

## A Comparative Study of Research Methodology of Geology and Geophysics(or Seismology)

\*Jun'ichi Chiba<sup>1</sup>

1.0-hara Business College

Jiro Tomari (2008), describing the process of acceptance of the plate tectonics theory into the Japanese circles of earth science, concluded that its acceptance in geology had delayed by 10 years compared to that in (solid-earth) geophysics and seismology. As one of the grounds for the conclusion, he pointed out that an increase in the frequency of use of “plate terms” in the presentations on the Meeting of *the Geological Society of Japan* had occurred 10 years after that in *the Seismological Society of Japan*. On the other hand, Miyoko Shibazaki (2011), citing the concept of “field” proposed by Pierre Bourdieu, criticized that the frequency of use of “plate terms” might differ between the two journals because the “field” differs between geology and (solid-earth) geophysics/seismology, and that the delay of an increase in the frequency of use of “plate terms” could not justify the delay of acceptance of the plate tectonics theory in geology.

In this study, the author discusses what differences in terminology may occur between geology and (solid-earth) geophysics/seismology by comparing methods in geology and those in geophysics/seismology, and explores ways to overcome “incommensurability” lying between researchers in both fields by comparing differences anew between geology and (solid-earth) geophysics/seismology, both studying the same object: the solid earth.

Keywords: Research Methodology, Geology and Geophysics, Plate Tectonics theory