

**Strategies for Labor and Employment Relations
as an Academic Field**

September 2019

Dong-One Kim
Korea University Business School

I acknowledge the research assistance of Ki Jung Kim, Peter Sylvestre, Kyung Yoen Kim, and Minju Shin, and thank Paula Voos and Russell Lansbury for helpful comments.

I. Introduction

The academic field of labor and employment relations (LER) is currently in turmoil. Because of decreasing union density and collective bargaining coverage in most developed countries (Visser, 2006), there are growing doubts that LER is relevant to the changing employment environment (Budd 2004; Jensen, 2011; Kaufman, 2008; Kim and Kim, 2018). This concluding chapter examines how LER researchers have responded to and discussed strategic options and the future implications for the field.

There exist two competing views on the evolution of LER. On the one hand, pessimists holding the “change or perish” view argue that the field has not sufficiently evolved in alignment with the increasingly dynamic world of work. Although the world of work has become more complex, they assert that LER remains excessively focused on unions and collective bargaining. Some even go so far as to argue that LER will become irrelevant and disappear if LER remains exclusively focused on its current research agenda. The implication of this “change or perish” view is the clear need for a radical shift in and expansion of the direction of LER research. For example, Kaufman (2008) argued that for LER to survive and prosper in the future, the field needs to greatly broaden its scope.

Conversely, optimists arguing for “maintaining the status quo” assert that LER is slowly yet steadily adapting to the changing world of work. For example, researchers are focusing on new forms of collective bargaining, nonunion employee representation, gender issues, and LER under globalization. Moreover, despite the stagnation of trade unions and collective bargaining in most developed countries, they continue to assert that unions and collective bargaining still remain central to labor relations. Some even express confidence that unions will rebound and accordingly assert that the essence of LER research must be preserved (Hyman 2007; Kelly 1998). Therefore, optimists conclude that no radical redirection from the present is warranted. Thus, currently there is much contention as to the future direction of the study of LER.

In the following, I will explain the trend analyses of LER research in the last decades, discuss various strategic options for LER as an academic field, and seek a viable strategic option for LER.

II. What We have Done: Trend Analyses of LER Research, 1947-2014

To resolve this debate and shed light on the future direction of LER research, one should first examine what we did in the past to obtain some implications for what we should pursue in the future. A study by Kim and Kim (2018) analyzed the abstracts in major LER journals in the post-World War II era (1947-2014). The data of this analyses include all abstracts available in five representative journals in the field of LER representing four Western countries: Australia, Canada, the UK, and the US. The five journals are the *British Journal of Industrial Relations* (BJIR) from the UK, *Industrial & Labor Relations Review* (ILRR) and *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society* (IR) from the US, *Journal of Industrial Relations* (JIR) from Australia, and *Relations Industrielles / Industrial Relations* (RI/IR) from Canada.

First, the frequency of keyword appearance was analyzed. Surprisingly, the number of studies researching trade unions has grown more or less steadily since the 1940s. Specifically, the number of studies dealing with general topics about unions remained stable, but topics about union decline or union revitalization have been on the rise since the 1980s. Therefore, the total number of studies on trade unionism continued to rise. Likewise, other traditional topics in LER such as collective bargaining, strikes, mediation and arbitration show little sign of declining.¹ Although some of the coefficients were negative, they were statistically insignificant. Although research in LER seemed to increasingly embrace new phenomena and new realities, the number of studies on new topics such as nonunion, temporary and contingent workers, family, gender, women and immigrants rose only marginally. We also found that research in LER was increasingly associated with HRM, while maintaining its traditional relationship with economics and law.

Second, utilizing co-occurrence matrix analysis commonly used to quantitatively examine network relationships among data, the relationships among the 20 most frequent keywords over eight decades (1940s-2010s) were investigated. Table 1 shows that the field evolved, but maintained its core: although some conventional topics (e.g., strike, industrial) declined in their rankings or disappeared entirely from the top 20 keywords, most traditional topics (e.g., union, wage, relations) consistently remained top rankers, Although new LER

¹ The reason union studies maintain their prominence in these LER journals could be that it has become harder over time to publish studies about unions elsewhere as their perceived relevance declined. Top journals in neighboring fields such as management, economics, and sociology might have been more likely to publish an article on unions in earlier years than now.

topics (e.g., women, job, workplace) received growing attention from academia, they were not included as top rankers. The field orientation was revealed to have shifted from economics to management, from state to market, and from collective labor to individual employees.

Put Table 1 here

Overall, the empirical results show that LER research is still largely dominated by union related topics. These results suggest that most scholars in this field tacitly follow the optimistic view of maintaining the status quo. The overriding question is whether the current level of emphasis on unions and collective bargaining is desirable. I argue otherwise.

III. Dimensions of Academic Disciplines and LER

In general, academic disciplines can be broadly assessed in three dimensions: significance of subject; existence of a paradigm (Kuhn, 1996); and practical relevance (Biglan 1973, Cox et al., 2009).

First, for any discipline to survive, the subject should be of significance to society. The best example is the academic field of mining in developed countries. As the number of mines in advanced countries decreased, the academic discipline of mining declined as well (McDivitt, 2002). If the significance of the content declines in real social terms, the field is likely to run the risk of sliding into irrelevance and becoming merely an academic plaything within a narrow academic circle in the short run, and probably become moribund in the long run.

In the case of LER, labor issues, rather than declining, remain or are becoming increasingly important to nearly every society. Heightened competition in product and service markets arising from globalization and rapidly changing technology have led to creative destruction of traditional industries accompanied by restructuring and layoffs. Consequently, we see labor related headlines in mass media and even SNS on a daily basis. There is no doubt that the subject of this field, labor problems, remains central to the contemporary society (Delaney, 2006).

Second, according to Kuhn (1996), a paradigm is a set of unique beliefs shared by an academic community that regulates scientific research by generating and solving research questions. Without a paradigm, the academic field will not be recognized by other academic fields as either rigorous or providing unique contributions to intellectual progress. Good examples include alchemy and astrology, whose paradigms were rejected and discarded because of their pre-scientific origins and the absence of robustness. On the other hand, LER is centered around the paradigm of cooperation and conflict in employment relations intersecting the domains of politics, economics and society (Kochan, 1998). Within LER exist three prevailing, robust sub-paradigms: Marxism, unitarism, and pluralism. Each of them has provided explanation and insight into various aspects of LER over time. LER has been recognized for its ability to explain group-level dynamics involving employment relations.

In the dawn of this field, it covered individual-level and group-level employment relations encompassing labor laws, labor economics, personnel management and social security (Kaufman, 2008). In the decades following the 1930s, unions and collective bargaining, which is but only one component of group-level employment relations, were so successful in resolving conflicts in employment relations that the field itself became enchanted by its very success. As a result, over time, the paradigm of LER became excessively restricted to unions and collective bargaining. That academic overdependence is the problem we now faced today.

Finally, practical relevance is the extent to which practical applications exists within the field (Biglan 1973, Cox et al., 2009). Without practical relevance the field is effectively meaningless to the sustainability and advancement of society. This is especially true for applied social science such as LER. The field of LER focusing on unions and collective bargaining initially had considerable practical relevance from the 1930s through the 1980s. At that time, however, the growing problem of the field was that it was becoming too dependent on union strength in, and its relevance to, society. Since the 1980s, unions have steadily declined, especially in the developed world. As a result, the field itself declined along with them, steadily losing practical relevance in the process. In turn, this loss of practical relevance has led to the closure of LER departments and the replacement of collective bargaining courses by human resource management courses, especially in U.S. universities.

In sum, the union-focused paradigm led to the decline of practical relevance of the field. Ultimately, although ironically the subject itself seems growing in importance in society,

its excessively narrow paradigm has reduced its practical relevance. I believe, however, as long as the subject is significant, pessimism is unwarranted. To increase the relevance of the field we must seek strategic options that can make the paradigm of LER adapt to today's social economic conditions and needs.

IV. Three Strategies for the Revitalization of Academic Disciplines and Underlying Assumptions

Most, if not all, academic disciplines historically have faced crises of identity and foundation as human knowledge expanded or circumstances have changed. Disciplines have either ebbed (e.g., mining in some developed countries), flowed (e.g., artificial intelligence today), or even entirely disappeared (e.g., alchemy and astrology). To revitalize academic disciplines in crises, three basic strategies can be identified: strengthening the discipline itself, collaborating with other robust disciplines, and reshaping and expanding the scope of the discipline². I believe these strategies are based upon distinguishable assumptions.

The first strategy suggested by Krishnan (2009) is to revitalize and reinforce the traditional boundaries separating this discipline from related disciplines. This strategy's effectiveness is predicated upon the assumption that the perceived changing environment is actually temporary and not only can but also will be reversed in due course.

Revitalization requires reemphasis of its traditional essence in terms of both theory and practice. So doing will make the discipline internally more coherent and less divisive. This strategy will enable the discipline to refocus its effort on more academically promising research (i. e., greatest return) without straying into the territory of other academic disciplines. Moreover, this strategy prevents other disciplines from intruding on its core areas. Krishnan (2009) cited the example of philosophy at the end of 19th century.

Jensen (2011) suggested that LER can adopt this strategy, if LER is in crisis due to temporary alteration in the political and economic environment arising from neo-liberalism that in turn has upset the balance between employer and employee in favor of the former. He

² Krishnan (2009) provided four strategies: reinforcement of traditional boundaries; subordination to a stronger discipline; embedding within a stronger field with the objective of eventual domination; union with other endangered disciplines to form a new field. Among them the first two are applicable to LER and similar to the first two strategies developed in this paper.

opined that if this is the case, LER should not abandon its core orientation of focusing on the relationship among collective actors.

Explaining his long wave theory, Kelly (1998) observed that LER ebbs and flows cyclically in correlation with overall economic trends themselves, and thus LER scholars and practitioners should not be distracted or enticed away from the essence of LER, i.e., unions and collective bargaining, by the lure of contemporary trends. In a similar vein, Hyman (2007) asserted that the emerging model in North America and the UK will not necessarily be representative of Europe and elsewhere, where traditional LER patterns can be expected to remain resilient to contemporary threats to traditional LER structures. Thus, both asserted that continued focus on traditional LER topics such as unions and collective bargaining will prove both useful and prescient when traditional patterns reemerge and restore the luster and glory to the field of LER temporarily in crisis.

However, the obvious problem of this strategy is the extreme dependence of LER on unions and collective bargaining. As long as LER remains as a field of unions and collective bargaining, the success or failure of LER as an academic field will always be affected by the ebbs and flows of unions and collective bargaining over time, which will greatly undermine the sustainability of the academic field in attracting academic talents and maintaining academic departments.

The second strategy is to create, as Krishnan (2009) termed, “strategic alliances with stronger disciplines.” To prevent obsolescence and inevitable decline into obscurity, it must collaborate with more promising, emerging, or robust disciplines. This involves removing boundaries around itself to venture forth into more academically rewarding territory by emulating and adopting relevant theories, frameworks, and approaches prevailing in other disciplines. Krishnan (2009) provided the example of the soft discipline of sociology merging with the hard discipline, biology, to form an emerging, synergistic field of ‘sociobiology.’ This strategy is premised upon two assumptions. First, it presumes that this changing landscape is not temporary but rather a permanent paradigm shift. Second, the field has little new to offer by itself as a result.

Jensen (2011) suggested that if LER utilizes this strategy, LER may incorporate itself into HRM both theoretically and methodologically. In so doing, it can shift its core to more fertile academic soil. In return, it can enable HRM to expand in a more pluralistic and less unilateral direction. This strategy, however enticing, is a double-edged sword that must be handled carefully as it poses a grave threat to the very existence of the field itself while

offering the prospect of rejuvenation and resurgence through new theories and methods. The danger with this option is that the merger may result in the weaker field being entirely subsumed by the stronger, such as having future promising researchers lured by the prospect of working in a more dynamic field (Krishnan, 2009). Already we are seeing the danger beginning to materialize as some junior researchers are choosing HRM over LER. Indeed some LER departments have already adopted a hybrid LER-HRM name or even relabeled themselves as HRM.

The final strategy is readjusting, repackaging and expanding the field to incorporate emerging trends while preserving its core. This strategy may not be applicable to all fields but only to those undergoing dynamic developments, such as experiencing new trends and paradigm shifts, that are forcing the field to expand. Newly emerging related fields offer unclaimed academic territory, creating new blue ocean strategic opportunities. This strategy is not the negation or displacement of the old; rather, increasing complexity compels the emergence of new approaches to theory, modality and methodology. For example, the discipline of Agriculture rebranded itself in the course of the last two decades as life science, thereby providing a much larger context in which to expand and thrive in multiple directions (National Research Council, 2009).

This strategy is based upon two assumptions. First, as the changing environment is irreversible, maintaining the status quo offers no prospect of restoring its old glory. This environmental irreversibility offers as much promise as threat to existing fields. Second, because of the rapidly changing environments and ever-growing complexity, there are likely to be new areas emerging that other disciplines are not likely to stake a claim over, therefore providing opportunities.

Regarding LER, there have been voices arguing for expanding the field. Such include Wood (2000) and Kaufman (2008). Wood (2000), in his BJIR editorial statement, proposed new directions for this discipline by arguing for broadening the scope of the field beyond unionism and collective bargaining, making the field more interdisciplinary, and further intensifying internationalization and comparative research. Kaufman (2008), comparing the original and modern paradigms of LER, lamented the narrow focus of the modern paradigm that is overly emphasizing unions and collective bargaining, and urged a return to the field's earlier, broader paradigm (i.e., original paradigm) encompassing the entirety of employment relationships in order to survive and prosper in the future.

Table 2 summarizes the above discussion by proposing an exploratory framework for the revitalization of academic disciplines that describes various assumptions and resulting strategies.

 Put Table 2 here

V. The Case of LER: The Analyses of Strategic Options and Relevant Assumptions

As seen above, assumptions are critically important when determining which strategic option is the most pertinent. Two domains of assumptions are identified here: (1) degree of permanence of the environmental change; (2) degree of rejuvenation of the field in the face of environmental challenges. The former assumption is externally determined, whereas the latter is determined by both internal and external dynamics. The above is applied below to the field of LER to analyze its status in order to determine the proper strategy for the field.

First, when the Webbs (1902) and Commons (1918), the founders of this field, initially envisioned its scope, the field was very broad, incorporating related disciplines ranging from professional labor management (HRM), to labor law, to unions and collective bargaining, and to macroeconomic stabilization. With the rise of unions in the 1930s, following upon their growing success as an effective tool to resolve labor conflicts, unions and collective bargaining became increasingly dominant in LER to the point where in the 1960s they became the central focus of this field to the exclusion of all other subfields (Kaufman, 2008). This phenomenon represents a form of competency trap in which success in one sub-field eventually narrowed the entire field. Since the 1980s the socio-economic environment has changed leading to the decline of trade unionism as the dominant mechanism for labor conflict resolution, which in turn has led to deepening stagnation of the field itself.

There are reasons to believe that the decline of unions and collective bargaining is not temporary but rather represents a permanent shift in labor and employment relations. Although the shift in the political landscape leading to the rise of neo-liberalism since the early 1980s has certainly accelerated the stagnation of trade unionism, two fundamental trends in employment relations are currently driving the stagnation of unions and collective bargaining. On one hand, we are witnessing the transformation of societal dynamics from

bilateral (i.e., conflicts between capital vs. labor) to multi-lateral (i.e., conflicts surrounding the issue of identity groups such as women, minorities, immigrants) since the human rights movement arising from the 1960s (Piore & Safford, 2006). Trade unions, however, are still largely based upon the capital-labor dichotomy emphasized in earlier eras. Labor unions are still often based on the idea that it is best to unite all types of labor together to confront capital, but this might not be realistic in today's society. Thus, there will be limits imposed on the growth of unions in the future society increasingly characterized by multilateral structures. Indeed, identity-based labor organizations such as quasi-unions, labor centers, and civil society organizations are increasingly emerging outside traditional unions, as shown through growing attention among researchers and practitioners (Heckscher & Carre, 2006; Heery, Abbott & Williams, 2012).

On the other hand, the Fourth Industrial Revolution poses another threat to trade unionism. The increasing number of freelance and on-demand workers (e.g., Uber drivers) in the gig economy spurred by the Fourth Industrial Revolution is resulting in weaker attachment of the present work force to enterprises, as shown by the increasing number of dependent self-employed workers. In essence, current employment seems to be returning to the free labor market of the 19th century, which is often referred to as "labor nomad." (Weil, 2014). Since unions have traditionally thrived on stable employment relations, the general trend of weakening attachment of workers to enterprises is inevitably leading to the decline of trade unionism. In the past, union vitality cyclically ebbed and flowed like the tide (Kelly, 1998); however, there is a growing consensus that we are now witnessing a permanent paradigm shift in labor relations (Weil, 2014). Therefore, there is emerging pessimism that unions will not resurge to their former glory, although unions, in the form of so-called ghetto-unionism, can be expected to remain entrenched in some sectors such as large-scale manufacturing and public sectors. The general societal and technological transformations are progressing slowly but steadily and seem to be irreversible.

The implication is that consequently a substantial minority, at a minimum, of workers in the future will not be able to or simply will not choose unions and collective bargaining as their main advocate and weapon. Instead, they will increasingly turn to new actors, such as civil society organizations, employment rights organizations, labor NGOs, quasi-unions, internet-based voice channels and various non-union voice channels to promote their interests. This paper does not argue that unions and collective bargaining will entirely disappear in the future. A more realistic projection is that unions will still remain as one of the

main modes regulating employment relations; however, future employment relations are expected to be much more diverse.

Second, this field has room for expansion in terms of actors, issues and approaches to conflict resolution, given the growing complexity of the area of employment relations arising from the current changing environment. Almost daily we observe in headlines diverse labor issues arising. Labor problems are becoming increasingly severe and important due to economic polarization and rapid technical advances; yet, ironically, our field is in crisis. That is because despite the growing societal attention to labor issues, this field fails to address the problem “in a way that has captured the public’s imagination” (Delaney, 2006:500). As a result, the general public does not fully appreciate this academic field as important. Judging from today’s headlines dealing with labor problems, the issues involving labor as a whole are expanding beyond the traditional boundaries of LER that is largely limited to unions and collective bargaining. This field has to be readjusted and reconstructed in order to meet the changing social needs that are increasingly beyond of the existing paradigm of unions and collective bargaining.

Clearly, an expanded focus is called for. We have to guide LER to expand beyond a rigid focus on unions and collective bargaining. First, this field must embrace rising new actors in the area of employment relations such as quasi-unions, labor NGOs, and civil society organizations. These organizations typically encompass, among others, various identity groups such as women, minorities, elderly, and physically challenged workers, all of whom traditional unions have tended to overlook. That is, this field should expand from its focus on capital-labor dichotomy to incorporate the multi-dimensional socio-economic relations among various identity groups. In doing so, we can attempt more alignment with sociology and its student of social movements and worker protest, and political science with its study of political actors.

We are observing a decline in the number of strikes in most developed countries; however, this is not due to increased labor tranquility (Gall & Hebdon, 2008). Rather, the form of labor disputes are mutating into new forms including demonstrations and protests that increasingly utilize social media because many workers cannot conduct strikes due to the inability to join unions. Even those who can often lack sufficient bargaining power to conduct effective strikes. This field must embrace new forms of labor disputes in addition to strikes.

Traditionally, this field primarily concentrated on the labor issues of developed industrial countries, and accordingly put less importance on labor problems in developing

countries. Now, however, the importance of developing countries in the political and economic sense is steadily increasing. Therefore, we have to pay more attention to them. The conventional theoretical framework formulated from the experiences of developed countries does not adequately explain labor and employment relations in emerging economies. For example, unions in developing countries create unique patterns of unionism distinctive from the Euro-American pattern (Ng, Lansbury, & Lee, 2019). Also, the role of the state in labor relations is a highly critical factor in all aspects of labor relations in developing countries. Yet, the pluralistic tradition of LER denies such role in its theoretical framework (Hyman, 2008). Consequently, Western textbooks that students in developing countries are currently using at schools are not well adapted to many LER phenomena around world. To attract ever increasing students and practitioners from emerging economies, the field must be made relevant to their world. Clearly, a new theoretical framework that acknowledges the deterministic role of the state in developing countries is urgently required.

LER has a long tradition of studying the relationship between technology and labor (Braverman, 1974; Marx, 1967; Piore & Sable, 1986). Given the nature of the Fourth Industrial Revolution currently underway, this relationship is expected to greatly intensify. Thus, this field must claim ownership of this domain within its academic scope. Otherwise, the related academic fields of technology (such as artificial intelligence) and labor can and will be claimed by neighboring fields. LER must expand to embrace technical revolution and human labor. Possible, indeed even likely, research topics include: under which conditions can technology help workers perform their jobs more efficiently and effectively; whether technology dominates humans through oversight and even direction in workplaces; under which conditions can technology entirely replace human labor; how the dramatic introduction of technology (e.g., artificial intelligence, bionics, implantation of devices into human bodies; physical fusion between humans and technology) in workplaces alter existing labor and employment relations.

Moreover, employment relations are changing under the gig economy characterized by weaker worker attachment to the firm. This development is greatly undermining a critical theoretical assumption of traditional LER, the existence of stable employment relations between workers and firms. Under the gig economy, unions and collective bargaining themselves are likely to assume very different forms. Needless to say, we need to develop a new theoretical framework to encompass this emerging phenomenon accelerated by the Fourth Industrial Revolution .

Another obvious issue is the growing incompatibility between existing labor law and the evolving world of work outlined above. Fundamentally revising labor laws to align with existing and future reality will be an urgent task. Accordingly, we also can incorporate the legal labor domain within LER. In brief, the above offers a few examples of the many emerging domains that LER could subsume in due course.

In sum, considering the revitalization of academic disciplines, three strategies and their assumptions were presented (See table 2). The above discussion suggests that the third strategy is most appropriate for LER, because the field is experiencing a permanent paradigm shift; and there are likely to be new areas emerging due to the rapidly changing environments and their dynamic interactions characterized by ever-growing complexity.

IV. Conclusion: Do We really Want to Be 21st Century Luddites?

Over the years, various academic organizations in our field have changed their names to reflect the concerns expressed above, (i.e., excessively narrow focus on unions and collective bargaining to the detriment of emerging employment structures). For example, in the last decade, the International Industrial Relations Association (IIRA), Industrial Relations Research Association (IRRA), and Korea Industrial Relations Association (KIRA) changed their names to International Labour and Employment Relations (ILERA), Labor and Employment Relations Association (LERA), and Korea Labor and Employment Relations Association (KLERA), respectively.

Despite the initiatives of such academic associations, our results suggest that LER is still a field of unions and collective bargaining. Our field must embrace the new world of work. Failing to do so will make our field increasingly irrelevant to the growing number of non-traditional actors. Accordingly, to remain relevant to the fast changing global world of work, we need to expand the paradigm of this field by conducting more active research on the following: artificial intelligence and employment relations in the Fourth Industrial Revolution era; emerging alternative representative bodies (such as civil society organizations, employment rights organizations, labor NGOs, and quasi-unions); new forms of labor disputes; employment relations of freelance and on-demand workers in the gig economy; LER in developing countries; and labor law compatible with the requisites of the new world of work; all of which are growing in importance as they advance from the periphery to the center of labor relations and practices globally.

However, I am not suggesting outright abandonment of unions and collective bargaining. I believe that we must also preserve our traditional core in addition to the above. Unions and collective bargaining may decline but are likely to remain one of the critical components of LER in the future society. Most likely, unions and collective bargaining will maintain their importance in large manufacturing companies and the public sector, where unions remain deeply entrenched. Unions and collective bargaining may be stagnant now in developed countries, but can rebound in different forms in the future. That said, however, unions and collective bargaining is not now and certainly will not be the only form going forward.

In conclusion, it is obvious that LER has been trapped by its own past success. However, opportunity often comes in the guise of crisis. As long as the subject of this field, labor problems, remains essential to modern society, we need not be discouraged. Now is time for a bold strategic decision for the revitalization of LER. If we do not want to be 21st century Luddites, we have to readjust, reconfigure and expand the field to incorporate emerging trends while preserving its core.

Table 1. Top 20 Keywords by Decade

Rank	Keywords							
	1940s	1950s	1960s	1970s	1980s	1990s	2000s	2010s
1	labor	union	Labor	union	union	union	union	union
2	union	labor	Union	industri	industri	industri	employ	work
3	relat	industri	industri	labor	relat	relat	worker	employ
4	industri	relat	Wage	relat	wage	wage	work	worker
5	bargain	wage	Relat	wage	labor	worker	wage	labor
6	manag	worker	State	bargain	employ	employ	relat	relat
7	organ	employ	employ	employ	worker	labor	labor	employe
8	wage	bargain	develop	state	work	firm	industri	wage
9	employ	state	worker	unit	bargain	work	employe	industri
10	problem	organ	econom	worker	job	job	job	job
11	econom	econom	Unit	unemploy	strike	employe	workplac	firm
12	act	collect	bargain	collect	model	bargain	market	new
13	strike	problem	problem	system	system	manag	new	bargain
14	worker	trade	public	public	market	Market	manag	workplac
15	arbitr	movement	collect	employe	arbitr	New	system	collect
16	collect	act	organ	model	manag	Product	firm	organ
17	product	program	present	develop	develop	Women	practic	research
18	state	issu	unemploy	polic	polic	System	associ	practic
19	plan	develop	market	econom	new	Signific	organ	market
20	disput	present	polic	determine	women	Polic	develop	women

Table 2. Exploratory Framework for the Revitalization of Academic Disciplines:
Assumptions and Resulting Strategies

Strategies	Assumptions
Strategy 1: Strengthen the discipline itself	1. Perceived changing environment is temporary and can be reversed
Strategy 2: Collaborate with another robust discipline	1. Changing landscape is a permanent paradigm shift 2. The field has little new to offer by itself
Strategy 3: Reshape and expand the scope of the discipline	1. Changing landscape is a permanent paradigm shift 2. Because of the rapidly changing environments and ever-growing complexity, there are likely to be new areas emerging

REFERENCES

- Biglan, A. (1973). The Characteristics of Subject Matter in Different Academic Areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 57(3), pp.195-203.
- Braverman, H. (1974). *Labor and Monopoly Capital*. New York: Monthly Review.
- Budd, J. (2004). *Employment with a Human Face: Balancing Efficiency, Equity and Voice*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- Commons, J. R. (1918). *History of Labor in the United States*. New York: Macmillan.
- Cox, M. Z., Daspit, J., Mclaughlin, E., & Jones III, R. J. (2012). Strategic Management: Is it an Academic Discipline?. *Journal of Business Strategies*, Vol. 29(1), pp. 25-42.
- Delaney, J. T. (2006). The Flattening of Industrial Relations. *Review Symposium: Global Evolution of Industrial Relations. Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 59(3), pp. 497-501.
- Gall, G., & Gebdon, R. (2008). Conflict at Work. In Blyton, P., Bacon, N., Fiorito, J. & Heery, E. (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Industrial Relations*, pp. 588-605. London: SAGE Publication.
- Heckscher, C., & Carre, F. (2006). Strength in Networks: Employment Rights Organizations and the Problem of Co-Ordination. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol.44(4), pp.605-628.
- Heery, E., Abbott, B., & Williams, S. (2012). The Involvement of Civil Society Organizations in British Industrial Relations: Extent, Origins and Significance. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 50(1), pp.47-72.
- Hyman, R. (2007). An Anglo-European Perspective on Industrial Relations Research. *Arbetsmarknad & Arbetsliv*, Vol. 13(3-4), pp. 29-41.
- Hyman, R. (2008). The State in Industrial Relations. In Blyton, P., Bacon, N., Fiorito, J., and Heery, E. (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Industrial Relations*, pp.258-283. London: SAGE Publication.
- Jensen, C. S. (2011). Between Industrial and Employment Relations – the Practical and Academic Implications of Changing Labour Markets. *Arbetsmarknad & Arbetsliv*, Vol. 17(3).
- Kaufman, B. E. (2008). Paradigms in Industrial Relations: Original, Modern and Versions In-between. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 46(2), pp. 314-339.
- Kelly, J. (1998). *Rethinking Industrial Relations – Mobilisations, Collectivism and Long Waves*. London: Routledge.

- Kim, D. O., Kim, K. J. (2018). Trend Analyses of Employment Relations Studies 1947-2014: Implication for Future Research Strategy. A Paper Presented at the 18th International Labor and Employment Relations Association (ILERA), 2018 World Congress, Seoul, Korea.
- Kochan, T. A. (1998). What is Distinctive about Industrial Relations Research?. In Whitfield, K. and Strauss, G. (Eds.) *Researching the World of Work*, pp.31-50. Ithaca: ILR Press.
- Kochan, T. A., McKersie, R. B. & Cappelli, P. (1984). Strategic Choice and Industrial Relations Theory. *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 23(1), pp. 16-39.
- Krishnan, A. (2009). *What Are Academic Disciplines? Some Observations on the Disciplinarity vs. Interdisciplinarity Debate*. Working Paper, University of Southampton National Centre for Research Methods.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1996). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (3rd ed.)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marx, K. (1967). *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. New York: International Publishers.
- McDivitt, J. (2002). *Status of Education of Mining Industry Professionals*. International Institute for Environment and Development (Mining, Minerals and Sustainable Development), No.3. London, United Kingdom: International Institute for Environment and Development.
- National Research Council. (2009). *Transforming Agricultural Education for a Changing World*. Washington, DC: National Academic Press.
- Ng, S., Russell, D. L. & Lee, B.-H. (2019, forthcoming). Perspectives on Asian Unionism as a Regional Pattern. In Lee, B.-H., Ng, S., Russell, D. L. (Eds.) *Trade Unions and Labour Movements in the Asia-Pacific Region*, London: Routledge.
- Whitfield, K. and Strauss, G. (Eds.) *Researching the World of Work*, pp.31-50. Ithaca: ILR Press.
- Piore, M. J. & Sable, C. F. (1986). *The Second Industrial Divide: Possibilities for Prosperity*. New York: Basic Books.
- Piore, M. J. & Safford, S. (2006). Changing Regimes of Workplace Governance, Shifting Axes of Social Mobilization, and the Challenge to Industrial Relations Theory. *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 45(3), pp. 299-325.
- Visser, J. (2006). Union Membership Statistics in 24 Countries. *Monthly Labor Review*, Vol, 129, pp. 38-49.
- Webb, S. and Webb, B. (1902). *Industrial Democracy*. London: Longman.
- Weil, D. (2014). *The Fissured Workplace: Why Work Became So Bad for So Many and What Can Be Done to Improve It*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wood, S. (2000). The British Journal of Industrial Relations and Industrial Relations in the New Millennium. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 38(1), pp.1-5.