

# Proposal Evaluation Form



## EUROPEAN COMMISSION

7 th Framework Programme for Research

## EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT

**Call :** FP7-PEOPLE-2010-IIF  
**Funding Scheme :** MC-IIF International Incoming Fellowships (IIF)  
**Proposal number :** 275025  
**Proposal acronym :** BETWATE  
**Duration (month) :** 24  
**Proposal title :** Beyond "the West" and "the East": Occidentalism, Orientalism, and Self-Orientalism in Italy-Japan Relations

N.	Proposer name	Country	Type	Total cost (€)	%	Grant requested (€)	%
1	UNIVERSITA CA' FOSCARI VENEZIA	IT					
<b>Total :</b>							

### Abstract :

Since the 1990s, Japan has become the most popular "eastern" country in Italy, while, on the other hand, Italy has turned into the most attractive "western" country in Japan, especially among women and youth.

This research project will investigate the reasons of this reciprocal popularity by focusing on mutual discourses and practices regarding "Japan" and "the East" in Italy, and regarding "Italy" and the "West" in Japan, respectively. It will analyse the most influential intersections of Japan-Italy relations from the late nineteenth century to the present, in relation to issues of national/regional/global identity, culture, and power. In order to map the imagined geography of "Japan" and "Italy" as seen from both sides, historical investigation will be conducted on the genealogy (1860s-1890s), climax (1930s-1940s), and maturation (1960s-1980s) of modern Italy-Japan relations. This will be followed by an ethnographic investigation of the social practices involved in the present popularity of "J-culture" (animation, comics, videogames) in Italy, and of the "Italy boom" (food, fashion, life-style) in Japan. Particular attention will be paid to the renegotiation between new transcultural identity processes on the local level and institutionalised nation-branding of the "Cool Japan" and of the "Made in Italy" in the globalised market.

The inter-disciplinary perspective adopted by this study is aimed at contributing to critical enquiry into the notions of "the West" (Occidentalism) and of "the East" (Orientalism). It will focus on the interrelational, intersectional, and complicit dynamics of mutual perceptions seen in Italy-Japan relations. The final scope is to elaborate an interrelational theory of Occidentalism, Orientalism, and Self-Orientalism, as well as to attest the reproduction or dismissal of its hegemonic relevance, in accordance to the transnational imperatives induced by present regionalism in Europe/Asia and globalization in the world.

### Marie Curie International Incoming Fellowships (IIF)

### SCORING

Scores must be in the range 0-5. Decimal marks may be given.

Interpretation of the score:

0- The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information.

1- Poor. The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

2- Fair. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.

3- Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.

4- Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.

5- Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.

### Criterion 1. S&T QUALITY (award)

(Threshold 3.00/5.00)

Mark: 4.70

**Strengths:**

The proposal is theoretically ambitious and envisages a fully innovative and original approach. It presents a very knowledgeable criticism of theorization and the state of the art in the field. The state of the art is perfectly outlined and the relevant theoretical references are made. The proposal builds on the applicant's preliminary research in the home country. The described research methodology is refined, promising and already highly elaborated; a set of analytical assumptions and hypotheses is presented. The incoming host and the researcher in charge have the relevant expertise in the field of the project.

**Weaknesses:**

The part concerning research in Italy, which is the main objective of the application, is not as detailed as the outline about the Japanese field-site. Section 3 in the description of research methodology is unclear on the issues of how, what, where, when, among whom, and in which realms social uses will be ethnographically observed, of comics, animation and videogame commodities in Italy. The modalities of participant observation concerning the interaction with tourists, immigrants and international marriages are not described in any detail. The proposal promises that the local levels will be addressed, and ethnography is rightfully recognised as the means of achieving this goal. However, the same rigour is not devoted to ethnographic research as to all other segments of the proposal.

**Overall comment:**

The research project is very well presented, with a very precise state of the art. The originality and the timeliness of the project are excellent. The host institution is adequate. The strengths of the proposal outweigh its weakness. This is a theoretically and methodologically advanced project, extremely ambitious, and of high scholarly quality.

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:

- Scientific/technological quality, including any interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary aspects of the proposal.
- Research methodology
- Originality and innovative nature of the project, and relationship to the 'state of the art' of research in the field
- Timeliness and relevance of the project
- Host scientific expertise in the field
- Quality of the group/researchers in charge

Please use the following structure in your comments to this criterion:

- Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):
  - Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):
  - Overall comments:
- (reflecting the relative importance of the strengths and weaknesses above mentioned)  
( copy the text above in the comment box )

**Criterion 2. TRANSFER OF KNOWLEDGE (award)****(Threshold 0.00/5.00)**

Mark: 4.70

Weight: 0.15

**Strengths:**

The project has an extremely high potential of knowledge transfer to the European host and, moreover, to European scholarly contexts. Precise dissemination strategies are outlined. The perspective of transferring knowledge at an international scale is inherent in the chosen topic. The applicant has an intercultural background and former experience in intercultural transfer.

**Weakness:**

The transfer of knowledge is already implemented, since the applicant already has thoroughly established contacts with the host country in general and with the host institution in particular.

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:

- Potential of transferring knowledge to European host and/or bringing knowledge to Europe
- Clarity and quality of the transfer of knowledge objectives

Please use the following structure in your comments to this criterion:

- Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):
  - Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):
  - Overall comments:
- (reflecting the relative importance of the strengths and weaknesses above mentioned)  
( copy the text above in the comment box )

**Criterion 3. RESEARCHER (award)****(Threshold 4.00/5.00)**

Mark: 5.00

**Strengths:**

*The applicant has an excellent track-record and a highly specialised knowledge on Japan and Italy. The applicant is renowned in the field of the proposed project and has substantial and innovative research results. Therefore, the match between the fellow and the proposal is perfect. It is clear that the applicant is capable of sophisticated independent thinking, and has capacity to transfer knowledge, also in light of his fluency in Japanese, Italian, English, and German. The CV also documents leadership qualities.*

**Weaknesses:**

*No relevant weaknesses can be found under this criterion.*

**Overall comment:**

*This is a truly excellent candidate.*

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:

- Research experience
- Research results including patents, publications, teaching etc
- Independent thinking and leadership qualities, and capacity to transfer knowledge
- Match between the fellow's profile and project

Please use the following structure in your comments to this criterion:

- Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):
  - Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):
  - Overall comments:
- (reflecting the relative importance of the strengths and weaknesses above mentioned)  
( copy the text above in the comment box )

**Criterion 4. IMPLEMENTATION (selection) (Threshold 0.00/5.00)**

Mark: 4.80

Weight: 0.15

**Strengths:**

*The information provided shows that the project is feasible. The work plan is presented in detail. The candidate is aware of crucial methodological problems that might arise and therefore foresees measures to overcome them (for example, how to avoid a "separate", not sufficiently "entangled" history of Japanese-Italian relations). The host institution has a broad experience in international collaboration.*

**Weaknesses:**

*The quality of infrastructure at the host institute is vaguely described in relation to this proposal. WP 9 and WP 10 are less credible in the outline of the work plan. The proposal promises that the local levels will be addressed, but the modalities and concrete goals of ethnographic research are not explained in a detailed manner.*

**Overall comment:**

*More rigour needs to be devoted to the ethnographic part of the proposed research.*

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:

- Quality of infrastructure / facilities and International collaborations of host
- Practical arrangements for the implementation and management of the scientific project
- Feasibility and credibility of the project, including work plan
- Practical and administrative arrangements, and support for the hosting of the fellow

Please use the following structure in your comments to this criterion:

- Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):
  - Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):
  - Overall comments:
- (reflecting the relative importance of the strengths and weaknesses above mentioned)  
( copy the text above in the comment box )

**Criterion 5. IMPACT (award) (Threshold 3.50/5.00)**

Mark: 4.50

**Strengths:**

*The project has a high potential for long-term collaborations between the respective institutions and, moreover, for academic and non-academic exchanges between European and Asian stakeholders. The interrelational approach of the project has a high potential in terms of contributing to European excellence and competitiveness.*

*An international agreement on collaboration and student exchange is expected, between the present host institution of the applicant in Japan and the proposed host institution in Italy.*

*The project would contribute to international and cross-disciplinary cooperation within the European Research Area.*

**Weaknesses:**

*The proposed mobility is genuine only in the sense that the applicants need to stay in Italy in order to do field research. Otherwise, it is not a case of genuine mobility, since the fellow has worked in Italian academia for long.*

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:

- Potential for creating long term collaborations and mutually beneficial co-operation between Europe and the third country
- Contribution to European excellence and European Competitiveness
- Benefit of the mobility to the European research area

Please use the following structure in your comments to this criterion:

- Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):
- Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):
- Overall comments:  
(reflecting the relative importance of the strengths and weaknesses above mentioned)  
( copy the text above in the comment box )

### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEGOTIATION AND/OR INDICATORS TO MONITOR PROGRESS OF PROJECT:

*Please observe that the proposed project is excellent, and its completion requires the applicant's stay in Italy. For that reason, it is necessary for the applicant to stay in Italy. However, as exposed on pg.14., this Japanese scholar obtained both his BA (studies 1988-97) and his PhD degree (2000-05) from the same Italian university he now wants to go to by the help of MC scholarship. In 2007-08 he was a Research Fellowship co-funded by the Italian Ministry for Universities and Scientific and Technological Research, again at the same university. In 2003-2008 he was also teaching undergraduate courses at the same university. In sum, he has a 5-year teaching experience at 4 different Italian universities. On the other hand, please observe that he mentions the intention to staying to work in Europe (pg.27). As he is a truly excellent and highly productive scholar, his establishment in Europe would by all means contribute to European excellence and competitiveness in his field of expertise.*

### Ethical Issues

Please answer both questions, even if the first answer is 'No'

Does this proposal raise ethical issues? Please refer to the list of issues in the Ethical Issues Report (EIR)

Yes

Should this proposal be referred to the Ethical Review Panel? If yes, please complete the Ethical Issues Report (EIR) form:

No

### Other Issues

Does the applicant request a return phase in an ICPC (including work plan)?

No

Do you believe that the project is lab-based?

No

Do you believe that the applicant has more than ten years of research experience?

Yes

**TOTAL SCORE** (Threshold 70.00/100.00)

Total: 95.00