Area Studies and International Studies in the Age of Globalization*

KISUK CHO and HYE YUN PARK

Graduate School of International Studies, Ewha Womans University

This study investigates the factors responsible for the recent decline in area studies and the surge of international studies in the U.S. in order to draw lessons from the U.S. experiences as a late developer. Three factors are identified: the demise of the Cold War, the methodological failure of area studies (and thus, the failure to meet policy objective), and the emergence of a new agenda due to globalization. After reviewing previous literature on American studies in Korea, we suggest that the identity of area studies be redefined by considering the world situation that Korea currently faces and that adequate methodology be employed combining empathetic interpretation and scientific methods. We have also explored policy options regarding the area studies program at the graduate and undergraduate levels and funding decisions for research grants.

*The authors would like to appreciate financial assistance provided by the Institute for International Trade and Cooperation, Graduate School of International Studies at Ewha Womans University, and anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.

Direct all correspondence to Kisuk Cho, Assistant Professor, Graduate School of International Studies, Ewha Womans University, and Hye Yun Park, Graduate School of International Studies, Ewha Womans University, 111 Daeyam-dong, Seodamun-gu, Seoul, 120-750, Korea.

GLOBALIZATION AND GOVERNMENTAL STRATEGY

Area studies is booming in Korea while the U.S., after the demise of the Cold War, has experienced a decline. It is also losing its appeal in Britain (How 1993). It is interesting to note that the two diverging phenomena were created by a single cause, namely, globalization. Considering the recent trend of globalization, the retreat of area studies in the U.S., as well as in Britain, is understandable since "globalization" basically refers both to "the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a single place" (Enderle 1997, 300). Correspondingly, area studies, of which the unit of scholarly attention is "the people of a definable geographical sector, acting in their society and their environment" (Wood 1968, 401), is expected to move in the opposite direction of the trend of international studies. The Social Science Research Council in the U.S. announced that research funds for area studies would be transferred to either comparative or global studies. Then, one might ask, 'why and how did the same force bring about a totally different outcome in Korea?'

The Kim Young Sam administration first launched educational projects to prepare scholars and students for the challenges and opportunities in the age of globalization. Scholars and Ph.D. candidates were granted scholarships that enabled them to conduct research in area studies. Also, nine schools were awarded special funds to further develop graduate schools of international and/or area studies. Unfortunately, there have been much confusion and misunderstanding regarding the eligibility of the area specialists, since we have not seriously discussed nor reached a consensus regarding the identity and methodology of area studies in Korea. Koreans have not been successful in defining their own identity of area studies, for they merely endorsed the area studies that has already been developed in the U.S. Area studies is a form of applied science born with specific goals pertaining to the government's short-term and long-term policy objectives rather than a purely interdisciplinary field. Although the government's globalization projects were successfully launched with great hope and expectations, the directions and future paths of these studies are still unclear.

It will be useful to identify the factors responsible for the surge of international studies, as well as the rise and decline of area studies in the U.S. We may get some benefits, as a late developer, by drawing lessons from the previous U.S. experiences. The next section delineates the underlying factors that contributed to the rise and decline of area studies in other countries, with a special focus on the U.S. The third section will examine the state and the problems of area studies in general, and American studies in particular, that have been carried out thus far in Korea. The fourth section proposes a desirable direction for the future area studies in Korea by drawing implications from the previous sections. It will shed some light on the relationship between area studies and international studies with respect to our globalization strategy. The final section summarizes and presents specific policy recommendations in line with the principles needed to allocate research grants and educational programs.

THE RISE AND DECLINE OF AREA STUDIES IN THE U.S.

Surveys on the origin and development of area studies in other countries show that area studies was initiated by governments with clear policy objectives. Nonetheless, the mode and the pattern of development in area studies vary according to the academic tradition and political culture of each country. U.S. area studies has been characterized as a university-oriented enterprise embedded with the free market ideology, and hence was able to maintain autonomy and independence from the intentions of policymakers (Lambert 1990, Merks 1995).

British area studies was originally founded by the government, but later moved in the same direction as that of the U.S. The origin of area studies dates back to 1916 when Great Britain founded the School for Oriental and African Studies. The school was established chiefly for language training of colonial officers. The institution was expanded after 1945 to include cultural and social studies (Wood 1968, 401-2). As area studies flourished in the U.S., Britain started emulating U.S. area studies in three aspects: (1) the large scale effort, (2) the organization of area centers, and (3) the emphasis on modern studies (Wood 1968, 402). British universities were able to apply for funds to the U.S. University Grants Committee to establish the centers for area studies.

In France, area studies is characterized as state centered, embedded in the French tradition of a strong state. It has been greatly expanded especially after 1995 when the *École Pratique des Hautes Études* received a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. During the same period, various forms of area centers were founded in other countries (i.e., African studies in the Soviet Union, a Chinese study program in Mexico, and Latin American studies in Brazil, etc.).

Throughout the late 1980s and early 1990s, Japan emerged as one of the biggest donor countries to international organizations, which reflected her advanced status in the global society. Financial support by the government and corporations provided universities with an opportunity to restructure their existing departments and organizations to meet social needs. Through this restructuring process, international studies was developed along with area studies in Japan.

As in other countries, area studies in the United States was initiated by the government with a distinct policy goal. It was a known fact that scholars and students in this field could not be bred without the government's purposeful support (Lambert 1990, 713). In this section, we will focus on the development of modern area studies in the U.S. since 1945, and the recent methodological battle between area studies and the social sciences after the 1980s, the post-Cold War era.² In the U.S., special language programs

Many, including an anonymous reviewer of this paper, seem to believe that the area studies program, in terms of research topic and policy implications, is not free from governmental interventions since I argue that the area studies program cannot be launched without government's financial assistance. The government might influence the selection of countries by allocating funds to specific areas. In such countries as the U.S. and Britain, however, the governments or funding organizations did provide research funds without any strings attached in terms of selecting research topics and research outcomes.

Kim, Kyungil classified area studies in the United States into four stages: (1) the prehistoric stage from 1800 to 1900; (2) the formative stage from 1900 to 1941 when the United States had entered World War II; (3) the developing stage from 1941 to 1973; (4) the reorganizing stage from 1973 to the present.

instituted by the armed forces during the war were the origin of area studies. After the war, these programs were transplanted into university area centers. Since then, the emphasis of area studies has varied with the political situation of the time. For instance, Southeast Asian studies was rendered to be a great emphasis during World War II,⁵ Sovietology and Eastern European studies during the Cold War era, and the study of developing countries and Third World during the post-Cold War era. This implies that area studies directly reflects the political needs of the period and thus, area specialists were condemned by many for serving their home country's interests at a host country's expense.

It is true that area studies has been, by definition, America-centric since "area has traditionally meant areas besides the United States" (Shea 1997). Nonetheless, the government, due to the *laissez-faire* nature of area studies in the U.S., was not able to dictate researchers on what to study, nor what to produce. Many Korean scholars claim that since area studies in the U.S. stems from the Cold War, it serves American national interests (Kim, Kwon, & Chin 1987). This claim, however, is an ungrounded conjecture at best. Lambert described area studies in the United States as being rooted in the area centers of the university, following the model that produced almost a pure market profile. Indeed, he asserts, academic debate over area studies in the United States is so unique that it cannot be found in other countries: (1) the relative value of an area versus a disciplinary focus, (2) research methodology versus content, and (3) applied versus pure research (Lambert 1990, 712). According to him, scholars in many other countries were not troubled with the relative value of the above issues because the topical and disciplinary focus of area studies were determined by the government's need of formulating political or economic strategies related to a country or a region.

Rather, the problem lied in the rigidity of defining the area. It was so rigid that it even prohibited a comparison between European nations and Turkey. Some of this rigidity stems from the fact that the division of the world in area studies mirrored that of the State Department and the Pentagon (Shea 1997). The launching of the Title IV Program, right at the wake of Sputnik in 1959, was made by the Education Department, which grants money to area programs and language programs. The mood of the period partly explains the goal of area studies programs.

Both government-centered area studies and university-centered ones, no doubt, have their own strengths and weaknesses (Lambert 1990, 714-15). Clearly in the United States, the academic research center based area programs allowed the recruitment of highly qualified students and faculty members from a wide range of academic disciplines, such as the humanities, and provided area specialists with vital contact points crossing disciplinary boundaries.

On the other hand, academic-centered area studies also had drawbacks. It was difficult

note (Kim, K. 1996, 223-86).

⁵ As a matter of fact, it is said that the division of regions like Southeast Asia was designated by the strategy of the United States Army during World War II. The division of area for research is not totally based on geography; that is, the boundary of a region is designated more by cultural similarities than geographic conditions. However, the nations in the Southeast Asia region have little in common with each other, both historically and culturally (Arvine 1996, 276-79).

for scholars to devote their time fully to their area specialty,⁴ and the focus and style of university research tended to be overly scholarly and thus, were not directed to the needs of policymakers. Besides, the need for in-country experience posed conflicts with the perspectives of the host country's policymakers. To avoid these types of conflicts, students and scholars have chosen "safe" topics in the humanities rather than in the social sciences (Lambert 1990, 719-20). Also, each area center was so isolated in its area specialty that it did not allow faculty members to cross institutional boundaries. Even political scientists concentrated on domestic issues only, leaving issues of international relations intact.

Above all, the most significant problem of area studies in the United States was, as mentioned earlier, the rigidity that did not allow specialists to research across regions. This inflexibility, however, faced a restructuring challenge. In 1996, Kenneth Prewitt, the president of the Social Science Research Council, announced that the council would 'focus on such topics as 'ethnic conflicts' and 'transitions to democracy' and would encourage comparative work" (Shea 1997). He also added that "areas are more porous, less bounded, less fixed than we previously assumed" (Shea 1997). This decision led to the abolishment of the Joint Area Studies Committees of the Social Science Council and the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) (Almond 1997). Similar announcements from The Andrew Mellon and Ford Foundation contributed to the speeding up of the restructuring process (Haw 1993).

These measures were viewed as a threat by area specialists and led to an emergency meeting among representatives of area studies scholars in September 1996, in Arlington, VA.⁵ Chalmers Johnson called the announcement of the council a form of unilateral disarmament in the fight with the theorymongers (1997, 170-74). Opposing the new Social Science Research Council decision, Gabriel Almond proclaimed that globalization was merely an ostensible excuse and the real cause was with the end of the Cold War that resulted in curtailment of research funds (Almond 1997). Although Almond's contention was persuasive, we are not yet fully convinced with respect to why the collapse of the Eastern bloc brought about the closing of the Committee. The globalized world still demands our broadened understanding of the other parts of the world for issues related with international trade and cooperation.

In fact, the controversy over the disciplinary value of area studies started from its inception. From the beginning, there have been endless debates on the methodology of area studies vs. the social sciences in general, and political science in particular (Almond 1988). The result was the total defeat of area studies in this on-going battle. In my view, there are two other reasons, in addition to Almond's account that ascribes to the demise of the Cold War, which explains the recent decision of closing the Area Studies Committee. One is directly related to the methodological changes that have occurred in political science, while the other is the emergence of new issues from globalization

⁴ Faculty members of government-supported, organized area programs who spend twenty-five percent or more of their professional time in the area are seventy-seven percent of the whole.

⁵ The Africanists, who got hurt most by this decision, contributed to *Africa Today* discussing the state and methodological issues of African studies (Baughered 1997, 131-22).

that cannot be properly dealt with by traditional area studies.

Disciplines, known to pursue objective knowledge (such as economics, psychology, and sociology), have not been vigorously involved in area studies, whereas language and literature, history, political science, and anthropology were the major participants in area studies as shown in Table 1. Although the humanities predominantly carried out area studies, political science, as a sole participant of the social sciences, has experienced major changes in methodology in the last fifteen years.

At the dawn of area studies, political scientists in the United States sought scientific knowledge employing empirical and quantitative methods. On the contrary, political scientists who joined area studies relied heavily on qualitative methods (such as participant observation) that was introduced by anthropologists. The goal of area specialists was to interpret the constitutive meaning of society from the insider's perspective, which in turn required them to have a full understanding of the language, history, and culture, with fieldwork experience of more than a year (Winch 1958; Fay 1984; Gibbons 1987, 3-29). This type of intellectual conduct has been coined the "thick description of culture" by Clifford Geertz (1973). This research method of area studies coincides with the political environment of the period: the enclaved societies of Eastern European countries and the USSR, the underdevelopment of communications, a lack of understanding about Asian and African countries, and so on. It was practically impossible to generalize or theorize systematically the phenomena of the other parts of the world without sufficient information and reliable statistics. As a matter of fact, since area studies was not initiated as a pure discipline, it was not even expected to meet high disciplinary standards. The success of an area specialist depended on how well the researcher described the outside world.

Recently, however, methodological controversy between political science and area studies entered a new phase with the domination of the rational choice theory in major political science journals. "I have long regarded area programs as a problem for political science," wrote Robert Bates, an Africanist and president of the comparative-politics section in the current issue of a newsletter published by the American Political Science Association (Bates 1996, 1-2). In this article, he made a sweeping attack on area studies. He wrote that "area studies defect from the social sciences into the camp of the humanists and they offer resistance to rigorous methods for evaluating arguments" and also that "the consensus has formed that area studies has failed to generate scientific knowledge" (Shea 1997). Dr. Bates made it clear that financial support was no longer available for the old area studies that lacked scientific methods. In the same vein, Duke University and the University of California at San Diego, the two that had incorporated rational choice in comparative politics, earned a great reputation. Indiana University, which used to be the heartland of an area studies program as a recipient of governmental grant, also followed suit.

Disturbed by Bates' attack, area studies scholars argued that area studies had never been reclusive nor indifferent to the comparative method or the development of theory (Geyer 1997; Watts 1997). Some of them made sarcastic comments that people without knowledge of area were only concerned about globalization (Hall and Tarow 1998).

There were, however, some with different views accepting the changing world environment as a challenge and an opportunity, since globalization required interdisciplinary work and comparative studies. Moreover, there was also such a voice as international studies that made a progressive innovation not only in methodology, but in the academic coalition between the natural sciences and the special graduate schools (Stone 1997).

More importantly, I believe that the changes made in area studies did not originate solely from the curtailment of funds after the Cold War or the methodological conflict. Additionally, globalization contributed to the emergence of a new issue agenda. The Social Science Research Council reports from the 1980s already drew our attention to the global issues⁶ across the national and cultural border. Therefore, this report led to the establishment of the transdisciplinary and transregional committees and programs so that a separate region could be studied at the global level. For example, during the 1990s, the Committee on Culture, Health, and Human Development and the Committee on International Peace and Security was organized to reflect this concept and the change in environment (SSRC 1993-1994, 13). The committee is distinct in its participants from all over the world, including non-Westerners and natural scientists (physicists, biologists, and engineers).

In sum, we should note that the factors contributing to the decline of area studies in the U.S. are not simply limited to the curtailment of research funds due to the demise of the Cold War. Instead, methodological development, especially in political science and the emergence of global issues, is also responsible for the decline of area studies in the U.S.

AREA STUDIES IN KOREA:

A SPECIAL FOCUS ON AMERICAN STUDIES

The previous section delineated factors responsible for the rise and decline of area studies in the U.S. Although the emergence of area studies dates back to World War II, later developments were made within the academic community relatively free from government intervention. Three major causes were identified in accounting for the decline of area studies in the U.S.: the demise of the Cold War, the methodological failure of area studies (and thus, the failure to meet policy objectives), and the emergence of a new agenda due to globalization. Our goal in this section is to explore the same forces that could influence area studies in Korea and the lessons we can draw from the past U.S. experiences.

Area studies in Korea began in the 1970s when policymakers became interested not only in developed countries for industrialization, but also in Communist countries for security purposes during the Cold War period. Publications during this period cannot

⁶The specific cases of global issues are: the multinational flow of labor and financial capital, religion and political ideology, the spread of science, technology and culture, the diffusion of terrorism and nuclear proliferation, global economy change and international security, peace movement, and the nuclear non-proliferation movement (SSRC 1981-1982, 17).

be regarded as area studies since they lack rigorous analyses and consist of pure descriptions utilizing secondary sources. Area studies in Korea faces new opportunities in the 1990s because of two factors: (1) the increase in the number of area specialists who have returned from abroad, and (2) global environmental changes both socially and physically. Above all, the globalization strategy launched by the Kim Yong Sam Administration allowed area studies in Korea to take a leap toward the second phase of development.

Notwithstanding the abundant research grants that have attracted disqualified researchers, no clear yardstick is available for distinguishing area specialists from non-specialists. The time seems ripe for defining area studies in Korea. Kwon (1998) presents an orthodox definition used by the Ministry of Education in its funding decisions as well as for the Institute for International and Area Studies of Seoul National University:

(1) studies on other countries and area (region), (2) studies based on comprehensive and encompassing understanding of subject countries, or (3) area studies with strong policy implications (1998: 619-21).

The above definition is puzzling since it does not distinguish area studies from mere studies on area. Area studies, from its inception, possessed a unique methodology embedded in interpretivism (which will be delved in depth later) that differentiated area studies from other disciplines. Even when the mainstream scholars decided to abolish the Area Studies Committee, they were not unsympathetic toward the essence of area studies methodology. Bates particularly proposed the "analytic narrative" as an alternative methodology for the new area studies, which is a combination of empathetic interpretation, the core of area studies methodology, and scientific methods (Shea 1997).

Area studies, born with the nation's policy objectives, should be identified within the national boundary and thus, area studies in Korea cannot be the same as the area studies in the U.S. Nonetheless, it should incorporate the genuine methodology of area studies regardless of the host or home countries. Having reviewed the area studies literature that was published in Korea during the 1990s, there is no agreement among scholars regarding the methodology and the identity of area studies in Korea (Cho 1998). This is not surprising since methodological controversy has been persistent in the U.S. as well. Scholars agree on two things in terms of methodology. One is the necessity of fieldwork to collect firsthand data and the other is the need for interdisciplinary study. The major reason for collecting firsthand data through fieldwork is to obtain an insider's perspective that renders interpretation of a society on the basis of indigenous knowledge. Although holding an insider's perspective is an essential part of area studies, the Korean academia, except for Professor Yun Whan Shin (1998), do not seem to recognize its necessity. Some scholars who lack an understanding of proper methodology in area studies sometimes erroneously assume that area studies use only descriptive and interpretive methods regardless of countries of interests.

As a result, identifying area specialists in the academia has been misleading. For example, a scholar who had specialized in international relations with a critical theoretical view was named the most representative of an U.S. area specialist (*Professor Newspaper*, April 15, 1998). The U.S. has never been a subject of area studies in the U.S. whereas she

is one of the most notable countries to be scrutinized by Korea given her national interests. The methodology employed to study the U.S. and other parts of the world has been dramatically divergent in the U.S. until recently. American politics has pursued scientific knowledge through comparative, quantitative, and formal methods. American political scientists have shown great discontentment toward the methodology of past area studies. As a result, methodology of area studies is undergoing a change by succumbing to the methodology of mainstream American politics since mainstreamers have the power to control research grants. When we consider not only U.S. experiences, but also our strategic goals at the time, it is ludicrous to claim that U.S. studies should employ only descriptive and qualitative methods simply because it is area studies.

Two reasons can be speculated for this type of misunderstanding. First, it stems from the notion of old area studies, which flourished in the U.S. right after World War II as discussed in the previous section. American studies in Korea, in fact, originates from cultural studies (Kim 1973). Second, the distinction between political science and the humanities (such as history or philosophy) has not been manifested in Korea. Furthermore, the Korean political science academia has a deep-rooted hostility toward behavioralism and scientific methods. The fact that the old area studies had lost its appeal in the U.S., in part due to methodological weaknesses, is not going to convince Korean scholars to abandon their reliance on qualitative methods. Hence, we will narrow our focus to American studies in Korea only by conducting the literature survey compiled in the *International & Area Studies Theses Abstracts 1993-1998* published by Seoul National University Graduate Institute and Area Studies.

We do not attempt to resolve the methodological controversy in Korean academia, nor believe that our area studies should repeat those in the U.S. Even if we comply with the dictum of old area studies, however, we are required to view American studies from a U.S. perspective. To be able to empathize with U.S. politics requires full understanding of their methodology. Table 2 indicates the importance of American studies in Korea. Compared with research in other areas, U.S. area studies is relatively well-represented in Korea.

When we consider the field of interest in American studies, as indicated in Table 3, politics, international relations, and security are the dominant topics when compared with economic and trade issues. Here, the validity of a researcher's approach to Korea-U.S. relations is tested. Most of these studies often choose one of the two ways. It is either to underline the brotherly relationship between the U.S. and Korea, or to condemn the U.S. for betraying a friendly relationship for her own national interests. Political scientists have seldom rendered a rational analysis on U.S. foreign policy decisions from her point of view. Another pertinent question is whether American specialists have a full grasp on indigenous knowledge and methodology of mainstream scholars to empathetically understand U.S. positions and interests.

We may find an indirect answer by identifying the methodology they have employed in American studies. Table 4 shows that most of the work that have been conducted were descriptive and far from being quantitative or analytical. Then, one might rebut that literature in area studies can hardly be quantitative or analytical since it should

include strong policy implications and thus needs to be accessible to ordinary policy makers without disciplinary knowledge. To test the soundness of this argument, we have probed further to check whether or not the research contained any policy implications. Only nine percent of total studies included explicit policy recommendations, while eleven percent suggested policy implications very briefly at the end of the paper in a few sentences or paragraphs.

In conclusion, area studies in Korea (particularly American studies) has been conducted with improper methodology and thus, its identity is equivocal at best. Not mentioning new changes in U.S. area studies, American specialists in Korea should at least be trained not only in interpretive fieldwork methods, but also in scientific methods. Unfortunately, the current state of American studies in Korea is far below our expectations.

AREA STUDIES AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

In the previous section, we have reviewed the current state of area studies, especially American studies in Korea in terms of methodology and identity. We suggested that American specialists be equipped with both the insider's perspective and scientific methods. This section deals with our long-term strategies to make area studies viable for a longer period in Korea in the light of the development of U.S. area studies. This task demands us to clarify short-term goals, and to forecast future trends. To achieve both ends, it is important to place Korea in the context of world history.

The unique circumstances Korea has currently encountered are expected to determine the nature of area studies in Korea. First, the Korean peninsula still remains under the influence of the Cold War, whereas it is undergoing sweeping forces of globalization at the same time. Second, Korea, as a middle power, needs to set up two different strategies—one toward advanced countries, and the other toward developing countries. Third, Korea has recently emerged as a donor country to international organizations which is quite different from being a major recipient (as she was in the past) and hence requires profound comprehension of not only areas of the world, but newly emerging global issues. That is, Korea faces the daunting task of balancing the Cold War with the post-Cold War issues, developed countries with the developing countries, and area studies with international studies. Even before we established the tradition of area studies, the area has expanded enormously such that its boundary has been blurred.

International studies is not a new concept at all, but innovative changes are occurring in the field in terms of methodology and approach. The realist approach has dominated international politics during the Cold War period, since security and military issues, a.k.a. "high politics," were major concerns. Under the bipolar system, Korea enjoyed less autonomy and independence as an international actor. The post-Cold War era, however, opens up new possibilities for traditionally alienated players such as multinational corporations, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, and women. Despite the arguments during the post-Cold War era signifies American hegemony, the current World Trade Organization system allows multilateral bargaining and

negotiations, which in turn poses new challenges and opportunities for Korea.

The current international studies is viewed by many as being North American-centric (Hermann and Woyach 1994). It is also seen in direct conflict with area studies in its methodology and its emphasis on the relative superiority between the nation-state and world order. Whereas international studies seeks universal values through a uniform generalization, area studies focuses more on a unique and particular understanding of enclaved regions. There is a belief among the Korean academia that globalization imposes a uniform standard to nation-states, to the extent that it disrespects sovereignty, keeping developing countries from competing on a level-playing field.

Complicated with nationalistic hatred, anti-behavioralistic tradition has hindered the Korean community from paying adequate attention to the new issue agenda of the global society. We can no longer deny that the growing number of problems that are global in scope—whether nuclear, economic, or ecological—demand various perspectives and methods. International studies is in great demand of scientific methods since it fosters collaboration between the natural scientists and the social scientists. Furthermore, we do not think that the development of international studies reverses the development of area studies. Rather, both of them are complementary in nature since genuine comprehension of the globe can be enhanced by in-depth understanding of particularities and uniqueness of the countries. Hence, we ask area specialists and policymakers to be more open and flexible on various methods and perspectives.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS:

GRANTS AND THE (UNDER)GRADUATE PROGRAM

The foregoing sections mentioned three major factors that contributed to the decline of the old area studies in the U.S. and evaluated the state of area studies in Korea. The future direction for Korea was presented in light of new developments and changes in the world environment. The identity and methodology of area studies are inseparable. "Koreanization"⁷ of area studies should be made. Korea's strategic position in the context of world history. Three balances should be maintained: between Cold War issues and post-Cold War issues, developed countries and developing countries, and in area studies and international studies.

When considering all these issues, area specialists (especially U.S. specialists) are expected to master not only interpretive methods, but also scientific methods. Nowadays, information about the other parts of the globe is easily accessible due to the advancement of communication technology and the Internet. The democratization of Eastern European, Asian, and Latin American countries also makes data collection easy. In addition, the whole world is affected by issues such as the environment, nuclear arms, and labor problems. International organizations are producing plenty of reliable statistics.

Then the following question becomes imminent: how can we implement the newly

⁷ This slogan, 'Koreanization of area studies' was used and claimed as our task by Kim et al. (1987) and Ha Yang Chul (1998).

conceptualized identity and methodology of area studies in this paper?²⁸ This study suggests policy implications in two different, but related matters. Financial support by the government should be given only to scholars who are qualified to conduct scientific research with fieldwork experiences. To be eligible, an area specialist should have at least a year of fieldwork experience and should speak the native language of the host country. However, at this time, difficulties may arise in recruiting a single scholar with both attributes. As long as funds are granted to a research team consisting of both scientists and humanists with fieldwork experience, the prescription will be fulfilled. It will naturally foster collaboration among various disciplines, since social scientists are likely to be equipped with scientific methods and humanists with interpretive methods based on fieldwork. When no specialist with fieldwork experience is available at a certain point, a native scholar is recommended to be invited to the project in order to enhance research with indigenous knowledge. Accordingly, it will free us from the criticism that funds have been exclusively monopolized by political scientists, or non-area specialists, who depend heavily on the secondary sources (Y. Shin 1998, 461). Rigidity in defining an area should be loosened. Cross-regional studies, as well as global studies, will nurture our adaptability to a globalizing world.

Regarding the area studies program in the university, the interdisciplinary ideal is said to have failed in the U.S. according to Lambert (1990). It turned out to be transdisciplinary at worst, sub-disciplinary at best. It is so because interdisciplinary study between the humanities and the social sciences seems hard to attain, in my view, due to methodological conflict, whereas interdisciplinary study among social scientists (such as political economy, social psychology, and political sociology) has been more or less successful. Instead of clinging to the unrealistic goal of interdisciplinary study, we should choose the second best alternative, that is, multidisciplinary. Undergraduate area studies is recommended to be structured into a transdisciplinary program, in which students are exposed to various subjects without methodological orientation and given major emphasis on language training.

On the contrary, a graduate-level area studies program based on the area center, which promotes dialogue among sub-disciplines, is recommended. Students should belong to a related department with a unique disciplinary methodology, but should also be trained as an area specialist at the center. This system will allow full utilization of resources on campus and multidisciplinary study, which is the second best alternative to interdisciplinary study. Multidisciplinary study is achieved when independent sub-disciplines collaborate on the same issue. The present system separating area studies from the existing department at the graduate level needs to be reconsidered since it will promote transdisciplinary study at best.

²⁸ Here, we defined the identity and methodology of area studies in the light of policy consideration. One anonymous reviewer has criticized our position as lacking in scholarly concerns, but we believe that area studies can survive when it is faithful to its original goal, which is the government's policy consideration. Nonetheless, we believe that the most constructive policy proposal can be devised only when it is based on the most rigorous scholarly research. Hence, pursuing both goals are not contradictory (Kisuk Cho 1978).

TABLE 1. PERCENTAGE OF AREA SPECIALIST*
BY THE DISCIPLINE AND THE WORLD AREA

Discipline	Africa	East Asia	East Europe	Inner Asia	Latin America	Middle East	South Asia	Southeast Asia
History	5.0	21.9	16.7	20.0	10.0	17.6	8.0	5.2
Language-Related	20.0	22.0	29.5	39.7	40.0	25.0	31.3	39.0
Arts	8.0	9.7	3.9	0.0	4.5	4.7	8.0	11.5
Religion & Philosophy	3.2	0.0	5.1	2.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	8.7
Area Studies	0.0	2.0	0.4	4.9	40.0	0.9	10.5	0.0
Economics	13.6	8.0	5.9	3.4	0.0	9.1	2.9	5.9
Anthropology	19.9	15.0	5.5	1.9	0.0	17.0	6.5	8.0
Sociology	5.2	3.0	3.8	2.0	0.0	8.0	2.4	2.3
Psychology	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.7
Archaeology	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.5	0.7
Geography	5.2	5.0	1.3	3.9	0.0	2.7	4.1	2.4
Political Science	8.9	8.0	8.9	10.8	0.0	8.2	7.1	10.3
Applied & Professional	4.0	7.6	10.8	0.0	14.1	4.1	6.0	7.3
N	100	237	204	15	219	170	122	47

Source: Lambert (1990), "Blurring the Disciplinary Boundaries," in *American Behavioral Scientist*, 3 (Jan./Aug): 726.

*Faculty of government-supported, organized area programs who spend 25% or more of their professional time on the area studies.

TABLE 2. CLASSIFICATION OF LITERATURE IN AREA STUDIES BY REGION : 1992-1997

Area	Asia				Africa (Oceania)		Europe				N/America			Total						
	China	Taiwan	Japan		G ^a	N/E ^b	S/E ^c	S ^d	M ^e		G ^f	W ^g	S ^h		N	E ⁱ	Russia	G ^j	U.S.A	Canada
Year																				
1992	48 (14.20)	5 (1.58)	51 (15.09)	8 (2.37)	9 (2.66)	16 (4.73)	2 (0.59)	2 (0.59)	6 (1.78)	4 (1.18)	1 (0.30)	20 (5.92)	14 (4.14)	45 (13.33)	6 (1.78)	5 (1.46)	38 (11.24)	7 (2.09)	56 (16.57)	2 (0.59)
1993	104 (36.38)	2 (0.68)	139 (47.89)	14 (4.28)	36 (10.62)	21 (6.31)	1 (0.36)	1 (0.36)	5 (1.79)	8 (2.36)	2 (0.51)	13 (3.92)	15 (4.36)	73 (21.50)	1 (0.29)	14 (4.22)	57 (16.98)	6 (1.70)	108 (31.70)	1 (0.16)
1994	140 (20.45)	6 (0.92)	57 (8.36)	6 (0.92)	25 (3.71)	21 (3.11)	2 (0.31)	2 (0.31)	5 (0.73)	2 (0.31)	2 (0.31)	26 (3.72)	1 (0.14)	60 (8.27)	1 (0.22)	4 (0.58)	44 (13.07)	3 (0.41)	88 (25.00)	2 (0.43)
1995	111 (16.05)	3 (0.51)	97 (14.61)	11 (1.80)	26 (4.45)	36 (6.16)	9 (1.54)	9 (1.54)	8 (1.30)	5 (0.77)	5 (0.86)	32 (5.18)	16 (2.74)	76 (13.01)	2 (0.34)	6 (1.03)	22 (4.67)	1 (0.17)	106 (18.53)	1 (0.17)
1996	56 (8.62)	2 (0.32)	50 (7.35)	12 (1.71)	5 (0.72)	22 (3.32)	1 (0.16)	1 (0.16)	15 (2.25)	10 (1.51)	6 (0.92)	20 (3.27)	27 (4.05)	32 (4.86)	3 (0.45)	8 (1.20)	31 (8.09)	64 (16.71)	7 (1.83)	
1997	65 (9.25)	4 (0.55)	29 (4.03)	5 (0.66)	9 (1.20)	36 (5.00)	5 (0.66)	5 (0.66)	6 (0.83)	1 (0.14)	1 (0.14)	11 (1.51)	22 (3.03)	34 (4.59)	2 (0.27)	2 (0.27)	27 (8.41)	2 (0.51)	26 (17.45)	
Total	484	32	423	56	20	152	20	20	65	25	17	22	105	320	7	55	224	15	488	13
% by area	17.60	1.16	15.38	2.04	4.36	5.55	0.73	0.73	2.36	0.91	0.62	4.44	3.82	11.64	0.25	2.00	8.15	0.55	17.75	0.47

* Source: Seoul National University Graduate Institute for International and Area Studies, *International & Area Studies Theses Abstracts 1993-1997*.

a. general issue. b. North East Asia. c. South East Asia. d. Southern Asia. e. Middle East. f. general issue. g. Western Europe.

h. Southern Europe. i. Northern Europe. j. Eastern Europe. k. general issue.

TABLE 3. CLASSIFICATION OF LITERATURE IN AMERICAN STUDIES BY TOPICS

Year \ Topic	Politics	Administration	Foreign Policy/Security	Foreign Economic Relation	Total
1992	6	3	5	2	20
1993	4	26	11	3	44
1994	14	5	5		24
1995	9	6	12	3	30
1996	19	3	11	2	35
1997	9	5	6	1	19
Total	61	48	59	9	177
%	34.46	27.12	33.34	5.08	100

Source: Seoul National University Graduate Institute for International and Area Studies, *International & Area Studies Thesis Abstracts 1993-1997*.

TABLE 4. CLASSIFICATION OF LITERATURE IN AMERICAN STUDIES BY METHODOLOGY^a

Method \ Year	Simple Case Study	Hypothesis/Theorem Verification	Hypothesis/Theorem Building	Descriptive Comparative Studies	Explanatory Comparative Studies	Statistical Analysis ^f	Total
1992	5	2		3			20
1993	32	5		3	3	1	44
1994	19			2	2		24
1995	23	4		4	1	1	33
1996	24	5	1	2	1	2	35
1997	17	3	1				19
Total	130	20	2	14	7	4	177
%	73.45	11.30	1.13	7.91	3.95	2.26	100

Source: Seoul National University Graduate Institute for International and Area Studies, *International & Area Studies Thesis Abstracts 1993-1997*.

a. This classification is based on the study by Yun-Whan Shin (1998) 'Comparative Political Studies and Area Studies in Korea: Critical Review', In *Area Studies in Korea: Present and the Future*, eds. Lee, Sang-Sup and Tae-Whan Kwon. He used Lipjarts classification in this research.

a. A study which systematically interprets specific cases based on a given theory. It is mainly interested in the case, not in the theory.

b. A study whose purpose is to verify the given hypothesis/theory.

c. A study whose purpose is to build new hypothesis/theorem by verification.

d. A study which compares two or more cases by describing differences and similarities.

e. A study which compares two or more cases by explaining and analyzing the cases.

f. A study which analyzes the data by using statistical methods.

TABLE 5. CLASSIFICATION OF LITERATURE IN AMERICAN STUDIES
BY POLICY IMPLICATION

Degree	4 ^a	3 ^b	2 ^c	1 ^d	0 ^e	Total
1992	1	0	1	4	14	20
1993	2	8	3	3	28	44
1994	0	1	1	1	21	24
1995	6	2	4	0	21	33
1996	4	4	0	0	27	35
1997	5	5	1	0	12	23
Total	16	20	10	8	123	177
%	9.04	11.30	5.65	4.52	69.50	100

Source: Seoul National University Graduate Institute for International and Area Studies, *International & Area Studies Theses Abstracts 1993-1997*.

4: a study whose purpose is to give policy recommendation and which explicitly pursues this goal throughout the paper.

3: a study which shows the policy direction in general sense.

2: a study which states policy implications only in the conclusion part.

1: a study which has no specific statement about policy implications, but bears it indirectly.

0: a study whose goal is hardly related with policy implications.

REFERENCES

- Bates, Robert. 1997a. "Area Studies and the Discipline: A Useful Controversy?" *PS: Political Science and Politics* June, 166-69.
- _____. 1997b. "Area Studies and Political Science: Rapture and Possible Synthesis." *Africa Today* 44(2): 123-32.
- Aimond, Gabriel A. 1992. "The Political Culture of Foreign Area Research: Methodological Reflections." In *The Political Culture of Foreign Area and International Studies* eds. Samuels, Richard J., and Myron Weiner. Washington: Brassey's Inc.
- _____. 1988. "Separate Tables: Schools and Sects in Political Science." *PS: Political Science and Politics* (Fall): 828-42.
- _____. 1997. "The Future of Comparative and Area Studies in the United States." Paper presented at the International Political Science Association Forum, Seoul, Korea.
- Bruck, Kogut, and Michelle Gittelman. 1996. "Globalization." In *International Encyclopedia of Business & Management*, ed. Malcolm Womer, vol. 2, Routledge: New York.
- Cho, Kisuk. 1998. "Area Studies in Korea: Identity and Methodology." In *World Area Studies Review* 12(7): 34 (in Korean).
- Enderle, Georges. 1996. "Globalization." In *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Management Business Ethics*, eds. Werhane, Patricia H. & R. Edward Freeman Vol. 6, Blackwell Publisher Inc.
- Fay, Brian. 1984. *Social Theory and Political Practice*, London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Gibbons, Michael T. 1987. "Introduction: the Politics of Interpretation." In *Interpreting Politics*, ed. Gibbons, Michael T. New York: New York University Press.
- Graduate School of Hangeuk University of Foreign Studies. 1996. In *Area Studies, the State, and Problems*, ed. Area Studies. Seoul: Hangeuk University of Foreign Studies Press (in Korean).
- Gyer, Jane I. 1997. "Distant Beacons and Immediate Steps: Area Studies, International Studies, and the Disciplines in 1996." *Africa Today* 44(2): 149-54.
- Hall, Peter A. and Sidney Tarow. 1998. "Globalization and Area Studies: When is Too Broad Too Narrow?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Jan. 23.
- Hermann, G. Margaret and Woyach, B. Robert. 1994. "Toward Reflection, Evaluation, and Integration in International Studies: An Editorial Philosophy." *American International Studies Review* 38: 1-10.
- Hungerud, Angélique. 1997. "Editor's Introduction." *Africa Today* 44(2): 111-22.
- Jenson, Chaimers. 1997. "Preconception vs. Observation, or the Contributions of Rational Choice Theory and Area Studies to Contemporary Political Science." *PS: Political Science and Politics* (June): 170-74.
- Kim, Kyung-Il. 1996. "Establishment and Development of Area Studies in the U.S.A." *Area Studies* 5(3): (Autumn) 223-68 (in Korean).
- Kim, Seuk Joo. 1973. "American Studies in Korea." *American Studies Review* 6: 157-38 (in Korean).
- Kim, Young Myung, Yong-Rip Kwon, and Dong-Ho Shim. 1987. "Area Studies in Korea." *Korean Political Science Review* vol. 21 (in Korean).
- Kwon, Tae-Whan, and Sang-Sup Lee. 1998. *Area Studies in Korea*. Korean University Press (in Korean).
- Lambert, Richard D. 1990. "Blurring the Disciplinary Boundaries." *American Behavioral Scientist* 33(6) (January): 712-32.

- Lee, Sung-Chul. 1997. "Area Studies and the Social Sciences: Intellectual Rivals or Necessary Complementus?" Paper prepared for the International Conference in "The Asia-Pacific Area On the Cusp of 21st Century: Conceptual Approaches and Policy Choices at President Hotel, Seoul, Korea, October 16-17, 1997. The Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies and the Asia-Pacific Research Center, Hanyang University.
- Palat, Lavi. 1996. "Fragmented Visions: Excavating the Future of Area Studies in a Post-American World." *Review* 19: 3.
- Proessor, 1997. "People Who Contributed to Establishing Korean Political Science." (in Korean) April 15.
- Richards, Haw. 1993. "Area Studies Lose Their Appeal." *Times Higher Education-Supplement*, Dec. 24, p. 1.
- Schwartz, Benjamin I. 1980. "Presidential Address: Area Studies as a Critical Discipline." *Journal of Asian Studies* 40(1) (Nov.): 15-25.
- Shea, Christopher. 1997. "Political Scientists Clash Over Value of Area Studies." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* Jan. 10, section A 13.
- Shin, Yan-Whan, and Seoung-Hyung Lee. 1996. "Area Studies in Korea." *National Strategy* 2(1): 155-81 (in Korean) Seoul: Se-jong Institution.
- Stone, M. Priscilla. 1997. "The Remaking of African Studies." *Africa Today* 44(2): 179-84.
- Watts, Michael. 1997. "African Studies at the Fin de Siecle: Is it Really the Fin?" *Africa Today* 44(2): 185-92.
- Winch, Peter. 1958. *The Idea of a Social Science and Its Relation to Philosophy* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Wood, Bryce. 1968. "Area Studies." In *International Encyclopedia of the Social Science*, ed. David L. Sills. vol. 1, New York: The McMillan Co. & the Free Press.
- Woodall, Brian. 1997. "The Role of Area Studies in Political Science." Paper prepared for the International Conference in "The Asia Pacific Area on the Cusp of 21st Century: Conceptual Approaches and Policy Choices at President Hotel, Seoul, Korea, October 16-17, 1997. The Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies and the Asia-Pacific Research Center, Hanyang University.