



ITHAKA ASIAN STUDIES FACULTY SURVEY

University of Washington Report

PROJECT RESEARCH TEAM

Deepa Banerjee, South Asia Studies Librarian
Judith Henchy, Head, Southeast Asia Section and
Special Assistant to the Dean of Libraries for
International Programs

Zhijia Shen, Director of East Asia Library

Azusa Tanaka, Japan Studies Librarian

Hyokyoung Yi, Korean Studies Librarian and Head
Public Services, East Asia Library

Principal Author: [Judith A.N. Henchy](#)

January 2018

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Methodology Note	3
3. Defining the Field of Asian Studies	4
i. Geographical Boundaries of Asian Studies	4
ii. Methodological Boundaries of Asian Studies	6
iii. Research Methodologies of Conflict and Other Anxieties	9
4. Collaboration and Unequal Partnerships	13
5. State of the Field Awareness	16
6. Defining and Accessing Research Data	18
i. Archives, Artifacts and Elusive Collections	19
ii. Library Research and Digital Resource Access	21
iii. Digital Media	22
7. Data Creation, Storage and Organization	23
8. Disseminating Research	26
i. Public and Engaged Scholarship	26
9. Open access	29
i. Open Data	31
10. Future of the Field	33
11. Libraries and the Future of Research	34
12. Conclusions for the University of Washington Libraries	36
Appendix I: Participants by Area and Department	40
Appendix II: Asian Studies Programs at the University of Washington	41
Appendix III: Photographs	43

Cover photo: Field notebooks wait in a faculty office to be preserved.

1. Introduction

This report is the result of interviews conducted in the spring and summer of 2017 with the aim of determining the research, networking and publishing habits of Asian Studies faculty at the University of Washington, one of the most significant and extensive programs for the study of the region in the United States. The programs focusing on Asia are administratively associated with the Jackson School of International Studies, which houses eight Department of Education Title VI Centers, but faculty and students are dispersed across a wide range of departments on campus, primarily in the social sciences and humanities, but also in professional schools, like Public Health, Law and Business. The Department of Asian Languages and Literature is home to many of the humanities scholars interviewed: in China, Korea, Japan and South Asian Studies, but Southeast Asia is not represented in these fields of linguistic and literary studies. Only three of the six Southeast Asian language taught on campus are housed in the Department. The dispersed administrative structure of the programs reflects the interdisciplinary nature of Asian Studies across all the countries and regions considered in this report.

The structure of the report emerged from coding interview responses around concerns that speak to Asian Studies as a distinct scholarly endeavor. As in most fields of study, faculty often identified most closely with a narrow sub-discipline, but in addition to these disciplinary fractures, there were distinct differences in the way scholars perceived their relationships to their regions and countries of study. For these reasons, in the section **Defining the Field of Asian Studies**, we looked at responses that helped either clarify or problematize the notion of Asian Studies as a coherent area of scholarship. The next two sections, **Geographical Boundaries of Asian Studies**, and **Methodological Boundaries of Asian Studies** further explore these fissures. The following section, **Research Methodologies of Conflict and Other Anxieties**, highlights some of the theoretical concerns arising from working in areas where the aftermath of colonialisms, war and violence, or repressive nationalist regimes, are still significant factors influencing choices of research projects, access to testimony and treatment of resources. The next section, **Collaboration and Unequal Partnerships** points to ethical issues that many scholars expressed that result from knowledge differentials between U.S. scholars and potential partners in the region. The section on **State of the Field Awareness** also addresses some of these same

theoretical concerns around boundaries, definitions, and the equivalence of an Asian Studies field of research within Asia itself.

The remaining sections of the report are focused more on access to resources, although these sections also attempt to tease out how these access issues are particular to the field of Asian Studies. The three sub-sections under **Defining and Accessing Research Data** consider concerns that arose about access to archival collections, secondary source materials and the complexities of digital access. The section on **Data Creation, Storage and Organization** discusses the extent to which scholars are engaged in resource collection and archiving activities, often with the assistance of librarians. The section on **Disseminating Research**, which includes comments on participation in public scholarship, reveals a high level of interest in what we have called “engaged scholarship,” arising from some of the issues of inequality mentioned in previous sections. These issues are also highlighted in the discussions of **Open Access**, where many faculty cite their desire to make their work available to colleagues in the region outside of paywalls. The final sections on the **Future of the Field**, and **Libraries and the Future of Research** encapsulate concerns expressed about the directions of scholarship, libraries and funding policies, considerations which are explored further in the **Conclusions for the University of Washington Libraries** section.

2. Methodology Note

This study, conducted under the auspices of Ithaka S&R, used semi-structured interview techniques and social science methods, under the guidance of Ithaka staff. Twenty-four participants were interviewed, representing five of the six University of Washington Asian Studies regional programs: China, Japan, and Korea, South Asia and Southeast Asia. The Central Asia program was not represented in the survey coverage. An overall description of the University of Washington Asia programs can be found in Appendix II.

Participant selection was based on seeking as wide a range of disciplines, country of focus, and research approaches as possible, and included faculty from all ranks and positions in their career paths. See appendix I for a chart of participants.

3. Defining the Field of Asian Studies

One of the most significant contributions of this survey is to the question of how the field of Asian Studies is constituted, and how the scholars working on the different regions within Asia consider their relationship to the field. Several of the interview questions relate to this issue in some way: faculty's thoughts on the future of the field, the types of journals they publish in, and the communities of practice with which they feel most connected through their professional networks. The responses to these questions show considerable differences across the various sub-regions of Asia represented in the report, perhaps reflecting the relative positions of dominance within the field, with the lesser studied, and less well-resourced areas feeling weaker affiliation to the notion of Asian Studies. As one scholar put it:

"I am honestly not sure what the field of Asian Studies is... We have South Asian studies, I know what that is. We have Southeast Asian studies, I know what that is. But I'm not sure Asian studies exists really as a field, in a certain way these questions imagine it to be. There are associations for example of Asian Studies. But to the extent that people collaborate across it, it is generally collaboration along disciplines or themes."

Below are some considerations that came to light regarding both the geographic and methodological boundaries of the field.

i. Geographical Boundaries of Asian Studies

With reference to the geographical definitions of the field, a majority of respondents working in South Asia were unclear about what constitutes Asian Studies, and described feeling stronger affiliations with their disciplines. One stated that the way Asian Studies is formed and institutionalized in the US is not compatible with the scope of their work, and expressed a need for reconsideration of a geographic framework that would encourage more meaningful academic collaborations.

"For example, the artist I am working with certainly works in Shanghai and participates in exhibitions and that fits very easily within an Asian Studies format or framework. However, other venues which have been extremely important for the circulation and display of South Asian Art have been areas like Dubai... So, Indian artists engaging with Afghanistan, Iran, the U.A.E. and other gulf states, is difficult then to think about within existing Asian Studies field work in the U.S."

Another respondent felt that Asian Studies tends to be dominated by China and Japan, resulting in some feelings of alienation for South Asianists. Yet others in South Asian Studies saw the emergence of a vibrant dialogue across geographic fields as an exciting trend, opening the door

for collaboration in new ways, such as joint panels or co-publications with scholars from different Asian countries. One commented: “I have a publication coming out this year called *Parallel Tracks* which thinks about possible links between feminist art history in China and India, or rather of Chinese and Indian artists. That has been one exciting development about Asian Studies.” A respondent who studies Japanese Buddhism commented: “And quite frankly my research has nothing to contribute, nothing to say to somebody who is studying the economics of India,” indicating how meaningless the notion of Asian Studies is in some areas of the field.

All China faculty appeared quite comfortable with the Asian Studies designation, as many were engaged in inter-Asian research, but some in broader fields of comparison. A historian of China emphasized that their research on the intersection of Chinese political and intellectual history also looked out at other parts of the world, but particularly broader Asia. S/he identified as a historian of Asia, connecting Chinese Qing history to Inner Asia, Manchuria, Mongolia, Tibet, and beyond to South Asia, as well as Southeast Asia. Chinese studies scholars generally saw their research as connected to the larger field of Asian studies in many ways; through demographics and population movement, and well as linguistic and economic influence, China maintains a dominant position in the region, as it does within the field of Asian Studies. A China linguist noted that the spread of Buddhism is “intimately connected with the adaptation of Classical Chinese as a written language and with the adaptation of the Chinese script to write Korean and Japanese.” They also noted that dialects of Chinese “spoken in the south are influenced by Vietnamese and Thai languages, and it’s changed the ways those dialects function.” Speaking to the notion of a pan-Asia Sinitic culture, they concluded: “Culturally, everyone who was writing in classical Chinese, including people in Japan, and Korea, and Viet Nam, were part of a broad cultural conversation because they could all read each other’s works written in classical Chinese.” In a recent article in the *Journal of Asian Studies*, Yufen Chang¹ has described this sphere of Sinitic culture as the Sinographic cosmopolis, offering one way in which at least parts of Asia are bounded. A scholar of Japanese Buddhism, whose work involves the transmission of doctrine from India through China, noted that Buddhism needed to be studied “as a pan-Asian religion,”

¹ “Spatializing Enlightened Civilization in the Era of Translating Vernacular Modernity: Colonial Vietnamese Intellectuals’ Adventure Tales and Travelogues, 1910s–1920s,” *JAS*, Volume 76, Issue 3, August 2017, pp. 627-654

offering an intersecting, but alternative, geography through which to consider the region. A China law scholar's work on the "One Belt One Road" policy of contemporary regional economic integration offers yet another.

A Korean studies scholar working in literature explained their diverse literary interests and the ways in which such literary studies cannot be bounded by any strict geographies, noting cultural affiliations that go beyond the Sinitic or Indic spheres of influence:

"And then I got interested in the relations of Korea, Japan and Russia, especially during the colonial period. They are all connected and then Korea, you know, translated and imported Russian literature through Japanese translations. So, the topic was more like transnational studies that covers East Asia and Russian... But then I got a job in Korean literature, so I...teach Korean literature mostly.... some East Asian literature. But that defines me as a Koreanist"

Korean Studies faculty interviewed generally considered themselves Korean Studies scholars (or Asian Studies scholars), mainly due to their affiliation and ties to the departments of Asian Languages and Literature or the interdisciplinary Jackson School of International Studies, and within that, the Korean Studies program: their job titles give them those identities within their Departments. The historian of Korea, however – who holds a joint appointment with the Jackson School of International Studies and History – feels more strongly about a disciplinary identity with History: as a labor historian and a gender historian; but they also considered their role as a labor historian to be interdisciplinary:

"So, I am an area studies scholar focusing on Korea but also working on Korea-Japan comparisons in particular. And as a labor historian I also teach courses examining China, Japan, and Korean workers and labor relations. I am within the umbrella of Asian Studies, but more than anything else I identify myself as a historian. A labor historian and gender historian."

One faculty member did express frustration at being treated/labelled as an "area studies scholar." as their research is transnational and comparative:

"For some reason, in the United States, Asian studies scholars are labeled as area studies people. So even though the topics they are studying are very comparative, transnational, and not even one area specific, they are considered as Asian Studies."

ii. **Methodological Boundaries of Asian Studies**

Many scholars discussed how their work is positioned between their region of study and a disciplinary focus. While some scholars seemed to appreciate the designation of Asian Studies (or country study) as an interdisciplinary home, others strained against its constraints: the

geographer of China considered their work to be interdisciplinary and situated much better in Chinese Studies than geography; an ethnomusicologist working in Southeast Asia described their work as being close to that of anthropology, although their focus on music and gender also aligned them with gender theory; a sociologist who identifies with migration studies, is currently using Nepal and Thailand as case studies for concepts and topics -- in this case those countries are merely platforms for testing theoretical concepts. A Japan Studies faculty member considers their research on the origins of Japanese urban space to fall more within the fields of architectural design and history than Japan Studies or Asian Studies. Another Japan Studies respondent who has a joint appointment in the Department of History and Jackson School of International Studies, noted that their research on the history of US-Japan relations is not focused only on history, but covers politics and economics, even beyond Asia; a scholar working on women in Buddhism focuses on the region of East Asia generally, and identifies as a “Buddhism person.”

A China anthropologist involved in multidisciplinary work on transnational gender history, migration and globalization in Chinese contemporary art, used methods that were partly ethnographic and partly archival. They noted that theorizing the meaning of Asia in the context of art is core to their research, emphasizing that whatever methods are used to study Asia, the point is that “it’s not just a region that sits there, but it’s a kind of region that’s made again and again through different kinds of cultural encounters... Trying to think through these international exchanges, our understandings of regions get made.” An art historian of South Asia, however, noted that their work is located “squarely within the discipline of Art History,” although they note their “particular interested in long standing debates in the field of South Asian History and Anthropology.” These intersections played out in the study of “artistic practice and modernism as it was theorized and practiced in literary studies, in theatre, in performance, and to some extent in cinema.” This researcher also “engaged in debates with popular visual culture that had been taking place within the disciplines of Anthropology, History, Sociology, to some extent English and definitely Cinema Studies over the past 15-20 years,” as well as with “geographies of globalization, the politics of indigeneity and critical studies of science and technology.” In trying to name their methods, they avoided evoking an Asia context: “Maybe we could call it transnational cultural studies.”

A South Asia scholar of comparative religion noted that their audiences are usually religious studies and History, but sometimes performance studies, textual studies, or area studies. They commented that “in religious studies, [the audience for their work] tends to have a wider scope while in history it just seems to be South Asia historians,” indicating ways in which Asian Studies makes contributions to theoretical fields beyond its own boundaries. A sociologist working on China expressed some concern that they did not fit naturally within the China Studies field, despite its interdisciplinary approaches, and even though they did “try to make [their research] grounded in local literatures... My ambition is to be able to speak to both the Asian Studies audience as well as a broader disciplinary audience.” They noted that within China itself, the definition of Chinese Studies is still quite proscribed, limited to the concerns of a few journals, and very much based in study of the classics, but that internationally the field has greatly expanded methodologically, and is a mainstream component of scholarly journals across a wide range of disciplines:

“Chinese Studies is not limited to China Studies journals, like China Quarterly... You can look through any top social science journals and find material on China. And some are addressing a broad international audience that is not really a Chinese Studies audience.”

Indeed, many of the China scholars interviewed are not engaged in traditional areas of classical study, but, like Southeast Asia scholars, identify with a post-Second World War scholarly approach based more in interdisciplinary social science methods: “China Studies used to have Sinologists who were just kind of steeped in the classics. But most of the Chinese studies we do on this campus is largely social science and historic... So, we are all engaging with disciplinary audiences, as well as more area studies focused.”

An archaeologist and a sociologist working within Southeast and South Asia had particular problems with the framing of Asian Studies -- mostly because of their quantitative methodologies -- despite their considerable scholarly engagements in the regions. The archeologist did extensive literature reviews of vernacular findings, with the assistance of local colleagues, and the sociologist carried out qualitative survey and interview work, much as an ethnographer would, in order to understand “what the numbers mean in that local context.” Both these scholars had fluency in one language of Southeast Asia, and some understanding of others, but because of the cross-regional or inter-regional nature of their work, they were reliant on local

assistance and collaborators to carry out survey work and understand vernacular resources in some areas of their study. This practice put them at odds with one of the primary assumptions of Asian Studies, which is based in language and cultural competency.

iii. **Research Methodologies of Conflict and Other Anxieties**

Other methodological choices speak not just to how the field is bounded, but to some underlying concerns about its construction and role in the academy and society. These questions are perhaps most acutely seen in Southeast Asian Studies. Historically, the scholarly field emerged at a time, and out of circumstances, different from the classical fields of “Oriental” scholarship, based on European textual and epigraphic traditions primarily of South and East Asia. An artifact of the military formation of the Southeast Asia Command of the Second World War, Southeast Asian Studies came of age in the era of social sciences; its trajectory has been haunted by both the region’s colonial roots, and the instrumental purposes to which post-war social science methods were put during the long engagements in the region with Cold War politics. Many of the residual uncertainties about the field are reflected in the interviews: in respondents’ attitudes towards research collaboration, their relationships with their departments, and their choice of research methodologies.

The Southeast Asia historian highlighted interdisciplinary approaches that seem particular to the disruptions of war and exile that are common to the regions of Asia, with their histories of colonial occupations, cosmopolitan linguistic and cultural syncretism, conflict and migration. This scholar noted “Research topics reside in the intersections of disciplinary understandings and the dislocations that emerge to be explored:

“I’m very interested in comparative nationalism...comparative history, the relationship between history and anthropology, as well as more recently questions around biography. The relationship between the biographical and the historical... how narratives of lives tend to outstrip and outrun analysis of larger social historical conditions, and the role of language in throwing history and biography out of sync with one another. It is these areas when they are thrown out of sync that I find extremely interesting for thinking about...”

At the same time, the field of Southeast Asian Studies, and Asian Studies generally, has been greatly enriched by the emergence of diasporic studies and theories of hybrid identities -- resulting often from those same colonial and post-colonial disruptions -- that have evolved in an

interdisciplinary alliance of literary studies, humanities more generally, and a new formulation of Cultural Studies. The respondent above noted that their research focused on “colonial connections and intersection.” These humanistic approaches are further enriched by what is now a vibrant Southeast Asian diasporic literary movement based in those connections -- between the U.S. and the Philippines, and with migrant Singaporeans in New York, for instance. This scholar did not question their comfort within the classification of Asian Studies, even as they recognized their important associations with Asian-American Studies and the broader field of cultural studies and humanistic practices. There was no question that those methodological concerns were also central to the mission of Asian Studies.

A Japan literary studies scholar noted that their work on the material history of texts also embraced diasporic studies and migration studies, and postulated that this work could “challenge some of the logics by which we think about the field,” re-situating Japanese-ness and the idea of “homogenous Japanese” in a diasporic context: using literature and its reception as a tool to problematize identity; and using diasporic communities who read Japanese but who are not Japanese to decouple Japanese texts from Japanese identity. They noted that researchers of Chinese and Korean literature have been interested in their research, “as a model of how to think about some of these questions.” In this sense, their work is theoretically as well as geographically situated within Asian Studies, but makes contributions beyond it.

“I think one of the arguments I am trying to make is that the terms we use in the field of modern Japanese literary studies, the way we name the field, the way we approach it from the United States, very much imagines, despite everybody’s best intention, still imagines a homogenous Japan and a homogenous Japanese. It reads these texts as somehow keys to understanding who the Japanese are, what Japanese culture is - my hope is to problematize that thinking. If you look at literature as an actual historical event, that sort of thinking cannot really be sustained.”

A Southeast Asia scholar, who identified with interdisciplinary medical anthropology and Science and Technology Studies (STS), hoped to go beyond the limiting theoretical concerns of imperialisms to find new critical focus on contemporary interdisciplinary endeavors such as global health, environment and security studies. They described the role of STS as an interdisciplinary framework through which to critique not just historical/colonial practices of scientific determinism and colonial medical regimes of control, but also the emerging global health field. In this way STS looks at “multi-disciplinarity as a humanistic meta-field.” They did

not feel that their work was accepted in the mainstream conferences and journals of Asian Studies, however, both because of its theoretical marginality to the field of anthropology and its focus on one of the least studied countries of the little-studied region of Southeast Asia. They noted that the conventions of practice in the field still dated from the dominance of Cornell's pioneering Southeast Asia Program and its enduring influence over what can be studied in Southeast Asian Studies:

"I feel less comfortable with Asian Studies writ large, because of that pigeonholing of what is, can be, said about [country x ...] For instance: 'you should be studying traditional birth practices if you are doing anthropology in [country x]', you know."

This scholar described their methods as being eclectic and boundary crossing -- in ways that would help "redefine post-coloniality," but also reject what they saw as an anachronistic residual influence of Clifford Geertz and structuralism in the field of Southeast Asian scholarship. They mentioned research on a minority Muslim group "being 'developed' by Muslim philanthropy -- mostly from the Middle East but also from Malaysia" -- as one example of a regional re-focusing. They also mentioned exclusive "inter-Asian circuits of technology and languages of practice" as driving research methodologies in a field, "where the focus has been on Asian high-tech centers." Their question was: what would STS research outside of those centers look like? In the field of global health, they talked about how Singapore promotes itself as "a mediation center for research on Asian bodies... 'We are the ethical center of scientific research so that your American dollars can do research on Chinese bodies, right?'"

A South Asia scholar was fearful of how their work on sensitive topics would be received, and this influenced their choices. Working in areas of religious, ethnic and post-Cold War confrontation influences choices of methodology, as well as sometimes publishing habits. Working in countries with authoritarian regimes also had consequences. The Southeast Asia archeologist noted their dependence on government permits for field work, and how they were constrained by nationalist agendas that determined what kinds of historical interpretations could be made. They were also constrained by the agendas of local tourism and even UNESCO, which promoted specific research sites above others. This scholar, although not particularly identifying their work with Asian Studies at this time, conceded that later in their career writing about these

political influences on the constructions of national historical narratives would draw them further into the field of Asian research.

Questions about the political and policy implication of scholarship were mentioned, and relate to long-standing debates in international studies circles between the scholars deeply based in local culture and a domain of policy orientation and international relations methods that tends to be dominated by non-area specialist. One scholar of Japan and international relations noted:

“I don’t know whether you know the name [named scholar] but he’s been a big influence on several other leading Japan scholars writing in a post-modernist kind of vogue ... And they have their own vocabulary... So, I think that’s an issue for the future, but it’s part of a bigger picture of making research accessible. The Jackson School now is doing much better. [In the past] they didn’t want to get their hands dirty writing on policy.”

A historian of Korea also noted: “There is a tendency to use professional jargon, very difficult to understand writing amongst scholars. I think it’s humanities in general, not just East Asian studies... If an educated lay reader cannot understand articles or books, that is a big issue.” They continued that it would be hard to change the disciplinary cultures in which this obscurity thrives, “because with easy to read materials, you can jeopardize your career.” Another Korean Studies faculty who aligned themselves with social sciences practices continued this critique with the question: “[To what] extent Asian Studies have contributed to the general level of theory on the frameworks for other fields, or general social sciences or humanities?” They noted that a focus too much on one specific country may inhibit development of “theory or conceptualization.” Future collaborative relations across Asia would improve this situation. They continued: “I think it is high time for Asian studies to provide something interesting, something significant, not only to other Asian studies but to the general social sciences and humanities in the U.S.... So far the tendency has been to apply Western-orientated theories and concepts to Asian case studies.”

These statements show the difficulty of generalizing a theory of Asian Studies, when the different regions and disciplines are engaged in very different languages of scholarship. Southeast Asian scholars, although also demonstrably concerned about the hegemonic practices of the Western academy and episteme, would no doubt point to Benedict Anderson’s “imagined communities” as a political and social science theory that has had influence way beyond Asian Studies. South Asian Studies scholars could look to post-colonial theory, and Subaltern Studies -

- also theories that have contributed substantially to scholarship beyond Asian Studies -- as attempts to challenge this hegemony. These divergent scholarly approaches are not easily classified by discipline or area of interest, but point to a divide within the field between empirical and more theoretical schools of thought.

Other scholars struggled with the “ethics” of maintaining Asian Studies as a “relevant” field, when its importance (to funding agencies and thus to university administrations) is often tied to national security imperatives. A South Asian scholar observed that area studies has enjoyed intermittent periods of importance, once during the Cold War and then after 9/11:

“And then 9/11 occurred -- we saw a renewed interest in funding Asian Studies, particularly South Asia studies, and the rationale behind that is deeply troubling... [A]s we struggle to make ourselves seen as relevant, the biggest challenge is how you articulate that in a way that is inclusive of many points [of view], including sometimes political points of view that some people consider distasteful [for instance] train[ing] students who may be entering the CIA or the military, that we are somehow compromising our ethics ... I think as a community we need to think about how we fit into the larger social structures.”

4. Collaboration and Unequal Partnerships

Discomfort concerning research relationships with partners in the region were often mentioned, both by Southeast Asia scholars and China Scholars. In the case of Southeast Asia, partners are from less well funded institutions, where faculty have fewer resource and educational opportunities. All the Southeast Asia respondents described their relationships with partners in their regions of study as a form of collaboration, but also questioned the nature of those relationships. The ethnomusicologist wondered if a teacher is a collaborator; they gave attribution in their writings to their teachers for ideas that they used, even though most of those practitioners do not speak English, so they “do not read my books or use my work” in any sort of reciprocal way:

“So, in my publications, if someone has offered a way to think about a piece, or to think about music, I do say, ‘this idea came from, you know X,’ or ‘Y pointed this out to me.’ I do my best to make it really transparent ... Most people were pretty enthusiastic about working with me, about the idea of an American researcher coming to them and wanting to know about their art form and know about their traditions and recording it and bringing it here.”

A sociologist working on China questioned the validity of their collaborative relations with scholars in China, because they “didn’t think that these scholars would consider this Chinese

studies. They would just consider it regular demography or sociology.” Many other China scholars questioned their collaborations, in part because their partners are not given due credit in the final products; their participation is not recognized as a core part of the intellectual work. Instead the “partner’s roles are subsidiary; or they were hired to help with the language or transcription of interviews, etc.” Another China scholar noted: “The work I do that is the most collaborative is the work on the large Sino-Tibetan language family that Chinese belongs to. Because there are so many languages that no one person is familiar with all of them. And if you want to do comparative work, it’s very helpful to work collaboratively.” The China Law scholar and the geographer regarded collaborative research and publication as core, while other respondents were involved in activities such as exhibitions, or organizing conferences, which they did not consider research projects. Another commented:

“Collaboration happen through the fieldwork, not necessarily in the production of the final research product. I would consider the exhibit that I curated to be a kind of research, but it is not in the typical scholarly domain. So that was very collaborative, the idea for it was conceptualized together with the artists...”

Southeast Asia respondents expressed their discomfort with their partners’ unequal access to scholarly knowledge, resources and power, literally electrical power in some cases, but also internet bandwidth. The archaeologist and sociologist relied on local partners for access to vernacular knowledge, carry out interviews and translate research texts. These collaborators were invaluable informants, whose resources could be “accessed” -- a term that one scholar disliked since it seemed to imply a sort of taking away -- but who were not equal partners in research publications. This dependence was emphasized by one respondent who commented: “And then there is an issue of being white... and an American academic,” which is a liability when interviewing trauma victims in the field. The Southeast Asia ethnomusicologist also raised questions about their time as a participant observer, not only living in the community and observing performances, but also participating as a dancer, and working with teachers to provide musical notation for pieces. They were concerned that they had paid for private lessons and remunerated musicians for recording sessions, indicating again an unequal -- and not disinterested -- relationship with partners in the region.

One Southeast Asia respondent commented on the practice of using English as the language of research and how this linguistic practice disadvantages local researchers, who are increasingly expected to publish in international journals with “impact factors,” but whose access to those publications and research trends is severely limited. This respondent noted: “English is not about communicating across heterogeneity, but about hegemonic practices,” highlighting that dominance of Western disciplinary practice also hindered collaboration, as noted elsewhere by Korea scholars. Other respondents were glad to see the increasing acceptance of multilingual presentations at conferences and publications: “Multilingual publications allowing local voices to speak intelligently in their own language.” The archaeologist described how they tried to work with local collaborators, offering critical feedback, and editorial assistance for international publication, but few took them up on this offer, since the roadblocks to attaining those editorial standards are daunting. Hence, they concluded that local collaborators did much of the research but ended up assisting little in the writing -- although this scholar made sure that they were given full recognition as partners: “I couldn’t have done it without them, but they’re not really in a position to add a lot to that final writing stage.” Nevertheless, this faculty member is committed to collaboration, and is writing an article on the philosophy of collaboration. They were critical of their colleagues in their field for not including local partners in the decision-making aspects of research projects and archaeological field schools, and noted that since they were dependent upon local agencies to approve permits, they needed to be in negotiation with local partners over research projects of mutual interest to pursue.

For Japan Studies faculty, the word “collaborate” could mean seeking feedback on publications from their colleagues, and peer-reviewing other scholars’ work. However, Korean and Japan Studies faculty reported that they seldom collaborate on research with other scholars, one citing the difficulties of working across disciplines: “It is great to discuss research and analyze data findings together, but when it comes to writing and publishing there are differences in disciplinary methods.” An exception would be an edited volume or anthology, for which they might write one or two separate chapters. For the China law scholar, however, this kind of interdisciplinary, and intra-regional collaboration was common:

“So, we have people studying Japan, people who study Central Asian countries, [and the] Middle East... So, in that sense, it is quite a lot of loose collaboration. And once we identify common interest, that is good enough, then we will probably start doing more close collaboration. That means co-authoring, or working on research projects in a more formal sense.”

5. State of the Field Awareness

Scholars in both Japanese and Chinese Studies noted that the fields had become so extensive that it was impossible to keep up with trends. When asked about their future wishes, a China linguist noted that help with what’s happening in the field -- not just UW Libraries acquisitions -- would be helpful. One Japan scholar who has been in the history field more than 50 years noted its huge expansion, and increasing specialization. Others in the Japan field commented that it was hard to define what was even meant by trends in the field, when a particular piece of scholarship could now be ground-breaking within its limited sphere, but of little influence to the field as a whole. More and more books on narrower and narrower topics are being published, and it’s hard to define what the field even is. A Southeast Asia historian also questioned the meaning of following trends in the field as a whole, when they thought it more important to be aware of, and remain loyal to, the scholarship that you found stimulating.

Methods employed to keep up with the field often included using the library, or library catalogs: one China scholar said that they had tried to go to the East Asia Library at least once a month “to flip through the latest journals.” One Korean Studies faculty noted that they did periodic keyword searches in the Libraries catalog -- looking for recent dissertations, for instance. Another respondent commented on the value of the table of contents analytics that were now often part of cataloging records, and another lamented that the new acquisitions lists that the Libraries used to produce had been helpful. Others, however, spoke to the transformative effect of social media. One South Asia scholar noted:

“The thing that has changed... in ways that have frankly surprised me has been Academia.edu. That has shocked me how much that has changed the way I am aware of publications and the way I read. I know there are critiques of Academia.edu because of some of the ways they are trying to monetize, and these concern me, but in terms of making me immediately aware when things are being published in my areas of interest, it is pretty much second to none.”

This service allows you to know immediately that something has been published in your field, and when someone you are following bookmarks a new work, you are notified. These bookmarked works often turn out to be ones that this scholar would want to read, and the

network provides, in their view, the same quality of relevant citations that searching JSTOR previously did. Two Southeast Asia faculty also reported making extensive use of scholarly networking sites, as well as Facebook academic groups and Twitter. They noted that colleagues were posting links to pre-print copies of articles that were uploaded to one site or another and that instant access was simple (including through illegal sites like Sci-Hub).

Several faculty mentioned the importance of working with their graduate students, who were often on the cutting edge of research, or were looking to them for reading suggestions. Undergraduate teaching was also an incentive to ensure that you were aware of developments in the field. One noted that they were so busy that the only way they found time to read new work was to assign it to a seminar class. Two faculty mentioned serving on grant selection committees as a means of gaining insights into the direction of their field, although the Southeast Asia ethnomusicologist noted that none of the applications were in their country area of focus, but were informative in terms of trends in the larger fields of arts and humanities. Others noted the value of being a peer reviewer for books and journal articles. A Southeast Asia faculty found the Country Group email lists of the Association for Asian Studies, like the Thailand/Laos/Cambodia Group, to be of some use, but felt frustrated at their paucity of coverage for the least-studied countries of the region.

Other faculty commented on the meaning of following trends within their region or county of study, where often no equivalent of the geographical field exists. The sociologist who works on South and Southeast Asia noted that Sociology is very U.S.-based, so although they would like to be more involved with colleagues from Asia, they felt that they had to focus on “what is useful” to them professionally within that U.S.-centric framework. What they are looking for in their state of the field research is “new theoretical ways of looking at things, or potential comparisons.” Within Southeast Asia, there is a consciousness of the region as field of study, with prominent centers of scholarship in several countries, but most U.S. scholars who are looking at trends within those countries are looking at their colleagues in their discipline. The Southeast Asia medical anthropologist discussed the difficulties of following communities of scholars across two or even three languages, but noted the growth of multi-lingual virtual forums via blogs and online lectures, even in the area of public health where English has been dominant.

6. Defining and Accessing Research Data

Several of the interview questions elicited information on the relationships between scholarship and sources: how research projects were initiated and how resources were integrated into final research products. Differences in the language used to describe what a scholarly source could be were largely determined by habits of the discipline, but also by a scholar's relationship to their sources and choices of methodology. Faculty members in the social sciences talked predominantly of "data" -- finding it, collecting it, storing and sharing it, while faculty in History used the language of "secondary sources" and "primary" or "archival sources." However, in the context of Asian Studies these disciplinary conventions may be complicated: for a linguist in China Studies, a primary source could be contemporary dictionaries, as well as their own fieldwork; a China scholar who identified as an art historian described their engagement with ethnographic research as "being in art classrooms painting with kids, [or] working as a kind of curator helping artists put together an exhibit -- to see what is it like to do that in a private gallery, what is it like to do that in a state-run museum."

Librarians tend to talk about strict distinctions between primary and secondary sources, but for scholars these distinctions are less clear, perhaps particularly so in area studies, where every disciplinary investigation is also a cultural engagement, and every artifact -- textual or otherwise -- is of potential ethnographic value. As one respondent in Japan Studies noted, "there is an almost philosophical question about what makes primary versus secondary material... A primary source, I think, is ultimately the source that you are analyzing. Whereas a secondary source is a source that is already engaged in the analysis of a primary source." A South Asia scholar elaborated on this ambiguity:

"The... idea of the primary and the secondary text is an artificial separation. Oftentimes primary texts are disguised as secondary texts until read in a serious light. What I try to study is a dispersive web of knowledge. If the primary text is a poem and the secondary text is 700 years of interpreting it, where do I draw the line? Information comes ten years after the poem is composed, so that itself is a primary text to me. Or a contemporary film made about it, can be a primary text as well... It's all part of the discourse around the thing that I am engaging with."

Reiterating the ways in which the same resource could play a different role across disciplinary approaches, the Southeast Asia historian expanded on the role of data in their research: "I don't ignore numbers, but I question their authority to shape the world." Discussing

their work with census data in past research, they described their methodology as multi-layered, looking at the census as a way of "producing the population." The question is "not so much whether the census offers material for interpretation, but the ways the census is already interpreted." The anthropologist of Southeast Asia also described their research as including an ethnographic approach to texts: "an ethnographer might ask what those formats tell them." The Southeast Asia ethnomusicologist commented that they, too, engaged in a multi-layered interpretation of their own field research data: were the oral histories gathered in the field from key practitioners in the village the same as ethnographic interviews? These oral histories depend upon unreliable memories of the past and are more about "making sense of what's happening right now" than discovering some historical truth.

A number of scholars discussed the absence of data: a China scholar noted that the feminist history research that they conduct "is trying to figure out what are the experiences that have not been documented... It's more like looking at the archives for their silence, what didn't go into the official library or the recorded history." The Southeast Asia historian noted that the absences of certain voices often inspired their research. When looking for one thing, they would often find another: "If that something else turns out to be much more interesting I end up working on that material. Or if I can't find the material I really want to find, I ask 'why can't you find it?' So, I begin to make the absence of that material into a research question."

i. Archives, Artifacts and Elusive Collections

All respondents talked about using library and archival resources both in the home institution library, and in their country of research, although their experiences with the latter varied widely. Most of the respondents in South Asian Studies reported having done extensive archival research in South Asia, in libraries, museums and/or private collections there, without particular obstacles to access. Interviewees in Japan studies, however, agreed on the challenge of finding sources available in Japan: not many materials are available online; and scholars who travel to Japan to use materials find that most sites are closed to them, as foreign-based scholars. The scholar of Japanese Buddhism lamented that primary sources -- collections of Buddhist canons "that take a lifetime to read (even for a native speaker)" -- are not easily available to foreign scholars. When asked what magical improvements in their research conditions they

would like to see, many scholars talked about access to archives: three out of five Japan scholars said they would like better access to archival and research materials from Japan; two of them requested a research assistant to go through the research materials; a Southeast Asia faculty would like more archival collections at UW, or surrogate collections for scholars who now found it difficult to travel for research (some noted the difficulty of balancing research trips with family obligations). While many noted the convenience of digital access, one scholar spoke to the problems of dissociating collections from their context through selective production of surrogates. A South Asia art historian described a collaborative project with the Tate Modern in London; the exhibition catalogs they needed were only in London, or perhaps India, “and the Tate agreed to photocopy materials and send them here, but it is not the same thing as a scholar being able to look through an archive yourself and identify materials that are useful. Because often as a scholar you are not able to know what you are looking for until you find it.”

The migration sociologist described looking for information about the caste affiliations of rebel commanders, information that is only available in highly specialized local sources, and sometimes aggregated by local agencies. They were also looking for NGO yearbooks of violent events that they needed to correlate with the migration data they were working with. These kinds of texts, although selectively online, and sometimes published in bilingual volumes, were not easy to get access to. A South Asia anthropologist also talked about their need for government reports and statistics, and NGO reports; all areas of concern for South and Southeast Asia scholars. They noted that their experience had been “that with foreign funding comes certain kinds of transparency requirements that these organizations are encouraged to create these kinds of publications online,” although some reports, even those which might eventually have been collected by a library in print, are now only available online behind password protection. Government ministries or NGOs may just give you the reports that you need, if you are on site to ask: “So, on the one hand there is a lot of material available through international organizations [online], but some of the government publications seem harder to get than they would have been twenty years ago.” On the other hand, many respondents commented on how archives, like the Korean Labor Archives, have been digitized, obviating the necessity to travel.

A South Asia scholar noted the difficulty of finding banned texts, a common problem across many regions of Asia. A historian of Korea raised the question of other elusive materials held in scholars' research collections: "unpublished materials in their possession from their collections or from interviewees... So, you have to talk to people to get access to these. It's more an issue with primary materials, but sometimes published books require you to locate a person who has it." A scholar of South Asia noted that they used informal networks to track down resources, often from private sources: "Sometimes it is just stored in a closet in a box. You know for my first book a lot of the primary materials I received were just considered refuse... It was a big pile of junk in an attic." A historian of Southeast Asia was also interested in this detritus: "primary sources include things like eyewitness accounts, police records, journalistic accounts of events, memoirs by direct participants themselves" but also material objects "that were part of whatever event you are looking at: uniforms of soldiers, the kinds of bullets that were used in guns during the revolution, the architecture of trenches, the shape of machines, that kind of thing, so you know, those would be primary sources."

ii. **Library Research and Digital Resource Access**

Respondents generally talked less about their access to secondary texts, indicating that most were generally comfortable with the Libraries book collections, database access, and what was increasingly available to them online in various forms. A South Asia scholar noted limitations when they needed to browse through several decades of a journal, looking for linguistic change over time; interlibrary loan does not allow for this type of research. This scholar was also critical of historical digital newspaper collections because they were indexed in ways "that the publication thinks was important to drive clicks, but not necessarily in a way that is helpful for me getting the information I need." They commented that sometimes it is easier to use newspapers on microfilm and lamented that this format was becoming increasingly rare. Others noted the loss of access to news in general, which used to be available through the US government news monitoring service, for instance. A China scholar who used Google scholar and Google books noted, that although not comprehensive, "it is a good way to know what is out there...But almost always you still need the print version of it, or at least get a PDF through

Interlibrary Loan. For me, I would say probably less than 20% of what I want to look at is available digitally, either primary or secondary.”

Various issues around language were raised by scholars across many of the regional fields: some mentioned the difficulty of accessing secondary sources in languages that they could read; a linguist working on China commented that they had to work with secondary sources in many different languages, including Korean and Japanese, which they could read, and Vietnamese, which they could not. Several East Asia scholars talked about the potential of Google Translate, and a Japan scholar noted that think-tanks are providing synopses in translation of Japanese journal articles, to assist with this problem. An early Buddhism scholar lamented the difficulty of reading classical texts, while another scholar noted the issue of reading the cursive script of manuscripts. A Southeast Asia respondent commented on the daunting task of reading sources in both multiple local (Javanese and Indonesian) and colonial-era Western languages. Another in Southeast Asian Studies lamented the way in which local languages were devalued, and how their transcription into English, often through another Western colonial language, into the Roman alphabet, rendered them unintelligible, to both native speakers and non-native scholars alike. Others spoke of variant orthographies, for languages like Javanese. Language transcription remains a problem in library catalogs for all non-Roman script languages of Southeast Asia.

iii. Digital Media

Several scholars mentioned the opportunities, and the challenges, posed by digital media, both born-digital and digitized. A scholar of China noted that “increasingly, people are using WeChat...to learn about public opinion and censorship in China and things like that.” They asked: “I don’t know what role the Libraries can have in that, but clearly, some kind of consortium that would gather up this kind of material ... And this is called big data, this is huge, huge amounts of data.” Others noted that “things appear on government websites, then disappear. Someone needs to be on top of this.” The migration scholar described a new project that involves Twitter data, research that initially is purely quantitative, following patterns of Tweets over time around particular kinds of disasters: flood, war, violence. They noted that they did not yet have either access to the Twitter content itself, or the methodological tools for interpreting content: “None of us has the experience with text analysis, we’re looking only at frequency.” A limited number

of country data sets had been made available free to the research team -- and that availability had influenced the countries of focus, since purchasing access would require grant funding. Other respondents also noted increasing interest in Facebook data analysis, underscoring the problems for libraries of archiving and providing access to these digital data.

Many of the China Studies faculty noted the importance of the CAJ journal database, and its limitations: a sociologist lamented that access to medical articles was not available because the libraries did not subscribe to the medical modules. Of greater concern was the total government editorial control over the database providers, and rumors that certain articles are missing, either by mistake or design. A China linguist who was seeking secondary sources in Japanese and Korean, presumed that there were similar sources for Korean, but noted that Japan has been particularly protective of author rights, and has lagged behind the kind of digital access available for China and Korea resources. There was little discussion of this type of access amongst Southeast Asian scholars; although online local indexing to journals and open access sources are increasingly available, it seems that informal distribution of research, even to foreign scholars, is still important in Southeast Asian studies. A China historian noted the difficulty of working with multi-volume historical sets, which are not indexed anywhere, making it impossible to know which volumes out of hundreds might contain what you are looking for. Digitization would help with this problem; creating a pdf of the index would help for those volumes not available for browsing on open shelves. There are projects to do this for printed sets, but not for government publications. A master index of available documents, and variant editions, would be very useful.

7. Data Creation, Storage and Organization

This section addresses the types of data that faculty reported collecting, and their methods for managing both original data and secondary research. Respondents reported various levels of comfort with bibliographic management tools, with many concerned about software obsolescence and compatibility issues. A China scholar noted the difficulties of working across different orthographies and languages using standard bibliographic software; for instance, when using Chinese characters, *pinyin* romanization and an English translated title, these parallel field entries are not supported by most bibliographic software. Entries in multiple languages using different fonts must be manually changed to display correctly. Some respondents commented

on using EndNote, but one confessed to difficulties retrieving materials because of their own inconsistent search terminologies:

“In my experience, as research projects involve and change, your way of cataloging information, your headings, your keywords and organizational pattern changes over time, so it is hard to be consistent. If you are not totally consistent, you can lose materials. In the end, I usually search my own notes using people’s names or other keywords that never change, and so it is a little bit less efficient and definitely not a perfect system, but I think it works for me.”

Some scholars discussed experimenting with new platforms for creating and managing data: a China historian reported “trying different note-taking software, like OneNote,” but since they “don’t have a lot of quantitative data, and primary source stuff, it is stored either as photocopies of original text or notes on them, or pdfs.” Another China faculty, who publishes both in English and Chinese mentioned using their cell phone to record and transcribe as they are writing, and an art historian also uses voice recording for a project that involves interviews with artists, although they were not yet sure how they would use, organize and manage that data. One respondent used MAXQDA, a qualitative data analysis software package which tracks interview transcriptions and photographs, allowing you to upload transcripts, and code, tag and search them. They noted that “what a lot of these data programs are trying to do is produce ‘big data’ out of techniques that were not intended to do that. For example, I do not find it personally helpful receiving a bar chart that shows that one word appears 10x more frequently than other words in my research...” Another scholar, however, noted that they didn’t think about digital media in terms of “a storage question” only, but more as a new form of scholarship: “Once you digitize it, you can run analytics...You can search documents for every appearance of a word, for what that is worth. But yes, [digitization] is a way to store the text.”

Many scholars expressed concern over the storage and organization of their original data, with most China Studies faculty reporting data from some period of their career: the linguist had collected field data on Chinese dialects that have never been fully published. Most respondents in Korean Studies conducted interviews and fieldwork and recorded/transcribed the information; one would write field diaries and keep those in a digital format by scanning their notes. Another respondent reported producing a lot of interview data “with former high-ranking bureaucratic officials in South Korea and Japan, in order to demonstrate how the bureaucracy and business

people interacted.” They wished there were a “clearing-house for data storage,” for those scholars who are retiring. A historian summed up methods that were common: “Most of my data is made by scanning copies. I have tons of materials in my office... interview notes and sometimes interview tapes. And then there is statistical data. I will make lists of people, perform surveys of collections things like that, and I keep them in my office.”

A China scholar identifying in part with art history noted that it was extremely difficult to get high quality images of art works. Old art journals and exhibit catalogs -- many of them not officially published -- are great sources, which s/he would try to buy from markets in China. The art historian of South Asia reiterated the importance of catalogs, as “usually the first place that a set of visual data has been presented and given some kind of analytic or theoretical framework.” Both art historians interviewed had extensive collections of photographs, and are involved in creating image databases. The China scholar noted that they were sympathetic to using libraries metadata standards and subject authorities for their data, so that it would be compatible across other database, but “when I started doing that I realized how the more Western-driven art history metadata authorities and databases, I was shocked at how bad they were for China, even the periodization. They have all the keywords for style and for period [but] it didn’t go past the Qing dynasty.” They also discovered that the controlled vocabularies being developed on the mainland, versus Taiwan and Hong Kong -- and how they are being translated -- are very different. Now they are working with metadata consultants in the Libraries to build a data dictionary, and with Master’s students in China Studies and Library and Information Science to devise a trilingual thesaurus. Talking of their 30,000 images, the South Asia scholar stated:

“I have a vast collection of images which is quite frankly essential to the work that I do because it is an emerging field and it is not documented or published anywhere else. There is no other repository, and I have to take images of a good enough quality that I could eventually publish them... I need a lot of financial and logistical support to manage what is a growing database...”

They commented that this work is a “non-negotiable” aspect of their research that they would be happy to share “with others as long as I was given credit for the images that I took.” To emphasize the importance of this work they noted: “I took photographs of a set of murals by a Sri Lankan painter called George Keith that were produced between 1939 and 1940... In recent years... those murals have been repainted in the name of preservation.”

Further aspects of the topic of archiving are discussed in the section on Open Data.

8. Disseminating Research

Most faculty were heavily influenced by their disciplines in their publication habits, although many discussed the tension between discipline and area-based publication choices. China faculty mostly write for an academic audience, in peer-reviewed Asian Studies or China Studies journals and university press monographs, publication choices that usually conformed to their departments' requirements for tenure and promotion. The China linguist noted, however, that the primary mode of dissemination for their discipline is articles, but the monograph is the major requirement for their Department -- the interdisciplinary Asian Languages and Literature - - which is dominated by literary studies, posing a problem for them. A South Asia anthropologist saw themselves publishing in various sub-fields of anthropology, although they also identified their research with refugee studies, and "broadly speaking Asian studies. And that can include comparative studies of South Asia, Africa, and the Middle East." The migration studies scholar noted that they would not consider publishing in an Asian Studies journal, but that the audience they want to reach is reading migration studies journals. Occasionally they would find a citation from an Asian Studies journal that interested them, but generally "new and exciting work is not appearing in Asian Studies journals."

Southeast Asia scholars noted that their publication habits were dictated mostly by their discipline. The ethnomusicologist stated that their recently published monograph was in a music and gender press series with a focus on ethnomusicology. For a recent article on masked dance they would consider an Asian theater journal or a country-specific journal. Many scholars in Southeast Asian Studies expressed frustration with the *Journal of Asian Studies*, the flagship publication of the Association for Asian Studies, because of both its regional biases and its "hierarchy of acceptable topics within the rubric of Asian Studies." The medical anthropologist also noted that the journals in that field are mostly focused on Africa, a trend that left them fewer publishing outlets for their Asia research.

i. Public and Engaged Scholarship

Attitudes towards public scholarship varied, although there was a general trend towards popularizing research in the interest of garnering greater public interest in Asian Studies. In

general, tenured full professors tend to use more diverse publication channels, including media op-eds. A veteran Japan Studies scholar mentioned writing encyclopedia entries as a means of contributing to public scholarship, “now that the requirements of tenure are no longer an issue.” Some respondents in South and Southeast Asian Studies published in less conventional venues: a political scientist of South Asia published in a newspaper titled *Wire*; an anthropologist published in specialized blogs such as *Hot Spots*, which is published by the American Anthropological Association, and allows 100 words to introduce your topic. Several scholars mentioned publishing in *The Conversation*. An archaeologist who reported a great response to one article posted there commented that the content was also controlled by a Creative Commons license that allows for wide distribution through other syndicated media: “Short pieces can be adapted by journalists so it’s a good way of getting scholarship out there, and its CCBY so can be syndicated on other websites.”

A South Asia scholar noted that *The Conversation’s* agreement with news outlets stipulates that the post, once edited by their staff for a general audience, “must remain as is, without taking a chunk of work and putting it in a different context, a practice which unfortunately happens to scholars often and makes them extremely uncomfortable.” Having had a bad experience with being misrepresented in the media, “writing in a slightly longer form for an open access source that preserves what I consider the scholarly integrity of my work, even if I am writing for a public audience, is really important to me.” They noted that *The Conversation* allows posts up to 1,000 words, which is long enough to do justice to your argument, unlike most blog posts of 300 to 500 words. This respondent speculated that scholars having their research misrepresented are driving new venues such as specialized blogs. Several Anthropology blogs, for instance, are “addressing issues important in a broader sense that anthropologists may be able to speak to, which are starting to have tremendous impact.” They noted that posts from the blog *Savage Minds* are “beginning to get picked up and reproduced in different places.”

Others mentioned giving public talks on current issues that are close to their areas of research. The scholar in ethnomusicology described how they had participated in a Jackson School project in collaboration with the local newspaper to provide readings about Asian cultures for local schools. They also talked about their work in performance as a way of popularizing the

field, and introducing local audiences to performance traditions from the region. Others expressed interest in writing for general audiences, but admitted that it was daunting to develop the contacts, and to learn to write in ways that address a popular audience. The South Asia art historian did not feel that they wrote outside of the traditional scholarly venues, deciding not to write art criticism or exhibition catalog essays, but “one area I would say I have taken on is... I publish many book reviews and exhibition reviews. I feel like there is an urgent need for people to review books, articles, and exhibitions to make people aware of developments in scholarly thinking around certain subjects. But review work is very poorly recognized as part of the tenure process, they commented. This respondent did also note that they had “done an interview with *MOMA* [Museum of Modern Art] on their blog or website that they call *Post*.”

Some Southeast Asian Studies respondents recognized that they usually wrote for “niche audiences,” but all expressed support for public scholarship and open access, as ways of both promoting their research and sharing it with disadvantaged communities, including their colleagues in the region. Many practiced what might be called engaged scholarship: for instance, making films that address the question of anthropologists bearing witness to injustice or violence; working with museums to bring communities in connection with artifacts, documents and histories alienated from their origins by colonialism or commercialism. One Southeast Asia respondent wanted to see libraries be more like museums in taking responsibility for mediating between communities and their histories, repatriating artifacts and documents to those communities. The Southeast Asia archeologist also talked about the importance of working with museums, describing how they gave recently-discovered artifacts to local museums in Southeast Asia to include in updated exhibits; this respondent also spoke to local schools, letting communities know why they were digging up the land in their village. The Southeast Asia historian had turned to journalism as a way of popularizing not just his/her own work, but to promote literature of the region through popular writings, including book and film reviews, both here and in the region. This scholar is also working with publishers in the U.S. to get Southeast Asian writers re-published in English; they see diasporic literature as a link to popular audiences in the U.S. It was noted by others that translation work too is not valued and rewarded in the tenure process, despite its critical importance in promoting public awareness of Asia.

9. Open access

Opinions towards open access varied from hostile to cautiously supportive, and from curious observer to conversant practitioner. Overall there was little interest in the changing scholarly marketplace, or author rights. One Japan Studies faculty was completely opposed to the idea of open access, having had to pay a publishing subvention to get published. They felt that the open access model would destroy the already economically marginal academic publishing industry, while a South Asia scholar wished that the university press system would simply accept the subsidized nature of the academic market. A China linguist noted the difficulty of working in an informal OA digital environment with complicated typographic issues, for instance the Vietnamese Sinitic orthography *chữ nôm*, which can only be partially represented in Unicode. Readers need specialized software to view these characters online. A China scholar summed up some of the dilemmas:

“Right now, there are still a lot of advantages to getting published by a real publisher. One of those is the ability to work with editors and external, anonymous reviewers and go through a manuscript revision process that is peer reviewed... We want the peer review system, but we don’t necessarily want to be under the control of publishers or deal with the long time periods that it takes to get work reviewed and published.”

One Southeast Asia scholar commented: “I want to be read and be on reading lists and be cited but I also want openness,” pointing to the tension between publishing in less well known but open source journals, or in “more staid,” and very expensive journals of record for the field. One South Asia scholar noted: “If reputed journals become open access, I would publish in them,” but another scholar lamented the rigid tenure policies that do not give due weight to open access publications. A journal editor made a distinction between the major journals of record, and their small minority-interest publication: “Because it is such a small journal, we were able to make it open access,” using a small grant which allows publication without charging the authors. “I don’t think a scholar should have to pay money to publish,” they noted.

Incentives for those supporting OA included journal pricing practices of unethical publishers, but detractors noted the lack of quality indicators for open access journals, and one added that many scholars in South Asia were being approached by predatory journals masquerading as OA and charging a lot of money: “What I am not seeing when I go [to Asia], is

that all of this talk about open access, is actually solving this problem that their universities don't have subscriptions to the core journals that would allow them to really increase their [engagement] in international state-of-the-art debates in the field." Other China faculty who did not report actively publishing in OA journals, or using institutional or subject repositories, did note their activities using academic social sharing sites, indicating that they were seeking wider dissemination for their work in ways that would in fact increase access for colleagues in the region. Many respondents reported making materials available on third-party sites: some on "ResearchGate" or SSRN [Social Science Research Network], once accepted for publication. One justified using Academia.edu, "not because it is a good option necessarily, but because it is low hanging fruit." Another respondent stated: "So, it is within fair use to put PDFs online on your own website, Academia.edu, and actually I have to say that for Academia.edu I am aware of emergent critiques about it, but it has been useful getting material to scholars in Asia who do not have access to their own sites." This respondent admitted that they did not understand the UW institutional repository, but "I am very resistant to any idea that I am giving this to the University of Washington." Few faculty who mentioned putting their work up on their own websites or on social sharing sites mentioned copyright restrictions. Some who did bring up rights issues assumed that publishers would not care. One senior scholar showed a greater awareness, noting how they had taken back rights from the publisher of a popular class text, because the price of the book was raised; it was transferred to a less expensive publisher.

A Japan scholar who considered themselves an early OA adopter said that if their work was not available in JSTOR, they made it available on their website, commenting that with open access and Facebook and a link, "it doesn't matter where you publish." They had used Academia.edu in the past, but had stopped doing so since understanding its commercial nature, and will investigate the UW repository, when they have time. Southeast Asia scholars also recognized the importance of promoting scholarship through informal circuits, using Facebook and Twitter "to say I've just published an article on such and such, here's a link." The Southeast Asia archeologist is committed to making pre-prints available: "I don't pay Gold page fees but I put a pre-print up on the OSF – Soc archive [SocArXiv]. I feel like I am satisfying my desire for accessibility by using a preprint server, rather than using a traditional open access model, like

Green or Gold open access." The medical anthropologist was also devoted enough to questions of access to write an article about OA practices in medical anthropology. While several respondents talked about social media as means to reach a larger audience, and to break down the artificial barriers of paywalls, one mentioned Facebook also as a forum for sharing first drafts of scholarship and soliciting reviews.

A South Asia faculty noted that they had made materials open access via the Digital South Asia Library, a not-for-profit consortial project of the Center for Research Libraries. Another commented that they had given a talk that was published through the California Digital Libraries digital repository: "And I think in part I wanted to see what the impact of that article would be and what audience I would get. I have been astonished, because they send you statistics of how many people have seemed to read, or at least downloaded that piece... I don't know if it is students writing a term paper and trying to get ideas, or people actually engaging with the ideas in that article." They stated that they have not published anything else since in an OA source, "in part because I was tenure track and cautious about where and how I was publishing."

i. Open Data

Several faculty were interested in various aspects of open data. One South Asia respondent was creating databases of legal cases from India and elsewhere, as well as researching online resources and media archives, such as *Times of India*, for legal cases. This respondent intends to make this database openly accessible. Some China faculty plan to make their rare datasets available, but before doing that, they are sharing them with a smaller circle of colleagues. They report plans to digitize some rare archival materials and manuscripts and "publish them via OA." The China scholar identifying with art history was considering loading some videos onto the Internet Archive. A Korean Studies faculty wished to make data available to other researchers: "I think it may motivate other people to be interested in what I am doing." They noted that many social science journals include basic data in an appendix. A China Studies linguist commented that they would have liked to make their extensive data on Sino-Tibetan languages more available, but "it takes so much time to clean it up. In fact... when I came back from doing that fieldwork, I talked to some people here at UW about whether there was a server that I could make my data available on."

The Southeast Asia archeologist is “fanatical” about making data available to the greatest extent possible, particularly data that substantiates the arguments of their published work. Noting that it was now relatively easy to find the publications online as pdfs, but much harder to find access to raw data, they were making as much as possible available in public subject repositories, linked by DOIs to enable sharing. They recognized the limitation of this position, given the size of data files they were generating, particularly from their photogrammetry methods (used to produce virtual 3D images of excavated objects), which required thousands of images. They noted: “It is a lot of work to archive it all, and the pay-off is not there yet.” They believed that all funding agencies should strengthen requirements for data management plans to include public access, and that “publishers should require scholars to make their data available along with the publication... Data is anything that supports the reliability of your claim, and that should be public.” Guaranteeing such access should be part of the publication contract. This faculty member is working on an article arguing the case for open data, having become engaged in debates with colleagues in their field about the subject.

The migration studies Sociology faculty has been a frequent recipient of NIH funding, so was familiar with that agency’s public deposit requirements. As a sociologist, they were also familiar with the national ICPSR repository: “NIH funded data has to be publicly available. So the data that I use and the additional pieces I collect are available through ICPSR at the University of Michigan.” They were content with this arrangement, since staff at ICPSR did the uploading work for you, unlike depositing in the UW Institutional Repository. The Southeast Asia ethnomusicologist, however, was concerned about making available recordings of performance and dance made during fieldwork, for reasons of cultural property rights, as well as conditions of Human Subjects Review. They felt that permissions were not clear from the original release forms that were signed, particularly since musicians were paid for the recording sessions in some cases, and some works recorded are traditional and subject to intangible cultural heritage protections: “Working with IRB I have a permissions form that informants initial, giving me rights to play [dance and music recordings] in class and conferences,” but archiving and dissemination rights are not clear. They were glad to work with the Ethnomusicology Archive at UW to make materials available there, however.

Another Southeast Asia faculty talked about the widespread use of Facebook to exchange not only published articles, but other digital resources – colonial archives for instance -- which were being shared and brought into popular discussion through Facebook networks. Historical photographs over time were shared and aggregated by enthusiasts. Mostly the repositories of origin were cited in these aggregated sites, making them useful resources. This scholar described open digital archival collections as “public tools for cannibalization.”

10. Future of the Field

Several scholars expressed concern about the future of the field, and whether it could survive in N. America, noting that entire sub-fields of study could be lost, particularly for the classical fields of linguistics, but for many specialties within the humanities. As one scholar noted, departments specializing in East Asian languages and literature are increasingly focusing on modern culture [editorial note: perhaps the influence of Department of Education Title VI funding, which does not support classical studies]: “There are fewer people interested in classical authors and more interested in modern Taiwanese film. It may switch in the future, but the danger is if the cycle is too long you can lose the knowledge before it comes back.” Many scholars in the humanities noted that as faculty retire in their fields they are not replaced. One lamented that students will have to go to Asia, “or a few places in Europe” to pursue these fields. A Korea specialist noted too that pre-modern studies are dying and many senior faculty are retiring, “while a new generation of Korean American scholars are rising.”

As noted above, a couple of faculty mentioned the distraction of “scholarly jargon,” which alienates scholarship from larger society, at a time when scholars need to be opening up the conversation and research results in a more accessible way to a broader public, as well as to policy makers and journalists. One respondent noted that in Japan Studies the field has become so specialized, with a proliferation of narrow research, that now there's a need to synthesize that research, to make it relevant across a wider sphere of academic and public interest. Many advocated broader approaches, using global perspectives, although the meaning of such a change was ambiguous. Scholars of Southeast Asia expressed hope for fewer rigid boundaries: some were looking for greater inclusion of scholars in the more empirical spectrum of the social sciences; others hoped for greater collaboration with Asian American Studies and issues of

interest to diasporic communities. These broader perspectives, however, may come at a cost. One China scholar noted the opportunities of new generations of truly bilingual scholars, and the difficulties of advising students who would be “publishing in English and in Chinese with equal facility. In part, I will have to learn how to ... advise them on how and where to publish what... Some things are politically sensitive, like how to navigate what they publish where and when and how.” Particularly so for students from Hong Kong, who are trying to figure out a relationship with the mainland, for instance.

One Japan respondent mentioned how fast China Studies is growing, to the detriment of other regions, like South Asia Studies, which is dying. A Korean Studies faculty noted:

“Another challenge would be a broadening gap between China and the rest of Asian studies... China is dominant over the other Asian country studies. So how to strike, if not balance, how to come up with a kind of cooperation between China Studies and the other Asian country studies will be a very serious challenge in terms of financing, in terms of research, and policy.”

A South Asia faculty mentioned the funding status of the Department of Education Title VI program, which “supports language training and livelihoods at this institution.” They believed, however, that despite the political attacks on Title VI, the funds would not be cut in the current political climate: “Title VI has always articulated itself in relation to neoconservatives and others successfully.” Another respondent noted: “I think funding is going to be a challenge, like maintain[ing] funding support for our graduate student, especially equipping them with the depth of regional and linguistic competence to do research in their fields.”

11. Libraries and the Future of Research

Most faculty were appreciative of the library, and many reflected with nostalgia on the importance of browsing stacks, noting the “democratic nature of library representation, where no one book is better than the next,” and the thrill of the contingent discovery of something important. One commented that they still tell their graduate students to go to the stacks (even though part of the collections at UW are now stored off-site).

“As a grad student it was very helpful to go to the shelf and see which journals and to find books that way. But I still think there’s something valuable to doing that, if you’re first coming into an area... Versus say, only looking on the search engines online and getting books out that way. I still tell students to go look at the shelves and see, because there’s just so much other stuff that just

doesn't appear, or it appears, but you have to know keyword ... you don't know what keyword to put in sometimes when you're first learning about a subject."

There were some criticisms of the Libraries: a South Asia faculty wondered why the Libraries had a rich collection of specialty books but lacked a number of foundational texts. "Sometimes I think we should be buying the entire list of books from certain presses because these are by and large not specialty books, they are affordably priced and I can imagine a wide range of people on this campus would use them," they said. On the other hand, a Korea historian was looking for more specialized books: "the challenge is rare books, old books published in the 50s or 60s that are not available even through WorldCat." They commented that you "have to go to the National Assembly Library because you cannot get it otherwise," and that materials for North Korea in the 1930s, particularly in Japanese, are hard to find. They suggested an official relationship with libraries in Korea and Japan so "when they needed to use their collections they wouldn't have to establish credentials and get a membership."

Others noted the changing role of libraries and challenges to their relevance: "The way topics are researched are also changing: part of ethnography is using social media, analyzing Facebook posts or YouTube videos and posted comments." Faced with rival information structures, such as Google, social networking sites and full-text repositories, some spoke of the enduring role of the library as an intellectual space. Another was critical of the Libraries' defensive response to these challenges, noting that they overreacted to popular predictions:

"I don't usually like the new, 2.0 Library databases where they try to replace Google as a search engine and you just punch in what you are looking for, because I find the search results are too chaotic... I think for students it's incredibly complex and confusing. If you put in a book title, often a review of the book will come up, which is crazy right?... I feel like a lot of the new library search engines are just a lot of noise, because they're very good at putting new sources into the database, but they are very bad at organizing the results..."

This respondent noted particularly that they wanted to teach students to differentiate good quality information from bad: "In the olden days you could say, well if it appears in the library catalog it's probably good quality because it's either a published book or a journal article, so it has a certain degree of academic credibility. But now it's hard to tell what's in those catalogs..." They thought the Libraries should be more interested in serving the serious researcher: "The number of advanced researchers will always be a small fraction of students. But it is the

researchers who really need and love and know about the library, and actually use the library. I think you cannot just look at the number of people walking through the door as if everybody walking into the library is equal.” A Southeast Asia faculty too recognized the importance of the library as an enduring repository of knowledge: "What I think will happen eventually is departments will get reconfigured. But if the sources are in the library, if you have good special collections, a good general collection, people will find those books, people will use those sources, in order to reinvent new fields of knowledge or to reinvigorate those that are flagging."

Some Southeast Asia respondents talked about the paucity of materials available for research on the region, particularly for the pre-colonial period, and the difficulty of finding citation indexing for vernacular journals. Others talked about the problems of locating library materials in the region, lamenting the lack of guides to local library resources, or remote access to finding aids for local archival collections and government publications. Some talked of the importance of simply being in the field to locate resources, including private collections, museums and collections of realia. Prominent was the sense of not knowing if you were not finding something because it didn't exist, because it did exist but no one knew where it was, or because you were being denied access as a foreign researcher. Another respondent noted that the problem with looking for materials on historical periods is not knowing if the information still exists, and when to stop looking, knowing that you have enough, or as much as you can get. A China historian talked at length about the potential for digital access, noting how European libraries had made available extensive collections of out-of-copyright materials. In Asia, "the libraries have digitized all their books, but they do not want to give them out for free because they feel like this is our property. This is true in Japan, Korea, Taiwan, China, and it's a totally different mentality among librarians that is very frustrating for a researcher like me."

12. Conclusions for the University of Washington Libraries

Perhaps one of the most striking characteristics of the field of Asian Studies is its interdisciplinary. Although, as alluded to by some scholars, Asian Studies lacks a single coherent methodology, the interdisciplinary social science and humanistic practices that have come to be associated with the core missions of the field have been enhanced by the comparative cultural methods that Asian research has brought to the fore. While the Libraries has struggled to address

this growing trend of interdisciplinary across all areas of scholarship it serves, the budget categories used in the Libraries' funding models still do not lend themselves to flexible response in this interdisciplinary environment. Besides budget structures, the types of services offered could also be better aligned to reflect these research trends, including collaborations across different areas of expertise in the Libraries – data services, OA outreach, for instance. The interdisciplinary of the field also has implications for the way librarians conceive of “primary” and “secondary” resources, how they select materials, and how they catalog them, (often classifying them in ways that do not reflect not how they are eventually used in research).

It is clear from the interviews that some new, or enhanced, library services are needed, such as research trends awareness. One respondent pointed out that librarians should keep abreast of current published research in areas of faculty research interest. As other respondents suggested, if subject librarians spent more time following faculty's research and teaching, it will help them best use the book budget to purchase the most needed resource. However, other faculty see the library as a crucial area of stability, an indiscriminating repository of knowledge that is independent of the fickle winds of research trends and funding fluctuations. Such fluctuations are perhaps particularly difficult for Area Studies programs in regions with multiple countries of focus, where a program could lose an anthropologist working on Thailand and have them replaced by one working on Viet Nam, for instance. While funding instabilities might leave departments with certain areas of research in decline, a well-balanced library collection, built with impartial vision, will enhance the overall strength and long-term health of the institution.

Keeping up with the trends of faculty research will enable librarians to see more opportunities for new services, ones which are more integrated with faculty's teaching and research, as well as the mission of the university. One faculty noted: “You could create [an acquisitions] list, and people like me who are eager to read will be able to see it.” But many faculty are looking way beyond an acquisitions list for state of the field awareness; they are looking towards trends within their country of study itself, raising the possibility of consortia which include key partners in Asia, who could help publish information bulletins about important new works published in vernaculars by their own scholars. But faculty are also looking for new trends in the various disciplines in which their research is based. Given the interdisciplinarity of

the research represented in this survey, this task, even if limited to English-language publishing, and even in collaboration with other subject selectors in the various disciplines, is a huge one.

Another obvious area of concern for faculty is archiving research data. As the concept of “big data” becomes more important in the sciences, the Libraries should not overlook the importance of (relatively) small data sets mentioned in the report, many of which present particular problems because of cultural rights and privacy concerns. Clearly, establishing or enhancing repositories – either locally or as a consortium of research libraries – for these materials is of critical importance to faculty. Such data repositories might also include information culled from social media, and the archiving of websites such as government and NGO websites. As part of this service the Libraries would provide metadata assistance to faculty, helping them not only passively to archive their data, but to suggest ways in which the data might be re-purposed in the form of new digital scholarship projects. A Japan faculty member mentioned digital scholarship as a tool in poetics, but there is a feeling that faculty on the whole do not understand this term, and how libraries have been involved in collaborations with presses and departments to explore these new digital research and dissemination practices. Any metadata created in relation to such projects should balance libraries’ needs for standardized vocabularies and classification terms with the requirements for vernacular language access and alternative ontologies based on non-Western thought habits and organizing conventions.

The related concern of open access, about which many faculty have questions, is one where enhanced librarian activism would be helpful. Despite a long history of working in this area, the Libraries still needs to better promote its institutional repository, and to educate faculty about author rights, and legal restrictions on works for which they do not own copyright. The popularity of third party social sharing sites, such as Academia.edu, shows how libraries have failed to make their repositories meaningful platforms for sharing research. While standard IR software packages used by most universities were not designed to provide the same sharing functionalities, we have seen from many respondents that they are using Twitter and Facebook as information sharing networks, which could just as easily link to a DOI from an IR. There could also be a case made for a dedicated national Asian Studies pre-print repository. Such national consortial repositories, which are now common in the sciences and even in the hard social

sciences, seem well-used and accepted by faculty who work in areas within their collecting scope (Sociology, Archaeology).

Finally, the Libraries should follow up on comments, primarily from Japan scholars, but also from Korea and China scholars, who lamented the limited access to archives and libraries in the region. They had suggested that the Libraries should establish consortia with research institutions in Asia, offering reciprocal access to research materials. Such consortia could address several concerns, including: onsite access to physical collections for scholars; enhanced and reciprocal ILL privileges (both within the OCLC network and outside of it); digital collections currently only available onsite might be made available on a limited bases, perhaps via such organizations as the Pacific Rim Digital Library Alliance, which includes Chinese and Japanese Libraries, as well as one library in Korea, the Singapore National Library, and a number of West Coast U.S. institutions. A consortial approach might also assist in considering the overwhelming issues of access to born-digital materials from the regions that are hosted on unstable and/or endangered servers. Whatever consortium might be put in place, it should recognize that we are in a transition between the long-standing reliance upon physical collections for Asian research, and the steadily increasing availability of digital resources, accessible both formally (through managed databases) and informally (though website access to materials as pdfs). As one China faculty appropriately noted:

“People still use books and librarians are reluctant to argue in favor of the paper book because it seems old fashioned. But in reality, that is still the workhorse of the library I would say. I think a lot of the trend in libraries is open the space, get rid of the books, but then you are just building a building with desks. You don’t need a library anymore. I think that is a very negative, dangerous trend in my mind in the library world.”

Summary Conclusions

- Better Libraries structures for inter-regional and interdisciplinary funding and services
- Need to maintain strengths across a wide range of specialized materials
- New research awareness services, in collaboration with partners in the region
- Services and assistance related to data archiving
- Enhanced platforms, perhaps consortial, for data archiving, including new media
- Better information about Open Access and author rights and responsibilities
- Consortia for access to local and digital collections in partner institutions in the region

Appendix I: Participants by Area and Department

<i>Department and Rank</i>	<i>Region</i>	<i>Rank</i>
History	SEA	Professor
Anthropology	SEA	Assistant Professor
Anthropology	SEA	Associate Professor
School of Music	SEA	Associate Professor
Jackson School and Sociology	SEA/SA	Associate Professor
Asian Languages and Literatures	Japan	Professor
Asian Languages and Literatures	Japan	Associate Professor
Architecture	Japan	Professor
Jackson School	Japan	Professor Emeritus
Religious Studies	Japan	Senior Lecturer
Jackson School	Korea	Professor
Asian Languages and Literatures	Korea	Associate Professor
History	Korea	Associate Professor
Jackson School	Korea	Professor
Asian Languages and Literatures	China & Tibet	Associate Professor
Geography	China	Professor
Jackson School and Sociology	China	Professor
Asian Law Center, School of Law	China	Professor
History	China	Assistant Professor
Gender, Women & Sexuality St	China	Associate Professor
Jackson School	SA/ India	Associate Professor
Art	SA/ India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka	Associate Professor
Anthropology	SA/ Pakistan	Associate Professor
Jackson School, Comp Religion	SA/ India	Professor

Appendix II: Asian Studies Programs at the University of Washington

The **Asian Studies program** at the University of Washington dates from 1909, when the Department of Oriental History Literature and Institutions was established with the appointment of Reverend Herbert H. Gowen as the chair of Oriental Subjects. The programs focused on South Asia, including Sanskrit language, and on China, Japan, South Asia, Russia and the Russian Far East. Its establishment coincided with the Alaska Yukon Pacific Exposition, held at the UW campus, an event that promoted the city as the “The Gateway to the Orient.” Russian language was taught from 1919, with Chinese added in 1926, Japanese in 1928, Korean in 1944 and Tibetan in 1952. In 1949 the Department of Far Eastern and Slavic Languages was established with Rockefeller Foundation support. A School of International Studies was established in 1976, which, in 1983, was renamed the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies.

The **Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies** leads the nation in hosting the most U.S. Department of Education Title VI grants, recognizing the excellence of its eight National Resource Centers for the study of Canada; Middle East; Russia, Eastern and Western Europe, as well as all regions of Asia, and Global Studies. Its oldest center, the East Asia Center, was established with a grant from the U.S. Department of Defense in 1959 as the Far Eastern Institute. It was followed by the Middle East Center, which now shares responsibility for the teaching of Central Asia with the Ellison Center for Russian, East European and Central Asian Studies. The South Asia Center was established in 1966, with the teaching of Hindi, Tamil, Thai and Vietnamese dating from this time. In 2012 the Jackson School established a Ph.D. program in International Studies. Other Ph.D. students focusing on Asia are registered across campus departments, primarily in Anthropology, History and Political Science.

Currently the **China Studies Program** has nearly 40 faculty members, providing extensive course offerings in the social sciences and humanities, and in some of the professional schools. The East Asia Library is among the 10th largest in the country. **The Japan Studies program** has 18 faculty members, offers language literature and culture classes and has a strong relationship with the Forster School of Business, where undergraduate students may earn a Certificate of International Studies in Business with a focus on Japan. The Asian Law Center is a preeminent international center for the study of Asian, International, and Development Law, offering

instructional programs for JD, LL.M., and PhD students with a focus on East and to a lesser extent, Southeast Asia.

By the mid-1960s a range of **South Asian languages and subjects** were being taught, and in 1972 the South Asia Center was designated a Title VI National Resource Center, now one of just nine South Asia NRCs in the U.S. The South Asia program currently has 37 core faculty, 25 affiliated faculty and offers a comprehensive curriculum of undergraduate and graduate education. Some major courses taught include Anthropology, Architecture, Art History, Hinduism, Buddhism, Comparative literature, Economics, geography, History, Music. Languages include Bengali Hindi Sanskrit, Urdu and Prakrit.

The **Korean studies program**, one of the oldest in the U.S. was founded in 1968 and offers courses in Korean language, literature, history, social organization, and politics. The language program currently consists of three years of modern language and advanced reading. Undergraduate and graduate courses on Korean history and society cover the period under Japanese colonial rule in the first half of the twentieth century, the liberation of Korea after 1945, the Korean War, and the political, economic, social, and cultural development of both South Korea and North Korea. Graduate seminars provide opportunities for research in Korean and other non-Western languages on a variety of topics in the political, social, economic, and intellectual history of the country.

The **Southeast Asian Studies Center** was established in the 1980s with support from the Ford Foundation, and then with Title VI funding, originally as a consortium with the Universities of Oregon and British Columbia. The Libraries' Southeast Asia Section was established in 1989, with assistance from the Henry Luce Foundation. The program has 17 core faculty, and teaches Vietnamese, Thai, Khmer, Tagalog, Indonesian and Burmese languages. Teaching focus is mostly in the social sciences and humanities, but includes Museum Studies, Marine Affairs and a connection to American Ethnic Studies through strong interests in the Philippines and Viet Nam. Other country strengths are Indonesia, Cambodia, Thailand, Myanmar and Malaysia. The program teaches undergraduates as part of the Jackson School Asian Studies concentration and in 2013 established an M.A. program with tracks in the social sciences or humanities.

Appendix III: Photographs



Notebooks and boxes of research material await preservation and archiving in offices of Southeast Asia and Japan Studies faculty. See [Section 7. Data Creation, Storage and Organization](#)