



SEAS

DISCUSSION PAPER NO. 49

Institutional and Methodological Problems
on Multidisciplinary Research
in Asian Area Studies

by
Shinichi Ichimura

August, 1972

The Center for Southeast Asian Studies

Kyoto University

Kyoto, Japan

THE CENTER FOR SOUTHEAST ASIAN STUDIES

DISCUSSION PAPER NO. 49

Institutional and Methodological Problems
on Multidisciplinary Research
in Asian Area Studies

by

Shinichi Ichimura

August, 1972

Institutional and Methodological Problems on Multidisciplinary Research in Asian Area Studies

1. Asian Area Studies in Japan

The academic institutions in Japan have been oriented to Western civilizations and technology. Even as late as in 1930, there was no well-established research institute specialized in the studies of contemporary Asia.* Perhaps the institution that had the best information on contemporary Asia in late 30's was the research department of South Manchurian Railroad Company. It was not until late 30's and the outbreak of the Great East Asian War that Institute of East Asian Studies and Institute of Ethnology was established to promote Asian studies. These and other institutions of Asian studies were completely dissolved after the war, and the documents and personnels were dispersed all over the country and even abroad.

It did not take a long time, however, to recognize again that as the Japanese economy recovered, Japan had to play a positive role in the studies of contemporary Asia. The postwar development of Asian studies had to be initiated by establishing a few governmental research institutes, but this fresh start

* In prewar Japan there are two Institutes of East Asian Cultures at Tokyo and Kyoto Universities. The studies of contemporary Asia were done in a small way there.

encountered various difficulties institutionally and methodological-ly. Soon enough a number of other private and university research institutes began to undertake Asian studies. This paper purports to review the postwar experiences of managerial and research administrations of these new institutes and other arrangements and derive lessons for better institutional and methodological ways of developing Asian area studies and other new scientific fields.

2. Types of New Institutions and Their Administration

The new institutions established for the purpose of reviving the practical and academic interest in the studies of contemporary Asia may be classified as the following three types. There are also two other ways of organizing research activities on the non-institutional basis. They are listed here as A, B, C, and d, e:

A: Governmental or Semi-Governmental Research Institutes,

B: University Research Institutes,

C: Private or Business Research Institutes,

d: Research Programs,

e: Research Projects.

Needless to say, d and e are not necessarily inconsistent with A, B, and C. These institutional setups are largely a reflection of general organization of research institutes in Japan, but there are some characteristics peculiar to new institutions for Asian studies as well as many problems common to all research institutes. These institutional measures will be explained first and then compared with each other in three aspects: (1) Managerial Administration and Funding, (2) Personnel Administration or the

Reward System, (3) Research Administration or Methodology of Multidisciplinary Research. Some discussions will be made on the critical evaluation of the system of institutions as a whole.

A: There are two ways of carrying out research works in government ministries. The first is to have a research section within some department of the ministry, and the second is to establish a research institute attached to the Ministry. Examples are: Institute of Economic Research at the Economic Planning Agency, Institute of Population Problems at the Ministry of Welfare, Institute of International Problems at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Institute of Education at the Ministry of Education, and so on. These institutes are more or less independent of the Ministry's day-to-day routines and meant to carry out the studies requiring a long term and somewhat more basic rather than practical. They have the advantage of recruiting specialists and establishing better contact with academic circles. Top management is sometimes adopted from professors but usually appointed from heads of other departments in the ministry. Some institutes made research contracts with outside researchers or even requested them to guide the research projects on part-time basis. This was a device started by Institute of Economic Research at the Economic Planning Agency. Relatively young and capable academic economists were assigned to be the leaders of research projects organized at the institute, and they succeeded in achieving the research objectives with the help of able assistants provided by the institute.

These institutes have been limited in their field of research

to the activities assigned to the ministries. For example, Institute of Population Problems could not study the population problems in foreign countries, because the Ministry of Welfare has no obligation to deal with the population problems abroad. When, therefore, it was contemplated to establish a new research institute for Asian economic affairs, it became necessary to have a new law passed by the Diet and to make the Institute of Developing Economies—the Japanese name is Institute of Asian Economy—a "special juridical person" not attached to any particular ministry. This institute is semi-governmental, because its budget is partially supported by the contributions from private businesses.* The great difference between this institute and old types of governmental institutes is that the former has its own employees, whereas the latter has not. Formally the personnel administration is independent in Institute of Developing Economies. In fact, however, the Parkinson's Law of related ministries created a fairly serious rivalry of de facto jurisdiction.

B: Good Japanese universities have research institutes in addition to the departments which are primarily for undergraduate and graduate education. Those institutes are administered independently of the departments, although some of their staffs often participate in graduate education.

* In 1971 the Ministry of Agriculture established the Research Center of Tropical Agriculture within the ministry. This is something new, contrary to the regulations mentioned above, which may open up the possibility for other ministries also to undertake the studies of the problems in developing countries. It is not, however, a special juridical person but simply an extension of old governmental research institutes.

Several new research institutes were established for Asian studies: Institute of Asian and African Languages and Cultures at the Tokyo College of Foreign Languages, The Research Center for Southeast Asian Studies at Kyoto University, Institute of Tropical Medicines at Nagasaki University. These are all at the governmental universities. They have the autonomy in personnel and financial administration in the sense that the faculty meeting of each institute can appoint its staffs and requests or allocates the budget through the university senate. The determination of budget by the Ministry of Education is made not at the level of each university but each department and institute. There are several private universities which have established similar institutes or research centers, but mainly due to the shortage of budget, they are organized in fact as "research programs" to be classified as d. These universities include such famous ones as Waseda, Keio, Sophia and International Christian Universities. Some governmental universities also have shown their interest in Asian studies and, without government's budgetary support, initiated small scale of research activities as "research programs," relying mainly on private contributions.

The notorious imbreeding of Japanese university professors and the simple seniority in the salary scale make the interchange of personnels of research institutes very difficult in spite of the great need of flexibility in staffs and their specialities. The ministry of Education is tightly controlling the budgets of all the governmental universities and the subsidies to private universities, but the subsidies are still very meager and priority is given to

about ten outstanding universities among governmental universities. It is very difficult, therefore, for private universities and non-privileged governmental universities to support the expensive research activities abroad. The annual budget of each institute is calculated mainly on the basis of the numbers of professors, associate professors and research associates. For this reason, the allocation of research funds is often made on the egalitarian principle. The additional expenses needed for team researches or large scale of special field works or experiments are usually provided only by the Ministry's support of the research projects to be discussed as e.

C: It would be obvious from the explanation above that both governmental or semi-governmental institutes and university institutes lack the flexibility to meet the urgent demand for quick answers to many Asian questions and training the necessary specialists and practical personnels in businesses. For these purposes and also for meeting the various other needs of expanding Japanese economy and foreign trade, a number of private institutes or research centers and consulting companies have been established primarily by private businesses. The Japan Economic Research Center, associated with the Japan Economic Newspaper Company, the Nomura Research Institute, associated with the Nomura Security Company, the Mitsubishi Research Institute, associated with the famous Mitsubishi group etc. are somewhat early examples of this type.

In the recent years, partly because quite a few capable

scholars left the universities due to the students turmoils on the campus, a number of non-profit-making research institutes have been created to tackle with the very contemporary problems with the help of private businesses or government ministries. Institute of System Engineering, Institute of Social Engineering, Institute of Resources Problems, The International Development Center of Japan etc. may be classified under this category.

There seem to be two ways of administering these institutes. One is to run it as a consulting company or its like. The institute has its own staffs, information system and carries out the research works in itself. Another is to run it as an organizer of research projects. It has the minimum number of core personnels, a fair number of assisting staffs and secretaries, and good contact with private businesses, universities and government offices. In both cases they are much more liberal in the salary scale among individual specialists and in the allocation of research funds and the decision of research programs. The leadership of director or managing directors can be more easily performed in this case than in the case of A and B types of institutes.

From these explanations and observations I would like to summarize the evaluation of efficiency of the administration of three types of institutions as Table I. From this table the reader should not jump into the conclusion that C type of institutions are the most suitable for research institutes. This is merely my personal rough observation of existing institutions in Japan in their ways of administration. Conclusions must be drawn after more careful examination of other aspects of these institutions to follow.

Table I Efficiency Evaluation of Institute Administration

	A	B	C
(1) Financial Administration	fair	poor	good
(2) General Management	fair	fair	good
(3) Personnel Administration	poor	fair	good
(4) Research Administration	poor	fair	fair

d: Research Programs have been the typical method of organizing the research activities in American universities for Area Studies. As the Foundations policies shifted from area studies, many of these centers or programs are dismantling themselves. In Japan this method was adopted, as was mentioned above, only as a substitute for B by some universities. The most serious shortcoming of this method is that the scholars can never get the full credit for their works in the research programs in the department to which they belong, because the departments are naturally discipline-oriented and the Asian area studies are often subsidiary to the professional training. Besides there is always an uncertainty that the program may be dissolved any time, and then the position of scholars participating in the program is relatively weakened. Joint appointment cannot overcome the difficulty. This method is particularly inappropriate for attracting young capable graduate students or scholars into the new research fields which require the adventurous spirits and long-term field research. The Asian studies in Japan as well as in the West are undoubtedly such

research fields. For these reasons I have been critical on the Asian and African area studies in the United States.

Unpopularity of this method in Japan, however, is not due to careful consideration of these disadvantages on the part of the Ministry of Education or university authorities. The reasons are: (1) the principle of budgeting is the number of personnels, (2) the budget is always annual, (3) no budget can be allocated to an interdepartmental group.

Since, however, there are advantages in organizing research programs in many universities, and the limitations mentioned above can be overcome by changing the government regulations, I believe that it is highly desirable to introduce "research program" method into Japanese universities and other institutes, because this seems to offer an experimental period for new fields of research or multi-disciplinary types of research to be finished after a certain number of years. This introduces the necessary flexibility into A, B and C. To some extent this direction of movement is beginning at some institutes.

e: The Research Project method has been used traditionally to support rather expensive research works and unusual expenses needed for young scholars' works or new types of research works. Although a considerable number of small grant-giving foundations have been founded, and still some more—maybe larger in scale—foundations are likely to be formed, the main source of funds for major research projects is the Ministry of Education, which has set up several committees of selecting the grantees for various kinds of

research projects respectively. The grants are limited to a single year, Japanese citizens and very restrictive in the use of funds. The committee members are usually well-established scholars, and criticisms are seldom heard about fairness of selection. If there is anything to be desired, it is the difficulty for junior scholars to obtain a large sum of grant for new research.

The need of extending research to international cooperation is recognized very well. The Ministry of Education setup the Japan Science Promotion Council to promote the interchange of personnels with foreign universities and institutes as well as within Japanese universities. But the scale is very small and the procedure is too complicated and time-consuming. The so-called Japan Funds newly created may hopefully make a unique contribution to the promotion of international exchange of cultural and academic activities.

There is one area of funding which is suffering most seriously from the shortage of grants. That is the training program of graduate students and young scholars. The underdevelopment of graduate education in Japanese universities and the shortage of capable young scholars in crucially needed areas like Asian studies are mainly due to the careful foresight and planning of personnel requirement in future academic and practical research and studies.

3. The Reward System

Three types of research institutions and two additional ways of organizing research activities have strong and weak points. At least one of most effective criterions to evaluate these organizations is to see how they stimulate good research and discourage bad

research and meet the need of developing new and essential inquiries. However, it is rather difficult to judge what researches are good. An easier way to look at the same question from the view-point of attracting capable research workers. Ragner Frisch once said that good research institutes are the ones with good research workers. In this sense we may examine which of these institutions attract more of outstanding scholars. In a similar sense we may also consider which of these institutions and the two methods can allocate the resources needed for excellent research more effectively to the hands of capable researchers. This is the way of evaluating the reward system in Japanese research institutions to be adopted in this paper.

The incentives for scholars consist of many factors. It is not just the pecuniary remuneration. The main factors to be considered would seem to be the following:

- 1) official salaries,
- 2) opportunities permitted to earn extra incomes,
- 3) research expenses guranteed or easily obtainable,
- 4) social prestige carried with the position,
- 5) free time beyond obligatory works,
- 6) chances of promotion in salary and position,
- 7) stability of position,
- 8) freedom or flexibility in selecting research subjects,
- 9) effective evaluation of research achievement.

Many of these incentives are mutually related and also depend not only the reward system of one institution but also on the surrounding environment of the Japanese academy. Nevertheless, it

would be of some interest to show my personal observations on the relative merits of three types and two methods from the nine points of view listed above. That is Table II.

Table II Evaluation of Reward System of Three Types and Two Methods

	A	B	C	d	e
1. salary	fair 3	fair 2	good 1		
2. extra income	fair 2	good 1	fair 3		
3. research expense	good 1	good 2	fair 3	good	fair
4. social prestige	fair 2	good 1	poor 3	fair	fair
5. free time	fair 2	good 1	poor 3	poor	poor
6. promotion	poor 3	fair 1	fair 2	poor	poor
7. stability	fair 2	good 1	fiar 3		
8. freedom in subject	poor 2	good 1	poor 3	excellent	excellent
9. achievement credit	poor 3	fair 2	fair 1	good	good

Table II would not require much of explanation. Caution is necessary against straight-forward interpretation, because there are many varieties of institutions and different ways with each category of classifications and, needless to say, opinions may differ from my own evaluation. Moreover, so much depends on the actual way of running each institution which is not only institutional but also accidental and historical. In particular, the appointment

of the director and key personnels who have the power of selecting the leading scholars and research staffs who can really guide the research works.

Comparison of existing research institutes' experiences and actual achievements in the field of Asian studies seems to indicate the difficulty of generalizing the observations of a few cases. But still I would maintain with the support of many colleagues that given the institutional framework in Japan at the present time and the most probable administration, university research institutes located at privileged universities are most likely to attract outstanding scholars, so that they are best suited for advanced research activities.*

This does not imply, however, that even the practical or policy-oriented research works cannot be carried out more advantageously by governmental, semi-governmental or private research institutes. I myself should admit that there are many institutions

* The view expressed here may be biased in favor of university institutes, because the author is a university professor and the director of a research institute at Kyoto University. A friend of mine, who holds a responsible position in a large governmental research institute, expressed the opinion based on his own observations that university professors are usually very poor administrators even in guiding a team of researchers and it is exceptional rather than normal for good researchers to be good administrators. Generally speaking I myself tend to agree with this view of a friend of mine. But the necessary number of capable administrators is very small, so that it is important and possible to appoint the exceptionally capable administrators with sufficient knowledge of the scholarly world.

It is important to note that the institutional framework of Japanese research institutions may change in the near future. The Ministry of Education is seriously contemplating to make Japanese universities internationally open. In addition, C type of research institutes and centers are mushrooming and may play much more important role in producing scholarly research and surpass universities at least in policy-oriented researches.

in government ministries and private businesses that have produced more results than university institutes in the same fields. In the field of Asian studies, however, the situation seems to be directed gradually toward specialization in academic research and practical, policy-oriented, data-collecting or -making types of studies.* This specialization seems to create the circumstance in which academically oriented specialists wish to move to universities. There factors 5), 6), 7), 8) and 4) seem to be playing important function.

Factor 9) has two aspects. One is to have the achievement in research recognized within the institute. Another is the recognition in the academic and intellectual circles. Table II considered only the former aspect. The latter aspect is also very important for researchers in any institute. It can be achieved through publication and personal contact. Hence, the incentive in this respect may be subdivided as:

- 1) the chance of publishing the results of research works with the author's name—anonimity is no attraction to confident scholarly researchers,
- 2) accessibility to and association with the well-established

* There are at least two more specializations which can be explored with benefit. One is by areas, and another by major disciplines. In the Japanese context, we badly need at least one sizable research institute on contemporary China as soon as possible and perhaps some institutes on South Asia, West Asia, Africa and Latin America later. Specialization by different groups of specialities is very difficult to draw a dividing line. Perhaps four groupings are possible; languages, humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. Any institute must be built around one or two groups of fields with sufficient emphasis but always specific in the areas to cover; otherwise, the integration of research activities will be extremely difficult and the institute may become an academic apartment house.

scholarly world—personal contact with outstanding scholars by attending national meetings and international conferences or joining in international research teams.

The more spiritual satisfaction can be derived from the achievement in research, the less important the pecuniary and other material incentive will be to attract scholarly personnels into the research institutions. In this sense, the old universities which historically carry a great deal of prestige and has many leading scholars in many fields have a great advantage. The institutes located within or officiated with such universities are very attractive from the view-point of young aspiring scholars who are about to go up the ladder of academic career. As we all know, the reward system of recognition in the academic or intellectual world is biased very much in favor of old prestigious universities. The recognition of new research can be more easily and quickly made if it is done by university professors. This is a very strong attraction of university institutes. The same circumstance, however, makes occasionally the university institutes mere "ivory towers" and deviate unduely from practically significant research. It seems highly desirable, therefore, on the one hand to have a certain reward system for recognizing practical or policy-oriented research and on the other hand to open the way of interchanging personnels among three types of research institutions and at the same time adopt two methods across all the related institutes.

4. Multidisciplinary and Interdisciplinary Research

The last perplexing matter is the methodological problems to

carry out the multidisciplinary and sometimes "interdisciplinary" research works in Asian area studies. This is a new type of research often emphasized in the study of developing countries. Apart from the institutional problems discussed above, there are methodological problems to be considered, and they are closely related to the research administration in all three types of institutions. It must be admitted that the studies of problems in Asian area research along the line of traditional scientific disciplines are undoubtedly very important in themselves but often reach the boundaries of each science very quickly. In order, therefore, to further the analysis, the knowledge of neighboring sciences must be brought in and combined with the science on hand—multidisciplinary—, or sometimes the development of new knowledge in "zwischengebiet" (in-between area) becomes necessary—interdisciplinary.

The basic reasons for the need of new approaches are the insufficient specialization of primitive societies in many parts of Asia and inadequate division of sciences and conceptual frameworks of western sciences to deal with Asian people and societies. A few concrete examples may be in order. A separation of demography from economics is most improper for the study of developing countries. The socio-political process of nation-building must be carefully analyzed along with the process of economic development. Many blunders committed by famous economists in presenting too optimistic forecasts for the future of South and Southeast Asian economies are often due to simple-minded or single-minded application of pure economic analysis. Another example may be the spread of "high-yielding variety" of rice in Southeast Asia. The green revolution

is often studied only by agronomists and agricultural economists, but the study must be supplemented not only by the studies of agricultural engineers but also the ones by anthropologists or political scientists. For the spread of new knowledge is very limited in the "loosely structured society" in Southeast Asia. Unless the characteristics of social organization of such a society are clearly understood, too optimistic policy suggestions are likely to come out.

For these reasons, I believe that the research institutes for Asian area studies at the present stage of our scientific inquiries had better be organized as multidisciplinary research institutes rather than a group of independent institutes organized around single disciplines. A definite advantage of having close contact with each other among different disciplines of scientists is that they can learn the way of thinking, research methods and the established knowledge in neighboring sciences on the kind of problems that they are studying or interested in through informal lunch meetings or seminars. Such discussions would never be possible unless many scientists live together, so to say, in the same institute and feel responsible for the achievement of the institute as a whole. The importance of friendly informal discussions can hardly be exaggerated. The kind of information and preliminary discussions obtainable at the informal talks among colleagues cannot be learnt from publications. The published works are very partial and formalized. In the field of Asian studies where so many problems are still unsettled or even not formulated yet, exchange of various experiences, casual or careful observations in field works and the front knowledge of

related sciences, is essential to pick up some topics for research, tentatively to discuss with scholars in related disciplines, evaluate the relative importance of the topics and examine the possibility of formulating some research problems. In fact, multidisciplinary research can be achieved most successfully when some specific problem can be formulated as a center of common interests of scholars in the related sciences. Such an identification of problems and collaborative effort in formulating the problem is a key to the success of multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary research. This is one of a few advantages of this type of institutes. Before discussing some other advantages, a list of advantages points may be listed:

- (1) easier formulation of problems common to multiple disciplines,
- (2) easier collaboration of junior-senior researchers,
- (3) ready cooperation with matching research programs in other Asian research institutes or government offices.

The concrete cases of success in the sense of (1) may be quoted here. There are two articles already published:

- a. T. Watabe, "The Formation of Glutinous Rice Zone in Thailand," Anthropology, 1970.
- b. H. Fukui, "Environmental Determinants Affecting the Potential Dissemination of High-Yielding Varieties of Rice," The Southeast Asian Studies, December, 1971.

Watabe, professor of agronomy at Kyoto University, succeeded in clarifying the historical changes in the spread of glutinous rice varieties in Thailand by discriminating the various kinds of rice hulls contained in primitive bricks discovered in old temple

buildings in Thailand. The discovery of such bricks was accidentally made and casually told by one of his colleagues, Takaya, geomorphologist at the Research Center for Southeast Asian Studies of Kyoto University, while both researchers were making field works in Thailand. The subsequent working seminars with agronomists, Thai historian, rice taxonomist, geographer suggested a more careful sampling of bricks and resulted in this unique, pioneering work which shed a light on the undocumented part of old Thai history.

Fukui's article is in effect a joint paper by agronomist, geomorphologist, soil scientist, irrigation engineer and economist. The topic was chosen to analyze more carefully the reasons why many experts on Thailand at the Research Center did not share with the common optimism on the spread of IRRI varieties of rice in the Chao Phraya basin of Thailand. This discussion started at the lunch meeting, and a chance of presenting our view on the Green Revolution at an international conference sparked a series of working seminars attended by quite a variety of scientists who had the common interest in the Green Revolution. As a result this unusually interdisciplinary paper was successfully written. It should be emphasized here that cooperation between social scientists and natural scientists is sometimes very important for Asian area studies.*

The importance of collaboration between senior scholars and junior postdoctoral researchers mentioned as (2) is not sufficiently recognized by many scholars as well as the administrators of

* One important interdisciplinary research project has been started at the Kyoto University Research Center for Southeast Asian Studies: "Man and Nature in Tropical Southeast Asia." This project tries to inquire into the interaction between climatic and other natural environment and socio-economic human behavior.

foundations and institutes. So often we encounter junior graduate students sent from some American universities or Japanese research institutes working isolatedly in remote villages in Asia or urban bustling with no effective research guidance which is so badly needed at some crucial points and which they can always get if they are at home universities. There is no doubt that so much time and energy is wasted by maladministration of thesis-writing field works by junior researchers. A well-organized research plan for anthropological studies in field works can be prepared more easily if junior members have the bases to contact at the local centers if possible or write back at least to the home center where various senior scholars can be reached. For this purpose, some research center must be firmly established for certain areas and the local liaison offices better be held. This is why we have the local offices in Bangkok and Djakarta and try to place at least one senior scholar in each office.

In Asian area studies the training period required to be an independent researcher is a few years longer than in the training of Ph.D.'s in ordinary disciplines, firstly because of additional language requirement and secondly because of the need of familiarity with the people and societies so different from home country. To economize the time required for such trainings, constant association with senior scholars with long years of field experiences and frequent visitors from the countries concerned is very effective. This is made easy by being affiliated with the multidisciplinary research center for area studies.

It is essential to keep friendly cooperation with native scholars and universities or institutes whenever possible. The best way is to carry out any research always as joint works with native experts. This can be more easily done when we respond to the demand for certain research or studies in which leadership is native in designing the program. Since many different problems are likely to be proposed by the same leading people in many Asian countries, it is easier to respond to them if the responding institutes are multidisciplinary and can answer many kinds of questions as requested. This aspect is increasingly important to ensure the welcome field works to junior researchers and also against the charge of intellectual or political neo-colonialism. It is also very effective for the training of native junior scholars as well as the junior scholars to be sent into the countries for the first time. The young Ph.D.'s who have just come home often need somewhat more training and experiences to carry out independent research works at their home countries. The international cooperation between academic research institutes seems to offer an excellent opportunity for this purpose.

5. The Size of an Institute

All these considerations seem to imply that the size of such a research institute must be fairly large. But of course the administration becomes more difficult as the size of an institute gets larger. When I made a trip around the world to learn lessons on the administration of multidisciplinary institutes for Asian area studies, almost all the experienced directors of similar institutes warned not to make the size of institute larger than 20 senior

research scholars. According to their advice, the primary reason for this limitation is the enormous burden on the director. The ideal director must combine wide and balanced knowledge of different disciplines and excellent managerial ability. It would be very difficult to find such a director, and moreover, if one is found, it is extremely hard for him to remain excellent for many years. For the scientific knowledge quickly depreciates. The difficulty must be overcome, therefore, by having plural deputy directors who can alternate directorship every two or three years. It remains to be seen, however, if this can be a solution.

If, however, it is admitted that the maximum size is about 20 senior scholars, the institute must have a number of affiliated scholars who participate in the research projects organized at the institute. This means that the institute must adopt the method of research program discussed in section 2 to supplement the research activities done by its own staffs. This arrangement can be made more easily if a multidisciplinary institute is established as a part of large university with many departments and institutes. The difficulty in organizing successful large projects at Institute of Developing Economies and Institute of Asian and African Languages and Cultures can be explained at least partly by the lack of affiliated scholars.

It is necessary, therefore, for institutes with no bases in large universities to find some way of adopting the method of research program as a supplementary measure. It would seem that devices could be made for this purpose. But there is still a disadvantage in this supplementary arrangement; that is, scholars

of different disciplines cannot have the opportunities of informal association unless they are on the same campus. Thus the institutes outside large universities better be more or less specialized in the specific fields of research where multidisciplinary research is only exceptional.