.3	39.0	38.1	36.5	29.3	39.1
Choongnam	37.1	30.5	37.8	60.7	40.0	63.0	54.5	52.7	54.8	35.4	37.6	35.1	40.1	28.9	42.5
Jeonbook	37.3	32.7	39.1	59.5	53.1	62.0	47.5	38.7	51.7	29.4	35.6	25.3	29.4	26.2	31.9
Jeonnam	36.6	35.4	37.0	54.2	53.7	54.4	54.2	43.1	57.7	41.2	28.0	42.8	34.4	21.2	36.7
Kyeongbook	44.6	47.2	43.3	53.3	45.9	57.3	52.1	49.9	53.3	33.2	41.2	31.0	27.8	26.2	28.4
Kyeongnam	44.0	40.5	46.7	53.6	48.4	58.8	48.0	43.6	53.8	36.2	35.0	37.8	30.6	31.2	29.6
Jeju	46.9	NA	46.9	58.9	NA	58.9	61.8	NA	61.8	35.8	NA	35.8	23.7	NA	23.7
Total	37.1	33.8	39.0	54.1	46.0	59.3	49.8	43.9	54.5	35.9	36.6	35.4	32.3	29.8	34.7

Province	1981			1985			1988			1992			1996			2000		
	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural
Seoul	33.9	33.9	NA	28.1	28.1	NA	26.2	26.2	NA	34.8	34.8	NA	36.5	36.5	NA	43.3	43.3	NA
Kyeonggi	38.7	36.8	40.3	34.9	31.4	43.9	36.4	33.1	41.7	36.5	34.2	42.5	34.3	33.3	42.1	39.6	39.3	44.5
Kangwon	45.9	42.4	46.7	46.4	49.7	45.2	43.6	38.5	47.8	38.8	37.4	40.2	37.3	37.1	37.7	38.6	39.7	37.0
Choongbook	34.1	33.6	34.3	56.7	40.4	61.4	43.7	34.8	51.1	44.6	38.7	50.8	31.5	27.6	37.5	30.6	32.4	27.9
Choongnam	35.9	36.6	35.9	38.3	49.7	36.0	30.2	25.3	32.5	37.9	28.4	44.4	26.1	22.7	36.8	19.6	21.7	15.1
Jeonbook	38.0	35.5	40.1	36.8	35.3	38.4	28.8	22.6	32.3	31.8	26.6	37.0	23.4	22.0	27.8	3.6	3.7	3.1
Jeonnam	31.0	24.5	32.3	35.7	28.0	37.8	19.2	11.4	24.8	20.1	14.4	27.0	14.2	10.2	21.9	3.8	3.8	3.9
Kyeongbook	37.9	33.8	39.7	38.7	34.0	45.9	49.8	47.3	52.8	48.2	48.2	48.3	30.5	30.5	30.2	56.9	57.9	49.5
Kyeongnam	32.5	30.6	38.8	34.1	31.9	43.4	36.1	32.5	45.9	48.3	48.3	48.6	51.0	50.6	55.2	55.4	54.9	62.2
Jeju	23.9	NA	23.9	31.9	NA	31.9	36.0	33.5	37.8	34.1	23.8	42.2	37.2	42.4	32.9	44.2	46.7	42.1
Total	35.4	33.4	37.8	35.4	31.5	42.3	33.9	30.5	40.4	38.4	36.9	42.4	34.5	34.4	35.3	39.0	40.7	28.2

Table 5

The Carry-Over Vote Effect:
Percentage of the Largest Party Candidates' Vote Share Due to Carry-Over Voters from the Previous Election by Province Over Pairs of National Assembly Elections

Province	63-67	67-71	71-73	73-78	78-81	81-85	85-88	88-92	92-96	96-00
Seoul	18.0	27.5	37.4	21.3	24.5	26.1	29.1	23.7	39.4	40.1
Kyeonggi	22.1	53.3	53.6	24.7	30.6	27.8	33.1	30.0	33.2	33.3
Kangwon	28.8	51.8	55.3	32.4	36.5	42.4	49.2	46.7	43.0	38.4
Choongbook	29.2	69.9	50.9	32.7	34.6	31.2	59.7	45.1	46.3	32.8
Choongnam	30.7	62.0	52.9	29.4	39.1	31.8	39.0	30.1	38.9	27.3
Jeonbook	30.3	61.8	47.5	25.7	28.9	34.6	39.0	30.6	33.6	25.1
Jeonnam	29.9	53.4	57.6	35.4	33.0	27.7	37.1	20.1	21.4	14.7
Kyeongbook	36.7	52.4	51.4	27.0	24.9	33.7	39.0	51.4	50.1	32.4
Kyeongnam	38.3	49.5	51.6	24.2	28.3	25.4	34.0	35.5	53.3	52.6
Jeju	41.4	52.5	60.7	26.4	22.4	20.4	31.9	33.3	34.9	36.7
Total	305.5	534.0	519.1	279.0	302.8	301.0	391.0	346.5	394.0	333.6
Total (Abs Val)	305.5	534.0	519.1	279.0	302.8	301.0	391.0	346.5	394.0	333.6

Table 6

The Provincial Voter Turnout Effect:
Change of Vote Share of the Largest Party Candidates due to the Change in the Provincial Voter Turnout by Province Over Pairs of National Assembly Elections

Province	63-67	67-71	71-73	73-78	78-81	81-85	85-88	88-92	92-96	96-00
Seoul	5.6	11.5	2.3	12.9	5.0	7.8	-1.0	2.6	-4.6	-3.7
Kyeonggi	7.2	4.3	-2.2	14.5	5.1	10.9	1.8	6.4	3.3	1.0
Kangwon	6.3	-0.1	-1.0	6.2	2.6	3.4	-2.8	-3.1	-4.2	-1.1
Choongbook	6.3	-3.7	1.4	5.6	1.9	2.9	-2.9	-1.4	-1.7	-1.3
Choongnam	6.4	-1.3	1.6	6.0	1.0	4.1	-0.7	0.1	-1.0	-1.3
Jeonbook	7.0	-2.4	0.0	3.7	0.5	3.4	-2.1	-1.9	-1.9	-1.7
Jeonnam	6.7	0.8	-3.4	5.8	1.4	3.3	-1.3	-0.9	-1.2	-0.5
Kyeongbook	7.9	0.9	0.7	6.3	2.9	4.2	-0.3	-1.6	-1.9	-2.0
Kyeongnam	5.7	4.1	-3.6	12.0	2.3	7.1	0.1	0.7	-4.9	-1.6
Jeju	5.5	6.4	1.1	9.4	1.3	3.5	0.0	2.7	-0.8	0.5
Total	64.5	20.6	-3.0	82.4	24.0	50.7	-9.2	3.6	-18.8	-11.7
Total (Abs Val)	64.5	35.6	17.3	82.4	24.0	50.7	13.1	21.3	25.4	14.6

Table 7

The National Politics Effect:
Change of Vote Share of the Largest Party Candidates due to the National Component
by Province Over Pairs of National Assembly Elections

Province	63-67	67-71	71-73	73-78	78-81	81-85	85-88	88-92	92-96	96-00
Seoul	4.0	-1.7	-5.5	-1.2	0.9	0.0	-0.4	1.2	-1.4	1.6
Kyeonggi	5.0	-2.5	-7.1	-1.4	1.1	0.0	-0.5	1.6	-1.4	1.5
Kangwon	6.0	-2.3	-7.5	-1.4	1.2	0.0	-0.7	2.0	-1.5	1.7
Choongbook	6.1	-2.9	-7.2	-1.4	1.1	0.0	-0.8	2.0	-1.8	1.4
Choongnam	6.3	-2.6	-7.5	-1.3	1.2	0.0	-0.5	1.4	-1.5	1.2
Jeonbook	6.4	-2.6	-6.6	-1.1	0.9	0.0	-0.5	1.3	-1.2	1.0
Jeonnam	6.2	-2.4	-7.5	-1.5	1.1	0.0	-0.5	0.9	-0.8	0.6
Kyeongbook	7.6	-2.3	-7.2	-1.2	0.9	0.0	-0.6	2.2	-1.9	1.4
Kyeongnam	7.5	-2.3	-6.6	-1.3	1.0	0.0	-0.5	1.6	-1.9	2.3
Jeju	8.0	-2.6	-8.5	-1.3	0.7	0.0	-0.5	1.6	-1.3	1.7
Total	63.2	-24.2	-71.4	-13.0	10.2	-0.3	-5.4	15.8	-14.7	14.4
Total (Abs Val)	63.2	24.2	71.4	13.0	10.2	0.3	5.4	15.8	14.7	14.4

Table 8

The Urban/rural Mix Effect:
Change of Vote Share of the Largest Party Candidates due to the Urban/Rural Mix Component by Province Over Pairs of National Assembly Elections

Province	63-67	67-71	71-73	73-78	78-81	81-85	85-88	88-92	92-96	96-00
Seoul	-1.2	0.9	2.6	-1.1	0.1	-0.6	0.1	0.5	0.5	0.7
Kyeonggi	0.2	0.2	0.4	-0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.2
Kangwon	0.4	0.2	-2.0	0.6	0.0	1.4	-0.1	-0.2	0.1	-1.5
Choongbook	0.5	0.1	-1.4	0.5	0.0	1.1	0.0	-0.3	-0.3	-1.4
Choongnam	1.0	-0.1	-2.0	0.6	0.0	1.3	-0.1	-0.3	0.2	-1.0
Jeonbook	0.5	0.2	-0.5	-0.1	0.0	0.6	-0.1	-0.2	0.1	-0.4
Jeonnam	0.5	0.1	-2.7	0.9	0.0	1.1	0.0	-0.2	-0.1	-0.8
Kyeongbook	0.1	0.1	-1.5	0.3	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.1
Kyeongnam	-0.3	0.5	0.5	-0.3	0.1	-0.1	0.0	0.2	0.5	0.4
Jeju	1.5	-0.3	-3.2	1.0	0.0	1.1	0.1	-1.2	-0.3	-1.7
Total	3.2	1.8	-9.8	2.4	0.4	6.3	-0.2	-1.6	1.5	-5.4
Total (Abs Val)	6.1	2.6	16.8	5.5	0.4	7.7	0.6	3.4	2.9	8.1

Table 9

The Provincial Effect:
Change of Vote Share of the Largest Party Candidates due to the Provincial Component
by Province over Pairs of National Assembly Elections

Province	63-67	67-71	71-73	73-78	78-81	81-85	85-88	88-92	92-96	96-00
Seoul	12.5	1.6	-2.7	-2.4	3.4	-5.1	-1.6	6.9	2.6	4.5
Kyeonggi	23.1	-3.8	-5.5	-1.9	1.8	-3.8	2.0	-1.7	-1.0	3.6
Kangwon	10.2	4.7	-6.3	1.3	5.5	-0.8	-2.1	-6.5	-0.2	1.1
Choongbook	24.0	-11.0	-5.4	-0.9	-3.5	21.6	-12.2	-0.7	-11.0	-0.9
Choongnam	16.3	-3.4	-9.6	5.4	-5.4	1.1	-7.5	6.7	-10.6	-6.6
Jeonbook	15.4	-9.5	-11.1	1.2	7.6	-1.7	-7.4	1.9	-7.2	-20.5
Jeonnam	10.9	2.3	-2.9	-6.3	-4.4	3.6	-15.9	0.2	-5.1	-10.2
Kyeongbook	1.0	1.0	-10.2	-4.5	9.2	0.5	11.7	-3.9	-16.2	24.9
Kyeongnam	2.4	-3.7	-5.7	-4.0	0.8	1.7	2.5	10.4	4.1	1.7
Jeju	2.5	5.8	-14.2	-11.9	-0.5	6.8	4.5	-2.4	4.7	7.1
Total	118.2	-16.2	-73.5	-24.0	14.4	24.0	-26.1	11.0	-39.9	4.8
Total (Abs Val)	118.2	46.9	73.5	39.7	42.1	46.8	67.5	41.2	62.6	81.1

Table 10

Cumulative Provincial Effect for 1963-1978 and 1985-2000:
Change of Vote Share of the Largest Party Candidates Due to the Provincial Component, by Province

Province	63-67	67-71	71-73	73-78		85-88	88-92	92-96	96-00
Seoul	12.5	10.4	7.2	2.0		-1.6	5.4	8.7	14.0
Kyeonggi	23.1	17.5	12.7	6.1		2.0	0.0	-1.1	2.5
Kangwon	10.2	15.0	9.0	8.9		-2.1	-8.8	-9.9	-9.1
Choongbook	24.0	14.4	8.6	6.4		-12.2	-13.3	-24.9	-26.8
Choongnam	16.3	13.2	3.2	8.0		-7.5	-0.8	-11.4	-18.5
Jeonbook	15.4	6.5	-4.6	-2.8		-7.4	-6.0	-13.5	-35.0
Jeonnam	10.9	13.0	11.0	3.2		-15.9	-16.4	-22.5	-33.5
Kyeongbook	1.0	1.9	-8.3	-11.2		11.7	8.2	-7.7	16.7
Kyeongnam	2.4	-1.5	-7.4	-8.9		2.5	12.9	18.2	20.5
Jeju	2.5	8.0	-6.3	-16.6		4.5	1.8	6.6	13.6
Total	118.2	98.3	25.0	-4.9		-26.1	-17.0	-57.4	-55.4
Total (Abs Val)	118.2	101.4	78.2	74.1		67.5	73.6	124.4	190.3