

AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENCE: CHANGING PARADIGMS AND RESOURCES FOR THE STUDY OF JAPAN

by Iwao Ishino

Of the many factors affecting the development of Japanese studies two will be considered here, research methods and financial support. In reviewing the development of Japanese studies during the past two decades, I find that the research methodology followed has been redundant, repetitious, and has few surprises. At the same time, resources for research in Japan as well as other foreign areas have considerably dwindled (cf. Deutsch 1968). Support for research on Japanese studies, especially in anthropology, psychology and sociology, has not grown to a degree commensurate with the increased numbers of specialists.

A question I would like to raise is whether the dwindling of resources for Japanese studies is in any way the consequence of the methodology and approach. If so, can something be done by our academic community to improve our research methods and will these improved research strategies be rewarded by greater public and foundation support? In this paper I try to consider evidence bearing upon these questions and make some personal evaluations about the total research enterprise, but I do not present any very specific plans—for the setting of plans and programs is one of the purposes of this conference.

Research Methods, Strategies, and Priorities

Before we enter directly into the problem I have posed, a brief over-view of the literature might be helpful. Richard Beardsley's *Field Guide to Japan* (1959), published ten years ago, is still current in many respects and contains helpful hints about the many dimensions of conducting research in Japan. In addition to this basic document, several papers summarize the literature as seen from different disciplinary angles. For a summary of anthropology in Japan, see Sofue (1962); for sociology, Ariga (1965); and for a recent statement on social psychology, Wagatsuma (1969) is helpful.

The papers by Sofue, Ariga, and Wagatsuma concentrate on the contributions by Japanese scholars. To obtain some idea about American contributions, I went to the annual bibliographic issues of the *Journal of Asian*

Studies and tallied the number of books and articles listed each year for the period 1964-1968. There I found an average annual listing of 14.0 books and 54.8 articles under the category "Social Science," the main entry for works in sociology, psychology, and anthropology. The number of entries under Social Science as compared with other categories may be seen from the following:

	1964 — 1968	
	AVERAGE PER YEAR	
	BOOKS	ARTICLES
Economics	23.6	69.4
Industry and Labor	14.5	55.2
Politics and Government	11.0	60.2
Law and Constitution	18.2	18.8
Language	16.0	15.4
Philosophy and Religion	20.2	48.8
History and Archeology	31.0	57.6
Social Science	14.0	54.8

I think that such numbers of new writings each year indicate that knowledge is increasing and that Japan specialists are very active indeed. Yet, one wonders what the impact of this literature has been on behavioral science as a whole. For example, in the volume edited by Berelson and Steiner (1964), *Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings*, only three citations on Japan are given in its index, which includes thousands of entries. Perhaps one can argue that such a limited number of references to studies of Japan reflects the predilections of the editors as much as it does the quantity and quality of the actual contributions made by the Japan specialists in the social sciences. But there are other characteristics of the published research that should concern us. These relate to the theoretical assumptions and value orientations of American social scientists who have worked in Japan.

It seems somewhat ironical that in his introduction to a recent book on the modernization of Japan, Ronald Dore (1967: 3) begins with this statement: "This is an old-fashioned book." He means that most of the papers in the book were framed in terms of concepts and problems first posed by sociologists of the nineteenth century—Maier, Spencer, Durkheim, Weber, Toennies.

I reviewed my own studies of Japan as well as those that have contributed most to my understanding of modern Japan (Embree, Benedict, Abegglen, Dore, Beardsley, Reischauer, Bellah), and could not escape the conclusion that what Dore said of the papers in his volume also applied to most studies of Japan that I am familiar with. Why is this so? During my graduate days at the end of World War II, there was the hope or rather the certainty that the basic theoretical frameworks of sociologists, psycholo-

gists, and anthropologists would converge and foster greater interdisciplinary cooperation (Gillin 1959). At that time various nineteenth-century conceptions as further developed by Wirth, Redfield, and Parsons seemed to be the most likely conceptual schemes to unify the social or behavioral sciences. Moreover, as interdisciplinary orientation was encouraged, so also was a cross-cultural perspective, for it was thought that a truly culture-free framework could develop in no other way. We then held a one-world view, with the atom bomb as the driving force behind that point of view.

Some of us who passed through graduate school in this period now look back upon it as the age of uncomplicated innocence. It was believed that however imperfect our society was, its major thrust would inexorably be in the direction of a just and humane social order. Our own values were oriented toward humanitarian, people-centered goals; individual freedom, permissive leadership, and social justice would prevail as society moved away from the bonds of traditionalism (Pffiffner 1962). Parsons' idea of "pattern variables" was a convenient package for these ideas and provided an essentially rational model of human behavior.

As American social scientists went to Japan to lecture or do research in this postwar period, they framed research problems within this paradigm. Their image of society was of a system moving toward integration. They regarded social conflict and tension as aberration or deviation from the norm. John Hall (1968) informs us that the reaction of some Japanese intellectuals was ". . . to view our approach as the product of insensitivity, affluence or 'bourgeois objectivity.'"

In the United States, our old view of the world is now being challenged, and the challenge is no doubt related to our domestic problems; social issues inevitably threaten the validity of existing paradigms. Frank (1967) argues with considerable cogency that the present American social science paradigms and their associated researchers are empirically wrong, theoretically inadequate, and ineffective for formulating policy. An equally severe evaluation of existing conceptual models is given by Walter Buckley (1967), who argues for another kind of paradigm, a modern systems theory.

The nineteenth-century foundations of our present conceptual schemes have provided American scholars with a more or less common framework to view both the structure and the changes taking place in Japanese society. Boguslaw (MS) refers to this kind of pervasive but subtle control over the direction of research as "paradigm specification." Such paradigm specification has focused the attention of American researchers on continuities with the past which are seen in the present society—we see "familism" in industrial structures, and *oyabun-kobun* relationships in modern contexts; we see *on*, *giri*, *ninjo*, and *amaeru* traits as characterizing the dominant

features of interpersonal relations—and such traditional elements have been interpreted as stabilizing forces in the changing society.

But while the paradigm specification has been enormously helpful in aiding us to select specific research designs, data-collecting-and-processing techniques, and modes of interpretation, we are now troubled by the criticism that appears from within the ranks of social science about our theoretical assumptions. Many argue for a new theoretical perspective emphasizing process. Religious organizations, especially the new religions, and various kinds of protest (or revitalization) movements, including campus power struggles, should be understood from this new point of view. An interesting example of this kind of study is provided by Passin's "Sources of Protest in Japan" (1962). The new perspective should also orient research toward understanding problems of public policy. David B. Truman (1968) writes of the paradox that as a social science achieves greater sophistication, it tends to become less involved with issues of public policy. An example is the current literature on the *dozoku* and family structure of Japan. Exceptionally, Fukutake's perceptive analysis (1962: 46-52) relates research to issues of public policy.

Boguslaw's paradigm specification is a convenient way to characterize the manner in which the old view governed our approach to the study of Japanese personality, culture, and society. It is interesting that Boguslaw was led to this idea by Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolution* (1964). Kuhn demonstrates that scientific breakthroughs have resulted from the discovery of new paradigms. Perhaps the new paradigm of which we see only faint outlines at this time may lead to a minor breakthrough in the social scientific studies of Japan.

Resources for Supporting Research on Japan.

So far I have considered the methodological issue or, more specifically, the framework in which research has been designed. The other side of the research equation is the support for research. It includes human resources as well as physical facilities.

In September, 1968, the Social Science Research Council established "The Area and Language Programs Review Committee" for the purpose of examining the role of area studies programs in American universities. The group is asked to look into such complex problems as the role these programs play in higher education, the kinds of training which foreign area scholars receive, and how this training relates to subsequent research and teaching experiences. This series of problems was delineated at the request of the United States Office of Education (AAS *Newsletter*, 1969, p. 16), which suggests that the study of foreign countries is more than an internal problem of the academic community and extends into the national purview. It also suggests there is some unease about inefficiencies in training, mis-

guided allocation of funds, and current conceptions of research priorities. These same issues could be legitimately raised about the training and utilization of the talents of the Japan specialists.

Through the courtesy of Frank J. Shulman of the Center for Japanese Studies at the University of Michigan, I have been able to obtain a list of "dissertations in the field of behavior sciences related to Japan." This is an incomplete listing, but it represents an adequate sample for our present purposes. From this list, I have tabulated the following distribution of Ph.D. dissertations categorized according to discipline and year of completion.

	BEFORE 1945	1946- 1955	1956- 1965	1966- PRESENT	TOTAL
Anthropology	2	10	13	3	28
Sociology	1	3	15	2	21
Psychology	0	0	4	1	5
Other Disciplines	3	2	6	4	15
	6	15	38	10	69

These 69 dissertations presumably represent people trained in a social science discipline who have done research on Japan. Shulman's data also includes 33 other dissertations concerning Japanese living outside Japan (mostly Japanese-Americans). In my opinion, 69 Ph.D.'s is not a very large pool of human resource for research in such a complex society as Japan.

I have also considered the universities that trained these Ph.D.'s. Since the six persons who were trained before 1945 belong to the generation of graduate students before World War II (some going back to the early 1900's), I dropped them from consideration here. This then leaves a sample of 63 persons who received doctorates after the war. Of these, it is interesting to note that 34 (more than half) were trained at four institutions: Harvard University (11), Columbia University (9), University of Michigan (8), and University of Chicago (6). Cornell University produced four, and New York University and Syracuse University each three. The following universities awarded two Ph.D.'s each: Princeton University, University of Washington, University of Southern California, University of California at Berkeley, University of Illinois, and Michigan State University. The remainder of the Ph.D.'s in the sample came from universities which awarded one doctorate each. The fact that universities such as Harvard, Columbia, Michigan, and Chicago turned out the most Ph.D.'s in Japanese studies is not surprising, however, for that is where the important training resources are located.

If we look at this pool of 63 Ph.D.'s to see how many are currently supported by grants for research in Japan, some added measure of productivity is revealed. I regard as disappointing the facts that I have been able to

obtain. For example, only one of the 29 Grants for Research on Asia awarded in 1968-1969 jointly by American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council went for research in Japan to an advanced scholar who represented the social sciences of concern to this conference—anthropology, sociology, and psychology. Seven other grants were for research in Japan, but they represented other disciplines, such as history, political science, and economics.

Another indication of the state of research support is the National Science Foundation Individual Research Grants. In 1968, 124 awards were given to anthropologists; of these, only one was given for research in Japan, and this was in archeology (*AAA Newsletter*, December 1968, pp. 5-6).

The same dearth of awards to anthropologists specializing in Japan is found in the Postdoctoral and Special Research Fellowships of the National Institute of Mental Health. Of the 14 awards made in the academic year 1967-1968 to anthropologists, none was given to a Japan specialist. While I do not have comparable data for sociologists and psychologists specializing in Japan, I believe the findings will be the same. It appears that scholars in these fields either are not applying for grants for Japan or are unsuccessful in their attempts. My guess is that the former circumstance is more common.

Now what about doctoral candidates who constitute the future pool of Japan specialists? In 1968, SSRC-ACLS Foreign Area Fellowships for doctoral candidates numbered 45, of which 16 were for research in Japan. But of these 16, only one (in sociology) was for research in the fields of concern here. Awards of the National Institute of Mental Health (Postdoctoral Research Fellowships) in 1968 were more generous to anthropology. Of the 69 grantees in anthropology, four were for research in Japan, as compared with one in the previous year.

The average annual production of Ph.D.'s in the three disciplines for the 23 years of the postwar period is 2.7. As judged by the grants currently being awarded to doctoral candidates, this average will probably remain constant.

Some language institutes provide potential support for Japanese studies, such as the Summer Far Eastern Language Institute at Indiana University, which is sponsored by the "Committee on Institutional Cooperation" composed of eleven midwestern universities; the Inter-University Center for Japanese Language Studies in Tokyo, which is supported in part by the Carnegie and Ford foundations; and the NDEA Summer Language Institute for Specialist Training at various universities around the country. But these programs, while helpful, are adjuncts to the training of researchers.

In addition to the language training institutes, a number of Asian Studies programs have emerged in American universities. For understandable reasons these centers emphasize China, although Japan is also an essential area

of interest. The February, 1969 issue of the *Newsletter* of the Association for Asian Studies (pp. 30-36) briefly reviews the area programs at Carleton College, Columbia University, Connecticut College and Wesleyan University, East-West Center of the University of Hawaii, Ohio State University, Pennsylvania State University, and the University of Pittsburgh. In other issues of the same *Newsletter*, the California Institute of Asian Studies in San Francisco and the programs of Duke University-University of North Carolina and Stanford University have also been described. It is my view that such programs are primarily oriented toward undergraduate instruction, and even though a master's degree may be offered, the curricula are designed for training teachers rather than advanced scholars.

If the signs are discouraging for a substantial increase in the number of anthropologists, psychologists, and sociologists specializing in Japanese studies, support from foundations for facilitating research in these three fields also seems niggardly. The three disciplines currently receive substantially less support from foundations than do other scholarly fields, say, Japanese studies in economics, political science, or history. For example, the Ford Foundation gave to Columbia University a grant of \$400,000 for research on "Japanese economic history and development"; the American Academy of Arts and Sciences the sum of \$100,000 for a three-year study of the impact of modern weapons and technology on international relations; a grant of \$100,000 to the Japan Economic Research Center (Tokyo) both for training and for supporting international conferences; \$100,000 to the Center for Modern Economics at Rikkyo University for research on Japan's postwar economic growth; and awarded Harvard University \$800,000 "to help support research projects on contemporary Japan at the University's East Asia Research Center." I do not know what proportion of the Harvard grant went to what disciplines, but I suspect that anthropology, psychology, and sociology are under-represented. The Ford Foundation should not be singled out. The Carnegie Corporation, for example, has awarded substantial sums of money to the University of Michigan's research project on the Political Modernization of Japan. Again, the same emphasis was made in the selection of disciplines.

If this interpretation of the trends of foundation support is correct, it seems to me that it gives warning about the future of studies of Japan by anthropologists, sociologists, and psychologists. That is, the kind of research we are doing has less public support and is deemed less socially relevant than the research of other disciplines. (See Pierce 1968 for an eloquent statement on what constitutes "good" research.) In the first part of this paper, I suggested that, as social scientists, we should frame our research problems in ways that contribute toward an understanding of public

policy. Perhaps a more conscious effort on our part, both in training future students and in designing our own research would be rewarded with greater public support for our endeavors.

Support from foundations is concentrated in a limited number of universities such as Harvard, Columbia, Michigan, and Stanford, leaving scholars and students in less favored universities with a severe handicap. Some Japan specialists in the latter universities are therefore directing their research efforts away from Japanese studies and into areas where the research support is more easily available. Some foundation and federal support is going to a number of universities where there is no obvious strength in Japanese studies; however, this is not done to foster research but primarily to enhance the instructional program of undergraduate education and the training of public school teachers.

This pattern of "adding strength to strength" in granting funds is found not only in Japan studies, but in most other area studies. This general attitude, which is perhaps also the policy, is stated by Robert F. Byrnes (1968 p. 15), who argues that world conditions have changed since 1958 and, accordingly, the universities should change with regard to area studies. Then he builds his argument for an elite status for certain universities:

... To begin with, we should recognize that we have successfully created institutions for training an adequate number of specialists for most foreign areas. There are exceptions, such as Vietnam, Southeast Asia in general, India, and Eastern Europe; but by and large, American institutions have created an adequate number of excellent graduate programs for training teachers and scholars for each of the foreign areas. Our main problem is that we should now begin to review the training we provide, because we have placed too high emphasis upon scholarship as compared with teaching. We are, in short, producing a sufficient number of theologians; we now need to produce more parish priests who will go out into the colleges and universities to increase enormously the quality and quantity of undergraduate education on all the foreign areas.

Insofar as Japan studies are concerned, I personally do not agree with Byrnes' conclusions that schools which produce the "theologians" have "excellent graduate programs." If what I have said about research methodology and theoretical perspectives in the earlier sections of this paper is taken seriously, something basic needs to be changed in the training of anthropologists, sociologists, and psychologists for research in Japan. This may sound like sour grapes, but I hope the assessment of the situation will speak for itself. The older, well-established institutions are less likely to be innovative and to discover new approaches and paradigms than younger, less well-established institutions (Schon 1967: 109-111).

Concluding Remarks

Most of the foregoing pages have presented evidence for two claims: (1) that some doubts are being expressed within the social sciences about the theoretical assumptions governing current research designs and method-

ology, and (2), that, while the pool of Japan specialists has grown at an even rate, the support for research has been meager and the present number of Asian studies centers is insufficient to provide tenured academic positions for this growing population of specialists. These two claims are amplified by questions posed at the beginning of this paper: Is the dwindling of resources for Japan studies in any way the consequence of the research methodology being followed? If so, can something be done by our academic community to improve these methods, and will these improved strategies be rewarded by greater public and foundation support?

Finding a new paradigm for organizing research is largely a prerogative of the academic community. On the other hand, the public or foundation support for research is controlled by outside groups and determined by such non-research considerations as national political conditions and changing international alliances (Deutsch 1968). Thus, in the short run the ability of the academic community to do anything about gaining public support seems to be nonexistent. This community can only hope that the vicissitudes of American politics and international relations may unexpectedly change in the favorable direction.

In the long run, however, there is some hope. For the bulk of Japan specialists who—to use the terms of Byrnes' (1968)—are like parish priests, the immediate clients are students. These students are the future decision-makers. The more effective the specialists are as teachers, the greater should be the public recognition and support for Japanese studies that may eventually accrue. To help college instruction, then, books designed for a variety of student audiences should be substantially increased. Norbeck's *Changing Japan* is an example of a highly satisfactory text for some undergraduate courses on Japan where an up-to-date, personalized, and ethnographically rich text is desired.

Another aid toward reaching these long-term goals is a greater understanding of social issues gained through comparative study. This may require some "retooling" in order to learn as much about American issues as is known about comparable Japanese issues. The increasing volume of public lectures and writings on social issues should enhance the relevance of Japan studies in the public view.

Still another suggestion concerns improved scholarly coordination of research efforts. Some way must be found to improve communication, preferably before publication, among scholars so that data obtained by one scholar can complement the findings of another. At present, cooperation of this kind seems fortuitous. Cooperative effort may be arranged on an institutional level. Often a more efficient allocation of talents, facilities, students, and funds is possible if several colleges join forces on a common project. As mentioned earlier, this procedure has enabled several small colleges to manage an expensive overseas studies program.

REFERENCES

- BERELSON, BERNARD, and GARY A. STEINER
1964 *Human behavior: an inventory of scientific findings*. New York/Burlingame, Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
- BOGUSLAW, ROBERT
MS The design perspective in sociology. Manuscript prepared for publication in Wendell Bell and James A. Man, eds. *Images of the future: Explorations in the sociology knowledge*.
- BYRNES, ROBERT F.
1968 The future of area studies. *In Newsletter of American Council of Learned Societies* 19, 7: 12-18.
- DORE, R. P., ed.
1967 *Aspects of social change in modern Japan*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- DEUTSCH, KARL W.
1968 The coming crisis of cross-national and international research in the United States. *In Newsletter of American Council of Learned Societies* 19, 4: 1-7.
- FUKUTAKE, TADASHI
1962 *Man and society in Japan*. Tokyo, The University of Tokyo Press.
- GILLIN, JOHN, ed.
1954 *For a science of social man*. New York, MacMillan Co.
- HALL, JOHN WHITNEY
1968 Reflections on a centennial. *Journal of Asian Studies* 27: 711-720.
- KUHN, THOMAS S.
1964 *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press.
- PIFFNER, JOHN M.
1962 Why not make social science operational? *Public Administration Review* 22: 109-114.
- PIERCE, J. R.
1968 When is research the answer? *Science* 159: 1079-80.
- SCHON, DONALD A.
1967 *Technology and change*. New York, Delta.
- SMITH, ROBERT J., and RICHARD K. BEARDSLEY, eds.
1962 *Japanese culture: its development and characteristics*. *In Viking Fund Publication in Anthropology* 34. New York, Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological research, Inc.
- WAGATSUMA, HIROSHI
1969 Major trends in social psychology in Japan. *American Behavioral Scientist* 12: 36-45.