

ISSN 1883-1656



Центр Российских Исследований
RRC Working Paper Series No.74

International Presence of the Japanese Study of Russian and East European Economies

Ichiro Iwasaki

April 2018

**RUSSIAN RESEARCH CENTER
THE INSTITUTE OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
HITOTSUBASHI UNIVERSITY
Kunitachi, Tokyo, JAPAN**

RRC Working Paper No. 74
April 2018

International Presence of the Japanese Study of Russian and East European Economies*

Ichiro Iwasaki

Russian Research Center, Institute of Economic Research
Hitotsubashi University

2-1 Naka, Kunitachi City, Tokyo 186-8603, JAPAN

TEL.: +81-42-580-8366 / FAX: +81-42-580-8333

E-mail: iiwasaki@ier.hit-u.ac.jp

Abstract: In this article, I examine the oversea activities of Japanese researchers in the field of Russian and East European economic studies based on objective data and offer several suggestions for improving their presence in the international academic community. The presence of Japanese scholars of Russian and East European economies as measured by the number of relevant articles published in international journals is still marginal at best, despite their high participation rates in academic conferences abroad. This may partly be due to the fact that many Japanese researchers are not effectively utilizing available international resources. Furthermore, although many of the works produced by Japanese experts have important implications in the research field, only a handful of them are submitted to international journals. In this and many other respects, there is still much room for enhancing the international status of the Japanese study of Russian and East European economies.

JEL classification numbers: D22, P20, P30, P51, P21, P31

Keywords: Japanese Study of Russian and East European Economies, Methodological Change, World Congress of Comparative Economics, International Publications

* This paper summarizes my invited lecture at the JSSEES Symposium titled “Slavonic and East European Studies: Where Is Japan Standing Now, and Where Is It Heading?” that was held during the 2017 Joint Research Conference co-hosted by the Japanese Association for Russian and East European Studies and the Japanese Society for Slavic and East European Studies (JSSEES) at Hitotsubashi University on October 22, 2017. I would like to thank Tadayuki Hayashi, the president of the JSSEES, and Takayuki Yokota-Murakami, editor-in-chief of the Japanese Slavic and East European Studies, for the opportunity to speak at the symposium. I would also like to thank Eriko Yoshida for her help with data collection and literature search and Mai Shibata and Tammy Bicket for their editorial assistance.

1 INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the publication of academic research works internationally has been strongly encouraged, not only in the field of natural science but also in the fields of humanities and social sciences. This is due to rapidly growing interest among Japanese policy makers and young researchers in internationally comparing universities and the so-called “impact factors” of publication media. Some experts legitimately point out that these indices are designed to be far more advantageous to universities and other research institutions in Western countries, and that researchers in Japan should, therefore, not be unduly swayed by them. Unfortunately, however, these voices are often muffled in the face of a series of incentives, offered not only by the central government but also by universities, to encourage international publication.

In the humanities and social sciences, the push for internationalization has especially intensified in the field of economics. Indeed, the use of a common theoretical basis and technical terms in economic analysis and the standardization of the methodology and reporting style of empirical studies across countries can greatly facilitate the comparison and qualitative evaluation of studies published by researchers of different nationalities. It is, therefore, quite understandable that world-class research findings produced by researchers in Japan are usually submitted to “international” academic journals based in Western countries for publication. This trend is now beginning to affect a broader spectrum of economists in Japan. In fact, practically every Japanese economist is strongly urged to present his or her research findings to the international community. Researchers studying Russian and East European economies are no different. One might even argue (although it may not be entirely true) that the degree to which research works are published internationally can influence not only competitive relationships with other research fields but also the careers of university faculty members. All things considered, researchers specializing in the study of Russian and East European economies can no longer turn away and pretend that they do not care. They must face today’s reality as every other researcher must do.

As is the case with many other foreign studies undertaken, Japanese scholars have predominantly used narrative and descriptive research methodologies to study Russian and East European economies. This is exactly why Japanese researchers in this field have traditionally found it difficult to find a place to publish their research outcomes in the international arena, where theoretical works or empirical studies that focus on the rigorous verification of theoretical hypotheses based on original data are highly valued. In the 1990s, immediately after the collapse of socialism, there were great opportunities to carry out empirical research in Russia and other East European countries. However, Japanese researchers failed to break away from the conventional research style and, as a result, missed out on a number of valuable research

opportunities, and fell far behind their counterparts in Western countries, in terms of publication in international journals. One could refer to this period as the “lost decade” in Japan. Since the turn of the century, however, things have begun to look brighter.

In a panel session held during the European Association for Comparative Economic Studies (EACES) Conference, which took place in England in September 2012, I delivered an invited lecture demonstrating to researchers from all over the world the international presence of the Russian and East European studies undertaken by Japanese economists during the period from the 2000s to the early 2010s. In this article, I highlight recent developments in this topic and discuss in detail where Japanese researchers now stand and where they are heading, in terms of their international presence in the field of Russian and East European economic studies.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: The next section argues the methodological changes necessary in Japanese studies of Russian and East European Economics to increase the possibility of international publication by Japanese researchers. Section 3 discusses the representation of Japanese researchers in international academic conferences. Section 4 reports the results of a literature survey carried out to identify the number of articles produced by Japanese researchers that have been published in major international journals in the field of Russian and East European economies. Section 5 demonstrates my view about the current status of Japanese researchers of Russian and East European economies in the international community and prospects for improving their status in the future.

2 METHODOLOGICAL CHANGES IN THE JAPANESE STUDY OF RUSSIAN AND EAST EUROPEAN ECONOMIES

This paper first addresses recent changes in the methodology of Russian and East European economic studies in Japan. This topic is closely related to whether research works presented by Japanese researchers are acceptable to the international academic community. As mentioned in the Introduction, economic research methods that are often highly valued by the overwhelming majority of researchers in today’s international academic community can largely be categorized into the following two types: (a) theoretical studies based on highly advanced mathematical models and (b) empirical analyses that utilize statistical and econometric methods. The only exception to this would be studies that focus on the history of economic thoughts or the like. Thus, setting aside the issue of whether this trend has any academic legitimacy at all, it is evident that the international acceptability of research outcomes presented by Japanese scholars of Russian and East European economies is largely determined by the degree to which they adhere to the above research approaches that are accepted worldwide.

During the lecture delivered in the panel session of the EACES 2012 Conference in England, I attempted to highlight the changes in the methodology adopted by Russian and East European Economic studies in Japan by reviewing a total of 237 articles published in a period of 22 years from 1991 to 2012 in the *Japanese Journal of Comparative Economics* issued by the Japan Association for Comparative Economic Studies (JACES). This journal was selected for review because many Japanese experts of Russian and East European economies belong to JACES. The following five types of study methods were identified from the 237 articles reviewed: (a) theoretical study, (b) empirical analysis,¹ (c) review of economic policies and conditions, (d) literature survey, and (e) other. The reviewed articles were divided into those published during the period of 1991–2000 and, for comparison, those published during the period of 2001–2012. The present study performed a follow-up survey of an additional 32 articles published in the same journal during the period of 2013–2017.

The results are summarized in **Figure 1**. Panel (a) of this figure breaks down a total of 269 articles published in the *Japanese Journal of Comparative Economics* by period. During the decade following the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, 66.7% of the articles (88 of 132 articles) published in the journal were either policy reviews or narrative descriptions of economic circumstances, with empirical analyses accounting for only 10% of all articles (13 articles). As mentioned earlier, this finding confirms that, even during the decade in which Central and Eastern Europe and former Soviet Union (CEE/FSU) countries were transitioning to a market economy, Japanese researchers continued to use the orthodox methodologies that had been widely utilized in studies of socialist economies. This is in sharp contrast to the dramatic change in the research style of studies published in Western countries during the same period. From 2001–2012, empirical analyses accounted for 20.0% of all published articles (21 of 105 articles), which is almost double their share during the period of 1991–2000. However, reviews of economic policies and conditions accounted for as many as 60.0% of all published articles (63 articles), which is almost the same as their share during the previous decade. As I reported at the EACES Conference panel session in the UK, although there have been some positive changes, these changes seem to be occurring too slowly.

During the past five years, a generation of socialism researchers have largely been replaced by a new generation of researchers specializing in transition economies. This emerging generation seems much more willing than the preceding generation to change the conventional research style and place greater value on empirical analyses. In fact, as demonstrated by the result of the review

¹ Meta-analysis is incorporated into the category of empirical analysis rather than literature survey because it involves the use of highly advanced statistical and econometric methods.

of literature published during the period of 2013–2017, shown in Panel (a) of **Figure 1**, empirical analyses accounted for 28.1% of the articles (9 of 32 articles) reviewed and published in the *Japanese Journal of Comparative Economics* during the five-year period. As a result, empirical analyses were only 9.4 percentage points behind reviews of economic policies and conditions, in terms of their share of the total number of articles. The share of theoretical studies has also increased from 12.7% (30 of 234 articles) in the 1991–2012 period to 18.8% (6 of 32 articles) in the 2013–2017 period. These are positive changes because they indicate that a greater number of research works presented by Japanese researchers of Russian and East European economies are now making their way into the international academic community.

As shown in Panel (b) of **Figure 1**, which illustrates the breakdown by target region, there is no noticeable change in the studied regions over time. It is probably a welcome fact that Russian and East European economic studies in Japan are not concentrated on certain regions.²

3 THE PRESENCE OF JAPANESE RESEARCHERS IN INTERNATIONAL ACADEMIC CONFERENCES

By considering recent changes in the research methodology adopted by Japanese economists argued in the previous section, this and subsequent sections attempt to measure and evaluate the presence of Japanese studies of Russian and East European economies in the international community. As a first step, this section highlights the activities of Japanese researchers of Russian and East European economies in international academic conferences.

To the best of my knowledge, several opportunities exist for Japanese researchers of Russian and East European economies to present their findings to the international academic community. These opportunities include the aforementioned EACES conference, as well as academic meetings hosted by US-based academic societies such as the Association for Comparative Economic Studies (ACES) and the Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies (ASEEE). Similar opportunities are provided by a world congress organized every five years by the International Council for Central and East European Studies (ICCEES), which is the international umbrella organization for the world's academic groups specializing studying Russia and East European countries. A relatively large number of Japanese scholars in this field also participate in the International Academic Conference on Economic and Social Development, which is held annually in April by the Higher School of Economics (HSE) in Moscow.

² For details about changes in both the methodology adopted by Russian and East European economic studies in Japan and the target regions over a longer period of time, see the JACES editorial board (2014), which reflects on 50 years of the association's activities.

Among these and other international research meetings on Russian and East European economies, one that is of most interest to the Japanese researchers is the World Congress of Comparative Economics, which is co-hosted by the associations for comparative economic studies based in Europe, the USA, Japan, and Korea and the related academic associations and organizations in Italy and China. Marcello Signorelli, the former president of EACES, took the initiative in organizing this congress. Spurred on by the great success of the first congress held in June 2015 in Rome, the second congress was held two years later, in June 2017, in St. Petersburg.³ The second congress was a bit smaller in scale than the first one held in Rome due to the worsened relationship between Russia and the West as a result of the Crimean crisis that broke out in Ukraine. It was, nevertheless, an extremely meaningful opportunity where eminent researchers of Russian and East European economies from all over the world, including Gerald Roland and Josef C. Brada, gathered to present the results of their work.⁴

The participation rate of Japanese researchers in the Second World Congress of Comparative Economics mentioned above can, therefore, be a good proxy for Japan's presence in international academic conferences. Fortunately, HSE in St. Petersburg, the host organization of the congress, created a congress program that listed all registered participants (Higher School of Economics in St. Petersburg, 2017, pp. 60–65). I counted the total number of researchers listed in the program and then also counted the number of Japanese researchers, Korean researchers, and Chinese researchers.

According to the breakdown of participants, as illustrated in **Figure 2**, a total of 372 researchers registered as participants in the congress, the majority of whom specialized in Russian and East European Economies. Japanese researchers accounted for 7.3% (27 persons) of them. Their participation rate was much higher than those of Korean (4.3%, 16 persons) and Chinese (3.0%, 11 persons) researchers. In fact, Japan had the largest presence among Asian countries. Although, quite naturally, the majority of participants were from Russia, the participation rate of Japanese scholars was comparable to those of researchers from the US and major European countries. This finding is in agreement with what I have witnessed during the series of regular EACES conferences in the past. In other words, during EACES bi-annual conferences held in various European cities, I have always felt that Japanese researchers play a significant part in the success of the conference, and the data shown in **Figure 2** seem to confirm that intuition.

Based on these recent developments, and taking into account the number of Japanese

³ The third congress is scheduled to be held in Seoul in 2022 and will be hosted by the Korean Association for Comparative Economics Studies (KACES).

⁴ Detailed information about the congress is provided on the website of the Higher School of Economics in St. Petersburg, which hosted the event (<https://spb.hse.ru/en/comecon/>).

researchers attending the Second World Congress of Comparative Economics in St. Petersburg, it is probably safe to assume that Japanese experts studying Russian and East European economies have a considerable presence in international academic conferences. The success of the aforementioned ICCEES World Congress held at Kanda University of International Studies in the Makuhari area of Chiba City in 2015 could have also contributed substantially to the improved presence of Japanese researchers in the field of Russian and East European studies.⁵ Further efforts are needed to maintain and improve the Japanese presence in international academic conferences.

4 THE PRESENCE OF JAPANESE RESEARCH WORKS IN INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS

As described in the previous section, the active involvement of Japanese researchers in international conferences and other academic meetings in the field of Russian and East European economies is highly commendable. However, in order for that presence to be maintained in the international community, Japanese scholars must actively publish their research works abroad. Thus, this section will attempt to identify the international presence of Japanese researchers by focusing on the articles they have published in international journals committed to Russian and East European economic studies.

To this end, I estimated the number of articles produced Japanese researchers that have been published in major international journals in the field of Russian and East European economies. More concretely, I selected a total of 20 peer-reviewed journals published in English and calculated the total number articles contained in 523 issues of these journals published during a period of five years and nine months from January 2012 to September 2017. I then counted the number of research works on studies of CEE/FSU countries (including Central Asian countries) in which named authors included Japanese researchers.

The survey results are summarized in **Table 2**. As can be seen, the 20 scientific journals mentioned above published a total of 4,095 articles during the survey period. The average number of articles published per issue was 7.8, with the median, standard deviation, maximum number, and minimum number being 7, 3.9, 26, and 2, respectively. Of the 4,095 articles, 31 satisfy the above-mentioned definition of articles written by Japanese researchers. Thus, the share of articles by Japanese researchers published in all journals would be 0.76%. Because the total number of researchers specializing in the study of Russian and East European economies in the world or in

⁵ For details about the ICCEES congress held in Makuhari, see the special website of the World Congress at <https://www.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/makuhari2015/index.html>.

Japan is unknown, there is no objective way of evaluating whether the share of 0.76% is close to or far away from the actual proportion of Japanese economists to the total number of researchers in this study field. The publication rate of 0.76%, however, obviously pales in comparison to the presence of Japanese scholars in academic conferences described in the previous section.

The 31 articles listed in **Table 2** clearly were produced by a very limited number of Japanese researchers. For example, five Japanese researchers, namely, Shigeki Ohno (Asahikawa University), Masaaki Kuboniwa (Professor Emeritus of Hitotsubashi University), Kazuhiro Kumo (Hitotsubashi University), Shinichiro Tabata (Hokkaido University), and this author published two or more articles in the 20 journals, which totaled 16 articles, accounting for 51.6% of all articles written by Japanese researchers. These five researchers are all members of JACES. According to the 2017 budget document produced by JACES, there were a total of 242 association members as of May 31, 2017. This means that almost half of all articles written by Japanese researchers and published in representative international journals in the field of Russian and East European economic studies have been produced by only 2.1% of JACES members. **Figure 3** displays the breakdown of articles written by Japanese experts by publication year and their share of all articles published. As shown in this figure, neither of these indicators demonstrates an increasing trend in the number of articles by Japanese researchers over the years. This may not be completely unrelated to the fact that only a handful of Japanese scholars are contributing their research findings to international journals.

It is lamentable that there are still only a small number of researchers who are active in the international academic community today. Despite recent efforts made by the Ministry of Education and Sciences, as well as by research institutions in Japan, to encourage more Japanese researchers to contribute their research outcomes to international academia, the overwhelming majority of Japanese researchers specializing in the Russian and East European economic studies have been unable to meet the demands of the time. This problem can be a huge barrier to maintaining regular posts in this field at universities and other institutions. However, from another perspective, one can say that there is still much room for enhancing the international presence of Japanese researchers in the field of Russian and East European economic studies.

The following two facts support the above arguments. First, Japanese researchers of Russian and Eastern European economies have not been able to fully utilize the framework of international scientific journals. As shown in **Figure 4**, which depicts the share of the total number of published journal articles authored by Japanese economists, eight of 20 journals, which included some of the prominent journals in the field of economics, such as *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade*, *Economics of Transition*, and *Post-Soviet Affairs* (the former *Soviet Economy*), did not publish any articles by Japanese researchers during the past five years and nine months. This, of course,

does not necessarily mean that no Japanese researcher has ever submitted an article to these journals, because it is possible that submissions from Japan have been rejected after peer review. However, the fact that no papers produced by Japanese economists have ever appeared in the above eight journals clearly suggests a paucity of submissions from Japan. Encouraging Japanese experts to utilize available overseas resources is key to improving their presence in the international community.

Second, it is strongly suspected that many research works produced by Japanese scholars that could have easily made it through the peer review process of international journals never got submitted for publication. **Table 3**, which shows the breakdown of articles written by Japanese researchers by journal grade and their share of all published articles, strongly supports this possibility. As shown in this table, while 31 articles written by Japanese researchers were published in some of the 20 journals listed in **Table 1**, as many as 19 (61.3%) of them were concentrated in journals listed as either Grade I or Grade II. The top Grade I scientific journals that published articles submitted from Japanese researchers include *Europe-Asia Studies* (the former *Soviet Studies*), which is the most prestigious journal of Soviet studies, *Emerging Markets Review*, which is regarded as a top journal in the field of emerging market economies because of its outstanding impact factor,⁶ and *Journal of Comparative Economics*, which is the flagship journal of ACES; Grade II journals include *Comparative Economic Studies*, *Economic Change and Restructuring* (the former *Economics of Planning*), and *Economic Systems*.

The above finding suggests that articles worked on by Japanese researchers not only tend to be concentrated in a limited number of journals but also are more likely to be published in higher-grade journals, as shown in **Table 3**. Considering the fact that high-ranked international journals are more likely than less prestigious ones to reject submissions, if we assume that articles of various quality levels written by Japanese researchers are evenly distributed across the 20 journals, the share of all published articles written by Japanese authors will probably show a negative correlation with the grade of the journals or will be more or less the same across grades. However, the truth is that the share of articles written by Japanese researchers neither shows a negative correlation with the grade of the journals nor is the same across grades. This could be evidence that many more Japanese research works could have made it through the peer review process if the authors had only submitted their articles for consideration by international journals. From this standpoint, I conjecture that many of Japanese researchers studying Russian and Eastern European economies may not have been able to fully demonstrate their true capability to the international

⁶ *Emerging Markets Review* had an impact factor of 2.065 in 2016 (or a five-year impact factor of 2.669).

academic community.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In the fields of the humanities and social sciences, the drift toward internationalization is particularly impressive in economics. For this reason, Japanese economic scholars are under ever-increasing pressure to present their research works abroad. Although in the 1990s, the end of the Cold War led to increased opportunities to carry out more field work and empirical research in CEE and FSU countries, most Japanese researchers failed to break away from the conventional research style and, as a result, fell far behind their counterparts in Western countries. Since the turn of the century, however, things have slowly begun to look brighter. In fact, the share of empirical analyses in all articles published in the *Japanese Journal of Comparative Economics* issued by JACES has been gradually but steadily increasing in recent years.

I suspect that Japanese researchers of Russian and East European economies are extremely positive about participating in international conferences. This instinct was confirmed by the significant involvement of Japanese researchers in the Second World Congress of Comparative Economics held in St. Petersburg in June 2017. The participation rate of Japanese scholars was, in fact, comparable to those of researchers from Western countries. However, the presence of Japanese researchers in international academia as measured by the number of articles published in international journals is still marginal at best, despite their eagerness to present their work at international conferences and other academic meetings. In fact, the share of articles authored by Japanese researchers accounted for less than 1% in major international journals in the field of Russian and East European economies during the period of 2012–2017.

The breakdown of articles contributed by Japanese researchers to surveyed journals shows that Japanese tend to submit their articles to only a limited number of journals. In other words, although many of the surveyed journals are highly rated in the field, Japanese researchers are not taking full advantage of these media to present their work internationally. Furthermore, contrary to my expectation, the share of works with the names of Japanese economists to all published articles was positively correlated with the grade of the journals in question. These findings imply that, if Japanese researchers would actively utilize untapped channels of publication, the number of articles produced by Japanese researchers and published in international journals can increase substantially in the future. If an article publication rate of 7.3%, which is equal to the participation rate of Japanese researchers in the Second World Congress of Comparative Economics, is to be achieved, Japanese researchers must publish a total of 299 articles in the 20 surveyed journals. If this is to be accomplished by the 242 JACES members, each must submit 1.24 articles for

publication. Considering the actual capability of Japanese researchers, meeting this goal seems far from unrealistic.

Needless to say, participation in international conferences and the publication of articles in international journals are not the only ways to present the research produced by Japanese scholars to the international community. Further increasing international awareness of journals published in a Western language by Japanese research institutions or associations such as *Acta Slavica Iaponica*, *Journal of Comparative Economic Studies*, and *Japanese Slavic and East European Studies* is also very important, in this respect. It would also be a good idea to hold more international conferences in Japan, where researchers from inside and outside the country can meet. Another effective measure would be for JACES and the Japanese Association for Russian and East European Studies to collaborate with their partner associations overseas to jointly host research workshops inside and outside the country.

In conclusion, there is still much room for enhancing the international presence of Japanese researchers in the study field of Russian and East European economies. Further efforts are necessary to improve the situation.

REFERENCES


- Gill, Indermit S., Naotaka Sugawara and Juan Zalduendo (2014) The center still holds: Financial integration in the Euro Area, *Comparative Economic Studies* 56(3), pp. 351–375.
- Grill, Tunde Veronika, Mohan Pyari Maharjan and Tomoki Sekiguchi (2016) Human resource management of Japanese companies in Hungary: How do Japanese and Hungarian styles blend? *Journal of East-West Business* 22(3), pp.145–167.
- Higher School of Economics in St. Petersburg (2017) *The Second World Congress of Comparative Economics: Revolution and Evolution in Economic Development 1917–2017* (Congress Program), Higher School of Economics in St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg.
- Hiwatari, Masato (2016) Social networks and migration decisions: The influence of peer effects in rural households in Central Asia, *Journal of Comparative Economics* 44(4), pp. 1115–1131.
- Ilmakunnas, Pekka, and Tatsuyoshi Miyakoshi (2013) What are the drivers of TFP in the aging economy? Aging labor and ICT capital, *Journal of Comparative Economics* 41(2), pp. 201–211.
- Ito, Hiroyuki, Robert N. McCauley and Tracy Chan (2015) Currency composition of reserves, trade invoicing and currency movements, *Emerging Markets Review* 25, pp.16–29.
- Iwasaki, Ichiro (2013) Firm-level determinants of board system choice: Evidence from Russia, *Comparative Economic Studies* 55(4), pp. 636–671.
- Iwasaki, Ichiro (2014) Global financial crisis, corporate governance, and firm survival: The Russian experience, *Journal of Comparative Economics* 42(1), pp. 178–211.
- Iwasaki, Ichiro, Mathilde Maurel and Bogdan Meunier (2016) Firm entry and exit during a crisis period: Evidence from Russian regions, *Russian Journal of Economics* 2(2), pp.162–191.

- Iwasaki, Ichiro, and Keiko Suganuma (2015) Foreign direct investment and regional economic development in Russia: An econometric assessment, *Economic Change and Restructuring* 48(3/4), pp. 209–255.
- Iwasaki, Ichiro, and Masahiro Tokunaga (2016) Technology transfer and spillovers from FDI in transition economies: A meta-analysis, *Journal of Comparative Economics* 44(4), pp. 1086–1114.
- Iwasaki, Ichiro, and Akira Uegaki (2017) Central bank independence and inflation in transition economies: A comparative meta-analysis with developed and developing economies, *Eastern European Economics* 55(3), pp. 197–235.
- JACES editorial board (2014) Comparative economic studies undertaken in Japan in the last half-century: Looking back on the 50 issues of the JACES journal, *Japanese Journal of Comparative Economics* 51(1), pp. 1–16. (in Japanese)
- Konno, Yugo (2016) Evaluating Russia's trade patterns, *Post-Communist Economies* 28(3), pp. 300–313.
- Kravchenko, Zhanna, Andrew Stickley and Ai Koyanagi (2015) Close relationships matter: Family well-being and its effects on health in Russia, *Europe-Asia Studies* 67(10), pp.1635–1655.
- Kuboniwa, Masaaki (2012) Diagnosing the “Russian Disease”: Growth and structure of the Russian economy, *Comparative Economic Studies* 54(1), pp. 121–148.
- Kuboniwa, Masaaki (2014) A comparative analysis of the impact of oil prices on oil-rich emerging economies in the Pacific Rim, *Journal of Comparative Economics* 42(2), pp. 328–339.
- Kuboniwa, Masaaki (2015) Russia's global value chain using modified world input-output data, *Eastern European Economics* 53(4), pp. 277–308.
- Kumo, Kazuhiro (2012) Tajik labour migrants and their remittances: Is Tajik migration pro-poor? *Post-Communist Economies* 24(1), pp. 87–109.
- Kumo, Kazuhiro (2016) Research on poverty in transition economies: A meta-analysis on changes in the determinants of poverty, *Transition Studies Review* 23(1), pp. 37–59.
- Kuromiya, Hiroaki (2014) Stalin's great terror and the Asian nexus, *Europe-Asia Studies* 66(5), pp. 775–793.
- Miyajima, Ken, M. S. Mohanty and Tracy Chan (2015) Emerging market local currency bonds: Diversification and stability, *Emerging Markets Review* 22, pp.126–139.
- Munir, Qaiser, Kok Sook Ching, Fumitaka Furuoka and Hanafiah Harvey (2015) Testing for unemployment hysteresis in selected transition economies, *Transition Studies Review* 22(1), pp. 103–120.
- Nagano, Mamoru (2016) The bank-firm relationship during economic transition: The impacts on bank performance in emerging economies, *Emerging Markets Review* 28, pp. 117–139.
- Ono, Shigeki (2012) Financial development and economic growth: Evidence from Russia, *Europe-Asia Studies* 64(2), pp. 247–256.
- Ono, Shigeki (2013) The effects of foreign exchange and monetary policies in Russia, *Economic Systems* 37(4), pp. 522–541.
- Sato, Keiji (2014) Acknowledgement of the secret protocol of the German-Soviet non-aggression pact and the declaration of state sovereignty by the union republics of the USSR, *Europe-Asia Studies* 66(7), pp.1146–1164.


- Tabata, Shinichiro (2012a) Observations on Russian exposure to the Dutch disease, *Eurasian Geography and Economics* 53(2), pp. 231–243.
- Tabata, Shinichiro (2012b) The booming Russo-Japanese economic relations, *Eurasian Geography and Economics* 53(4), pp. 422–441.
- Tabata, Shinichiro (2016) Factors underlying inflation in Russia 2000–2015, *Eurasian Geography and Economics* 57(6), pp. 727–744.
- Tahara, Fumiki (2013) Principal, agent or bystander? Governance and leadership in Chinese and Russian villages, *Europe-Asia Studies* 65(1), pp. 75–101.
- Toyofuku, Kenta (2013) Stability or restructuring? Macroeconomic dynamics under soft budget constraint problems, *Economic Systems* 37(4), pp. 625–649.
- Yang, Li, and Shigeyuki Hamori (2013) EU accession, financial integration, and contagion effects: Dynamic correlation analysis of CEEC-3 bond markets, *Transition Studies Review* 20(2), pp. 179–189.

Figure 1. Breakdown of articles published in the Japanese Journal of Comparative Economics in 1991-2017 by methodology and target region

(a) Breakdown by methodology




(b) Breakdown by target region



Note: The total number differs between the breakdown by methodology and that by studied region because, in the latter case, some articles addressed multiple regions and were therefore counted more than once.
 Source: Illustrated by the author based on JACES editorial board (2014) and the website of Japanese Journal of Comparative Economics (<https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/browse/jjce/-char/ja/>)

Figure 2. Breakdown of registered participants in the 2nd World Congress of Comparative Economics by country



Source: Illustrated by the author based on Higher School of Economics in St. Petersburg (2017, pp. 60-65)

Table 1. List of surveyed journals

Journal name (abbreviation)	Journal name (official name)	Publisher	Surveyed issues		
			From	To	Total number of issues
CER	<i>Comparative Economic Research</i>	De Gruyter	Mar 2012	Jun 2017	23
CES	<i>Comparative Economic Studies</i>	Palgrave Macmillan	Mar 2012	Jun 2012	22
CPCS	<i>Communism and Post-Communism Studies</i> (formerly <i>Studies in Comparative Communism</i>)	Elsevier	Mar-Jun 2012	Jun 2017	18
EAS	<i>Europe-Asia Studies</i> (formerly <i>Soviet Studies</i>)	Taylor & Francis	Iss. 1 2012	Iss. 6 2017	56
ECR	<i>Economic Change and Restructuring</i> (formerly <i>Economics of Planning</i>)	Springer	Feb 2012	Aug 2017	20
EEE	<i>Eastern European Economics</i> (formerly <i>Journal of Communist Studies</i>)	Taylor & Francis	Iss. 1 2012	Iss. 4 2017	34
EEP	<i>East European Politics</i>	Taylor & Francis	Iss. 1 2012	Iss. 3 2017	23
EGE	<i>Eurasian Geography and Economics</i> (formerly <i>Soviet Geography</i>)	Taylor & Francis	Iss. 1 2012	Iss. 3 2017	31
EJCE	<i>European Journal of Comparative Economics</i>	Università Carlo Cattaneo	Iss. 1 2012	Iss. 2 2016	10
EMFT	<i>Emerging Markets Finance and Trade</i>	Taylor & Francis	Iss. 1 2012	Iss. 10 2017	67
EMR	<i>Emerging Markets Review</i>	Elsevier	Mar 2012	Jun 2017	22
ES	<i>Economic Systems</i>	Elsevier	Mar 2012	Jun 2017	22
ET	<i>Economics of Transition</i>	Wiley	Jan 2012	Apr 2017	22
JCE	<i>Journal of Comparative Economics</i>	Elsevier	Feb 2012	May 2017	22
JEWB	<i>Journal of East-West Business</i>	Taylor & Francis	Iss. 1 2012	Iss. 2 2017	21
PCE	<i>Post-Communist Economies</i> (formerly <i>Communist Economies</i>)	Taylor & Francis	Iss. 1 2012	Iss. 3 2017	23
PPC	<i>Problems of Post-Communism</i>	Taylor & Francis	Iss. 1 2012	Iss. 3/4 2017	32
PSA	<i>Post-Soviet Affairs</i> (formerly <i>Soviet Economy</i>)	Taylor & Francis	Iss. 1 2012	Iss. 5 2017	32
RJE	<i>Russian Journal of Economics</i>	Elsevier	Mar 2015	Jun 2017	10
TSR	<i>Transition Studies Review</i>	Transition Academia Press	Iss. 1 2012	Iss. 2 2016	13

Table 2. Number of articles written by Japanese researchers that have been published in 20 major journals in the field of Russian and East European economic studies during 2012 - 2017 ^a


Journal name ^b	Number of articles written by Japanese researchers							Authors and publication years	Total number of published articles	Share of articles written by Japanese researchers in all published articles (%)
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total			
CER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		216	0.00
CES	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	Kuboniwa (2012), Iwasaki (2013), Gill et al. (2014)	182	1.65
CPCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		192	0.00
EAS	1	1	2	1	0	0	5	Ono (2012), Tahara (2013), Kuromiya (2014), Sato (2014), Kravchenko et al. (2015)	404	1.24
ECR	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	Iwasaki and Suganuma (2015)	85	1.18
EEE	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	Kuboniwa (2015), Iwasaki and Uegaki (2017)	147	1.36
EEP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		160	0.00
EGE	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	Tabata (2012a), Tabata (2012b), Tabata (2016)	202	1.49
EJCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		53	0.00
EMFT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		801	0.00
EMR	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	Ito et al. (2015), Miyajima et al. (2015), Nagano (2016)	228	1.32
ES	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	Ono (2013), Toyofuku (2013)	237	0.84
ET	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		140	0.00
JCE	0	1	2	0	2	0	5	Ilmakunnas and Miyakoshi (2013), Iwasaki (2014), Kuboniwa (2014), Hiwatari (2016), Iwasaki and Tokunaga (2016)	331	1.51
JEWB	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	Grill et al. (2016)	74	1.35
PCE	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	Kumo (2012), Konno (2016)	178	1.12
PPC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		162	0.00
PSA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		126	0.00
RJE	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	Iwasaki et al. (2016)	50	2.00
TSR	0	1	0	1	1	0	3	Yang and Hamori (2013), Munir et al. (2015), Kumo (2016)	127	2.36
Total	5	6	5	6	8	1	31		4095	0.76

Notes: ^a These articles include those co-authored with researchers from other countries. The number shown for 2017 refers to the number of articles contained in issues published until the end of September 2017.

^b See Table 1 for details about each journal.


Source: Data and documents disclosed on the websites of respective journals.

Figure 3. Breakdown of articles written by Japanese researchers by publication year and the share of them in all published articles in 2012-2017



Source: Author's illustration based on data provided in Table 2. See Table 1 for details about each journal.

Figure 4. Breakdown of articles written by Japanese researchers by journal and the share of them in all published articles in 2012-2017



Source: Author's illustration based on data provided in Table 2. See Table 1 for details about each journal.

Table 3. Breakdown of articles written by Japanese researchers by journal grade and the share of them in all published articles in 2012-2017

Journal grade (journal names)	Number of articles written by Japanese researchers	Total number of published articles	Share of articles written by Japanese researchers in all published articles (%)
Grade I (EAS, EMR, JCE, PSA)	13	1089	1.19
Grade II (CES, ECR, ET, ES)	6	644	0.93
Grade III (EGE, EJCE, EMFT, PCE)	5	1234	0.41
Grade IV (CPCE, EEE, JEWB, PPC)	3	575	0.52
Grade V (CER, EEP, TSR, RJE)	4	553	0.72
Total number of articles published in all 20 journals	31	4095	0.76

Source: Based on data provided in Table 2. See Table 1 for details about each journal.