

일반연구논문

Living as Foreign Scientists: Stories of Nineteen Expatriate Professors in South Korea[■]

Hyung Wook Park*

* Associate Professor of History, School of Humanities, Nanyang Technological University

전자우편: park0717@gmail.com

This paper discusses an important dimension of the globalization of science by investigating the lived experiences of nineteen expatriate scientists in six institutions in South Korea. Although much has been written on the globalization and science, few works have dealt with scientific experts' migration across national borders in contemporary contexts. In this regard, the lives of foreign science professors in Korea offer an interesting case, as they illustrate how the ideas of global science both clash with and appropriate Korea's local practices and discourses. I argue that the globality of science is a main factor that fosters the continued Korean stay of many foreign scientists, who manage and appropriate what is entailed in this globality, namely, Korea's perceived status as a peripheral country in the dynamics between "center" and "periphery." This includes several strategies and unintended situations differing according to each foreign scientist's ethnic origins, professional experiences, and institutional circumstances, which lead them to make sense of their continued stay in Korea.

주제어 | globalization, globality, expatriate scientists, foreign professors, South Korea, migration, center, periphery

1. Introduction

Once called the “Hermit Kingdom,” Korea, especially its Southern half, has been integrated into the globalizing world since the end of the Cold War (Alford, 1999; Kim, 2000; Chang, Seok, and Baker, 2009). Science is possibly the most important enterprise that Koreans are promoting in this age, as it is thought to symbolize knowledge and practice shared by researchers across national borders. Yet the global face of Korean science is also inward-looking, just like Korea’s globalization itself. As Gi-Wook Shin has argued, Koreans’ effort for globalization has been a way of expressing their ethnic nationalism (Shin, 2006: 204-221). Therefore, nationalistic and globalizing movements are mutually corroborating rather than conflicting in South Korea. Likewise, the Korean effort for making their science “global” has also been made in their nationalistic context. To many Koreans, science is a strategic arena that should be elevated to the “global level” (*segyesujun*) to make the ethnic nation stronger and more competitive.

In this age, the community of expatriate science professors in Korea showcases the contradictions of globalization. Occupying a sizeable number of faculty posts in the country since the inception of the World Class University (WCU) project in 2008, foreign professors in science have represented how globalized Korea has become in the twenty-first century. Their increased number in Korean universities reflects the expatriate faculty community’s growth as whole, which is considered a prime index of Korea’s global take-off, along with the number of foreign students, English-only courses, faculty publications in international journals, and collaborative

projects with overseas scholars (Palmer and Cho, 2011; H. Lee and K. Lee, 2013; Shin and Jang, 2013; Moon, 2016). At the same time, the WCU project reiterates South Korea's long-lasting nationalistic desire to join the world's leading powers, which supposedly have a large group of outstanding scientific and technical experts recruited across the world.

But it may not be easy for Koreans to fulfil this desire. As several journalistic reports portray, a fairly large number of foreign professors are resigning to find better posts in other countries, and some of the remaining scholars feel deeply frustrated (McNeill, 2011; Moon, 2013; Ch'oe, 2015; Fouser, 2015; Yi, 2015; Matthews, 2016; Mun, 2016). They have found it hard to work for the Korean universities and academia with its strong hierarchy and rigid bureaucracy. Housing, food, and banking services also make their lives difficult, while the Korean language deepens their isolation in the campus. Some of them even mention xenophobia and racism in Korean society.

This problem has attracted scholarly attention. Three articles written by Stephanie Kim (2016), Mikyung Sim (2014), and John Palmer and Young Ha Cho (2011) have analyzed the origins of foreign professors' agonies and anxieties in the context of the country's efforts for globalizing its higher education. In her study of Underwood International College of Yonsei University, Kim has claimed that Koreans failed to integrate foreign academics "in a meaningful way" due to the "systematic disempowerment" of expatriate professors in the campus. Similarly, Sim has pointed to Korean universities' lack of proper leadership, persistent sexism, and internal struggle as the major factors that would disappoint expatriate professors. In the same vein, Palmer and Cho have mentioned discrimination against foreigners in faculty promotion and tenure exercises as a probable cause of their discontent.

I revisit these problems by focusing on expatriate science faculty members, who have not yet been investigated in depth. In effect, Kim's and Sim's research subjects were humanities scholars and social scientists, while Palmer and Cho did not even specify their subjects' fields. Yet natural scientists' lives in Korea should be distinct. Above all, many of them have their own laboratories, which make a substantial difference to their lives. They should acquire a constant stream of sizeable research grants for purchasing and updating experimental equipment, and must also recruit and manage a number of graduate students as laboratory workers. These are usually not the concerns of those in the humanities and social sciences.

In fact, natural scientists are more favorable to globalization. While the social sciences and humanities often address locally specific questions and rely on localized methods and approaches, the natural sciences are thought to deal with universal phenomena with globally shared research tools. Of course, this distinction is not absolute. In the age of globalization, all academic disciplines are globalized through international journals and transnational conferences. Nevertheless, some notable differences persist. For example, French philosophy is very different from British philosophy, let alone Chinese or Hindu philosophies.¹⁾ In contrast, most natural scientists will deny that such differences are matters of concern in their fields. In Korea, it was found that the colleges in "hard disciplines (engineering, natural science, medicine, etc) are [more] aggressive" in their response to the government's drive for globalization (Shin and Jang, 2013: 156).

This feature of natural science is partly a consequence of its historical development. As Thomas Schott has claimed, "the institutionalization of science in Europe," especially after the seventeenth century, "codified

1) Of course, these regional philosophies themselves have been globalized, as they developed their own worldwide journals and global academic networks. Yet few would deny that linguistic and cultural differences still matter.

a conception of nature as invariant in time and place” (Schott, 1993: 197). Natural scientists thus developed their “belief in the universal validity of science,” which became a conceptual basis of their defense of free exchange of ideas across national borders (Schott, 1991: 443). Rudolf Stichweh (1996) has detailed this process by showing how the “progressive internal differentiation of science” amid its nationalization in the nineteenth century fostered the globality of researchers and professional organizations around the world. Similarly, Elisabeth Crawford, Terry Shinn, and Sverker Sörlin (1993) have stressed the simultaneous progression of “nationalization and denationalization” through the “standardization” of nomenclature, methods, and measurements.

The concurrent nationalization and internationalization of science imply that it may be hard to find universal epistemology and egalitarian practice shared across the world in the age of globalization. Many STS scholars, especially after the start of the Strong Programme, have investigated locally contingent knowledge production and appropriation (Shapin and Schaffer, 1985; Gooding, Pinch, and Schaffer, 1993; Hess, 1995; Livingstone, 2003). Science has been globally institutionalized, yet it is also a local enterprise whose practices differ widely according to regional situations. Simultaneously, local scientific communities are all different in power, which inevitably produces the division and tension between “center” and “periphery” in making the globality of science (Ben-David, 1971; Schott, 1991; Lebeau, 2003; Hwang, 2008; Gibbons, Limoges, Nowonty, Schwartzman, Scott, and Trow, 2010). Formed by the unequal political relations during the age of imperialism, the “center” usually means North American and Western European countries that primarily produce mainstream scientific knowledge, while the “periphery” is known to be the rest of the world, including many Asian countries that experienced colonial rule until the mid-twentieth century. The periphery supposedly consumes knowledge

coming from the center or produces only marginal or subsidiary knowledge. However, the peripheral countries have been neither passive nor static in the global scientific arenas. Appropriating sciences from the metropole, Asian practitioners built their hybrid techno-cultural formations in making their own modernity (Gooday and Low, 1998; Prakash, 1999; Arnold, 2000; Clancey, 2002; Rogaski, 2004; DiMoia, 2013; Andrews, 2014). Against this backdrop, we can understand that Korean sciences—as a product of an Asian country that experienced traumatic colonization and destruction until the mid-twentieth century—may not yet have completely departed from periphery, while some engineering communities in the country have become centers of the world’s knowledge economy (K. Kim, 2005; Hwang, 2008, Y. J. Kim, 2012). Despite the substantial economic growth, Korea is still not regarded by “global talents” as an ideal place for their long-term career planning (Shin and Choi, 2015: 2-5).

My paper borrows the insights and perspectives from these studies. I argue that the globality of science is a main factor that fosters the continued stay of many foreign scientists, who, in their local contexts, manage what is entailed in this globality, namely, Korea’s perceived status as a peripheral country in the dynamics between “center” and “periphery” in the world sciences. Various factors, including their ethnic origin, professional experiences, intentional strategies, and unintended institutional circumstances, make possible their divergent responses to Korea’s local settings and peripheral attributes, which lead them to justify and make possible their long-term stay in Korea.

This analysis deals with situations, which are partly similar to, but not the same as those of foreigners in David Arnold’s (2000), Gregory Clancey’s (2002), and John DiMoia’s (2013) historical writings. Unlike the foreigners in these studies, some of my interviewees came from Asian

countries, while many of those from North America or Europe are junior scholars with lesser scientific experience than seniors in their departments. To some Asians scientists, Korea was close to center, which might facilitate their global career advancement. To most Western professors, however, Korea was close to periphery, as they found several features of Korean scholars and academia different from the conventions of European or North American institutions where they were trained. However, the foreign professors could make sense of their stay in their local contexts, especially through their intentional efforts or some unintended circumstances that prompted them to address and redefine Korea's peripheral characteristics on their own terms. They blurred and moderated the boundary between center and periphery and appropriated—or even internalized—several features of Korea and its scientific institutions that did not appear central to them.

I relate these points in four sections. The first section introduces my research subjects and main methods. In the second section, I briefly portray the formation of Korea's historical legacy of state-driven science, which is followed by the third section that discusses how this legacy shaped some of my interviewees' stressful encounters with the Korean culture in their institutions that they regarded as peripheral. In the fourth section, I analyze some foreign professors' strategies and circumstances that enabled them to address the peripheral characteristics of their universities and institutions. This section has three subsections that respectively deal with the foreign professors' moderating, appropriating, and incorporating the peripheral features of Korea's scientific communities and practices. In studying these features, I do not deal with foreign scientists' actual research programs and their progression. Although this topic is very important, it must be investigated in another publication. Instead, my paper

addresses cultural dimensions of foreign scientists' lives and their adaptation, which I think are also highly significant in understanding the globality of science.

2. Interviewees and Research Methods

This paper relies on my interviews conducted from May, 2016 to March, 2018. I met nineteen science professors at six Korean institutions, including five major universities and a national research institute. The interviewees were those who replied to my email invitation that I sent to most foreign scientists in these institutions.²⁾ They were either tenured or tenure-track faculty members, except one at Hanyang University, who was in a non-tenure track post.³⁾ I will call these people with simple anonymous designators, such as “Professor A,” which comes with some general information (Table 1).⁴⁾ Occasionally, however, I will also write down a real name or use terms like “a biochemist,” if there is a good reason to do so.

2) The rate of reply was extremely low in Yonsei, Hanyang, and Sungkyunkwan Universities, as only one professor in each of these universities agreed to be interviewed. None at Korea and Chung-Ang Universities replied to me. I was not able to find any foreign professor in natural science at Pohang University of Science and Technology (POSTECH), although it is another major research university. According to the Information Service of Higher Education in Korea, there are four foreign regular science professors at POSTECH. It seems that they are all Koreans with foreign nationalities. In general, this study has dealt only with professors in elite universities in Korea. It would be even harder to interview expatriate professors in less prestigious schools, as their proportions in the regular faculty was even lower than those in Yonsei, Hanyang, and Sungkyunkwan Universities, where I could meet just one professor per university. In addition to the foreign science faculty, I also interviewed three graduate students at Seoul National University.

3) In the university website, the title of this foreign faculty was just “assistant professor.”

4) In my paper, I cannot reveal any further details of the interviewees, as I have to protect their privacy according to the rules of the research ethics set by the Institutional Review Board of my university. Their names, nationalities, and academic departments could not be specified, as such information can be used to spot their identities in the relatively short list of foreign science professors in each institution.

Among them, six professors were ethnically Asian, while the others were Caucasian.⁵⁾ However, their ethnicity does not necessarily tell where they “came from.” Many of them were born and educated in different countries, and worked in several cities in distinct continents prior to becoming a faculty member in Korea. Nevertheless, I found, their ethnicity remained important in their adaptation to Korean universities. Regardless of their transnational paths of career, all Caucasians interviewed by me were born and educated in Europe or North America, while Asians, even after their education in Western institutions, were culturally attached to Asia. Some Westernized Asians who spent a large part of their early lives in the West were not different in this regard.

There are two common features applicable to all my interviewees. First, all of them used the term, “science,” to designate their job, although their research fields were diverse, encompassing the physical and biological sciences as well as some disciplines dealing with more practical matters.⁶⁾ Second, they were all men, probably reflecting the skewed gender constitution and discrimination in Korean academia (Ch’oe, 2008; Cho and Park, 2010). Of course, I emailed female foreign professors, whose number was quite small. None replied.

5) No interviewee was an ethnic Korean with a foreign nationality.

6) I mostly contacted foreign professors in natural science colleges. However, I also emailed those in other colleges, as far as their fields of research included the basic sciences.

Table 1. Basic information on the nineteen interviewed professors. SNU, KAIST, and KIST respectively stand for “Seoul National University,” “Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology,” and “Korea Institute of Science and Technology.” Interviews were conducted in each professor’s office or nearby conference rooms in the campus.

Designation in the paper	Institution	Date of interview	Ethnicity	Location of terminal degree	Tenure status on the day of the interview
Professor A	SNU	7 June 2017	Caucasian	Asia	Tenure track
Professor B	SNU	18 May 2016	Caucasian	Europe	Tenure track
Professor C	SNU	9 June 2017	Caucasian	Europe	Tenure track
Professor D	SNU	18 May 2016	Caucasian	Europe	Tenure track
Professor E	SNU	7 June 2017	Caucasian	Europe	Tenure track
Professor F	SNU	17 May 2016	Caucasian	Europe	Tenure track
Professor G	SNU	18 May 2016	Caucasian	Europe	Tenured
Professor H	SNU	23 May 2016	Asian	Europe	Tenured
Professor I	SNU	19 May 2016	Asian	Asia	Tenure track
Professor J	KAIST	2 March 2018	Caucasian	North America	Tenured
Professor K	KAIST	8 March 2018	Caucasian	Europe	Tenured
Professor L	KAIST	8 March 2017	Caucasian	North America	Tenured
Professor M	KAIST	8 March 2018	Caucasian	North America	Tenured
Professor N	KAIST	9 March 2018	Asian	North America	Tenured
Professor O	KIST	6 March 2018	Caucasian	North America	Tenured
Professor P	KIST	7 March 2018	Caucasian	North America	Tenured
Professor Q	Yonsei University	17 May 2016	Asian	North America	Tenure track
Professor R	Hanyang University	6 March 2018	Asian	Europe	Non-tenure track
Professor S	Sungkyunkwan Univ.	7 March 2018	Asian	North America	Tenure track

This paper uses qualitative research—especially narrative inquiry—as the main method. By tracing the stories of people’s lives, narrative analysis explores the implicit, as well as explicit, meanings of their shifting experiences imbedded within their social settings (Clandinin and Connelly, 2004). Used by sociologists, historians, and anthropologists, this method is useful for uncovering the contexts of research subjects’ lived experiences. For this work, I spent more than two hours per person and analyzed the

cultural implications of their replies, alongside their gestures, facial expressions, and tone of voice, which were recorded and transcribed. Although these interviews were largely unstructured, I usually asked the following questions:

1. In what contexts did you come to Korea?
2. Do you think that you are scientifically successful after coming to Korea?
3. How have you acquired your research grants?
4. Are you getting along well with your colleagues in the department?
5. How are you recruiting and managing your graduate students?
6. Are you comfortable with communicating with Koreans, including your departmental colleagues and graduate students?
7. How are you interacting with your professional peers, including those in other countries?
8. Has your life in Korea been satisfactory? Will you stay there for the rest of your professional career?

Some professors' answers to these questions went far beyond the original scope of my inquiry. When they kept speaking, I allowed them to relate whatever they wanted to say without stopping them. From their long responses, I learned a lot about their troubles, anxieties, and agonies.

But I do not regard these as the definite "truth" of their lives. Rather, I interpreted them as objects of my analysis, which aims at a nuanced understanding of their lives as scientists in their social worlds imbedded in the modern history of Korea (Miller and Glassner, 2016). For this purpose, I appropriate the perspectives of historians and sociologists of science, who constitute the field of STS. To make sense of the foreign scientists'

transnational career and cultural experiences, I will utilize STS scholars' works on the formation of the national and international characteristics of science. These works include historical and sociological studies of Korean scientific communities, which address the legacies of the military regimes and developmental nationalism (D. Kim and Leslie, 1998, W. Song, Lee, S. Song, and B. Kim, 2003; J. Park, 2006; Chekar and Kitzinger, 2007; L. Kim, 2008; G. B. Kim, 2011; Hong, 2012; Bak, 2014; S. Kim, 2014; H. W. Park and Cho, 2018).

3.State, Science, and Foreign Academics in Korean History

The modernity of South Korea, including the formation of modern science and technology, cannot be described without referring to military dictatorship, especially the regime under President Park Chung Hee. Seizing power through his 1961 coup, Major General Park militarized the entire country in the name of industrialization, economic growth, and anticommunism. Park implemented what Seungsook Moon (2005) has called “militarized modernity,” which included the establishment and systemic support of the Korea Institute of Science and Technology (KIST)—a research institute—and the Korea Advanced Institute of Science (KAIS)—a national science university that later became the Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST) (D. Kim and Leslie, 1998; Mun, 2010; G.B. Kim, 2011). As science and technology were considered a foundation of the anti-communist state's rapid modernization against the North Korean threat during the Cold War, students attending KAIST were given full scholarship and exemption from military service, if they would work for defense industry after graduation. In this process, Korean scientists were deeply engaged with the matters of the state, its authority, and military-style hierarchy (D. Kim and Leslie, 1998: 169-170; W. Song, Lee, S. Song, and B. Kim, 2003; Park, 2006; Bak, 2014). Some of them, including Choi Hyung Sup,

became key technocrats responsible for the direction of the state's industrial and scientific growth, and others actively promoted their research with governmental funding. Yet there were several issues. Above all, basic research attracted less attention from the military government in this era (G. B. Kim, 2011: 538-541). Moreover, few Korean scientists questioned the politics and military culture of the state, while some even actively justified them (Moon and Kang, 2013: 241). Overall, most scientists were barely interested in the persistent movement for democracy (Hong, 2012: 260; Park and Cho, 2018).

When this democracy eventually came long after Park's death in 1979, Korea underwent a considerable change without abandoning its state-centered modernization program.⁷⁾ Kim Young Sam, the first president of the democratic civilian government, demilitarized the country and started the drive for "*segryehwa*" (globalization) in 1994 (Kim, 2000; Shin, 2006: 205-209). This governmental drive initiated a significant structural evolution in Korean economy including the privatization of public corporations and the liberalization of financial markets. Korea's membership in the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in 1996 was a culmination of this evolution spurred by the state, but Kim's work made the country vulnerable to the impact of the 1997 Asian Financial Crisis.

While the sudden surge of unemployment then terrified many Koreans, however, university professors, including the science faculty, could partly distance themselves from the unexpected repercussion of globalization. Their jobs remained relatively stable and secure. Moreover, most Korean universities still did not hire many foreigners. For instance,

7) After Park's death, Chun Doo Hwan, another military dictator, seized the power through a bloody coup. Although he had to listen to the voice of participants of the 1987 democratic movement, his military cooperator, Roh Tae-Woo, was elected in that year's democratic election. The first civilian government could start only after Roh stepped down in 1992.

the number of expatriate professors in Seoul National University (SNU) increased from 14 to 20 during Kim's regime (1993-1998), but their proportion in the entire faculty remained around 1 percent (Seoul National University 2003). Neither foreigners nor a foreign economic crisis could trouble Korean scientists.

However, more expatriate scholars began to come after 2008, as the Korean government under President Lee Myung-bak launched the WCU project. In the age of the neoliberal economic order, President Lee's globalization policy was even more aggressive than Kim Young Sam's. His WCU project did introduce some changes in Korean academia through its tripartite programs (National Research Foundation, 2013). The first was to create new disciplines or departments through collaboration between foreign and Korean scholars. The second was to hire overseas researchers into existing university departments as regular faculty members for collaborative work with Koreans. The third was to invite global academic leaders, such as Nobel laureates, as visiting professors in Korean universities as strategic advisors. As a result, major Korean universities came to have far more foreign professors, including those in science and technology (Table 2).

Table 2. The number and proportion of foreigners among the regular (tenured or tenure-track) faculty members in science and engineering at five major Korean universities in 2016. The data came from an official website of the Ministry of Education of Korea, *Taehak allimi* [Information Service of Higher Education in Korea] (<http://www.academyinfo.go.kr/>).

	The number of foreign faculty members in science and engineering	The number of all faculty members in science and engineering	The proportion of foreign nationals in the science and engineering faculty (percent)
Seoul National University	53	500	10.6
KAIST	49	467	10.5
Yonsei University	22	329	6.7
Hanyang University	31	327	9.5
Sungkyunkwan University	22	349	6.3

In a sense, however, Lee did not appear to make a complete departure from the legacy of the past shaped during the military regimes. Both Lee Myung-bak and Park Chung Hee aimed at enhancing the level of research in Korea, especially scientific investigations, using the government's power and budget. Admittedly, Park's dictatorial approach substantially differed from Lee's neoliberal policies, implemented alongside stronger corporate initiatives. Nevertheless, Lee's administration still relied much on its own drive that shaped many arenas of the country. In particular, Lee's "Four Major Rivers Project" (*sadaegang saõp*) was accused by several social activists and environmentalists, who were afraid that Lee would reinstate the state-driven civil engineering program in Park's time that had severely destroyed Korea's nature (Normile, 2010; Park and Cho, 2018: 62-65).

Indeed, the WCU project had several problems. While the project led to an increase in the publication of high-impact journal articles, including those registered in SCI (Science Citation Index), it achieved only a moderate success in globalizing the Korean research community due to several reasons (National Assembly Budget Office, 2011; Korea Education Development Institute, 2012; Kim, Yi, and Jang, 2014). These included the "ambiguity" in project designations, the inappropriate project evaluation system, the obscure academic standard for foreigner hiring, and the advanced age of "global scientific leaders" invited to Korea long after retirement. Some journalists reported that most invited foreign professors were deeply unhappy in the campus, and left for different countries after staying in Korea for a few years (McNeill, 2011; Mun, 2016). Nevertheless, their total number might appear constant due to the continuing stream of new hires, as Stephanie Kim (2016) showed with her study of expatriate social scientists and humanities scholars at Yonsei University.

However, foreign academics in the natural sciences, at least according to my research, reacted rather differently, although I could hear similar concerns. Among the nineteen professors I met, only three (15.8%) expressed their deep disappointment, while nine (47.4%) were quite satisfied with their lives in Korea. Seven (36.8%) were neither entirely satisfied nor disappointed. They had a number of complaints, but felt that there were several strong reasons for their continued stay. What caused these differences? How are these professors living and working in Korea? Why do some of them want to leave?

4. Cultural Conflict, Globalization, and the Faculty Life in a Peripheral Country

The foreign professors I interviewed came to Korea for various reasons. Some were contacting Korea's professional community prior to accepting an offer. They were already aware of several Korean scholars through international conferences and occasionally visited the country as colloquium speakers. For instance, Professor H was asked to apply for a Korean faculty post by his Korean colleagues whom he had met in an international workshop. Professor G came to Korea due to the recommendation of his advisor who befriended a senior Korean scientist in the same discipline. To Professor I, a cooperative project of Korea and his country was important in his professional career, because his role in that project as a graduate student ultimately gave him a faculty job, after he finished his doctoral training. Yet others chose to stay in Korea without any previous professional engagements. Professor A came to Korea, because he wanted to feel "true Asia," which might let him experience something unavailable in his country. Professor D applied for a Korean university professorship, when he repeatedly failed in his funding applications in his earlier uni-

versity, which would not confer tenure to those without enough external grants. Meanwhile, Professor N had to accept a job in Korea, as it was the only country that gave him an offer during the 2008 global financial crisis. There were also six professors married to Korean women, and three of them came to Korea due to their family.⁸⁾ Either for their children's education or their wives' desire to return, they had to settle down in Korea.

These reasons illustrate how globalization as a complex worldwide phenomenon became interlinked with the Korean government's nationalistic drive. They came to Korea for several different causes, reflecting the complexity of globalization with its myriad facets affecting various people in distinct situations. Yet it was the Korean government that ultimately brought the majority of them to the country. Despite their dissimilar reasons, eleven of them landed on foreigner-only positions offered by the WCU project. The World Class Institute (WCI) project, a Korean governmental program similar to WCU but was implemented to hire scientists in research institutes rather than universities, motivated two interviewees at KIST to come to Korea (Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology of Korea, 2011).

This interlinking does not conceal the cleavages between the Korean government's "managed globalization" and the globalization as a force of transnational scholarly migration (Alford, 1999). In truth, some of the expatriate professors stressed that their universities hired them for a wrong reason. Four out of nineteen complained that their schools employed foreigners only to enhance their international ranking, which partly depended on the proportion of expatriate scholars among the regular faculty. Professor F, one of these professors, even said that his university just wanted to use its foreign professors to advertize itself as a globalized in-

8) For Professors B, H, and L, their family and spouse were the key factor of their migration to Korea.

stitution of higher education. To Professor G, his university did not really understand why foreigners were necessary. Most major schools in the West had at least 50 percent of foreigners among both the faculty and students, because it was unlikely that the smartest and brightest people could be found only among their own countrymen. Without being aware of this truth, he claimed, his Korean university administrators and the government were concerned only about their school's reputation as an international institution.

But this problem was certainly less significant than the cultural problems, as many journalists have pointed out. During my research, three professors bitterly complained that they were isolated in the campus. They hardly interacted with Korean faculty members in the same department, even though they were willing to get closer to them. According Professor F, his country's scholars often invited each other to their homes to have dinner together. To him, this was a primary way of socialization in Europe, but Koreans appeared to regard their home as their "castle." No outsider could enter that castle, unless he or she was a very close friend. In such a situation, there occurred another problem that could have a more serious repercussion: Due to the lack of social relations in the school, they were never asked to serve any faculty committee, and the absence of committee activities caused the rejection of their first tenure applications. In their university faculty evaluation system that had three components—research, teaching, and service—their isolation in the campus meant that there was no way for them to earn credits for "service."

Not surprisingly, a central factor underlying these troubles was the Korean language. Except for two professors who could speak Korean, all the others felt that it was difficult to master the language.⁹⁾ To them, their

9) Professor A spoke Korean fluently, while Professor M's Korean was passable.

university did not fully fund their language courses and never allowed them to have a leave of absence for a semester to master the language. As they did not have enough time or motivation to take the language courses with their own money, they regrettably failed to learn the language even after staying in the country for many years.

There were several significant problems due to their limited command of Korean. Above all, they could not understand the university's official emails written only in Korean, and some of the emails contained crucial information, such as a revision of the tenure and promotion policy. Furthermore, some foreign academics found that most faculty members in the department, during their casual conversation in the campus, kept speaking Korean even when foreign scholars approached them to join.¹⁰⁾ Although many of these Koreans had finished their doctoral training in English-speaking countries, they did not attempt to speak English in such a situation, except for a small number of exceptional people. But even this problem was less troublesome than another critical issue: Fourteen professors said that their department's faculty meetings were held only in Korean. In KAIST, there was a free real-time translation service that considerably eased their concern, but the translator was not always available. In such cases, there was no way for them to know what was discussed in the meeting.

Several foreign academics perceived that Koreans' "refusal to speak English" insinuated its status as a peripheral country in the world of science. Professor E asserted that English was the *lingua franca* of science. Scientists were supposed to speak English, whenever they discussed science, especially in an international setting. Indeed, Professor A said that German scientists would quickly change their language to English upon

10) Professors A, D, and L mentioned this as a possible problem.

meeting a foreigner, even if they had been talking to each other in German. Why was this difficult in Korea? Clearly, Korean is distinct from German, a European language similar to English. Associated with this linguistic difference is Koreans' experience in a developing country under the American hegemony, which has formed their sense of cultural inferiority with regard to English. Admittedly, many Koreans regard their language as "the most scientific in the world" (Shin, 2010). Yet this nationalistic pride often pales in front of the need to use English to interact with Americans as well as scientists of the "center," with whom they are not always comfortable (Hwang, 2005: 408). In fact, some foreign professors were sympathetic toward this quandary. According to Professor L, Korean academics felt that their intellectual capability would drop considerably whenever they tried to say something in English: "When they use Korean, their IQ is 150, but as soon as they speak English, their IQ becomes 100." Professor M pointed to a related issue during his class. His Korean students often thought that they became "second-class citizens in their own country," when they could not understand his lecture in English. However, Professors D and F were less considerate. During the interview, they told me that they were not just frustrated but even angry when Koreans did not try to speak English. Their failure to speak lingua franca showcased Korea's peripheral status in global science, as their language remained a peripheral tongue.

To several foreign professors, Korea's intra-school hierarchy and the culture of obedience was an equally salient cause that made Korea peripheral. As I have written, President Park left a longstanding legacy through his "militarized modernity," which crafted professional communities obedient to the state and the authority. Despite the recent movement for more democratic science governance, this legacy is still continuing

in the twenty-first century (Bak, 2007; Bak, 2014; Kim, 2014). However, it displeased many foreign academics. To Professor F, obedience to the authority appeared more important than scientific achievement for professors' success in Korea. Similar complaints were addressed by KAIST professors. Right after receiving a job offer from KAIST, Professor N heard from his colleagues that he should not accept it as Korea was a country with a strong hierarchy based on seniority. Although he did accept the offer as no other post was available amid the global financial crisis, he indeed was troubled by chair of his department right after coming to the country. When he requested a leave of absence for his first summer break, the chair rejected it by saying that the new professor must work harder and longer. Professor N recollected that he seriously considered resignation at the time.

Expatriate scientists saw similar problems among graduate students in Korea. In fact, many of them agreed that their Korean students were hard-working and quick-witted. Professor L even said that his students at KAIST were “world-class.” However, some foreign professors were less enthusiastic. In particular, Professor C acknowledged that his graduate students were certainly less capable and creative than their counterparts in a German university where he stayed for his sabbatical. For him and other foreign faculty members, their students lacked certain key qualities for successful research, such as creativity, enthusiasm, and strong will to overcome failures. For a reason for this problem, six expatriate professors referred to Korean students' “excessive obedience” to their professors.¹¹⁾ Their “obedience” discouraged the growth of their critical spirit, which might be a key feature in scientific endeavors. In this sense, Professor G claimed that some students' obsession to show respect toward their pro-

11) Professors B, D, F, G, I, and J were concerned about this issue.

fessors was “not a normal part of good science,” which he meant to be the science in “center.”

To the foreign academics, this in part resulted from Korean professors’ manner of training graduate students. Professor D said, “In all the Korean labs, students are kept as prisoners, basically, six days a week, sometimes seven, and they are supposed to be here at nine, and they go home at nine or ten, and they have no life, and they go home only after their professor go home.” In effect, he was partially right. As revealed to the public through the laboratory conditions of the veterinarian Hwang Woo Suk—the key figure of the stem cell scandal of 2005—Korean graduate students are not just “obedient” but also are enforced to endure long work hours that can often continue with inadequate payments throughout Sundays and public holidays. Hwang justified this exploitation in the name of their future success, which would also enhance the nation’s competitiveness, as stem cells were regarded as the country’s next growth engine (Chekar and Kitzinger, 2007; L. Kim, 2008; T. Kim, 2008; S. Kim, 2014). However, such exploitations could backfire, as could be seen in the misconduct committed in Hwang’s laboratory. More recently, an exploited engineering student at Yonsei University even tried to harm his academic advisor. He created a bomb that exploded in front of his academic advisor, who had severely admonished him during his laboratory training (Ch’oe, 2017). Of course, these episodes do not indicate that all Korean professors are abusive. For instance, Sungook Hong and Ha Won Chang (2010) have shown how the SNU molecular biologist Narry Kim (Kim Pinnaeri) successfully fostered her graduate students’ creativity in the laboratory, especially through her friendly and egalitarian approach. However, my interviewees at SNU said that Narry Kim, whom they knew well, might be an exception, as other Korean professors at the university were far more authoritarian. Professor N at KAIST also said that at least two thirds of his Korean

colleagues were harshly treating their graduate students during laboratory education. In general, the abuse seems at least partially true, as Eun-Kyoung Lee and Chulwoo Oh reported: many Korean graduate students themselves complained of their advisors' authoritarian attitude and exploitative practices (Lee, 2006: 92; Oh, 2010).

Several foreign professors found another feature of Korea as a peripheral country in "*hoesik*," the Korean-style dinnertime get-together with alcoholic beverages. Like foreign students in Korea, many foreign professors thought that Korea's drinking culture was odd and excessive (Moon, 2016: 100). Repeated dinner gatherings with alcoholic beverages were generally seen useless and inappropriate to expatriate academics. According to Professor D at SNU, *hoesik* was even "disgusting," when he saw that many senior male faculty members were "getting drunk together, shouting, and singing" with "no sense of shame." To him, such behaviour was "not socially acceptable" in "the Western world." Furthermore, Professor C commented, the faculty *hoesik* was not just socially unacceptable but was also unethical and illegal, because many Korean professors paid for their casual *hoesik* with their corporate credit cards that their schools issued only for research expenses. This was a "bad use of money." Professor J at KAIST also remarked that his Korean colleagues drank too much and often, even during weekdays: "It was Monday evening. I joined the departmental dinner. They drank until 2 am, or perhaps 4 am. I thought that it was unacceptable and unprofessional." After such a long overnight drinking, how could they commence their usual scientific research in the next morning? Professor J thus concluded that Korean scientists were "not disciplined enough," compared to his colleagues in the United States.

Hoesik also looked like a ritual for reconfirming the pecking order in the campus formed according to gender and seniority. To Professor D, it was a "boys' club," as most professors who came there were men.

Furthermore, Professor H, who was otherwise getting along well with his Korean colleagues, was shocked to see the following scene during a dinner meeting of his department. He recalled,

It's like a formal dinner, a departmental dinner. What I saw is that, sure, we give way to the seniors, they take a seat first, but one thing that I really, truly cannot understand is that, you see, all the female faculties had to stand outside, all the guys going first. No, what age are we in today? It's the twenty-first century....These are something that are against my belief.

Although he told me that he and other foreign academics should “make some compromises” in Korea with a different culture, this observation was a reminder of the gulf between Korea and the more egalitarian—or “central”—countries where he had lived in the past.

Foreign professors observed gender discrimination in other occasions (Sim, 2014). To Professor B, for instance, SNU had a great female professor, with a brilliant research career. Her experimental discoveries were very significant, as she was one of the most innovative scientists in the country. But she was utterly powerless in her university, as she was still considered a young woman. The problem was that she was the most helpful and sympathetic toward foreigners in the department. Since she had no power, there was little that she could do for him and other expatriates.

To some of my interviewees, Korea was peripheral not only for sexism but also for racism and xenophobia. Five among nineteen scholars interviewed by me mentioned racism in the country, and three of them were deeply frustrated by it. Admittedly, Professor G stressed that foreigners' difficulties largely came from Korea's “ethnic nationalism” rather than “racism.” Foreigners might find many things in the country inconvenient, but it was not an outcome of Korea's indigenous racist culture. However,

Professor F bitterly complained that he was a victim of “implicit and subtle” racism, prevalent among his professional colleagues in the university. To him, his Korean colleagues often isolated and bullied him with suggestive words and gestures. However, the attack was not even “implicit and subtle” to Professor D, who told me what happened during a faculty meeting:

There was a faculty meeting, and we were all sitting there, and two other foreign professors were there as well, and then one of the older professors stood up and started shouting, red in the face. I asked the person next to me what he was shouting about. He said, “We don’t want foreigners in this department.” We were taking their space, and there were better Koreans who could take this space. We were just a kind of token, we are not real professors. And he, on other occasion, told my [colleague] directly to his face, “You are not a real professor. You are just here to teach in English.”

He added that the older xenophobic professor was completely obscure outside of Korea, while he and his foreign colleagues were well known in international scientific societies due to their impactful publications. They were assaulted by a peripheral senior scholar with little contribution to global science.

Notably, a KAIST professor told me a similar story. Professor J said that he was attacked by an older Korean colleague during a departmental meeting for discussing new faculty hiring. When Professor J attempted to raise his opinion as a specialist in the field of hiring, the older professor stopped him and expressed his own view in Korean. At the end of his long speech, the senior scientist uttered just one sentence in English, turning toward Professor J: “We are going to hire only Koreans.” Professor J then wondered how this senior colleague could do this, if he did not even know the field of hiring well. Professor J regarded himself as an internationally renowned expert in that field, while the senior

professor was not just a non-expert in the field, but also was completely obscure outside of Korea. The senior academic wanted to exercise his power in a peripheral institution where seniority was still important.

These unhappy encounters might illuminate what Stephanie Kim, C. Fred Alford, and Gi-Wook Shin have discussed on Korea's globalization. Kim (2016) claims that Yonsei University systematically disempowered expatriate faculty members, even though they were hired for the university's global take-off. In a similar sense, Alford (1999) has argued that globalization is a necessary evil to Koreans, who do not want globalization at all. They open their country to globalization, only when they have to do so. Shin (2006), however, are opposed to such views, as he finds that Korea's globalization is closely intertwined with its internal politics and cultural conditions, including its nationalism. However, my research suggests that this intertwining is not without a bitter conflict.

There are two sides in this conflict. Koreans want to continue their conventional way of managing academic affairs and human relations, which, at least to foreigners, may seem fraught with sexism, racism, and blind conformity to authority and seniority. Some expatriate professors are deeply unhappy with what they see in Korea and regard them as typical characteristics of a peripheral country. Even Koreans' language practice can be considered a facet of the country's peripheral status. But their lives in this periphery can become considerably better and easier depending on their local contexts, including their family life.

5. Global Science and Local Context:

Center, Periphery, and Foreign Professors

Many of my interviewees found a reason for their continued stay in their family. Most of all, having a Korean spouse was important. Their wives

did various works in lieu of themselves, including housing search, bill payments, and even translation of emails from their schools. As I have already discussed, three of my interviewees came to Korea due to their wives and families. The other three married Korean women after their arrival. For these six professors, their family further justified their continued stay in the country, especially after they came to have children. With their half-Korean children attending local schools, it was hard to leave the country, no matter how difficult their lives were in their universities. Professor P at KIST had a slightly different situation, as his unmarried Korean partner headed the department where he worked. As both scientists were working in the same building, it was difficult for one of them to move to another institution in a distinct country.

There were other kinds of localization, although their endeavor did not necessarily pay off. For instance, Professor A made his unofficial Korean name, by which he was called within the department. This probably made him more approachable in the school. But a more drastic move was to acquire Korean citizenship: Professor N changed his nationality through his successful Korean citizenship application. As the country did not permit dual citizenship, he was completely naturalized as a Korean. However, this seemed to be a strategic move rather than an expression of his loyalty to the nation. He said that he would leave Korea at any time with another attractive job offer. In effect, his citizenship did not always lessen his troubles. He had to spend more time in filing his tax return due to his wife and children who did not become Koreans. He was also distressed by his wife's longstanding unemployment as well as his children's education in a Christian international school. He and his family were Muslim.

However, Professor N determined to remain in Korea due to his "global scientific success," which was more important than his Korean citizenship. During his career at KAIST, he stressed, he tried to be a scien-

tist with an international academic recognition. He kept publishing in top journals of the world, which led him to be successfully tenured at KAIST. This also enabled him to ignore his university's hierarchical culture and faculty politics, because even some authoritarian Korean professors could not disregard the number of his publications and their total citation counts. He thus declared, "I have no attachment to any country," as he could go anywhere as far as he could continue his research and publish in major journals. To him, the "republic of science," with its universally shared rules of conducting and evaluating research, was far more important than a particular country, as Michael Polanyi (1962) had argued many years ago. Strikingly, this differed from what Stephanie Kim (2016) found through her study of scholars in the humanities and social sciences, who complained that their disciplines' criteria of academic evaluation were different from those of their school.

The foreign scholars who denounced Korea's cultural problems also emphasized that their research was successful in the country. For example, Professor F accusing the "implicit and subtle" racism toward him recently published two papers in a top international journal with his Korean graduate students. One of these papers was cited in a Korean daily newspaper as a highly successful case of foreign faculty invitation, without ever mentioning the deep cultural troubles that he ran into. Even Professor D, who seemingly suffered a severe xenophobic abuse in his department, acknowledged, "Academically, it's been a great success [to come] here." From him and his graduate students, I heard that his laboratory was annually publishing more than five papers in mainstream international journals, which benefited not just him but also his students, who also wanted global scientific recognition for their own career advancement. When I asked these students if they ever worried about their foreign advisor's ability to give them faculty posts in Korea, they said they were not really

concerned. Probably, they said, their publication in major journals like “Nature or Science” would be enough for their future job placement.¹²⁾

Natural scientists’ universal standard of research was also important to Professor L, who had been equally ineffectual in cultivating relationship with other scholars in the campus. During the interview, he bitterly complained that his Korean colleagues overlooked him since he came to Korea in 2009. He perceived this isolation most painfully, when one of his graduate students married another student under the supervision of a Korean professor in the next door. He then found that he had not even had lunch with his Korean colleague, let alone pursuing any cooperative projects together. In academic terms, however, Professor L was exceptionally successful in Korea. His h-index is the highest among all professors in his department.

To most of my interviewees, their laboratory symbolized and made possible such a global scientific success, which appeared unrelated to any other locations in Korea. In particular, Professor H said that he usually stayed in his laboratory from 9 am to 11 pm for six or seven days a week, because there was nothing else he would like to do. Prior to his Korean stay, he had worked at Singapore, a tropical country with its hot and humid weather. Yet he did not care, because he rarely went to other places outside of his heavily air-conditioned laboratory. Connected to the rest of the world through the latest information technology, his laboratory was thus placeless. Hence, Singapore and Korea, despite their different climate, were not distinct to him, because his placeless laboratory allowed him to pursue his transnational scientific research, along with other prominent scholars of the world.

12) Interviewed on 18 May 2016, in the lobby of the college building. The faculty webpage of his university showed an impressive list of publications.

Some expatriate academics emphasized that science was not just transnational but also “cosmopolitan.” According to an astronomer, his field was cosmopolitan, because he and his colleagues were observing the same “nature,” which, to him, had no national borders. Unlike the humanities and social sciences, he claimed, his field had little to do with politics, as it dealt with “pure” nature, uncontaminated by social complications. Moreover, his discipline was far from any vested interest, because it did “not need much money” owing to its relatively simple procedure of data collection. In a sense, even his residence in Korea was not necessary, because the few global observatories located strategically at several cities with dry weather and clear sky were the actual places where most astronomers would gather across national borders and cooperate for their work. Their science was thus a “bridge-maker.”

In effect, international collaboration was a key part of the scientific life of all foreign professors interviewed by me. Many of them stressed that they were successfully pursuing their projects with other investigators in various countries in the world, including Japan, Switzerland, Luxembourg, France, Austria, Australia, Germany, and the United States. In particular, Professor D said that he was able to make a connection to them “out of the blue” by simply emailing them. In many instances, the scholars in these countries sent positive replies, as far as their research goals were similar.

International collaboration also occurred even within their laboratories. Most of my interviewees had graduate students coming from various foreign countries, including China, India, Tunisia, Iran, Bulgaria, Vietnam, and Columbia, although the largest ethnic group was, of course, Korean. Initially, students from these countries emailed the professors before their application, based on the faculty profiles posted in the university websites. If they could meet the university admission requirements, they could join the laboratory under the supervision of the professor whom they wanted

to learn from. None of my interviewees said that they ever rejected a student accepted by the university, because they always needed more manpower in their laboratories.

Yet these two kinds of internationalization were different, reflecting the center-periphery dynamics in the globalizing world. The professors tried hard to start and maintain their relationship with renowned scholars in the world's industrial powers—including their own countries of origin—while few were pursuing cooperation with scientists in Asia except Japan. Some considered joining Asian research networks, but only Professors D and G mentioned that they had ever conducted actual cooperation. Professor N even said that “geographical proximity is not very important in research.” Obviously, what he meant was that for a global recognition he needed a connection with scientists in the “center” rather than those in Asian countries that were geographically close to Korea. In contrast, as Professor P said, most foreign graduate students came from “the third world.”¹³⁾ To these “third world” students, Korea's top schools certainly had a merit, as they seemed better than institution in their own countries. From the professors' viewpoint, their students were good enough for various laboratory tasks, although they may not always be highly skilled or intelligent. What was important was to maximize the use of their manpower for producing papers publishable in the world's premier journals. Foreign professors, landed on a country between the two, were thus always vigilant to be successful using networks and human resources available to them.

But all these efforts might not be entirely successful if it had not been for certain conditions that made sense of their stay. Significantly, they had to address what they perceived as peripheral attributes of Korea

13) Most of my interviewees did not have any students from “center” countries, except for Professors and A and P, who had students from Britain and the United States.

and its academic institutions. In this respect, their ethnicity and past experience were important. In particular, Asian professors were encountering a very different world.

1) Blurring and Moderating the Boundary between Center and Periphery

My Asian interviewees saw their students from a distinct point of view. Just like Western professors I met, they struggled hard to achieve their global success with their graduate students' work. But they did not say that their students were from the "third world." To Professors S and R, all their students came from their own countries. Professors H and I did not train any foreign students, as their supervisees were entirely Korean. Professor Q did not yet have any graduate students, while Professor N had some foreigners, whom he never regarded as "third-world boys."

Another critical difference was found in their perception of their ethnicities and their cultural relevance. Admittedly, Korea was not convenient to Professor N, since it had little infrastructure catering to Muslims. However, the country was satisfactory to the others, and their ethnicity was a key: Professor I enjoyed Korean food and culture that were similar to those of his country. Even Koreans' face was akin to his countrymen's, and the Korean language could be easily translated to his own through google translate with a reasonably accuracy, whereas translation from Korean to English was much less reliable. Similarly, Professor Q mentioned food, culture, and ethnic similarity as a reason for his intention to stay long in Korea, while Professors R and S stressed that the Korean dining and drinking practices were conveniently similar to their own. In contrast, due to his extended international career, Professor H did not necessarily view Korea from an Asian viewpoint. Yet he still emphasized the significance of the country's strategic location in East Asia, especially

its proximity to China, as a factor for his extended stay, because he expected that it might be easy to start collaborative projects with people in China, in which he was very interested, probably owing to his ethnic origin.

Furthermore, four of these Asian academics did not view Korea and its universities as peripheral. Professor Q asserted that “Seoul is an exciting and dynamic city,” full of young people’s energy. He also said that Yonsei University is one of the best schools in Korea—“one of the top three, or if not, one of the top five.” To this professor, university rankings within Korea did matter, while no Western academics mentioned it. Likewise, Professor I regarded SNU as a major international academic institution, because the faculty at his university had long established an equal collaborative relationship with several scientists in his home country where he finished his doctoral training. He was participating in a cosmopolitan project with scientists in Korea, America, and his home country.

Professor I had another reason for his satisfactory life in Korea. He found that he could manage his students well through English, which, in some contexts, was not a language of the center of global science, but a regional medium of communication between people who were not born in the West. Like other foreign professors who spoke English in teaching their students, Professor I used English in training his graduate students. But he unexpectedly discovered its new use, when he found that he should also look after his students’ distress. He said,

We had some personal problem like a psychological problem, mental problem. The student could obviously explain it to me...For Korean students, it is easier to explain in English than the Korean language, because they can honestly express their opinion, because English expression is very straightforward. But if you make a conversation with Korean, you have to unclearly explain it to other people, and that is, sometimes there is a mis-

understanding of each other. But in my case, students can honestly explain their concern or some psychological problem, so our communication sometimes works well....Some Korean students do not [explain] their problems to their parents, because parents expect many other things from the kids.

As an Asian with no education in English-speaking countries, he did not appear entirely fluent in English, just like his Korean students. Hence, it is possible to interpret his remark—"English expression is very straightforward"—not as the true "straightforwardness" of the English language but as his and his students' limited command of it. However, their mutual communication could become even easier, precisely because neither was very fluent. Sometimes, an inadequate command of a language can make it useful for more direct communication, as one's excessive confidence in her or his native language can foster misunderstanding, especially under the multiple layers of cultural assumptions in a language community. Professor I thus found a new dimension of English, which, to him and his students, was not a language of the center of the world's science, but a regional communicative tool useful for fostering a positive faculty-student relationship in his laboratory.

Professors S and R were even more positive on his university and Korea as a whole. They were grateful for Korea, as it provided them and their students with an opportunity to learn from experts in their universities. Korea was also a "rich country" to Professor S, who had been deeply disappointed by the previous university in his hometown that had made him teach too many students with a minuscule salary. After moving to Sungkyunkwan University, he was thus pleased by a substantial pay rise and a reasonable teaching load. Notably, his Korean students "spoke English very well." His Korean colleagues were also remarkably helpful, and drank very little during *hoesik*, unlike SNU or KAIST professors whose

binge drinking astonished several Western academics. Similarly, Professor R, a non-tenure track professor at Hanyang University, came to Korea, because his original university in his own country assigned him too much administrative duty, even though he was just a junior scholar. He thus decided to learn more in Korea for two years before his return to his home with a stronger scientific expertise. This decision turned out to be good. To him, Korean students were far more disciplined than those in his country, and were able to produce higher-quality original work if given an assignment. More crucially, his faculty mentor at Hanyang generously invited him to join his research project, with which he could also educate his own student from his country. Koreans were all kind, polite, and scientifically advanced.

How can we interpret these remarks, which seem diametrically opposed to those of several Western scholars at SNU and KAIST? One possible answer is that the science faculty members at Hanyang and Sungkyunkwan, especially the professors in the two Asians' departments, were scientifically stronger than their counterparts in SNU and KAIST. They might also be more considerate and less xenophobic than the abusive Korean scientists mentioned by Professors D, F, J, and N. Similarly, the Korean students the Asian academics happened to teach might have been more competent and creative. Equally plausible, I think, was that the professors' experience depended on the perceived status of their native country in the global knowledge economy. Even though both were trained in the West, their original identity as Asians remained strong, alongside their membership in the academic networks in their own countries. Seen from these countries, which might be considered more peripheral than Korea, their current academic environment appeared close to center.

Certain features of Korean academia did not look peripheral even to some Western scientists. To Professor K, a scientist from Europe, it

was easier to work in his department at KAIST, because all research seminars, if not faculty meetings, were conducted in English. In contrast, everything was in Japanese in his earlier school on the other side of the East Sea. The Korean universities' hierarchical culture could also be considered normal from the standard of Europe. Professors C and E indeed said that the European universities they attended had comparable authoritarianism. Perhaps authoritarianism is not a unique characteristic in Korean academia, but a universal feature in all countries' institutions of higher education. Interestingly, even Korea's drinking culture could be seen from a different angle. Whereas Professor C wondered why his Korean colleagues drank so often and much—unlike the scholars he had met at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, who seem to drink moderately just once a semester—Professor L claimed that Korean scientists' drinking culture was not different from that of the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory (CSHL), a cosmopolitan research institute in Long Island, New York. There he saw that many renowned scientists suddenly went out for a drink in the night during their experimentation. They might talk about interesting recent discoveries and might even drink until 3 am to conclude their scientific conversation.

What, then, do these statements mean? I do not mean that an objective comparison is possible with these few people's comments: It is unclear if Korean scientists feel more comfortable with their use of English than the Japanese, especially Professor K's former colleagues. Likewise, no comparative research has been done about the community culture at KAIST and CSHL. Several STS scholars do say that hierarchy and authority are a normal part of laboratory life, but their study probably does not mean that Koreans and Germans share the same authoritarian culture in their universities (Latour and Woolgar, 1986: 216-230; Ravetz, 1996: 104-108; Golinski, 2005: 17-18). Rather, what I think is more important is foreign

scientists' perception of the Korean scientific community, as it might look very different, depending on their past experiences. What made them develop distinct views were their global voyages, including Professor K's migration from Japan to Korea, Professor E's doctoral training in Europe, and Professor L's research experience at Cold Spring Harbor. Even to Western academics, depending on their career paths, at least some features of Korean universities and academia may not look like the hallmarks of peripheral scientific institutions and communities. The center-periphery distinction can thus be flexibly understood by expatriate professors, who thereby make sense of their career in an East Asian country.

2) Appropriating the Peripheral

Some foreign scientists did not even need this flexibility, because they were working in a highly Westernized school. In truth, Professors O and P at KIST were enjoying their lives in Korea, since their department, launched nine years ago with the WCI project, had many foreign scientists, whose number was more than a half in the entire faculty. This was partly because of the WCI project's rule, which stipulated that the chair of each funded group should be a foreigner (Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology of Korea, 2011). In this environment, there was no need to be frustrated with the Korean language, because everyone spoke English in the department. As the general departmental culture was Western, they were not embarrassed or confused by "Korean ways."

But Professors O and P did not think that they were in a global center of scientific research. Professor O said, "KIST is not Yale," where he had been trained as a postdoctoral researcher. KIST was certainly less prestigious in his scientific fields. Moreover, KIST was still carrying its historical legacy as a militarized institution established by President Park. Professor P said, "There are many weird things here." They found strict

security precaution and red tape in every portion of their scientific life. Even a USB stick could not be freely chosen, as they must use only the hardware approved by the institution. Their graduate students also had a few problems, since some had significant difficulties in comprehending scientific concepts and conducting experiments.¹⁴⁾

However, working in a peripheral institution was not bad. Professor P said that if he could go back to North America it would be eventually good for his career advancement but he should then give up his well-designed laboratory at KIST and set up an entirely new one. Furthermore, it was easy to secure money for his research at KIST. They did not need to apply for grants coming from other organizations, because their research budget was guaranteed by the Korean government. Once the department received the money, it was distributed to each principal investigator in the department after their discussion. Professors O and P did not have any complaint on this process, as they received enough amounts of financial resources every year. In contrast, Professor P said, there was no guarantee that he could ever acquire the same amount of money in America, as most funding exercises—either at the National Science Foundation or the National Institutes of Health—should be extremely competitive.

The other foreign professors were generally content with their funding. Professor N said that he had initially worried about research support during his first year at KAIST. Yet he was soon able to gain a reasonable amount of money, including an overseas grant. Its absolute amount, minus personnel expenses, was quite comparable to what was available to his peers in major American universities, because the student salary was cheaper in Korea. The astronomer stressing the cosmopolitan nature

14) At KIST, the principal investigators can have graduate students, who are official registered in different institutions. They are trained at KIST, but will have their degrees from the universities in which are enrolled.

of their discipline also said that his research was well funded in the country. Similarly, Professor D, who had failed in all his funding applications in the United States, found that it was considerably easier to gain money for his experiments in his current Korean university. A theoretical physicist even said that he was receiving too much money, although his group needed just computers and conference trip supports.

These foreign science professors' funding situations illustrated a key local factor that made possible their global scientific enterprises. Even transnational projects were driven by national interests affecting major scientific institutions supported through each country's public funds (Crawford, Shinn, and Sörlin, 1993). In Korea, their major, if not sole, patron was the National Research Foundation (NRF), whose aim—as posted in its homepage—was to “contribute to promoting the nation's academic and technoscientific advancement and research potential.”¹⁵⁾ Interestingly, the English version of NRF's website did not mention the term, the “nation” (*kugka*), in its introductory page. Instead, it said that its mission was to “promote research creativity and nurture global researchers.”¹⁶⁾ The “nation” was deliberately erased in NRF's international face and was replaced by the term “global” for expatriate scholars and other international audiences. Of course, this was not so much a deception as a facet of the contradictory nature of Korea's globalization. NRF, a governmental institution supported by Korea's tax revenues, aimed at promoting the nation in the “global stage” by aiding foreign, as well as domestic, scientists. The foreign scholars' research with their international networks should

15) National Research Foundation, Ch'edan sogye [Introduction to the Foundation]. (http://www.nrf.re.kr/cms/page/main?menu_no=99, accessed 26 June 2017).

16) National Research Foundation, Introduction. (http://www.nrf.re.kr/eng/cms/page/main?menu_no=221, accessed 26 June 2017).

thus foster Korea's stronger "competitiveness" (*kyōngchaenglyōk*), which might assist in its further advancement in the twenty-first century.

How, then, are the foreign professors so successful in their NRF funding applications? Even though funding is less competitive in Korea than America or Europe, a large number of academics do fail. How, then, do expatriate scientists acquire money necessary for their projects? For this, I found at least two factors, both of which were also related to Korea's regional conditions and problems. Not to mention the formal agendas and visions of NRF, the actual logistics of funding applications heavily depended on local circumstances, which the expatriate scholars could not highly praise.

The first should be found in NRF's peer review system that relied only on the scholarly community within the country. To most expatriate professors, this was a signifier of Korea's peripheral status. Professor A complained that it was difficult to find world leaders in the Korean scientific community due to its limited size and meagre internationalization. Unlike American or European research communities, Korean academia was not likely to have the best talents in each discipline, due to its relatively small size and the modest number of foreign participants. Professor C also told me that in Korea there were only three scholars, including himself, who had expertise in his subdiscipline. He did not know if any of these two colleagues ever reviewed his NRF proposals, but his applications were successful so far, unlike his earlier attempts in Germany where funding was a much trickier affair. Strikingly, he did not completely deny the possibility that at least some of his NRF applications were reviewed by non-expert referees who could have approved his proposals that were unintelligible but looked "impressive" to them.

The weakness of NRF and Korean academia could also benefit foreign natural scientists pursuing interdisciplinary cooperation. Professor B

said that due to the lack of experts in his subfield in the NRF review board—reflecting the tiny Korean academic community as a whole—his proposals were often assessed not in terms of its overall disciplinary relevance but its use of new technologies. Appropriating this weakness, he was able to implement several cooperative projects with engineers in his university who wanted to apply their new inventions to the natural sciences. The weakness of Korean academia as a regional community thus made possible some of his “crazy projects” that could have been impossible in his country.

The second reason for the international faculty’s successful funding application was connected to another factor constituting Korea’s peripheral status, that is, the characteristics of their graduate students. As I have already mentioned, many foreign professors worried that their Korean students’ obedience could discourage their creativity. Although Professor L stated that his KAIST students were scientifically promising, other professors were far less enthusiastic. Their students were too compliant and docile to be scientifically successful. However, these students were essential in a task that belonged to neither their coursework nor thesis project: They were quite willing to help their advisors complete their funding proposals, even though this job had nothing to do with their formal school duties. In effect, except for Professor F who had spent “almost two years” in translating the NRF guidelines from Korean to English by himself, all the other expatriate professors I interviewed had little difficulty in acquiring money from NRF due to their students. While the foreign professors wrote down the technical justification part in English, their graduate students completed the rest in Korean, which was required by NRF. The professors’ “obedient” students thus played a main role in their successful experiences, even though it was unclear if it was a part of their official task assigned to them.

These two reasons imply the complexity of globalization in science through Korean institutions. It appears that NRF was at least partly successful in implementing its global mission by patronizing a number of expatriate faculty members with international collaborative networks. Yet this modest success was made possible by the problems of the Korean science and higher education, which might initially disappoint the foreign science professors. Korea's small and ethnically homogeneous scholarly community and the docile graduate students ironically enabled the expatriate scholars to do their job well.

3) *Incorporating the Peripheral*

Some foreign professors did not simply derive benefit from what they thought was the peripheral features of Korean science, but also actively incorporated them in their own way. Admittedly, many expatriate professors regarded Korea's "managed globalization" as a peripheral country's struggle fraught with critical limitations (Alford, 1999). Professor G states that Koreans want to "become globalized on the one hand, but, on the other hand, don't let the globalization in too much." However, all foreign professors were deeply engaged in this managed globalization, especially through their English-only courses, one of the main components of President Lee Myung-bak's globalization drive (Palmer and Cho, 2011: 121-128). They were expected to be exemplars for Korean professors who were also encouraged to teach in English. For this task, a KAIST chemist David Churchill, along with his father and two Korean co-authors, even published a manual for Koreans who were enforced to teach English-only courses. The manual, *How to Prepare for General Chemistry Taught in English* (Hwahak: Yōngō kangūi irōk'e chunbihaja), was published through Darakwon, a Korean company specializing in reference books (*ch'amgosō*) for various state licensing exams (D. G. Churchill, M. R. Churchill, Yi, and Kim, 2010).

In writing this manual, he made a unique choice: He did not choose to win Koreans' heart and assuage their anxiety in the age of globalization by teaching his classes in Korean. Instead, he chose to be an active collaborator for a peripheral country's managed globalization project, in which English fluency is supposedly essential.

More striking was some of my interviewees' way of administering their laboratories and graduate students. As I have mentioned, many expatriate academics disliked their Korean colleagues' manner of enforcing laboratory discipline. In their own laboratories, they thus led their students to work voluntarily without administering any strict scheduling or rules, except for those concerning safety. However, some of the foreign academics were as harsh as Koreans when it came to the matter of running their laboratories.

The most prominent among them was probably Professor E. When I asked how he trained his students, he asserted that all of them should come to the laboratory by nine o'clock in the morning. Even though there was no "police officer" enforcing this, it was a definite rule that all his students must comply with. After that, they had to have a meeting with their advisor, who would guide their actual experiments that they should carry out during the day. Their work would then continue until late night, in stark contrast to the laboratory research in Europe where the professor himself was trained. While everyone there went home around 4:30 pm, Korean graduate students were working harder and longer, and this was the key reason why they were more productive and skillful. Being proud of his graduate students and their productivity, he said that he would stay in Korea for the rest of his career.

In contrast, Professor A was not entirely satisfied with his students. He said, "When I was a graduate student, I would probably not go to the lab once a month." However, his students now were having every

Sunday off. According to him, his “graduate students....didn’t experience the hardship in the same way as the previous generation did,” as they had “nice life when they grew up.” In his laboratory, they thus continued to live like this:

You come at 11 and you read your emails and the news and then it’s 11:30 and you go to [student cafeteria], and you have lunch, and you are back at 12 at your desk, then you’re full, and you have to [digest]. And then maybe you start to do some work once maybe at one o’clock, okay? You work from one to five, that’s four hours. And then at 5 you start thinking about going to dinner, and at 5:30 you do go to dinner. Okay? And it’s six, may be past six, because you walk around, and you work two more hours until 8 o’clock, and then it’s time to go home. So, how many hours have you worked? It’s six hours. That’s it. Not even eight.

Some sorts of the Foucaultian discipline were thus necessary for his students (Foucault, 1995). As there was “very fierce competition....around the world,” they should “work like crazy” like older Koreans. While Koreans’ work hours were “50 percent more than other people” in “the OECD,” no other countries “showed bigger progress than Korea in the last forty years.”

But his graduate students did not make this professor’s life unhappy in the campus. The professor’s point was not that they were undisciplined or lazy, but a stronger discipline was imperative to further the competitiveness of his laboratory. Of course, he said, his students were not like those at Cambridge. His Korean students were probably less competent than those at Britain’s top school. But most Koreans were extremely hard-working, and this was the basis of their “tremendous success” so far. Korea and its students were not yet at the center of the world science, yet their diligence would further enhance their status in the global age.

These remarks illustrate Professor A’s internalization of Korean

practices and discourses. He accepted not just some Korean professors' harsh management style but also their national cultural discourses, such as hard work, competitiveness (*kyöngchaenglyöök*), and the legacy and importance of Korea's rapid industrialization. His view that Korean students were less capable than those at Cambridge but would work harder also reflected some people's notion that Koreans were "hands," not the "brains" in a "global division of labour" (Chekar and Kitzinger, 2007: 294-295).

This dimension points to a factor for some foreign scientists' successful adaptation to Korean universities. Professor A was well recognized for his academic achievement and was appreciated in the campus for his contribution to his university's internationalization. Professor E was also successful at SNU as he was soon tenured after the interview. It may then be unsurprising that Professor D, who had complained of Koreans' treatment of graduate students as "prisoners," recently resigned to accept an offer from a European university.¹⁷⁾ While some professors became globally successful by appropriating a peripheral country's practices and discourses, others could not do so. They thus had to leave.

6. Conclusion

As far as I know, this is the first study of the lives of expatriate scientists in South Korea in a contemporary context. I think that my paper has illustrated not just their experiences in a foreign country but also several common features shared by South Korean scientific communities. Foreigners' gaze can sometimes be more illustrative, as it can point to the problems in the cultural practices that Koreans themselves often take for granted. Their comments can also illuminate a hitherto neglected dimension of Korea's globalization.

17) I received an email from him on 8 May 2017.

Through this study, I have discussed certain key reasons for the continued stay of foreign professors of science in Korea. I have analyzed why they chose to stay by focusing on the globality of science, which entails the center-periphery dynamics, understood and appropriated in different ways by them. Many of them, especially Western academics, thought that their Korean institutions were peripheral in the global scientific knowledge economy. They indeed pointed to several persistent problems that embarrassed them during their Korean stay. Yet these problems, alongside their intentional efforts and unintended circumstances, led to the re-interpretation of the meanings of the peripheral traits of the Korean academic culture and practice. This reinterpretation also affected their ways of doing science in Korea, as they found what might not be always available in their own countries, that is, easier and more flexible funding opportunities as well as obedient and hard-working graduate students as lab workers. Ironically, some of the problems of Korea contributed to their long-term stay.

These foreign scientists had to deal with various local issues, such as cultural isolation, language problems, authoritarianism, sexism, and even xenophobia. These issues are partially a consequence of the historical trajectory of Korean science, which has been an engine of the postcolonial country's rapid growth and industrialization under a military dictatorship. Even Korea's globalization itself is a legacy of this trajectory, although its scope—especially in popular culture—has recently broadened far beyond the early perimeter of “managed globalization” (Jin, 2016). I have claimed that Korea's historical legacy and its current formulation, along with some scientists' professional experiences, ethnic origins, and strategies, contributed to increasing the length of their stay in this era. This paper has thus shown that their scientific life critically depended on their interaction with both the global arenas of the natural sciences and Korea's local cultural contexts.

참고문헌

- Alford, C. F. (1999), *Think No Evil: Korean Values in the Age of Globalization*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Andrews, B. (2014), *The Making of Modern Chinese Medicine, 1850-1960*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Arnold, D. (2000), *Science, Technology and Medicine in Colonial India*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bak, H. (2007), “Han’guk kwahakchadŭl ŭi kwahakcha sahoe kyubŏme taehan insik kwa p’yŏngga” [Perceptions and Evaluation of Norms of Science among Korean Scientific Community], *Kwahakkisurhak Yŏn’gu*, Vol. 7(2), pp. 91-124.
- Bak, H. (2014), “The Politics of Technoscience in Korea: From State Policy to Social Movement”, *East Asian Science, Technology and Society*, Vol. 8(2), pp. 159-174.
- Ben-David, J. (1971), *The Scientist’s Role in Society: A Comparative Study*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Chang, Y., Seok, H., and Baker, D. L. (eds). (2009), *Korea Confronts Globalization*, London: Routledge.
- Chekar, C. K. and Kitzinger, J. (2007), “Science, Patriotism and Discourses of Nation and Culture”, *New Genetics and Society*, Vol. 26(3), pp. 289-307.
- Cho, A. and Park, J. (2010), “Hankuk yŏsŏng kwahakcha ŭi ‘kwahakcha toeki’esŏ poinŭn t’ŭkching” [The Features of ‘Becoming a Scientist’ of Korean Women Scientists], *Asia Yŏsŏngyŏnku*, Vol. 49(2), pp. 83-120.

- Ch'oe, C. (2008), “Yösöng kwahakcha üi songchangkwachöng yönku” [Female Scientists' Expertise Development: Individual & Environmental Factors], *Han'guk Shimnihak'oeji: Yösöng*, Vol. 13(2), pp. 153-176.
- Ch'oe, M. (2017.6.15.), “Kyöngch'al, yönsedae saje p'okt'an pömmaeng tonggi 'yön'gu chido kwajöng üigyön ch'ungdol” [The Conflict of Opinions during Supervising Led the Criminal to Produce the Bomb, Police Says], *Kyunghyang Shinmun*.
- Ch'oe, S. (2015.10.26.), “Oekukin kyosutüli chinchöngülo wönanün kösün?” [What Do Foreign Professors Really Want?], *Kyosu Shinmun*.
- Churchill, D. G., Churchill, M. R., Yi, G., and Kim, K. (2010), *Hwahak: Yöngö kangüi irök'e chunbihaja* [How to Prepare for General Chemistry Taught in English], P'aju: Darakwon.
- Clancey, G. (2002), “Foreign Knowledge: Cultures of Western Science-Making in Meiji Japan”, *Historia Scientiarum*, Vol. 11(3), pp. 245-260.
- Clandinin, D. J. and Connelly, F. M. (2000), *Narrative Inquiry*, San Francisco: Wiley.
- Crawford, E., Shinn, T., and Sörlin, S. (eds). (1993), *Denationalizing Science: The Contexts of International Scientific Practice*, Dordrecht: Springer.
- DiMoia, J. P. (2013), *Reconstructing Bodies: Biomedicine, Health, and Nation-Building in South Korea since 1945*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1995), *Discipline and Punish*. (trans. Alan Sheridan), New York: Vintage.
- Fouser, R. J. (2015.10.26.), “Han·mi·il 'oekukin kyosu' nün oelopta” [Korean, American, and Japanese 'Foreign Professors' Are

Lonely], *Kyosu Shinmun*.

- Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowonty, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P., and Trow, M. (eds). (2010), *The New Production of Knowledge*, London: Sage.
- Golinski, J. (2005), *Making Natural Knowledge: Constructivism and the History of Science*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gooday, G. J. N. and Low, M. F. (1998), “Technology Transfer and Cultural Exchange: Western Scientists and Engineers Encounter Late Tokugawa and Meiji Japan”, *Osiris*, Vol. 13, pp. 99-128.
- Gooding, D., Pinch, T., and Schaffer, S. (eds). (1993), *The Uses of Experiment: Studies in the Natural Sciences*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hess, D. J. (1995), *Science & Technology in a Multicultural World*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hong, S. (2012), “The Relationship between Science and Technology in Korea from the 1960s to the Present Day”, *East Asian Science, Technology and Society*, Vol. 6(2), pp. 259-265.
- Hong, S. and Chang, H. W. (2010), “Sirhōmsil kwa ch’angŭisōng: Ch’ aegimja wa sirhōmsil munhwa ūi yōkhal ūl chungsimūro” [Laboratory and Creativity: The Role of the Leader and Laboratory Culture], *Kwahakkisurhak Yōn’gu*, Vol. 10(1), pp. 27-72.
- Hwang, K. (2005), “The Inferior Science and the Dominant Use of English in Knowledge Production”, *Science Communication*, Vol. 26(4), pp. 390-427.

- ————. (2008), “International Collaboration in Multi-Layered Center-Periphery in the Globalization of Science and Technology”, *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, Vol. 33(1), pp. 101-133.
- Jin, D. Y. (2016), *New Korean Wave: Transnational Cultural Power in the Age of Social Media*, Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Kim, D. and Leslie, S. W. (1998), “Winning Markets or Winning Nobel Prizes? KAIST and the Challenges of Late Industrialization”, *Osiris*, Vol. 13, pp. 154-185.
- Kim, G. B. (2011), “An Anatomical Chart of South Korean Science and Technology in the 1960s”, *East Asian Science, Technology and Society*, Vol. 5(4), pp. 529-542.
- Kim, K. (2005), “Kukchejök in kwahakkwa kukchijök in yön’gu” [Global Science and Local Research], *Kwahakkisurhak Yön’gu*, Vol. 5(1), pp. 31-54.
- Kim, L. (2008), “Explaining the Hwang Scandal”, *Science as Culture*, Vol. 17(4), pp. 397-415.
- Kim, S. (2014), “The Politics of Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research in South Korea”, *Science as Culture*, Vol. 23(3), pp. 293-319.
- Kim, S., Yi, P., and Jang, D. (2014), “Segyesujun yön’gujungsim taehak saöp ūi sönggwa punsök: BK21 saöp kwaui pigyo” [An Analysis on the Research Outcomes of World Class University Project Comparing with BK21 Project in Korea], *Kyoyuk Chaejǒng Kyǒngje Yön’gu*, Vol. 23(3), pp. 61-88.
- Kim, S. K. (2016), “Western Faculty ‘Flight Risk’ at a Korean University and the Complexities of Internationalization in Asian Higher

Education”, *Comparative Education*, Vol. 52(1), pp. 78-90.

- Kim, S. S. (2000), *Korea's Globalization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, T. (2008), “How Could a Scientist Become a National Celebrity?”, *East Asian Science, Technology and Society*, Vol. 2(1), pp. 27-45.
- Kim, Y. J. (2012), “Han'guk kwahakchisigüi segyehwa ch'ui punsök” [An Analysis of Globalization Trends in the Korean Scientific Knowledge], *Kwahakkisurhak Yŏn'gu*, Vol. 12(2), pp. 1-31.
- Korea Education Development Institute. (2012), “Skyesuchun üi yŏnkuchungsim taehak (WCU) yuksŏngsaöp üi sŏngkwa wa kwacha” [The Achievements and Problems of the World Class University Project]. *KEDI 2012 Position Paper 9*, no. 20-18.
- Latour, B. and Woolgar, S. (1986), *Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lebeau, Y. (2003), “Extraversion Strategies within a Peripheral Research Community”, *Science, Technology & Society*, Vol. 8(2), pp. 183-213.
- Lee, E. (2006), “Igonggye kip'i nonüi rül t'onghae pon kwahakkisulja sahoe üi t'üksŏng” [Differentiated Community of Scientists and Engineers in Korea], *Kwahakkisurhak Yŏn'gu*, Vol. 6(2), pp. 77-102.
- Lee, H. and Lee, K. (2013), “Publish (in International Indexed Journals) or Perish”, *Language Policy*, Vol. 12(3), pp. 215-230.
- Livingstone, D. (2003), *Putting Science in Its Place*, Chicago: University

of Chicago Press.

- Matthews, D. (2016.3.15.), “Foreign Academics in Korea: Disempowered and Ready to Leave?”, *Times Higher Education*.
- McNeill, D. (2011.2.27.), “South Korea Brings in Foreign Professors by the Thousands, but Is It Ready for Them?”, *Chronicles of Higher Education*.
- Miller, J. and Glassner, B. (2016), “The ‘Inside’ and the ‘Outside’”, in Silverman, D (ed.), *Qualitative Research*, pp. 51-66, London: Sage.
- Ministry of Education of Korea. *Taehak allimi* [Information Service of Higher Education in Korea] (<http://www.academyinfo.go.kr>, accessed 27 May 2018).
- Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology of Korea (2011.11.29.), “Segye chujun ūi yŏn’gu sent’ŏ chiwŏn kwaje chunggan p’ yŏngga kyŏlgwa” [Results of an Interim Appraisal of the Outcomes of Support for the World Class Institutes], *Podojaryo*. [From the National Assembly Library].
- Moon, H. (2013.5.5.), “Nŭlŏkanŭn oekukin kyosu, chunpian toen sŏultae” [Increasing Foreign Professors, Unprepared Seoul National University Resign], *Taehak Shinmun*.
- Moon, R. (2016), “Internationalization without Cultural Diversity?”, *Comparative Education*, Vol. 52(1), pp. 91-108.
- Moon, S. (2005), *Militarized Modernity and Gendered Citizenship in South Korea*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Mun, H. (2016.7.26.), “Sŏultae watŏn oekukin kyosutŭl, chulchuli ttŏnanta” [Foreign Professors at Seoul National University Resign in Droves], *Chosun Ilbo*.

- Mun, M. (2010), *Hankuk ūi hyōntaechōk yōnku ch'echeūi hyōngsōng: KIST ūi sōllip kwa pyōnch'ōn*, 1966-1980 [The Formation of Modern Research System in Korea: Creation and Transformation of KIST, 1966-1980], Seoul: Sōnin.
- Mun, M. and Kang, M. H. (2013), “Pak Chōnghūi sidae kwahak kisul ‘chedo kuch'ukcha’: Ch'oe Hyōngsōp kwa O Wōnch'ōl” [The Institution Builders of Science and Technology during the Park Chung Hee Era: Choi Hyung Sup and O Won-chol], *Han'guk Kwahaksa Hakhoeji*, Vol. 35(1), pp. 225-244.
- National Assembly Budget Office. (2011), “Segye sujun yōn'gu chungsim taehak yuksōng saōp p'yōngga” [An Evaluation of the WCU Project], Seoul: NABO.
- National Research Foundation. (2013), *Sekeye suchun ūi yōnkuchungsim taehak (WCU) yuksōng saōp* [A Project for Establishing World-Class University]. (http://www.nrf.re.kr/biz/info/info/view?biz_no=40, accessed 26 June 2017).
- ——— . *Ch'edan sogye* [An Introduction to the Foundation]. (http://www.nrf.re.kr/cms/page/main?menu_no=99, accessed 26 June 2017).
- ——— . *Introduction*. (http://www.nrf.re.kr/eng/cms/page/main?menu_no=221, accessed 26 June 2017).
- Normile, D. (2010), “Restoration or Devastation?”, *Science*, Vol. 327(5973), pp. 1568-1570.
- Oh, C. (2013.8.28), “Mōchin hūin kaun yōnkucha? Pich'chōhūn kaesalkuin semichyo” [Researchers in Cool White Lab Coat? Appearance Is Deceptive], *Science On*.
- Palmer, J. D. and Cho, Y. H. (2011), “Does Internationalization Really

- Mean Americanization?”, in Palmer, J., Roberts, A., Cho, Y., and Ching G. (eds.), *The Internationalization of East Asian Higher Education*, pp. 119-146, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Park, H. W. and Cho, K. (2018), “Science, State and Spirituality: Stories of Four Creationists in South Korea”, *History of Science*, Vol. 56(1), pp. 35-71.
 - Park, J. (2006), “Yŏn’guja chiptan ūi sŏngjang kwa pyŏnch’ŏn” [A Study of the Historical Development of Research Community in Korea], *Kwahakkisurhak Yŏn’gu*, Vol. 6(1), pp. 119-160.
 - Polanyi, M. (1962), “The Republic of Science”, *Minerva*, Vol. 1(1), pp. 54-74.
 - Prakash, G. (1999), *Another Reason: Science and the Imagination of Modern India*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
 - Ravetz, J. R. (1996), *Scientific Knowledge and Its Social Problems*, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
 - Rogaski, R. (2004), *Hygienic Modernity: Meanings of Health and Disease in Treaty-Port China*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
 - Schott, T. (1991), “The World Scientific Community: Globality and Globalization”, *Minerva*, Vol. 29(4), pp. 440-462.
 - ——— . (1993), “World Science: Globalization of Institutions and Participation”, *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, Vol. 18(2), pp. 196-208.
 - Seoul National University. (2003), “*Sŏltae t’ongkyeyŏnpo*” [The Annual Statistical Reports of Seoul National University], Seoul: Seoul National University.
 - Shapin, S. and Schaffer, S. (1985), *Leviathan and the Air-Pump*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Shin, D. (2010.11.1.), “Hunminjōngūm ūn wae kwahakchōk in’ga” [Why Is Hunminjōngūm Scientific], *Sciencetimes*.
- Shin, G. (2006), *Ethnic Nationalism in Korea: Genealogy, Politics, and Legacy*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Shin, G. and Choi, J. N. (2015), *Global Talent: Skilled Labor as Social Capital in Korea*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Shin, J. C. and Jang, Y. S. (2013), “World Class University in Korea”, in Shin, J. and Kehm, B. (eds.), *Institutionalization of World-Class University in Global Competition*, pp. 147-164, Berlin: Springer.
- Sim, M. (2014), “Oekukin kyowōntūl ūi hankuk taehak saenghwal kyōnghōm yōnku” [A Study of Foreign Professors’ Perceptions toward Their Lived Experience in Korean University], *Tamunhwa Kyoyuk Yōnku*, Vol. 7(3), pp. 171-190.
- Song, W., Lee, E., Song, S., and Kim, B. (2003), *Han’guk kwahakkisulja sahoe ūi t’ūksōng punsōk* [An Analysis of the Characteristics of the Korean Community of Scientists and Engineers], Seoul: STEPI.
- Stichweh, R. (1996), “Science in the System of World Society”, *Social Science Information*, Vol. 35(2), pp. 327-340.
- Yi, C. (2015.9.30.), “Oekukin kyosu·haksaeng ‘nanūn taehakūi ipangin’” [Foreign Faculty and Students: ‘I Am a Stranger to the University’], *Kyosu Shinmun*.

논문 투고일	2018년 09월 28일
논문 수정일	2018년 11월 03일
논문 게재 확정일	2018년 11월 19일

Living as Foreign Scientists: Stories of Nineteen Expatriate Professors in South Korea

Park, Hyung Wook

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses an important dimension of the globalization of science by investigating the lived experiences of nineteen expatriate scientists in six institutions in South Korea. Although much has been written on the globalization and science, few works have dealt with scientific experts' migration across national borders in contemporary contexts. In this regard, the lives of foreign science professors in Korea offer an interesting case, as they illustrate how the ideas of global science both clash with and appropriate Korea's local practices and discourses. I argue that the globality of science is a main factor that fosters the continued Korean stay of many foreign scientists, who manage and appropriate what is entailed in this globality, namely, Korea's perceived status as a peripheral country in the dynamics between "center" and "periphery." This includes several strategies and unintended situations differing according to each foreign scientist's ethnic origins, professional experiences, and institutional circumstances, which lead them to make sense of their continued stay in Korea.

Key terms | globalization, globality, expatriate scientists, foreign professors, South Korea, migration, center, periphery