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ABSTRACT

Purpose and Outcomes

Although this dissertation deals with events that took place years ago, it is more than an historical study. And even though it investigates an effort to change English language teaching (ELT) in Japan, it is not an attempt to prescribe a solution for Japan's ELT "problem." Rather, through an investigation and description of the campaign conducted by the English Language Exploratory Committee (ELEC) to reform English language teaching practices in Japan, this study addresses the much larger question and more universally applicable issue of how internationally oriented reformers of educational systems and practices can bring about change and deal with the resistances to it. Its major purpose is to reveal and illustrate the challenges inherent in the process of creating cross-cultural, directed contact change in educational institutions and practices. The most important outcomes of this research are a greater awareness and more accurate perception of the innovation-implementation process, the various factors that influence the success of reform efforts, and the constraints within which reformers operate.

To accomplish this purpose, and to analyze the English Language Exploratory Committee's reform campaign, this study develops a hybrid diffusion-of-innovations model which, in and of itself, is an equally important outcome. Because the model is abstract in nature and general in its applicability, it can be used to plan and/or analyze other reform efforts. Likewise, because many of the problems the ELEC reformers encountered are far from unique, a knowledge of the ELEC case can be of benefit to those who attempt to create change—not just in ELT in Japan but in other educational endeavors and settings also.

Thesis

Creating an innovation is not the same as bringing about change, and carrying out a "revolution" involves much more than coming up with a new idea. Innovation alone is
seldom sufficient, nor is merely communicating the innovation to the appropriate audience adequate. Successful, directed contact change requires both a careful analysis of the target setting, which takes into account the potential barriers to change, and an appropriate implementation strategy to overcome them. Without the proper co-incidence of critical facilitating factors, change takes place slowly or not at all.

Method

A historical case-study approach is employed to reveal and illustrate the above points. The particular case studied is the attempt by the Rockefeller-funded English Language Exploratory Committee to reform ELT methods in Japan by introducing Charles C. Fries' Oral Approach. Sources of data include interviews in Japan with people acquainted with the ELEC effort ("insiders" as well as "outsiders"), interviews with colleagues of Fries in the United States, Fries' correspondence relative to his work in Japan, Rockefeller Foundation documents regarding the ELEC operation, and published accounts about ELEC and C. C. Fries in Japan. In keeping with the nature of this data and the study itself, a qualitative analysis is employed.

Summary of Chapters

Chapter one introduces the study and explains its intended outcome. It makes a case for the study of the diffusion and implementation of innovations—in formal education generally, in foreign-language teaching, in English-language teaching, cross-culturally, and in Japanese ELT. While many studies have dealt with the diffusion of innovations generally or with curriculum development in education, relatively few have been done which not only combine these focuses but also narrow them to the field of English language teaching. Furthermore, despite the importance of English language teaching in Japan and the frequency of attempts to reform that system, no studies dealing with this specialized area have been reported.

Chapter two provides background and a chronological overview of the ELEC effort in Japan. It explains John D. Rockefeller 3rd's interest in and support for reforming ELT
in Japan. It also provides background on Charles C. Fries and his Oral Approach to ELT. The major portion of this chapter is devoted to a chronological overview of ELEC-related events. The story of ELEC is traced, beginning with the early exploratory phase and going on to the establishment of the the English Language Exploratory Committee, the first ELEC Specialists' Conference, and the involvement of Charles C. Fries in ELEC's campaign to reform ELT in Japan. Apart from Fries' involvement, ELEC's activities in producing textbooks, re-training English teachers, and establishing its English Language Institute are also discussed. Eventually, ELEC was incorporated as the English Language Education Council, and with Rockefeller help, it constructed its own building. Nevertheless, even though (and perhaps because) it had achieved stability, ELEC began to lose momentum, and Rockefeller (and Ford Foundation) support eventually shifted to other organizations for improving English language teaching in Japan.

Nevertheless, a chronological account does not lead to the conclusions which can make the ELEC story truly useful. For that, an analysis of the ELEC experience is necessary, and chapter three presents the model and framework used for conducting this analysis. Various perspectives on change and models for explaining diffusion-of-innovations phenomena are covered in this chapter, as well as the criteria for an adequate analytical model, leading to a discussion of Rogers and Shoemaker's paradigm of the innovation-decision process. This paradigm—supplemented with Havelock's "barrier factors," Richards' "secret life" factors, as well as a few others—forms the "hybrid" model/framework used in subsequent chapters to analyze the ELEC effort in Japan. The remainder of the chapter is devoted to a discussion of the model, emphasizing several dozen factors that encourage/discourage change. These are grouped into four general categories: characteristics of the innovation itself, characteristics of the resource system, characteristics of the user system, and inter-elemental factors.

Since the first major element in the analytical model is antecedents, chapter four discusses the historical development of various characteristics of the Japanese ELT system, which ELEC attempted to change, and notes the historical basis of particular pedagogical traditions in foreign language teaching in Japan. Some of these characteristics date back over a thousand years, to the time when Japan's first contacts
with the outside world led to the study of Chinese as a foreign language. Others
developed later, some as recently as the post-WWII Occupation of Japan and the "reverse
course" years which followed it (and immediately preceded the ELEC effort).

Chapter five combines the chronological and analytical perspectives of the previous
chapters and uses the "hybrid" model as a framework for analyzing the ELEC effort to
reform Japanese ELT by implementing C. C. Fries' Oral Approach. In this way, it
investigates the role played by a number of critical facilitating/inhibiting
factors—characteristics of the Oral Approach itself, of the ELEC resource system, and the
Japanese ELT user system, as well as various inter-elemental factors—which affected the
outcome of the ELEC effort.

The final chapter summarizes the previous five and arrives at a number of
conclusions regarding the usefulness of a diffusion-of-innovations perspective in general
and, more particularly, of the analytical model developed for this study. It also notes the
limitations of this study and makes recommendations—both for researchers and for
would-be reformers.
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PREFACE

Before this dissertation formally begins, some explanation regarding the use of terminology in several areas is appropriate.

The first area is names—family and given. Since the normal Japanese pattern is to place the family name first and the English pattern is to place it last, a problem arises when Japanese names are used in English. There is no hard and fast rule in this regard. When writing Japanese names in English, some authors preserve the Japanese order while others reverse the family and given names to make them follow the Western pattern. For the sake of consistency, however, throughout this dissertation the Western pattern has been followed. The only exceptions are in direct quotations, where the order used by the original author has been preserved.

In recognition of the fact that learning does not always take place in a formal, school context, many scholars make an important distinction between the terms *schooling* and *education*. This distinction is especially important in language learning. In many settings, where the target language is used by the majority of the members of the community in which the learner finds himself, the amount of out-of-school learning of that language may be much greater than what takes place in the classroom. In other settings, however, the foreign-language classroom may be the only place where students use the target language. Nevertheless, since this schooling-education distinction is not critical to the thesis of this study (and because many of the authors quoted do not make it), it is generally ignored in this dissertation. In addition, using *schooling* and *education* interchangeably often makes for better style as it allows for variety in writing.

In the same vein, another crucial distinction, between English as a *second* language (ESL) and English as a *foreign* language (EFL), is often made by those who work in this field. Although there are several differences between EFL and ESL teaching, the major one has to do with the extent to which students encounter and use English outside the classroom. When that use is considerable, then students are said to be learning ESL. When it is minimal and English is merely a school subject (as is most often the case in Japan), students are considered to be learning English as a *foreign* language. When this
distinction is not important or desired, however, the most commonly used cover term (in the United States and areas within its sphere of influence) for both ESL and EFL is *English to speakers of other languages* (ESOL). In the United Kingdom (and wherever the influence of the British Council is felt), however, the preferred cover term is *English language teaching* (ELT). In this dissertation, for the sake of stylistic variation and to preserve authors' original words in quotations, all of these terms are used. Starting with the title, however, the term *English language teaching* is used most often. This preference for ELT is due to its worldwide usage and its stylistic superiority, and not to any intention to distinguish between ESOL and ELT or between EFL and ELT.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"The assumption is that a much greater development would be found...in the adoption of [an] almost revolutionized system of teaching of English."1

"My understanding is that the necessary improvement in the [English] teaching system would require almost revolutionary change."2

Revolution is a strong word, especially in tradition-bound Japan, particularly at a time when that country had only recently been released from the yoke of the Allied Occupation. Yet, as the lines above reveal, the planners of the first conference of the English Language Exploratory Committee (ELEC) in 1956 spoke of revolutionizing the Japanese English-language-teaching (ELT) system. This dissertation is the result of an investigation and analysis of their attempts to bring about a grand, revolutionary change in the way English was taught in Japan.

Formed in the early 1950's under the impetus of John D. Rockefeller 3rd, ELEC energetically propagated Charles C. Fries' Oral Approach throughout Japan for over a decade. In this effort to reform the teaching of English in Japan, ELEC experts provided training to thousands of Japanese teachers of English and produced and published a special set of Oral Approach textbooks for use in that country. At ELEC's invitation, between 1956 and 1959, Professor Fries himself made annual visits to Japan, working
with the ELEC staff, writing materials, and traveling the length and breadth of the nation on lecture tours. Nevertheless, in contrast with its widespread influence in the United States during the previous decade, Fries' Oral Approach encountered considerable resistance in Japan. Even Rockefeller's staff eventually recognized that "ELEC failed to achieve its main objective... ELEC was not able to change the grand strategy of English-language teaching in Japan or to bring overall improvement in teaching methods."³

**Intended Outcomes of this Study**

Numerous would-be reformers in Japan today could tell a similar tale of woe, and their experiences are by no means unique. They have much in common with the experiences of crusading educational reformers (in English language teaching and other fields) elsewhere in the world.

For this reason, the story of ELEC's attempt to change the methods and materials used for teaching English in Japan nearly thirty years ago is of more than historical interest. It reveals and illustrates the challenges inherent in the process of creating change—a process in which educators always seem to be involved. Consequently, while this study brings to light much information about the experiences of Charles C. Fries and his ELEC colleagues in Japan, that is not its major purpose. Neither is its purpose to prescribe a solution for the ELT "problem" in Japan.

Rather, through an investigation and description of the English Language Exploratory Committee's campaign to change English language teaching practices in Japan, this dissertation addresses the much larger question and more universally applicable issue of how internationally oriented reformers of educational systems and practices can create change and deal with the resistances to it. The most important outcomes of this research may be a greater awareness and more accurate perception of the innovation-implementation process, the various factors that influence the success of such reform efforts, and the constraints within which reformers operate. To accomplish this purpose, and to analyze the ELEC campaign, this study develops a hybrid diffusion-of-
innovations model which, in and of itself, is an equally important outcome. Because it is
abstract in nature and general in its applicability, this model can be used to plan and/or
analyze other reform efforts—in Japan as well as other settings. The experience of the
English Language Exploratory Committee serves to illustrate the necessity of considering
the factors which compose the model and the inter-relationships between them and then
employing appropriate diffusion-of-innovation strategies if externally directed change is
to be achieved.

Even though many of the elements of the Japanese system within which ELEC
operated were peculiar to that particular time and place and therefore restrict the
generalizability of the findings of this study, it would be far from correct to conclude that
generalization from this case to others is impossible or invalid. Brosnahan claims that
although some aspects of the Japanese effort to teach English are "peculiar to Japan," "many of the problems encountered [in Japan] are also found in one form or another
almost everywhere that languages are taught." Thus, while caution must be exercised to
avoid overgeneralization, general principles can be drawn from the ELEC case of
educational innovation and attempted diffusion which may be useful to those who attempt
to create change, not just in ELT in Japan but in other educational endeavors and settings
also.

Fundamental Considerations

At the outset, it is best to note a trio of fundamental considerations which affect
points made throughout the remainder of this study.

The Type of Change

All change is not of the same type, and different types of change involve different
elements and processes. Consequently, the type of change pursued in a particular case of
attempted reform is an important factor which must be taken into consideration when
analyzing it as well as when any attempt is made to generalize the results of such an analysis.

In this respect, Rogers and Shoemaker provide a useful typology of social change. Their categorization system is based on two factors: the source of the change and the recognition of the need for change (see figure 1).

"Immanent change occurs when members of a social system with little or no external influence create and develop a new idea (that is, invent it), which then spreads within the system."5

On the other hand, change may also originate with and/or be promoted by outside forces. When "members of a social system are exposed to external influences and adopt or reject a new idea from that source on the basis of their needs," the result is labelled selective contact change. In contrast, "directed contact change, or planned change, is caused by outsiders who, on their own or as representatives of change agencies, intentionally seek to introduce new ideas in order to achieve goals they have defined."6

This dissertation will focus on Rogers and Shoemaker's final type of change, for—despite attempts to make it appear to be a case of immanent change—the Rockefeller-funded ELEC effort to promote the U.S.-based Oral Approach in Japan fits best within the category of directed contact change.

The Insufficiency of Innovation Alone

This dissertation rests on the thesis that merely creating an innovation is not enough to bring about change. Carrying out a revolution involves much more than coming up with a new idea, even if it is considered an "improvement." Such a position runs counter to the widely held belief that improvements naturally "catch on and spread." Traditional faith in the inevitability of progress is epitomized by the famous saying: "Build a better mousetrap, and the world will beat a path to your door."7

Nevertheless, the experience of many would-be reformers and the evidence gathered by researchers in the "diffusion of innovations" field demonstrate that although
**ORIGIN OF THE NEW IDEA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition of the Need for Change</th>
<th>Internal to the Social System</th>
<th>External to the Social System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal: Recognition is by members of the social system</td>
<td>I Immanent change</td>
<td>II Selective contact change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External: Recognition may be by change agents outside the social system</td>
<td>III Induced immanent change</td>
<td>IV Directed contact change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Although this situation might be improbable, it is not impossible. A missionary in a peasant village may recognize a need or problem and bring it to the attention of the villagers but not offer suggestions on how to change the situation. Once the problem has been called to their attention, the villagers proceed to invent their own solution.*

---

**Figure 1.**

Paradigm of Types of Social Change

Source: Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 8.
change in a desired direction is possible, such change seldom happens by itself. Generally, these studies show that innovation, while necessary, is seldom sufficient on its own. Neither is merely communicating the news of the innovation to the appropriate audience enough to bring about change. As Miles states, "Educational innovations are almost never installed on their merits. Characteristics of the local system, of the innovating person or group, and of other relevant groups often outweigh the impact of what the innovation is [italics in original]." If successful diffusion and utilization of an innovation are expected, both a careful analysis of a situation, which takes into account the potential barriers to change, and an appropriate implementation strategy are called for—particularly in cases of directed contact change. Such analyses and strategies constitute the domain of the diffusion of innovations field.

Conscious Purpose

"Seeking to attain specific ends" is a common human activity. In fact, as Kobayashi notes, "To have no clear goals, to have no clear purposes, is simply unthinkable." This sort of "conscious purpose" is "so much a part of modern life that we generally do not question its validity." In the minds of most people, schooling epitomizes this process of seeking specific objectives.

Modern systems of education throughout the world, whether they are communist, socialist, capitalist, all have large bureaucracies that are deliberately created to undertake specific purposes. Curricula and courses of studies are worked out to achieve certain deliberate ends, while teachers are encouraged to determine specific objectives in their approaches to children and then to carry them out using appropriate effective techniques. Much of educational research is devoted to the search for more efficient methodologies, learning technologies, and programs. Education is imbued with conscious purpose as a mode of thinking, acting, and feeling.

"Conscious purpose" is also an inherent characteristic of virtually all change efforts. Reformers desirous of creating change typically formulate their objectives and then
consciously and purposely work toward them. This is especially likely to be the case when the type of change pursued is directed contact change.

Although most people see this process as normal, and few question it, others have criticized the formation and pursuit of conscious purpose. Bertrand Russell, in his critique of John Dewey's substitution of "inquiry" for "truth," warns that the removal of checks on man's pride, such as those provided by the concept of independent truth, can lead to an "intoxication of power." Contributing to this intoxication are "the belief in human power, and...the hopefulness engendered by machine production and the scientific manipulation of our physical environment." Conscious purpose is a manifestation of that intoxication.

Kobayashi agrees that

Since the dawn of consciousness, man's purposefulness, coupled with ingenuity, has produced tools, agriculture, dams, vaccines, factories, democratic government, and the rest of technology that we associate with progress. But today, we are beginning to become aware that much of this advancement has brought about not only illusory control over our future but also the dangerous deterioration of the environment.

Applying this thinking to the social as well as the physical environment leads to the conclusion that social change efforts seeking to attain specific ends may eventually lead to a "vast social disaster." Likewise, campaigns to bring about change in schooling may upset the educational ecosystem and end up doing more harm than good—particularly if the reformers and the reform come from outside the system, as in the case of directed contact change.

Such a position might seem to argue against any attempt to increase our knowledge of how to create change more effectively. Nevertheless, greater knowledge of the type pursued in this study—not just of strategies for creating change but also of the variety of interlinking elements in the social system which are affected by and which in turn affect any change effort—can, in fact, lead to greater humility and an increased appreciation of the social system. Without such an awareness, reformers are more likely to promote change in a single area and thus upset the system's balance and create resistance to their
reforms. With it, they will be more apt to take the entire system into account and pursue change in a more harmonious (and successful) manner.

The Need to Study the Diffusion of Innovations

The diffusion of innovations is an interdisciplinary field of study whose theories and models draw upon a variety of academic disciplines, such as sociology, psychology, social psychology, and organizational behavior. Diffusion of innovations studies also vary widely in the subject-matter areas they deal with, including the experiences of would-be reformers in fields as diverse as business administration, education, agriculture, public health, and computer technology.

In all these fields, innovations are common, leading to frequent attempts to bring about change. Nevertheless, few of these attempts are based on an adequate foundation of knowledge about how innovations can best be communicated and implemented. Moreover, many important questions about the most effective way to get people to put new ideas into practice remain unanswered.

For both of these reasons, there is a great need to study and learn more about diffusion of innovations principles and procedures. In support of this conclusion, Rogers and Shoemaker assert that diffusion and utilization processes, while critical to the success of "improvements," are far from thoroughly understood and need to be more carefully studied.14 And their concern is nothing new. As long ago as 1959, Emilio G. Collado, chairman of the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development, explained, "Methods of determining what is useful and accelerating the adoption of proven ideas may well be the greatest need of all in our educational system."15
The Need in Formal Education

There is a need to know more about the diffusion and utilization of innovations in formal education because attempts to reform various aspects of the school system are so widespread. A recent *U.S. News and World Report* article proclaims: "Around the world,...the starting gun has sounded in a race to overhaul education systems, but no one knows quite how to run it." Beauchamp adds that this concern is not merely transient. In fact, it seems to be universal, "Educational reform and the influence of foreign educational models are common, at least to some degree, in all societies." Educational reform has certainly been a central concern in the United States in recent years. Since 1983, when the well known report *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* appeared, "some 30 major reform reports" have been issued. Politicians and educators have become embroiled in reform-related issues, which have been widely reported in the popular press. As a result, attempts at school reform have been initiated in many locales.

In spite of large and expensive campaigns, however, history shows that disappointingly few of the proposed "improvements" catch on.

Regarding school reforms, Mann estimates that "innovations or revisions in programs have had only about a 20 percent success rate." Naturally then, one wonders, "How can so much effort directed toward changing the schools produce so little change?"

Wondering of this sort leads to a number of important questions: How can change in educational practices be accomplished? What conditions are necessary for it to happen? What are the obstacles to its success?

Although they are important if greater success in educational reform movements is to be expected, the answers to these questions are more complicated than most people would expect, as the discussion in chapter three of this dissertation evidences. In addition, "few educational researchers concern themselves with systematic study of widely accepted diffusion/utilization generalizations within educational settings." Nevertheless, until questions of this sort are addressed and answered, we are bound to
endure consequences which "amount to repeating the mistakes of the past, to inventing
the same wheel repeatedly, and to tolerating a myriad of usually well intentioned
charlatans who profess, but in fact do not command, know-how essential either to
resolve communication problems or to modify current practices meaningfully."23

The Need in Foreign Language Teaching

Foreign language teaching is an educational specialty with some distinctive
characteristics. Its objective is the building of communication skills which require the
rapid and accurate use of a complex set of cognitive and motor skills in a natural way. All
these complexities must be managed by language users in an almost subconscious way,
since to truly communicate they must pay more attention to the message than the medium.
For this reason, foreign language teaching employs methods quite different from those
used to teach most other school subjects. In addition, successful language learning
depends heavily on a number of social and psychological factors (such as group identity)
which are not of concern in most content areas.

In at least one respect, however, foreign language teaching is no different from
other branches of education. Attempts to get teachers to change from traditional methods
and materials and employ new approaches are common. In fact, foreign language
teachers may experience more than the usual share of such attempts. Dostert, et al. state:
"It is an important and widely recognized characteristic of our culture to be subject to
sudden shifts of interest and emphasis. This is certainly true in the realm of education
generally. It is particularly true today in our field of foreign language teaching."24 Of
course, wherever there are new ideas, there are corresponding efforts to promote them.
For example, the foreword to a recently published book for foreign language teachers
which deals with a variety of innovative methods states, "A principal aim of the book is to
accelerate change in language teaching."25
The Need in English Language Teaching

Around the world today, the most commonly taught foreign language is English. In fact, English language teaching is a major educational endeavor in virtually every country. Estimates of the number of learners and users of English as a second language vary considerably due to the almost universal scope of the undertaking and to difficulties in determining what qualifies one to count as a "learner of English." After quoting figures ranging from 400 million to two billion, Crystal calculates one billion to be a "conservative" total.26

As previously noted, within the field of foreign language teaching generally and English language teaching in particular, attempts at reform and change are common. "Methodological innovators abound and they all seem to desire 'instant implementation on a world-wide basis.'"27 Nevertheless, among would-be language-teaching reformers there has been (and continues to be) a discouraging lack of awareness of diffusion of innovation factors and processes.

Although innovators commonly promote change in ELT practices around the globe, they often do so in virtual ignorance of the context into which they would introduce change and of the process of change and the factors it involves. Generally speaking, the promoters of new ideas for teaching English as a foreign language seem to rely on the supposed merit of the innovation itself and seldom employ an adequate implementation strategy. While the avowed purpose of many modern-day methodologists is to "accelerate change," they seldom base their efforts on an understanding of the change process.

Rather, in foreign-language-teaching circles, the efforts of materials developers and the controversies among methodologists, as well as the supporting research of linguists and psychologists, have typically been aimed at answering the question, "What is better?" The tendency has been to focus attention on the product and assume that a simple "delivery of the curriculum" approach will suffice. The operating assumption seems to have been "If we can just develop a better science of linguistics, or get a better understanding of how people learn languages, the ideal teaching methods and materials
will naturally follow and be adopted and used by classroom teachers." In other words, "If we can just build a better mousetrap, the world will beat a path to our door."

While linguistics, psychology, and the other concerns relative to coming up with a better product are undoubtedly important—even necessary—they are far from sufficient if a language-teaching innovation is to spread and become widely used. A sound program is only the beginning and, as Tajima notes, its success is often dependent on "external conditions" rather than on the program itself. Likewise, Kelly, in his historical overview of language teaching, points out that "every age...has its rebels whose teaching techniques, though scientifically justifiable, failed to gain acceptance because they did not fit the atmosphere of the time." Kelly pities "the innovator who takes his stand on scientific proof and is unaware of the social forces which isolate him."29

The idea that the successful spread of a method depends heavily on how its promoters deal with a variety of social, cultural, and political factors is rarely considered in ELT circles. In a pioneering article on this subject, Richards points out that "the reasons for the rise and fall of methods are often independent of either the theories behind those methods or their effectiveness in practice."30 He goes on to explain that an accurate understanding of the "rise and fall" of methods depends on an awareness of the nature and power of various social, political, and economic forces. Nevertheless, in the ELT profession, there is such a lack of awareness regarding these "implementation factors" that he labels them the "secret life of methods." More knowledge about the factors that influence the process of creating change in ELT practices across socio-cultural boundaries is unquestionably needed.

The Need for a Cross-Cultural Perspective

The worldwide scope of English language teaching commonly results in the extension of efforts to promote change in ELT practices across national boundaries. As teachers and ideas travel from one setting to another, methods developed in one country (such as the United States) are often promoted in foreign lands (such as Japan).
According to Rogers and Shoemaker's typology of change, such campaigns constitute directed contact change. But the fact that the innovation crosses cultural boundaries and encounters a new, foreign socio-cultural matrix adds another dimension which makes the process of implementation even more complicated. In such settings, a variety of implementation factors, which are often ignored in domestic reform campaigns, become particularly critical.

This international, cross-cultural perspective brings on additional questions: What happens when methods/materials developed in one socio-cultural setting are transplanted into another? How much adaptation/accommodation is necessary, and in what areas? Reformers who ignore these concerns run a high risk of failure. Yet regrettably few of the answers to these questions are known. For these reasons, this dissertation's focus on directed contact change across cultural boundaries would seem to be particularly valuable.

Although it deals, not with English language teaching but with international business, a recent article in Forbes illustrates the importance of appropriate cross-cultural diffusion of innovations strategies. Entitled "They didn't listen to anybody," it discusses how "Procter and Gamble charged into Osaka with marketing strategies that played so well in Ohio. The results were disastrous."31

The Need in Japanese English Language Teaching

The worldwide scope of English language teaching is so great that it would be impossible for one dissertation to even begin to cover it adequately. Therefore, this dissertation focuses on ELT reform in only one country—Japan. The choice of Japan is based on more than convenience or personal interest. ELT reform in Japan is a subject of considerable interest and importance as well as promise for many reasons.

One is the large size of Japan's ELT program. The teaching of English as a foreign language is a major educational enterprise in Japan. Throughout the country a tremendous amount of time, money, and energy are devoted to the teaching and studying of English. Children begin working on English in the first year of junior high school,
and they continue to study the language for at least the next six years. In the words of Brosnahan, "The current efforts being made [in Japan] to teach English are the greatest dedicated to a single foreign language by any nation on earth." Although the present-day ELT effort in the People's Republic of China probably surpasses Japan's, at least in size, for many years English teaching in Japan ranked "as the largest, single modern foreign language program in the world." The number of people involved in this undertaking is truly impressive.

In 1976, 4,700,000 students in junior high schools, 4,400,000 in senior high schools, 50,000 in technical colleges, 380,000 in junior colleges and 1,840,000 in universities were studying English. To accommodate this large number of students, 58,000 high school teachers and 6,000 university and college professors have been trained and are currently teaching. By now, approximately one eleventh of the Japanese population is engaged in the study of English.

A program of this magnitude is undoubtedly expensive. "Perhaps as much as one-ninth of the secondary school expenditures goes for English instruction."

When so much energy and resources are expended in an enterprise, "success and failureloom large in importance." Unfortunately, the result of the tremendous Japanese investment in English teaching is often disappointing. Harasawa charges, "Of all the countries in the world where English has been taught on a nationwide scale, Japan seems to me about the least successful....The time and energy our students devote to English is mostly wasted....On balance our English teaching...has become a disastrous failure." Reischauer agrees, "The amount of effort put into English language teaching and learning probably produces smaller results in Japan than anywhere else."

As Brosnahan puts it, "For everyone to spend 3 years—and most people 6 years, and many people 10 years—in pursuit of a language and then remain unable to function effectively in it is obviously a situation demanding change." In 1955, when the ELEC movement was just getting under way, Reischauer expressed a similar sentiment, calling the reform of Japanese English language teaching "a matter of the utmost importance." He went so far as to label the teaching of English in Japan as "the most important problem in all modern Japanese education."
Another reason for choosing to study an attempt to reform ELT in Japan is the fact that foreign language teaching in Japan has a long history, which goes back many centuries. This history provides an important backdrop and (as shown in chapters four and five) illustrates the importance of antecedent factors in a very revealing manner.

In the course of this history several attempts have been made to reform language teaching practices in Japan. For instance, besides the ELEC campaign, another major reform attempt was made by Harold E. Palmer earlier in this century. Reform efforts are being made at the present time, and others will undoubtedly be made in the future. This variety of attempted reforms is another reason for studying the diffusion and utilization of ELT innovations in Japan. It provides the opportunity to compare and contrast the different cases, and such study is quite educational.

A final factor that makes Japan an optimal setting for a study that investigates the social foundations of change—especially cross-cultural change—is the fact that the Japanese culture is relatively homogeneous. "Although Japan has been greatly influenced throughout its history by ideas imported from other nations...it has not had an influx of new peoples." Consequently, "the Japanese have remained remarkably homogeneous." This characteristic makes it easier to see the effects which culture has on language-teaching practices.

The above mentioned factors will all be discussed in greater detail later in this dissertation. Here, they serve only as evidence for the fact that the reform of Japanese ELT practices is both a promising and an important topic, which needs to be studied from a diffusion-of-innovations perspective.

Potential Benefits of Studying the Implementation of Innovations

Increased knowledge about the process of creating change and the factors that determine the success of reform campaigns can be of benefit in at least three ways: (1) increasing the likelihood of success in diffusion and utilization campaigns, (2) helping to close the gap between knowledge and practice, and (3) increasing our understanding of
the structures we deal with. These benefits accrue whether the desired change is in public health, computer technology, or educational systems and practices, but the focus in this section will be limited to formal education, and later narrowed to English language teaching.

Increased Likelihood of Success in Reform Efforts

Although the merits of the goals of some reform campaigns are debatable, there is little doubt that the numerous would-be reformers of the school system would welcome knowledge that might lead to greater success in their campaigns. As has already been mentioned, the rate of success in educational reform efforts has been low. Leithwood refers to a number of studies (by Berman and McLaughlin, Pincus, House, Leithwood et al., Smith and Keith, Gross et al., and Goodlad and Klein) and concludes, "Substantial evidence has demonstrated that while schools have adopted many curricular innovations in the past two decades, the degree of their actual use in classrooms has been very limited." In discussing "the generally melancholy picture of how little of the reform agenda of the recent past has been achieved," Mann notes, "Most educators realize that the amount and pace of change has fallen far short of initial expectations....Programs were planned, curriculum was developed, teaching/learning units were packaged, teachers were trained, and the results were frustrating, uneven, unexpected, and temporary." Mann concludes that the reason for this stunning lack of success is the failure of educational reformers to attend to implementation factors: "With hindsight it is easy to see that designing and disseminating change is not implementing change....yet the gap in our knowledge about implementing change in the schools is formidable." Despite the great amount of theorizing and planning that go into the development of a new curriculum, Sarason charges that "what their theories fail to do is face the problem of how one gets to one's goals." Explaining why there is so little real change amid so much attempted change, Sarason blames planners who seldom operate with either an adequate
knowledge of "the setting in which the desired change will be effected" or "an explicit theory of change."46 In fact, Sarason contends that those who wish to change the schools generally suffer from "an amazing degree of ignorance about the culture of the school, and (equally as fateful)...seem to have no theory of the change process."47 In the same vein, Rodgers holds that "failures in program innovation are not as often failures of content as failures of contextual planning."48

Many educational reform attempts suffer from the delusion that simply creating a "better" product is enough. After "building a better mousetrap" the innovators expect the world to "beat a path" to their door. This simple "delivery of the curriculum" approach, is criticized by Sarasor49 yet it continues to be common and no doubt accounts for a considerable portion of the failures in school reform.

Sarason argues that "Good ideas and missionary zeal...are rarely, if ever, effective in changing complicated organizations (like the school) with traditions, dynamics, and goals of their own."50 Parish and Arends agree that "lack of success in implementing programs may be related to a lack of understanding of how schools work as social systems, how political processes influence change efforts, and the many dilemmas facing those who attempt to facilitate school improvement."51 In fact, Sarason continues, "Many of those who are aware that intended outcomes have not been achieved have no clear understanding of the factors contributing to failure."52

If lack of success comes from lack of understanding, then it follows that greater understanding of the factors involved will lead to greater control and greater success. Greater knowledge of the change process will result in an increased ability to achieve reforms, a decrease in wasted time, and less disillusionment.

Closing the Knowledge-Practice Gap

A greater likelihood of success in reform efforts is not, however, the only benefit of an increased understanding of the process of change and the factors that influence it.
From the perspective of users, such an understanding can also help close the gap between knowledge and practice.

Rogers and Shoemaker point out that the "information gap" is a serious concern in many fields: "Our activities in education, agriculture, medicine, industry, and the like are often without the benefit of the most current research knowledge. The gap between what is known and what is effectively put to use needs to be closed. To bridge this gap we must understand how new ideas spread from their source to potential receivers and understand the factors affecting the adoption of such innovations." While supporting research, they emphasize that it alone is not sufficient: "It is clear that research alone is not enough to solve most problems; the results of the research must be diffused and utilized before their advantages can be realized."53

Leithwood makes a similar point: "Many pressing social problems and aspirations could be much more effectively addressed than they are at present by existing, underutilized knowledge, systematically applied."54 Roberts-Gray and Gray echo: "The cost of faulty implementation can be counted not only in money wasted on development or acquisition of new knowledge or technology; it also represents lost opportunities to achieve benefits offered by the innovation."55

Greater Understanding of the Structures with which Educators Deal

A third benefit of an increased understanding of the process of creating change in formal education and the factors that influence that effort is an increased understanding of the school system itself. When an attempt is made to change an organization or system, many seemingly simple factors become amazingly complex and many previously "invisible" aspects become painfully obvious. Speaking of the public schools, for instance, House explains: "The public schools are composed of substances so common that their study is a bore. Each feature etched on the mind of the child becomes a tiresome peculiarity to the adult. Only when we try to change them do we realize that we really do
not understand their structure. Suddenly we encounter complexities we never envisioned.\textsuperscript{56}

Likewise, an understanding of the constraints within which reformers operate and a realization of the limits to which they can expect to push reforms can help define the boundaries of a system and the forces that surround it. To use an analogy, in order to understand a room, it is necessary to discover, not only the furniture which it contains but the location and nature of its walls.

A cross-cultural perspective on the process of creating educational change produces similar benefits of increased understanding of a system by revealing which of its aspects are variables and which are constants or universals.

**Benefits of a Comparative Perspective on Change**

Narrowing the focus further and studying directed contact change that crosses socio-cultural boundaries strengthens the promise of the three benefits mentioned in the preceding section and also produces additional ones. For instance, it reveals the importance of social factors that might otherwise be ignored.

Change does not take place merely within the school system. In fact, change in a school system often reflects changes in the larger social system within which it operates. For example, bilingual education and integration in U.S. schools were not implemented for pedagogical reasons alone. Rather, they reflected larger movements in American society. As Sarason says, "the school culture reflects and is a part of a larger society."\textsuperscript{57}

Yet when study of diffusion and innovation phenomena is restricted to a single culture, powerful social variables which can determine whether an innovation spreads or disappears may appear to be "constants," and consequently may be ignored. A cross-cultural perspective often reveals these social factors to be variables that must be taken into account in forming an effective implementation strategy. Furthermore, after innovation and implementation efforts in various cultural situations have been studied and
compared, those universal factors which transcend cultural boundaries also become apparent.

The benefits of a cross-cultural perspective for understanding the diffusion of innovations are similar to several of the values of the comparative study of education in general. In discussing the uses of comparative education, Noah explains, "Cross-national work has not only pointed toward improved theoretical models but has also, in fact, prevented overgeneralization on the basis of results derived from a single country." Noah adds, "A comparative approach enlarges the framework within which we can view the results obtained in a single country: by providing counterinstances, it challenges us to refine our theories and test their validity against the reality of different societies; and, by providing parallel results, it can yield important confirmation of results obtained elsewhere."58

An example of how such a cross-cultural perspective can bring about a changed view of the importance of social variables comes from Everett Rogers' *Communication of Innovations: A Cross-Cultural Approach*. In this book Rogers broke from "traditional diffusion research (including his own) which [had] always emphasized the 'individual' adopter of innovations." Utilizing a cross-cultural perspective, Rogers found it necessary to emphasize "the informal social group and the formally organized system, assessing their influence on the adoption behavior of their members."59

While a cross-cultural perspective may be beneficial, promoting change across cultural boundaries can still be dangerous. Noah warns against the "wholesale appropriation and propagation of foreign practices,"60 and Beauchamp echoes the warning: "There is virtually unanimous agreement that an educational system is essentially an outgrowth of a society's unique history and culture and therefore, transplantation into a foreign environment is fraught with danger."61

Despite such warnings, the borrowing of educational practices from foreign sources and the propagation of foreign solutions to educational problems in a different country have been common throughout history and certainly will continue in the future. In such cases, where reformers are determined in their attempt to create change in one setting by
implementing practices foreign to it, a simple warning is not enough. They need
guidelines regarding specific factors to watch out for and processes to employ.

The guidelines resulting from the study of cross-cultural implementation efforts can
also be helpful when Noah's warning is heeded and reformers wish to make a "careful
analysis of the conditions under which certain foreign practices deliver desirable results,
followed by consideration of ways to adapt those practices to conditions found at
home."62 Such a set of guidelines respecting the special difficulties of creating change
across socio-cultural boundaries is one of the products of this dissertation.

Review of Literature

The subject of ELEC's attempt to promote change in ELT practices in Japan does
not fit neatly within the boundaries of any one field. Rather, it calls for the intersection of
several fields: curriculum development, the diffusion of innovations, cross-cultural
studies, and English language teaching. In the following review of relevant literature,
each of these areas will be treated separately, although overlap will also be recognized
through the use of "hybrid" categories.

Curriculum Development

The most general field within which the topic of this dissertation can be located is
curriculum development in education. Curriculum development includes "activities such
as conceptualizing, planning, implementing, field testing, and researching..."63 Because
of the breadth of this field, the professional literature in curriculum development is, in
sheer numbers, overwhelming. The ERIC database, accessed through Dialog
Information Retrieval Service, lists 26,678 items (journals articles, books, conference
presentations, etc.) dealing with curriculum development. 11,707 of these have been
produced in the last ten years alone. Reviewing all of these would be a hopeless (and
pointless) task, since implementation is only one aspect of curriculum development. Therefore, the focus of this review of literature will be narrowed appropriately.

**Diffusion of Innovations**

In the field of diffusion of innovations, a lesser number of studies have been conducted, but the number is still formidable. In 1969, Havelock found over 4,000 studies "which pertained directly or indirectly to knowledge dissemination and utilization, innovation and technological change....By field, the largest number appear in 'education' (17%), followed by 'agriculture' (13%), and 'communication' (13%)."\(^{64}\)

When the above mentioned Dialog search of the ERIC database was narrowed to focus on diffusion of implementation concerns, it produced a total of 3,993 items dealing with some aspect of "program implementation," a figure close to Havelock's count. Combining this descriptor with "curriculum development" reduced the total to 407 items, a smaller figure but still too many studies to attempt to review here. However, findings from many of these studies are discussed in the appropriate sections of chapter three, where they contribute to the development of the analytical framework used in this dissertation.

**Comparative Education**

Adding an international, comparative, cross-cultural aspect to the search restricted the number of relevant studies considerably. Of the above mentioned studies dealing with curriculum development and program implementation, only forty dealt with education in foreign countries. Adding the descriptor "comparative education" reduced the number to a total of only five.

The smallness of this figure attests to Kelly and Altbach's assertion that "studies of the nature of knowledge transfer" "looking at the ways in which knowledge was disseminated, produced, and used" have been "hitherto ignored"\(^{65}\) in comparative
education. Nevertheless, Kelly and Altbach consider such studies to be one of the important challenges of the present and future of the comparative study of education.

Although relatively little comparative education work has been done in "program implementation" in foreign countries, one of the pleasant exceptions is an article by James Coleman entitled "Professorial Training and Institution Building in the Third World: Two Rockefeller Foundation Experiences." Coleman identifies "the various factors associated with the success or failure of efforts to further the advanced professional education of prospective members of the professoriate at the National University of Zaire and Mahidol University (Bangkok, Thailand). He also compares the effects of the "sociopolitical-cultural environment" and the "professional infrastructure" in the two different home countries on the reception, retention, and professional performance of indigenous scholars.

Another comparative education study which dealt with a diffusion of innovations topic was conducted by Kevin Lillis. Entitled, "Processes of Secondary Curriculum Innovation in Kenya," Lillis' report focuses on the period following Kenyan independence (1963-81) and consists of case studies of two curriculum innovations—the Africanization of the literature curriculum and the new School Mathematics of East Africa program. Both of these innovations failed, and Lillis compares the history and major features of each case. He concludes that, even in this immanent change scenario, "educational values were inherited by the newly independent system.... This inheritance created several persistent assumptions about what secondary school curricula might contain and also imposed a number of constraints on innovation." In the end, "the ruling ideology ensured the continued domination of [Eurocentric] equivalency criteria." Most importantly, Lillis noted that "the complex interrelationships among the actors involved, the processes of adoption and development, the nature of the curriculum content, and the nature of the infrastructure are important determinants of the nature of the change process."

On the other side of Africa, Mathieu R. Ouedraogo analyzed some of the factors that affected curriculum development in Upper Volta. He noted that proposed reforms in the
school system had brought about a number of "opposing and negative reactions against implementing suggested changes." Ouedraogo, however, did little more than list those factors which hampered change. They consisted of "language of instruction, (French vs. Voltaic); concentration on productive instruction (e.g., animal husbandry) [which] gives rise to fears about obstruction for the student who may be socially upwardly mobile; parents negative attitudes; difficulty in recruiting and training teachers; differences between urban and rural needs and opportunities; and the question of the role the government should play in education."70

Yet another study relevant to the diffusion of innovations and comparative education (and the final one which will be reviewed here) was conducted by Colin Marsh, entitled the "Implementation of a Curriculum Innovation in Australian Schools."71 The implementation effort he investigated promoted immanent change rather than directed contact change, and it did not involve cross-cultural implementation (in fact, it was limited to only one state in Australia). Nevertheless, it is relevant to the topic of this dissertation as it emphasizes the importance of specific contextual factors which influenced the course of the implementation. Although Marsh's main point is that because of the specificity of these factors the generalizability of the findings from one study is limited, his emphasis on contextual factors can also serve as a valuable caveat to those involved in cross-cultural implementation campaigns who might otherwise ignore such factors entirely.

Program Implementation in English Language Teaching

As mentioned earlier, ELT professionals have paid little attention to program implementation. The Dialog search of the ERIC database bore this out. Restricting the focus to documents that dealt with program implementation and the teaching of English as a second or foreign language produced only twelve items (of the nearly 27,000 dealing with curriculum development).

Foremost among these studies is "The Secret Life of Methods"72 authored by Jack Richards, a professor in the ESL Department at the University of Hawaii. Of the few
articles on ELT program implementation and change, Richards' is by far the most influential (by virtue of its publication in the widely read TESOL Quarterly and Richards' delivery of a plenary address with the same title and virtually the same content at the annual international convention of TESOL [Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages] in 1983). It deserves credit as a pioneering effort, but utilizes a simple framework (with only four general factors) and reflects no awareness of other studies in educational change and diffusion of innovations. Interestingly, Richards uses the case of Charles C. Fries' Oral Approach (in the United States) as an example of successful implementation.

Another TESOL Quarterly article, by Ann Raimes, bears a promising title, "Tradition and Revolution in ESL Teaching." It turns out, however, to deal with revolutions at the theory or "approach" level only. Drawing heavily on Thomas Kuhn's The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, Raimes discusses paradigm shifts, but never deals with actual language teaching practices in particular situations.

The Determination and Implementation of Language Policy is an important but unfortunately rare book (it was not in the ERIC data base). It discusses efforts to determine and then implement an official language policy in the Philippines in the late 1950's and 1960's. The authors, Ramos, Aguilar and Sibayan, discuss the role of research, as well as the training of teachers and production of materials. They urge "careful planning and preparation of both people and materials" and warn against "hasty implementation." The authors also discuss a lengthy list of factors to consider, ranging from funding, to public relations, to the role of colleges and universities. Lacking, however, is a model to show the interrelationships among these factors. Interestingly, it was a grant from The Rockefeller Foundation that provided funding for the Philippine Center for Language Study, which in turn sponsored not only a considerable amount of research on language teaching in the Philippines but also the publication of this valuable book.

At the 1985 TESOL convention, Robert Maple, an EFL specialist in Rio de Janeiro, gave a reform-oriented presentation entitled "Turning Heads Around: Retraining Teachers for Communicative Approaches." Maple restricted his focus to in-service teacher
retraining, and made the important point that such retraining consists of both "outer" (training based) and "inner" (development based) reorientation. Nevertheless, he entirely neglected or avoided many curriculum development issues.

Donald Freeman, of the School for International Training, is another TESL researcher who has shown an interest in the process of creating change. Like Maple, he stresses the teacher training vs. teacher development distinction. Freeman explains,

Training deals with building specific teaching skills: how to sequence a lesson or how to teach a dialogue, for instance. Development, on the other hand, focuses on the individual teacher—on the process of reflection, examination, and change which can lead to doing a better job and to personal and professional growth. Also like Maple, however, Freeman's interest has been restricted to creating change in teachers. He does not deal with the larger issues of curriculum and program change.

In her book, Beyond Methodology: Second Language Teaching and the Community, Mary Ashworth, a TESL notable from British Columbia, points out the importance of social context to teachers of English as a foreign language who might entertain visions of reforming teaching practices in a foreign setting.

EFL teachers should study the educational system—its values, structure, and goals—and the social and economic systems; and they should consult with local teachers and try to see the situation through their eyes before launching into a program of change which may be both harmful and ineffective. It is better to make haste slowly! What works in the United States, Britain, Canada, and Australia may not work in China, Nigeria, Thailand or Saudia Arabia, and vice versa.

Beyond this general warning, however, she offers little to would-be innovators in the way of a framework for analyzing the target situation or for planning a program of change.

In contrast, Alan Maley, in a paper presented at a Singapore conference on "Trends in Language Syllabus Design," provides a detailed examination of "the problems involved in implementing syllabuses." Based on his experience in the People's Republic of China (although he tries to "avoid the impression that these issues are China specific"), Maley lists over 150 questions which would-be reformers should ask about the target situation. These are grouped according to whether they deal with cultural, educational, organizational/administrative, learner, teacher, or material factors. The weakness of
Maley's study is that it lacks a solid theoretical base. Nevertheless, it is still valuable, and many of the points he raises are relevant to the ELEC case. They are discussed in later chapters of this dissertation.

At the same Singapore conference, a number of other papers dealt with the topic of curriculum reform, although none of the authors went into the detail that Maley did.

Theodore Rodgers' paper on "Communicative Syllabus Design and Implementation" provides a useful matrix "for estimating the implementation difficulty of new programs." It takes into consideration factors such as "the educational requirement sought," "renewal activities and resources required," and "the content of the renewal program." Although Rodgers ignores some important implementation factors, this matrix is still useful. With it, reform planners can plot a "difficulty profile" which will help them decide whether to proceed and, if so, where to place emphasis.

In his paper, Roger Hawkey noted that "'Constraints' apply to syllabus design as well as implementation." Emphasizing the importance of diffusion and implementation planning at the earliest stages of a project, he commented further, "No wonder there is concern when people want to leave constraints till later. Traditional constraints like untrained teachers and book shortages are all connected with the syllabus specification itself as a constraint [italics in original]."

Other presenters at the syllabus design conference either ignored implementation factors or mentioned them only incidentally.

Emy Pascasio, for instance, presented a case study from the Philippines. After a twelve-page description of the syllabus, she devoted only one paragraph to implementation, although she noted that "the implementation of the...syllabus has to go hand in hand with the development of the language materials."

Pranee Thanachanan addressed the problems associated with implementing a new language syllabus but the only solutions she could recommend were developing "pertinent teaching materials" and making the new syllabus "as explicit as possible to all teachers, administrators, and educators concerned."
Asiah Abu Samah, reporting on the implementation of a new communicative syllabus for English language teaching in Malaysia, noted the resistance the movement encountered. Respecting implementation strategies, Samah's report indicated that although a strategy was employed it was minimal. Resource materials for teachers were duplicated and disseminated to the schools, textbook publishers were briefed, and a group of "pioneer" teachers were selected. This "key-personnel system of teacher-orientation" was intended to have a "multiplier role of ensuring positive snowballing of the new programme." These pioneers "bravely survived" and "persevered," but their task might have been much easier had other implementation factors been taken into consideration by the planners of this campaign.

**ELT Program Implementation in Japan**

When the descriptor "Japan" was added to the previous combination, the number of relevant studies in the ERIC database dropped even further. In fact, the result was "0 [zero] items." Although it is possible that studies of ELT program implementation in Japan have been done, their results have not been reported—at least not in a form that makes them widely available. This is a distressing finding in light of the numerous attempts to reform the English teaching system in Japan which have ended in failure. If such reform attempts are to ever succeed, studies of the factors that influence them are needed.

**Limitations to the Previous Studies**

The most obvious conclusion to be drawn from the preceding review of literature is that, in spite of the need for knowledge about the process of reforming English language teaching in Japan, no studies focusing on this area have been done.

Given the worldwide nature of English language teaching and the frequency of attempts to bring about reform in this field, the general paucity of studies dealing with the
implementation of change in English-language teaching practices is equally disturbing. Moreover, the few studies that have been done typically lack a solid theoretical base.

Relative to formal education in general, many more studies dealing with program implementation have been conducted and reported, but most of them still suffer from problems that make them inapplicable to the purposes of the present study. Much more is said in this respect in chapter three, in the section which discusses the criteria for an adequate model for analyzing cross-cultural campaigns aimed at bringing about directed contact change in educational practices. Here it will only be noted that most of the studies surveyed suffer from one or more of the following problems:

Typically, they deal with immanent change and thus are not relevant to cases involving directed contact change.

Many are extremely narrow, focusing only on factors within the school system and ignoring the larger social context of education.

Most are not comparative in nature and thus suffer from the mono-cultural blindness discussed elsewhere in this chapter. In short, they fail to deal with the complexities of cross-cultural change and its social foundations.

Another common limitation to implementation studies in education is the lack of a theoretical base or a coherent framework for analysis. Many reports consist primarily of a description of a situation followed by a list of factors related to the problems of implementation (e.g., Maley) or lessons learned from an implementation experience (e.g., Parish and Arends).

Even when studies are based on a model of change, it is sometimes an oversimplistic one. Gordon and Lawton, for instance, base their study on a two element process. They report that for a reform to be successful reformers need (only!) 1. access to a wide audience, and 2. the ability to express clearly the changes advocated.

This study of ELEC's attempt to change ELT practices in Japan attempts to overcome these difficulties. First of all, it avoids confusing the factors and processes involved in different types of change by focusing on only one type—directed contact change. Also, in contrast to the narrow, mono-cultural studies, it takes a broad, cross-
cultural point of view. Furthermore, it benefits from a solid base in diffusion-of-innovations theory. As a result, the analytical model it employs is complex and includes many factors which others ignore, but such complexity is to be preferred over misleading simplicity.

Method

As mentioned in the preceding sections, there are many good reasons for investigating the topic of this dissertation. In addition, as this section explains, there are several good reasons for conducting a study of this particular type. The sources of data and analytical procedures employed are also important to note.

Type of Study

This dissertation employs an historical, case study approach to examine ELEC’s attempt to reform English teaching in Japan. Because of its subject matter and approach, it could also be classified as a comparative education area study.

Yin notes that "the common stereotype of the 'case study' is that this way of doing research: (1) should be used at the exploratory stages, (2) leads only to unconfirmable conclusions, and (3) is really a method of last resort." He goes on to point, however, that "case studies paradoxically seem to be appearing with increasing frequency" and concludes that "the stereotype is in fact wrong. Although case studies indeed can be used for exploratory purposes, the approach also may be used for either descriptive or explanatory purposes as well."  

Yin also holds that "case studies are relevant for studying knowledge utilization, because the topic covers a phenomenon that seems to be inseparable from its context." Other experts in the diffusion of innovations field would seem to agree. For example, after reviewing the diffusion of innovations literature, Havelock notes that "although there were many quantitative research studies, there was a paucity of case materials." He then
goes on to say, "We need more case studies which carefully document and report dissemination and utilization events." Miles adds, "In the development of theoretical understanding, there is no substitute for the close examination of concrete, particular situations."

The historical perspective of this case study is also valuable for a number of additional reasons. First of all, a diachronic perspective reveals aspects of elements and processes that a synchronic view often misses. As Claude Lévi-Strauss explains, "By showing institutions in the process of transformation, history alone makes it possible to abstract the structure which underlies the many manifestations and remains permanent throughout a succession of events."

In addition, the fact that this history (of the ELEC effort) takes into account another much larger history (of the development of foreign language teaching in Japan) gives double recognition to the fact that antecedent background is important. Change processes do not begin from nothing. Rather, they start with an already existing system, and, as Sarason notes, changing an extant system is considerably more involved than setting up a new one. The change agent's analysis of a situation must include what went before. As Sarason sums it up, "Present characteristics have a history."

The fact that this study deals with events that took place several decades ago offers several advantages. Foremost among them was that it made it possible to gain access to information about these events which might not have been available otherwise. Fullan and Pomfret note, "It is politically naive to expect open discussion of problems of implementation (even when this is invited by sponsors) in most large scale programs."

Nevertheless, issues that are "sensitive" during a reform campaign, can be discussed freely many years later, and access to once "private" documents becomes possible with the passage of time.

A final reason for doing a historical study is to reverse one "curse" of the language teaching profession. In this field, few historical studies have been done, and a historical foundation is conspicuous by its absence from the training of teachers of English as a foreign/second language. One of the few books on the history of foreign language
teaching concludes: "Language teaching has shared neither the honesty nor the self-knowledge of the fine arts. Whereas artists are willing to seek inspiration from the past, teachers, being cursed with the assumption that their discoveries are necessarily an improvement on what went on before, are reluctant to learn from history."94

Another valuable feature of this historical case study is its comparative nature. The value of a cross-cultural perspective in studying efforts to create change has already been discussed. Because it is a comparative area study which deals with the promotion of an American-based educational model in Japan's English-teaching system, an analysis of ELEC's experience reveals socio-cultural variables which both facilitate and inhibit change but which might be "invisible" or perceived as constants and thus ignored in a single-culture setting.

Sources of Data

Data used in this study come from a variety of sources: personal interviews, historical documents, and publications.

A number of interviews were conducted in Japan with former (and current) ELEC leaders and workers, many of whom worked with Charles C. Fries. To provide balance, other interviews were conducted with ELEC "outsiders" (ELT experts at Japanese universities and in the Ministry of Education) who were knowledgeable about ELT in Japan, but had nothing to do with the ELEC campaign. Data was also gathered through interviews with Fries' colleagues and subordinates in the United States, including Robert Lado (his chief disciple) and Agnes Fries (C. C. Fries' wife, his nearly constant companion in his travels in Japan, and his unofficial executive secretary).

Additional information came from copies of C. C. Fries' personal correspondence relative to his work in Japan. These were obtained through the generosity and cooperation of his son, Peter Fries.
Rockefeller Foundation documents regarding the ELEC operation and John D. Rockefeller 3rd's activities in relation to ELT in Japan, obtained from the Rockefeller Archive Center, formed another valuable body of data.

The many published accounts (pamphlets, books, articles, etc.) regarding not only ELEC and C. C. Fries in Japan but a variety of other relevant subjects (language-teaching, Japanese history and culture, the diffusion of educational innovations, etc.) comprised the final source of information used in this study.

**Analytical Procedures**

The nature of this data has called for a qualitative, rather than a quantitative, analysis. Such a qualitative approach is also in keeping with the "humanistic historical-cum-philosophical-cum-melioristic approach" preferred by the great scholar of comparative education, I. L. Kandel, who disliked "the more meticulous, more mechanistic, and more dispassionate approach to society characteristic of the social sciences."95

The information gathered is organized and analyzed within the framework of a "hybrid" model developed in the course of this study. It shows both the process of innovation-implementation and the various elements which are involved in and which influence that process. Since an entire chapter is devoted to explaining this model later, only a brief overview of it will be given here.

Numerous models of the innovation and implementation process have been produced and used by diffusion of innovations researchers. After investigating the features of a number of these, this study found it advisable to develop a hybrid model, based primarily on Rogers and Shoemaker's innovation-decision process model. Modifications came primarily in the form of additions borrowed from Havelock's "barrier" and Richards's "secret life" factors since failure to consider their effects would neglect a number of critical aspects of the ELEC (and any other cross-cultural directed contact change) experience and thus render the analysis incomplete.
The analytical model contains three major components: antecedents, the innovation-decision process, and consequences. "Antecedents" includes both historical traditions and established social system norms. The "innovation-decision process" consists of three phases (knowledge, persuasion, and decision, followed later by confirmation) which are all affected by the messages received through various communication channels. The "consequences" section allows for various options and an assessment of the results of the decision.

Organization and Outline of the Study

As stated at the outset, the goal of this dissertation is an increased understanding of the innovation-implementation process and the factors which affect it. To achieve this end, the case of ELEC's attempt to reform ELT practices in Japan is investigated and analyzed.

To understand this analysis of the ELEC effort, basic knowledge in two areas is required: (1) the story of ELEC's campaign, and (2) the analytical model. To facilitate understanding, each of these two areas is first discussed separately. It would be confusing to attempt to analyze the ELEC experience without first explaining the events which constituted it and the order in which they occurred. Conversely, the analysis would quickly become disjointed if it addressed the components of the ELEC experience in chronological order. With the nature of both the history and the analytical model well established, however, they can be put together and the analysis of the ELEC experience conducted in a comprehensible and fruitful manner.

Accordingly, chapter two tells the story of the ELEC effort, providing background information and a chronological overview of important events from the mid 1950's to the late 1960's. The major portion of this chapter is devoted to a chronological overview of ELEC-related events in Japan from 1956 until 1968, when Rockefeller support for ELEC was "phased out." Nevertheless, since the ELEC effort really began many years before the 1956 Specialists Conference" which marked its official commencement, this chapter
also discusses those beginnings. It explains John D. Rockefeller III's interest in and support for reforming ELT in Japan. It also provides background on Charles C. Fries and his Oral Approach to language teaching, including his work at the University of Michigan and his previous Rockefeller Foundation contacts. In addition, the socio-historical context in which Fries' Oral Approach developed and influenced language teaching throughout the United States is discussed.

Chapter three discusses the challenges of analyzing the implementation of cross-cultural, directed contact change and develops a model equal to the task. Starting with a discussion of general theories, it goes on to examine the merits of a number of diffusion and utilization models and then explains in detail the various components of the hybrid analytical model/framework used in subsequent chapters to analyze the ELEC effort in Japan.

Inasmuch as "antecedents" form the first part of the analytical model, this chapter provides an overview of the development of ELT in Japan prior to the ELEC effort. It also illustrates how socio-cultural and political forces have influenced language teaching in Japan. In addition, this overview notes the historical basis of particular pedagogical traditions in foreign language teaching in Japan. It also includes a brief look at previous attempts to reform Japanese ELT.

Chapter five analyzes the ELEC effort using the "innovation-decision process" portion (and to a lesser degree, the "consequences" portion) of the model/framework presented in chapter three. The nature and extent of ELEC leaders' planning to implement the Oral Approach in Japan, the characteristics of the Oral Approach itself, the characteristics of the ELEC resource system, the characteristics of the Japanese ELT user system, and a number of critical inter-elemental factors are all investigated.

Chapter six, the concluding chapter, summarizes the preceding chapters and draws some general principles from the particulars of this case. It also discusses the usefulness of a diffusion of innovations perspective, in general, and, more particularly, evaluates the model/framework used to analyze the ELEC effort to reform Japanese ELT. It concludes
by noting the limitations of this study and making recommendations, both for future diffusion-of-innovations researchers and for would-be ELT reformers.
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CHAPTER 2

BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW OF THE ELEC EFFORT

To understand the effort of the English Language Exploratory Committee requires knowledge—not only of the organization's purposes and activities, but also of the people behind it and the events leading up to it. Such information is provided—in general chronological order—in this chapter. (In chapter five, many of these same purposes and activities are discussed again—in a topical arrangement—as they are analyzed from a diffusion-of-innovations perspective.)

The English Language Exploratory Committee was officially formed in 1956, but the ELEC effort actually began many years before. The history of foreign language teaching/learning in Japan (as explained in chapter four) has been characterized by cyclical waves of interest. One of the strongest of these waves occurred after World War II as Japanese contacts with western nations (especially the United States) increased, and the Japanese need for practical, oral communication skills in English become more and more apparent. Consequently, many Japanese—especially those in business and financial circles—desired reforms in the English-teaching methods and materials commonly employed in the schools system since these traditional approaches did not lead to the ability to communicate in spoken English.

The catalyst that started the action of the English Language Exploratory Committee, however, was John D. Rockefeller 3rd. It is appropriate, therefore, for this chapter to
begin by examining Mr. Rockefeller's role, and that of the Rockefeller Foundation, in the ELEC effort.

This chapter also provides background on Charles C. Fries and his Oral Approach to ELT, including his work at the University of Michigan and his previous Rockefeller Foundation contacts. The socio-historical context in which Fries' Oral Approach developed and influenced language teaching throughout the United States is also discussed.

Rockefeller Foundation Efforts around the World and in Japan

Since its establishment in 1913, the Rockefeller Foundation has funded projects around the world. This international pattern of spending continues today—perhaps more than ever. According to a recent report, for instance, the Rockefeller Foundation plans to double its spending (to nearly $300 million between 1986 and 1991) on developing nations.1 Various explanations for this generosity have been advanced, and most of them would seem to apply to the case of Rockefeller support for ELEC in post World War II Japan..

Humanitarian, Philanthropic Interests

The "official" explanation, of course, is that the Rockefeller Foundation was established by John D. Rockefeller, Sr., "with the sole motive of devoting a portion of [his] fortune to the service of [his] fellow men."2 As the responsibility for the Foundation has passed from generation to generation of Rockefellers, they have channeled their efforts "along lines that might mean a step forward in the long struggle of nations to find a way to live peacefully together."3 Many agree with this view of Rockefeller intentions. Especially after the destruction of World War II, it would seem both appropriate and desirable to promote world peace. Sensible people didn't want any more war, but they also realized that future peace would depend on true communication among nations.
After the war, English language teaching was seen as having the potential of playing an important role in furthering future U.S.-Japanese relations and intercultural understanding. In a 1953 memorandum to John D. Rockefeller 3rd, Donald McLean urged:

If I had additional funds for this purpose, I would undertake a program of English-language teaching in Japan on an extensive scale on the theory that if the Japanese accepted English as a "second language" they would naturally read our literature without the problem of translation and if they learn the language while they are young enough they will have a feeling of understanding toward us which they probably would not have toward any other country.4

Furthering U.S. Foreign Policy and Commercial Interests

Others, however, take a different view of the purpose of the international activities of the Rockefeller and other U.S. foundations. Berman, for example, argues that "this public rhetoric of disinterested humanitarianism" has been "little more than a facade behind which the economic and strategic interests of the United States have been actively furthered."5 His thesis is that after World War II, "since overt colonialism was no longer acceptable to world opinion, the United States needed surrogate organizations to protect and further her interests in the developing areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America"6 and that U. S. foundations played this role. "The foundations accomplished this primarily by funding programs linking the educational systems of the new African nations to the values, modus operandi, and institutions of the United States."7

Proponents of the foundations argue back that such interpretations of their purposes are both incorrect and unfounded. Francis X. Sutton of the Ford Foundation, for instance, states, "The benefits from trade, investment, or educational exchange do not all flow one way." A more abrupt response comes from Laurence D. Stifel, representing the Rockefeller Foundation, who simply labels Berman's allegations, "unsubstantiated assertions."8

Nevertheless, it seems likely that at least one purpose of the ELEC effort to improve English teaching methods in Japan was related to U.S. foreign policy. The ELEC campaign began during the years of the cold war, at a time when Communist agitation in
Japan was growing. Naturally, the United States did not want Japan to go over to the Soviet side, and efforts were made to strengthen Japan's ties with the United States. As early as 1953, in a follow-up to the "Dulles Report" of 1951 (written after John D. Rockefeller 3rd toured Japan with U. S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles), it was recognized that "private agencies" could "improve the relationship between the two countries" and "aid on the Marxism problem," and such efforts were encouraged. The Rockefeller-supported Japan Society was established for this purpose. In a memo written shortly before the formation of the Society in 1952, Donald H. McLean, Jr., John D. Rockefeller 3rd's legal advisor, wrote:

The peace treaty has now been signed by Japan and is awaiting confirmation by the United States Senate. Since the end of the war there has been a considerable change in the relationship between Japan and the United States and it seems essential that in our own self-interest as a nation we take affirmative steps to further a healthy understanding between the two countries.

Believing that a sound economy was another prerequisite to healthy relationships and cultural interchange and hoping to help strengthen Japan's economy after WWII, John D. Rockefeller 3rd established "a small philanthropic fund called the Council on Economic and Cultural Affairs." (Most of his later financial support for the ELEC operation was provided through CECA.)

After World War II, the economic recovery of Japan, the introduction of American technology into that country, and the establishment of strong economic ties between the United States and Japan were in the interest of many parties in the United States. The Rockefellers were no exception. A 1955 report to the president of the Standard-Vacuum Oil Company concluded with these words:

Much of my thinking about the future of Stan-Vac in Japan has grown from my appraisal of the economic, political and psychological forces at work here....I think we should join hands with the most competent Japanese we can find because it will help us to build a more solid business here. I think that we should actively promote policies which will strengthen the over-all foreign exchange position of Japan because it will broaden the market for our products....We have the chance at this point to take a significant step forward in good corporate citizenship.
Absolving Guilt

Rockefeller concern for Japan may have also stemmed, at least in part, from feelings of guilt after the great nuclear destruction at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, for "the Foundation contributed heavily to the development of nuclear fission and, unhappily, the atomic bomb."\textsuperscript{14}

Interesting though such \textit{ex post facto} analysis may be, it will not be pursued further in this dissertation. For present purposes, it is sufficient to note that, whatever the intention(s) may have been, Rockefeller Foundation interest in and support for reforming English language teaching methods in Japan was strong\textsuperscript{15}—especially in the case of one of the third-generation Rockefeller brothers, John D. Rockefeller 3rd.

\textbf{John D. Rockefeller 3rd's Interest in Japan and English-Language Teaching}

A history of the Rockefeller brothers notes:

John's greatest postwar interest...has been in the Far East, particularly Japan, and in 1952 he became president of Japan Society, Inc., which has the purpose of helping to bring the people of the United States and of Japan closer together in their appreciation and understanding of each other and each other's way of life.\textsuperscript{16}

But John D. Rockefeller 3rd's interest in Japan began more than twenty years prior to his becoming president of the Japan Society. After graduating from college, "in 1929 he took a trip around the world, visiting in Asia, Japan, China and Korea."\textsuperscript{17} At that time he became greatly interested in Japan, and later visited the country "on various occasions before World War II."

He returned after the war and then accompanied the John Foster Dulles mission to Tokyo when the peace treaty was being negotiated. At that time he met with many Japanese in all stations of life and out of those discussions began to emerge a plan for a cultural center that would work for harmony between the two peoples.\textsuperscript{18}

This was in keeping with his idealistic proposition that "if the people of different nations understood each other better, international problems will be much more capable of solution and the lives of all will be enriched." It was also based on the less idealistic idea.
that "a peace treaty is only as valid as the relationships between the contracting parties are good."19

It was not long before Rockefeller realized the important role that English language teaching would play in his plans. Economic development and cross-cultural understanding required the interchange of scholarship and information, and this interchange depended on language ability—that is, the English language ability of the Japanese.

Unfortunately, most Japanese were woefully lacking in English communication skills—especially listening and speaking. English had been widely studied in Japan since the late 1800's, but typically only the written modality of the language was emphasized. Furthermore, in the years prior to and during the war, English came to be seen as "the enemy's language."20 "As the war proceeded, the study of English in secondary schools became suspect, until in 1944 it nearly vanished."21 Therefore, after the war, the level of English proficiency—especially oral proficiency—among the Japanese was very low. This, of course, created some problems when the post-war need for English skills became critical for many Japanese.

For instance, when, under the GARIOA (Government Aid and Relief in Occupied Areas) program (1949-1953), Japanese scholars were sent to the United States, it quickly became apparent that, to succeed in America, these scholars needed better English skills—especially oral English (listening and speaking) skills. The Japan Society, which was also funding Japanese scholars in the United States, found that they needed an extra year, just to get their English up to standard, before beginning study in their content area.22

One proposed solution was to provide an intensive English course in Japan for those chosen to come to the United States.23 A better solution, however, that would benefit many more Japanese, would be to improve the quality of English instruction in all of Japan.24 A number of prominent Japanese agreed that the need for such improvement was great, and the timing was right. For instance, while attending the Stanford-Tokyo University Summer Seminar on American studies in 1950, Yasaka Takagi, a professor at the University of Tokyo (and later a member of ELEC), stated: "It seems to me that the
time is now ripe for revitalizing the American Studies in Japan, and to adopt a new and improved method of teaching the English language."25

If the Japanese were really interested in the renovation of English language teaching in their country, John D. Rockefeller 3rd was willing to help.26

As early as 1951, in the "Dulles Report" (prepared by John D. Rockefeller 3rd) English language teaching was recognized as "a field of the greatest and most fundamental importance."27 A few years later, another report suggested the idea of introducing in Japan "the newer language teaching methods now in use with such success in American colleges."28 Nevertheless, in spite of the recognized importance of encouraging and improving ELT in Japan, little action was being taken. Four of Rockefeller's colleagues reported:

Despite the comments of the Dulles Report and the fact that English-language teaching constitutes one of President Cole's four recommendations, very little is being done to improve English-language teaching in Japan. On the contrary, we understand that for budgetary reasons the State Department has abandoned the idea of sending an English-teaching specialist to Japan.29

Although Rockefeller's advisors attached importance to the need to improve Japanese ELT practices, they were "not enthusiastic about the establishment of an independent language center in Japan, as suggested in the Dulles Report." Instead, they recommended providing several Japanese universities with "the most modern facilities for the teaching of the English language."30 In the end, however, this suggestion was not followed either.

An alternative solution was to encourage the spread of modern methods for teaching English through the existing school system. In their 1953 report to JDR 3rd, Mclean, Overton, Borton, and Carman suggested, "It is clearly impossible to provide enough English-speaking teachers to change the situation....But it should be possible somehow or other to introduce the newer language teaching methods now in use with such success in American colleges."31 Nevertheless, for the time being, nothing was done to implement this suggestion.

As time went by, Rockefeller's concern increased. According to those who knew him, he "always thought in global terms." From this perspective he saw that, more than ever before, the world was becoming one and needed a common language. He also
realized that, as Japan recovered from the war, it would need to learn to communicate with the world better than it had done in the past. In July 1955, from the Imperial Hotel in Tokyo, he wrote of his feelings about the importance of improving English language teaching in Japan:

As never before I am appreciating on this trip the importance of English language teaching in Japan. The lack of a common foreign language is a barrier which becomes increasingly serious with the development of modern communications. What has particularly struck me on this visit is the fact that it is not only a barrier to the west but also within Asia itself. This all makes me keener than ever to consider the further possibility of whether English language teaching in Japan can be made more effective.

The Early Exploratory Phase

Rockefeller's growing concern led him to want to take action to reform English language teaching practices in Japan. Nevertheless, as he admittedly was not an expert on this subject, he suggested that the Japan Society study the problem and recommend possible solutions. Douglas Overton, executive director of the Japan Society, and Hugh Borton, one of the Society's vice presidents, decided to commission an expert, third-party assessment of the situation. Interestingly, Charles C. Fries, who later played such a significant role in the ELEC campaign, was recommended as one who "would be well qualified to make the survey, especially in Japan and the Philippines." In the end, however, William Cullen Bryant, Jr., head of the American Language Center (for foreign students) at Columbia University, was selected to do it.

William Cullen Bryant's Report and Recommendations

Bryant traveled to Japan in the fall and winter of 1954-55 and did extensive research. During the three months he was in Japan, he visited "about 50 classes in 20 secondary schools" both public and private, in metropolitan areas, smaller cities, and rural areas. He also "observed classes in teacher training institutions," visited 15 universities and held discussions with English teachers from 15 more, besides attending the annual conferences of two professional organizations in the field." In addition, he
visited a number of private adult English schools. He even attended a "festival of English plays, speeches, and songs" put on by lower secondary school students.\textsuperscript{35}

Not surprisingly, Bryant's report was quite hefty (90-pages).\textsuperscript{36} It was also quite thorough, beginning with "A History of English in Japan," examining "English Teaching Today—The Situation and the Problem," and finally making recommendations. It emphasized the importance of understanding the background of the Japanese ELT situation and going through proper channels in any attempt to modify it.\textsuperscript{37} His advice was that it would be a "fatal mistake" not to work with the Ministry of Education\textsuperscript{38} and other prestigious, influential organizations. His report also discussed the potential for poisonous inter-organization "jealousies" to develop if things were not handled sensitively.\textsuperscript{39} In addition, it recognized the power of Japanese university and high school entrance examinations and the difficulty of changing them.\textsuperscript{40} The fact that older men, less interested in change headed the hierarchy of leaders within the Japanese school system was also perceived as a serious obstacle to any attempt to change ELT practices in Japan. Generally, Bryant's message was that "the problem of English teaching improvement is an immense one which is... unlikely to be solved by a single 'pilot project' built around a 'new method,' no matter how carefully planned."\textsuperscript{41}

Unfortunately, it seems that many of the recommendations in Bryant's report were not taken seriously enough and its warnings were not heeded. In fact, the reaction to the report was rather critical. One commentator, for instance, began, "Haven't read this report very thoroughly, as I am suspicious of its method," and went on, "I don't see why anyone couldn't have turned out this particular version after one course at Teachers' Training and two books on Japan....I don't see why a visit to Japan was necessary to this report given the library facilities of 1955."\textsuperscript{42}

Perhaps Bryant's recommendations were ignored because they were not in keeping with what certain Rockefeller "insiders" had already decided. By the time Bryant's report was submitted (in late summer of 1955), it seems that plans to establish some kind of "Japan English Center" (as envisioned by JDR 3rd in his 1951 "Dulles Report") were already being made.
Deliberations on How to Proceed

Nearly a year before the English Language Exploratory Committee was formed, deliberations regarding the proper course of action began. At first, there was only an informal "committee on English teaching method" spearheaded by Shigeharu Matsumoto and involving Takeshi Saito, Yasaka Takagi, and Edwin O. Reischauer. Matsumoto—a prominent Japanese lawyer and statesman, a graduate of Yale, and a personal friend of John D. Rockefeller 3rd—had been encouraged by Rockefeller "to explore possibilities in this direction." The first meeting of this informal committee was held August 5, 1955 at the International House of Japan. They agreed on the following points (outlined in a subsequent letter to JDR 3rd from Matsumoto, who emphasized their compliance with Rockefeller's wishes):

1. The sponsoring organization or committee should be organized and operated on Japanese initiatives and Japanese responsibility; this point was one of your basic points, I remember.

2. The sponsoring body should consist more of laymen than of experts. Experts should form a technical advisory committee under this sponsoring body; this is again in harmony with your thinking I believe.

3. The sponsoring body should have no special affiliation with any of the existing institutions being interested or to be interested in this program of teaching method; this is the last of the points you had in mind I think.

4. All four of us have agreed that Chairman of the Committee should be either a public-minded businessman or a senior diplomat.

5. Four of us agreed on the timeliness (sic) and pertinency of the project; time is just getting ripe enough to start this kind of project afresh; and also there will not be strong opposition from any quarters concerned if the plan is launched tactfully enough.

6. As a practical approach, the plan of giving intensive courses to "in service" secondary school teachers is believed to be most effective. Special courses of functional English in the curriculum for college students would be another approach. Both can be carried out simultaneously.

There followed a proposed budget for this program (in two phases, to cover a period of three years) of between $150,000 (minimum) and $300,000 (maximum). This amount would cover operating, administrative, and research and development costs in both Japan and the United States.
The "Temporary Committee on English Teaching Methods" was organized in November 1955. Committee members were "Dr. Gordon T. Bowles, Professor at the University of Tokyo; Miss Tano Jodai, President, Japan Women's University; Mr. Shigeharu Matsumoto; Professor Edwin O. Reischauer; Dr. Takeshi Saito; Professor Mamoru Shimizu of International Christian University; Mr. Ryohei Shishido, a curriculum specialist from the Ministry of Education; and Dr. Yasaka Takagi."\(^{48}\)

The speed with which the movement should proceed was one subject of committee discussion. Reischauer regarded English language teaching as "the most important problem in all modern Japanese education," but recommended a "go-slow policy" lest the attempt to reform ELT methods be "bumbled by inexpert or hasty handling."\(^{49}\) Donald H. McLean, Jr., Rockefeller's on-site representative, agreed that an effective movement would "take time and a considerable amount of negotiating."\(^{50}\)

Nevertheless, the events of the next few months proceeded at an almost dizzying pace. The committee recommended that a "conference of technical advisors be held for about a week sometime in late March 1956." It also planned for a three-week "experimental In-Service Training Course scheduled for August 1956."\(^{51}\) Although this conference and training course did not take place quite as quickly as they hoped, the committee did work faithfully over the next few months, holding its twelfth meeting on April 25, 1956.\(^{52}\)

In these meetings, Reischauer also emphasized the need for any movement to "grow fundamentally out of a genuine Japanese interest in the problem" and "to have the sympathetic support of influential members of the former group ["old fashioned teachers of English literature and English as a language only to be read"] if it is to have much success."\(^{53}\) This was also in keeping with John D. Rockefeller 3rd's wishes. In fact, Rockefeller himself wrote, "This should be a genuinely indigenous movement in its origin and nature. It seems to me this is essential to its success."

Nevertheless, in the same communication, Rockefeller also suggested that "advice and support" come from outside Japan and urged the committee "to consider some responsible group like a University, and preferably in the United States where so much time and thought have been given to the improvement of language teaching methods."\(^{54}\) Some, such as McLean, questioned whether a university should be involved.
("Universities do not do these jobs too well since their principal concern is with teaching and research")55), but there was never any question that the methodological expertise behind the reform should could from the United States.

As time went by, the plans for the ELEC conference became more definite. Within a short time, a budget (totaling $9,500) for the "Proposed Specialists' Conference" was drawn up. It included passage and per diem for "visiting consultants," two from the United States and one from England.56 This was in keeping with one of its major purposes—to bring to Japan "some of the outstanding Americans in the field with the thought that as a result of such a conference the views of the Japanese might become more definite and certain not only as to the contribution which Americans could make but also as to the individuals who could make this contribution.57

Meanwhile, back in New York, the search began for the right experts and methods to be sent to Japan from the United States. A number of major American universities offered intensive English language courses for foreign students and had faculty with experience and expertise in English language teaching. Michigan and Cornell were recognized as being "foremost," with Michigan being given "the edge."58 Naturally then, Charles C. Fries, the head of the Michigan English Language Institute, was a prime candidate.

Rockefeller's workers also investigated the Ford Foundation's English language teaching project in Indonesia, which had begun a few years previous to this time. They reported that "at the outset, instructors were drawn from Cornell, but it was found that there was a scarcity of trained personnel with the result that Michigan personnel were recruited. The result was that Michigan techniques proved more successful and have since been adopted."59 Without doubt, this report also swayed the committee in favor of inviting Fries to Japan to explain his Oral Approach.

With this information, the "Conference Preparation Committee" met in early May and "agreed unanimously that the middle of October would be the best time for holding this Conference of experts, and the first scholar we should like to have among us for this purpose is Prof[fessor] Fries. As to another scholar to be invited from the United States, our conclusion was that it would be best to leave that choice to Prof[fessor] Fries."60 So high was their regard for Fries that they not only left the choice of the second scholar up
to him, they also rescheduled the conference to September to accommodate his schedule when they learned he could not come in October.61

Fries chose Freeman Twaddell of Brown University (and a frequent visiting professor at Michigan's summer institute) to be the second American scholar, and from England, representing the British Council, came A. S. Hornby. By far the most influential of these three was Fries. He, "more than anyone else,"62 played a major role in establishing ELEC's methodological foundation. And ELEC would advocate his Oral Approach "as the most effective way of teaching and learning English"63 for many years—long after Fries had come and gone.64

Charles C. Fries and His Oral Approach

Because of the important role Fries and his Oral Approach played in the ELEC campaign, it is appropriate to devote a special section of this chapter to a discussion of the man and the language teaching principles he promulgated.

Personal Background, Training, and Experiences

Fries was born in Reading, Pennsylvania in 1887, one hundred years ago. His death in 1967, at the age of 80, marked the end of a long and productive life—professionally and otherwise.

Fries earned his first university degrees in Greek and Latin and became a teacher of Greek and rhetoric in the classics department at Bucknell University. Nevertheless, his interests led him to develop expertise and a reputation in other areas. In 1915, to the astonishment of his colleagues, he transferred to the English department. He later went to the University of Michigan, where he completed his Ph.D. in English in 1922 and then joined the faculty of the English department. Until he retired as Professor Emeritus in 1958, the University of Michigan served as Fries' base for the remainder of his wide-ranging academic career.65
In the 1930's (with financial support from the Rockefeller-funded General Education Board) he did extensive research work on sixteenth and seventeenth century English, leading to the production of an Early Modern English Dictionary. Fries also became involved with American applied linguistics in its early stages. He was a founding member of the Linguistic Society of America and became its president in 1939. Nevertheless, unlike many linguists of the time, who worked with exotic or at least "foreign" languages, Fries devoted himself to the English language, and his major emphasis was in applying linguistics to pedagogy. In fact, Howatt calls Fries "the first applied linguist in the modern sense."

He served as president of the National Council of Teachers of English (1927-28) and also served on committees and commissions of other professional organizations, such as the American Council of Learned Societies and the Modern Language Association.

Fries' work covered a wide range of topics—lexicography, the teaching of reading, signals grammar, vocabulary frequency, etc.—and he published widely also. By 1956, when he went to Japan, he had authored seven books: The Teaching of Literature (1925), The Teaching of the English Language (1927), English Word Lists—a Study of their Adaptability for Instruction (1940), Language Study in American Education (1940), American English Grammar (1940), Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language (1945), and The Structure of English (1952).

At the University of Michigan, in 1941, Fries established the first English Language Institute in the United States. Its methods and materials were based on his ideas concerning the best way to teach and learn a foreign language. Interestingly, this institute was originally funded by a grant in aid from the Rockefeller Foundation. Naturally then, Rockefeller Foundation eyes were on Fries and his work, and the reports were favorable. As early as 1941, it was reported, "I am convinced that Fries is going rapidly in the right direction and will be an excellent counter-balance to other forms of English teaching." Fifteen years later, as preparations for the first ELEC Specialists Conference were being made, Rockefeller personnel recognized Fries as "a creative pioneer in the language field" and "the outstanding man in the United States on the teaching of English as a foreign language."
Basic Principles of Fries' Oral Approach

In his 1945 book, *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language*, Fries outlined the basic tenets of his Oral Approach. Very simply, it aimed at using the spoken language for communicative purposes. As Fries himself put it:

"Oral approach" is a name primarily for the end [italics in original] to be attained in the first stage of language learning rather than a descriptive limitation of the permissible devices to attain that end. That end is the building up of a set of habits for the oral production of a language and for the receptive understanding of the language when it is spoken.75

To this end, the Oral Approach relied on materials which had been carefully prepared utilizing the principles of "modern linguistic science."

The most efficient materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner. It is not enough simply to have the results of such a thorough-going analysis; these results must be organized into a satisfactory system for teaching and implemented with adequate specific practice materials through which the learner may master the sound system, the structure, and the most useful lexical materials of the foreign language.76

For Fries, the Oral Approach was much broader than a set of classroom procedures. It was much more than pattern practice or minimal pairs. In fact, he did not even use the term method to refer to his Oral Approach. He explained:

The word 'approach' rather than 'method' has been chosen deliberately. It has been chosen in order to stress the fact that we are concerned with a path to a goal.... We are concerned with such a path rather than with a method of teaching.77

In contrast to the traditional language teaching methods used in Japan at that time, that path was the "oral use of English." Fries emphasized oral language not only because modern linguists viewed language as primarily vocal but also for pedagogical reasons. Oral practice was less time-consuming than practice in written language and it also led to good reading habits because it prevented students from going back and forth to decipher the text (a typical Japanese practice in translation).78 Fries explained:

No matter what the final goal of the person who starts to learn English (full control of English, reading scientific books or English literature, passing university entrance exams by translating),...what we have called the "oral approach" is the most efficient, the most time-saving way to begin the study of English, and throughout the first stage of English learning.79
It is important to note that Fries' Oral Approach dealt only with the "first stage" of foreign language learning. At this stage, the goal was carefully defined and quite different from the typical outcomes of English study in Japan. Fries claimed:

A person has "learned" a foreign language when he has thus first, within a limited vocabulary [italics in original] mastered the sound system (that is, when he can understand the stream of speech and achieve an understandable production of it) and has, second, made the structural devices (that is[,] the basic arrangements of utterances) matters of automatic habit. This degree of mastery of a foreign language can be achieved by most adults, by means of a scientific approach with satisfactorily selected and organized materials, within approximately three months. In that brief time the learning adult will not become a fluent speaker for all occasions but he can have laid a good accurate foundation upon which to build, and the extension of his control of content vocabulary will then come rapidly and with increasing ease.80

Although the "special goal" of the Oral Approach and the "special materials" which it employed were of primary importance to Fries, he also admitted that it also necessitated "certain special principles of method." Most of these were in stark contrast with traditional Japanese methods for English language teaching.

1. Inasmuch as all the significant basic materials of language are features in contrast, much of the teaching is based on the use of contrast.

2. As a principle, the development of accuracy comes first—accuracy of sound pattern, accuracy of structure pattern, accuracy of response, accuracy of production.

3. The goal set up in the "oral approach" is the ability to use the language....To use a new language one must develop a new set of habits. And habits can only be developed by practice....On the whole the classes using the "oral approach" are thought of and planned in terms of opportunities for pupil practice.

4. Practice exercises to be most effective must proceed through at least three important steps

(a) Accurate imitation of the pattern in the sentence as presented by the teacher; and then enough repetition of the complete sentence to make the oral production by the pupil easy, smooth, and in a proper English tempo.

(b) Practice by the pupil in choosing the proper item of a contrastive pair...

(c) Automatic unconscious use of the appropriate item or structure, when the attention is centered upon the meaning of the whole utterance and is thus drawn away from the particular necessity of making a selection

5. All practice should lead to the stage of learning in which the language forms themselves sink below the threshold of attention and the speaker becomes conscious only of the meaning
6. A satisfactory control of a language can not be achieved through a process of memorizing rules and trying to remember and apply them.81

Much more could be said about Fries' Oral Approach, but that is not the purpose of this dissertation. Neither is it to defend or attack his positions in linguistics, psychology, or pedagogy. The Oral Approach has already been explained, attacked, and defended elsewhere.

Nevertheless, one final point about Fries and his Oral Approach must be made. Although the present-day tendency is to think of Fries' ideas as belonging to one of two categories—"classic," or "old fashioned"—for his time, Fries was a "radical."82 He was a great reformer, a pedagogical revolutionary. "Compared with foreign language teaching in the U. S. before 1940,...the innovations established by Fries were a radical departure from previous concepts of language instruction."83 Moreover, his innovative ideas spread far beyond the University of Michigan campus. Perhaps more than anyone else of his time, he and his ideas were instrumental in bringing about major changes in the way foreign languages were taught in the United States and elsewhere around the world. "Whether one chooses to accept or to reject specific elements of the 'Fries Legacy,' one can neither ignore nor deny the importance of the impact of Charles C. Fries on ESL and on the applied linguistics research underlying it."84

The Spread of the Oral Approach

As early as 1939, "in anticipation of increased concern with the teaching of English in Puerto Rico and the Latin American countries," due to President Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Good Neighbor Policy," a conference was held to determine which methodological approach U.S. Department of State operations would follow in teaching English in that part of the world. The choice was between "the Basic English with pictures proposed by I.A. Richards and a linguistically based approach advocated by Fries."85 After some deliberation, the decision was to support Fries.

The success of Fries' English Language Institute at Michigan, the first of its kind in the United States, was well publicized, and interest in his methods and materials grew. "The experimental intensive course was a resounding success and the English Language
Institute was established as a permanent part of the university. By 1943, the ELI offered continuous eight-week intensive English courses throughout the entire calendar year.... From modest numbers of students during the first few years, enrollments rose steadily. 

Because of its reputation for success, the Michigan institute served as a model for ELI programs set up at numerous other American universities in subsequent years, and the books produced by Fries and his staff for use in the Michigan ELI were adopted by similar programs throughout the country.

Fries' 1945 book for teachers, *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language*, became a classic (still in print today). Moreover, an intensive Teacher Education Program was set up on the University of Michigan campus which would eventually train "over 4,000 teachers of English from the United States and from countries around the world." 

Michigan started its own journal, *Language Learning*, in 1948. Devoted to "the pedagogical implications of linguistic science," it was unique for its day and found an eager audience. Since most articles (at least in the early years) were written by Michigan people (Fries' disciples, for the most part) and dealt with their language-teaching principles and programs, this publication lent prestige to Fries' work and aided in disseminating his Oral Approach gospel far and wide.

**Conditions Encouraging the Spread of Oral Approach Ideas in the U.S.A.**

Of course, Fries was also fortunate in encountering favorable conditions for the spread of new language teaching methods in the United States in his day.

When the United States entered World War II, the importance of foreign languages to the war effort soon became apparent. The "frightenly practical and urgent communication needs of the battlefields, the refugee and prisoner of war camps, and of military intelligence" often demanded personnel who could communicate in non-English languages. Yet, "only one American out of 5,000 could speak passable French or German" and "there were practically no trusted Americans who spoke Japanese, Malay, or Yapese."
To remedy this problem, the U.S. Army set up a special language training program. This "Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP) commenced operations in 1943 and soon involved 15,000 trainees at 55 American colleges and universities. It is noteworthy that although it used existing campuses, the Army did not contract with the universities to provide conventional language courses. Many of the military students had already been through such traditional coursework, and it was obvious that such an approach did not lead to a utilitarian command of the spoken language, which is what the military operations required.

The ASTP lasted only a short time—about nine months. Operations were suspended in 1944, but its influence was to endure much longer. "Achievement was, on the whole, greatly superior to that in the conventional language courses previously given in schools and colleges."91 "The results after a few months seemed so impressive that it was believed that the 'Army Method' contained the secret of successful language teaching."92 Consequently, the program "caused great interest among language teachers generally"93 and it gained "widespread recognition"—"both through articles in scholarly journals and...the popular press."94 Naturally then, after the war, there was an intensified demand for similar courses in American secondary schools and universities,95 and many schools and colleges attempted to duplicate them.96

The method and materials used by the Army were based on those used in the relatively obscure Intensive Language Program started in 1941 by the American Council of Learned Societies. The program was originated by and for anthropological linguists (with the aid of two $50,000 grants from the Rockefeller Foundation97) and derived from the work of Franz Boas and Edward Sapir, as well as Leonard Bloomfield, the "father" of American structural linguistics.

Charles Fries' Oral Approach, though it developed distinctly at Michigan, was in this same tradition, and it benefited from the post-war interest in the application of modern linguistics to language pedagogy. The appearance of Fries' book for teachers in 1945 and the prominence of his English Language Institute successes occurred at a time when the mood for reforming U. S. foreign language courses was strong. As Anthony explains, "the War provided an irresistible force that weakened the previously immovable traditions of grammar-translation methods employed to gain largely literary aims. And
this change enabled some foreign language teachers to break with tradition and to innovate.\textsuperscript{98}

A decade later, the Sputnik panic and the resultant National Defense Education Act renewed the emphasis on reforming foreign language teaching in America's schools along Oral Approach/Army method/audio-lingual lines. Modern language teaching was given high priority, and books such as William Riley Parker's \textit{The National Interest and Foreign Languages} \textsuperscript{99} appeared. U. S. educators lamented that "the general ignorance of foreign languages throughout the country does, in fact, isolate us from the thinking and friendship of other peoples."\textsuperscript{100} and noted other factors encouraging language study, such as the large number of U. S. soldiers sent abroad since World War II (20,000,000!), the "expansion of U. S. trade and investments abroad," the "sending of technicians, doctors, and teachers abroad," "the creation of defense pacts such as NATO and SEATO," and the "increase in international conferences."\textsuperscript{101}

In addition to these exhortations about the importance of foreign language study, the NDEA provided government money to "pay for a teacher's attendance at a summer institute where his knowledge of the language he teaches [was] improved and he [was] given an acquaintance with linguistics and the audiolingual method."\textsuperscript{102} Many teachers attended such institutes, and the result was felt in language courses throughout the country.

In sum, a crisis was perceived, and (in accordance with a normal pattern in the United States) sweeping changes occurred.\textsuperscript{103} "new age" dawned in the history of American language teaching\textsuperscript{104} and much of the light came from Charles C. Fries. "He himself thought of his innovations as applying not just to EFL but to foreign language teaching generally."\textsuperscript{105} His ideas spread widely, and "in the 1950s, the Michigan approach and the Michigan materials became nothing less than the 'American way,' the orthodox methodology of American English specialists in both the United States and abroad."\textsuperscript{106}

Most importantly, language teachers were in the mood to accept these new ideas and they were given training so they could understand and implement them. These conditions combined to encourage the spread of the new gospel of linguistics and language teaching "that swept foreign language departments in North America in the late 1950s and 60s."\textsuperscript{107}
The Spread of the Oral Approach Outside of the United States

The influence of Fries' "Michigan Method" was not restricted to the United States, of course. It quickly spread across national boundaries to different parts of the world.

The first place it was exported was Mexico.

In 1943, the United States for the first time in its history moved through the Department of State to set up an ongoing English-teaching program abroad. It provided a grant to the Michigan Institute to support for eighteen months the English Language Institute at the Benjamin Franklin Library in Mexico City. Fries sent the late Albert H. Marckwardt as the first director. 108

But Mexico was only the first in a long list of countries to be influenced by the ideas for teaching ESL developed by Fries at Michigan. "In the 1940's, 1950's and 1960's, the ELI was deeply involved in English language instruction on five continents. In total, during the years from 1941 to 1984, the ELI has conducted special programs in language teaching and/or teacher training in Ann Arbor and in over 30 host countries around the world." 109

Fries was personally involved in many of these ventures. In the early 1940's, his experiences with the teaching of English to Spanish speakers at Michigan led to other projects in Latin America. From 1949 to 1954, he headed up a program to revise the English teaching program in elementary schools in Puerto Rico. 110 When Rockefeller personnel inquired about his work there, the report they received was that it "was well received and that the results have been significant." 111

In 1954-55, when ELEC was investigating the possibility of having Fries attend the Specialists' Conference, he was lecturing in Germany on a Fulbright award. 112 While there, he received numerous invitations to lecture in other countries: Singapore, Syria, Hong Kong, Ceylon, Indonesia, Taiwan, the Philippines, and Japan. 113

The Japanese invitations were to lecture at Meiji Gakuin and International Christian University. 114 Fries was willing, even eager to visit Japan, having become acquainted with the country through contacts with GARJOA students at Michigan. Unfortunately, due to delays and misunderstandings, he did not make it that far. He expressed his regrets at not being able to visit Japan. To the United States Educational Commission officer in Germany he wrote, "Japan is the one place in which I could do the most good." 115 And to the USEC executive secretary in Japan he apologized: "I am
exceedingly sorry, not because of myself for it would have been a strenuous trip, but because of the fact that I did feel that I could have been of some use to your teachers of English. Perhaps the opportunity may arise again for me to give some help to the teachers of your country.”

Those words were more than just a polite apology. Fries was genuinely interested in Japan. Later in that year, he investigated a possible Fulbright opening teaching English as a foreign language in Japan, and in Ann Arbor there was also discussion of opening a University of Michigan Center in Japan with which Fries would be involved.

Ironically, at the time he was investigating possible opportunities in Japan, Rockefeller representatives were investigating the possibility of involving him in their effort to reform English teaching in Japan. Only a few months later he would receive an invitation from the newly formed English Language Exploratory Committee to travel to Japan and speak at their upcoming Specialists' Conference.

Establishment of the "English Language Exploratory Committee"

Although the name English Language Exploratory Committee had been used as early as May 1956, the "First Meeting of the Central Committee" of the "English Language Exploratory Committee" was not held until July 28, 1956.

The Committee consisted of an elite group of prestigious and powerful Japanese, some of whom were elected only about a month before the Specialists' Conference and served only a "ceremonial" purpose:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eikichi Araki</td>
<td>Governor, The Bank of Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daishiro Hidaka</td>
<td>Former Vice-Minister of Education; Dean, Institute of Education, International Christian University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanki Ichikawa</td>
<td>Director, Institute for Research on Language Teaching; Professor-Emeritus, University of Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taizo Ishizaka</td>
<td>President, Federation of Economic Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamihei Iwasaki</td>
<td>President, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Tano Jodai</td>
<td>President, Japan Women's University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seiji Kaya</td>
<td>President, Japan Science Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobutane Kiuchi</td>
<td>Managing Director, Institute of World Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinzo Koizumi</td>
<td>Former President, Keio University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takashi Kuroda</td>
<td>Professor of English, Tokyo University of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ceremonial or not, the prestige of this impressive group lent considerable power and credibility to the ELEC cause.

The "aims and aspirations" of ELEC were ambitious. Plainly stated, its purpose was "to change English teaching methods in Japan," to re-educate the teachers of English in that country.

As early as April 1956 these intentions had been made clear:

The assumption is that a much greater development would be found necessary (than what is actually being made) in the adoption of almost revolutionized system of teaching of English, and therefore in the preparation of entirely new series of textbooks and other teaching materials.

Even more ambitious, Rockefeller felt that the project could not only "make a real contribution to language teaching in Japan," but that it also "might even serve as a pattern for other areas."

The ELEC objectives were explained in a letter sent to "all individuals concerned" in August 1956:

In spite of all the efforts made by authorities concerned as well as by teachers of English themselves, the present status of the teaching of English in this country still has much room left for improvement. If we can effect fundamental improvement of this situation by training as many young Japanese as possible to speak good practical English, this will undoubtedly be a contribution to the future international activities of our country. This is the reason we organized the English Language Exploratory Committee last July.
The immediate concern of the Committee was the upcoming "Conference of Specialists." Other topics of discussion, however, included university entrance examinations, "the advisability and possibility of requesting the assistance of Dr. Fries in preparing a new series of textbooks to correct some of the inappropriatenesses of existing texts," and the importance of stressing to the public that "the initiative for the present project was taken by Japanese." To emphasize this point, they officially added "Nihon" to the committee's Japanese name (Eigo-Kyoiku Kenkyu linkai), decided to "make no reference to Mr. Rockefeller's interest," and pointed out that the Japanese Ministry of Education had agreed to be one of the official sponsors of the conference.124

In spite of these ambitious plans, for the time being the committee was still "exploratory" only, and a careful, "go slow" philosophy prevailed. In a memorandum to Rockefeller, Donald McLean explained, "I think that the situation has developed in a healthy sort of way. We are not committed to anything beyond the conference and at the moment we have not really made any specific commitments to it....In short, it seems better to take one step at a time rather than to try to lay out a grand plan."125 Whatever advantages this "let things develop as they may" approach had, the lack of a "grand plan" for ELEC also proved to have some serious disadvantages in the long run.

The ELEC "Specialists Conference"

In keeping with ELEC's major purpose of reforming ELT methods in Japan, the Specialists' Conference had three major purposes:
1. To stimulate interest in English-teaching methods generally,
2. To point out problems with the English-teaching methods commonly used in Japan, and
3. To spread information about new methods (particularly, the American methods).

In his address at the opening session, Eikichi Araki, chairman of ELEC, urged participants to "be as bold and as thoroughgoing as possible in making Recommendations and in preparing Plans of reform."126
The Conference was held at International House and lasted six days (from Monday, September 3 to Saturday, September 8, 1956) and was prepared "in such a way that...all of the important problems of English teaching...in Japan [could] be discussed." Session topics included the following:

"Problems of Teaching English in Japan"

"Present Situation of English Teaching in the Upper and Lower Secondary Schools: The Standard of Achievement to be Required in the University Entrance Examination"

"Comparison of Japanese and English"

"Audio-Visual Aids in the Classroom"

"Training in Universities of Prospective Teachers of English"

It is worthy of note that all three of the "guest consultants," Fries, Hornby, and Twaddell, were originally scheduled to speak on "How to Improve English Teaching in Japan" even though they had arrived in the country only a few days before. Apparently, the conference planners were willing to accept the specialists' prescriptions based on the assumption that "what worked back home" would work equally well in Japan. Wisely, however, the guests spoke on topics with which they were more familiar. Fries, for instance, chose to speak on "Some Aspects of Recent Developments in Linguistics that have Special Significance for Language Teaching," and Twaddell's topic was "Recent Trends and Problems of Foreign Language Teaching in U.S.A."

Of course, the majority of participants were Japanese, and many of the papers were presented by Japanese scholars. This was in keeping with the desire to ensure that the ELEC movement was "genuinely indigenous" and not perceived as an attempt by foreigners to impose a solution on Japan. Such a perception could have been very damaging to ELEC's prospects in these post-occupation years.

The "Conclusions and Recommendations" drawn up at the end of the Specialists' Conference were lengthy. They evidenced the strong influence of Fries' Oral Approach ideas and also outlined the directions ELEC's future activities would take. These conclusions and recommendations were divided into four general categories:

1. General Principles of Teaching Methods. Today too many Japanese teachers of English are teaching about English instead of teaching English itself. Often they are not aware of the ultimate aim toward which their efforts should be directed....Few
of them know much about modern developments in the field of linguistic science. They ought to be made aware of the need of applying these theories to their classroom work. If they were, English teaching and learning here, we are firmly convinced, would become more effective. Oral practice with materials prepared according to scientific principles is considered essential at the beginning of language learning.

2. Teaching Materials. Teaching materials to be used for the new approach must be built upon a systematic comparison of the analyzed structural patterns of English and Japanese. In accord with the principles of the new approach, the textbook used must indicate those activities for the students which guide them in the building-up of speech habits as near as possible to those of native speakers of English. Such a textbook must be accompanied by a teachers' guide with complete descriptions of the activities suggested to induce efficient oral practice. In order to make the new textbook most usable, teacher training must go hand in hand with the compilation. Regarding the preparation and completion of the textbook, it is desirable that the Committee should undertake it promptly.

3. General and Specialized Training of English Teachers. To meet the immediate needs a summer training program in 1957 is highly desirable, primarily for lower secondary school teachers and lasting three to six weeks. For continuing needs consideration should be given to the desirability of establishing one or more institutes which might or might not be attached to existing universities. Such institutes should perform the following tasks: (a) training younger teachers with new methods and new materials, (b) re-training older teachers, (c) supplementing the training of prospective teachers of English in universities.

4. Achievement Tests and University Entrance Examinations. Entrance examinations tend to become a means of selection only, against which every warning should always be given. The Specialists' Conference herewith asserts its earnest desire to have the achievement test conducted always as a means of evaluation rather than as a means of selection. In recent years there has been a steady improvement in the quality of the university entrance examinations in English. But there remains the danger of unrealistic entrance examinations, which are neither a reliable test of the applicant's ability to use English in his future studies nor a just evaluation of his achievement in upper secondary schools. The Specialist's Conference recognizes the great difficulties of administering university entrance examinations in English in view of the large numbers of applicants. It suggests the exploration of language testing procedure with a view to improving the quality of the examinations and reducing the expenditure of trained scholars' energies in this task. One possibility is a national entrance examination prepared by experts in testing techniques and English language teaching, with the understanding that each university would continue to set its own standards of achievement as a requirement for admission.

The sponsors of the Specialist's Conference judged it an unqualified success. Don MacLean, Jr. reported to John D. Rockefeller 3rd:

1. The Conference clearly served the purpose for which it was held in that there now appears to be a firm resolve on the part of the leaders in the English-teaching profession to initiate active steps to improve conditions in this field.
2. The feeling is that the present materials and methods are completely inadequate and that a fresh start must be made. Initially this will probably be at the lower secondary-school level.

3. The current time schedule for the preparation of the proposed materials is indicated in the attached notes on the conference....Indications are that this work will start promptly...In this connection Fries may be asked to return for a month or two in February or March which it appears he may be able to do.

4. A summer teacher-training session is contemplated for 1957. For this they may desire Fries and Twaddell who complement one another beautifully. Fries is about 65 but vigorous. His strength, I would guess, is linguistics. Twaddell is about 55 and I think he is probably a really outstanding teacher—tho (sic) a competent linguist as well. They have really done a superb job here.

5. That there has been such unanimity has been a surprise and a source of great satisfaction...It is a great tribute to the consultants.132

According to McLean, Fries and Twaddell were much more impressive than Hornby. In fact, the British representative was "overshadowed completely." Even this was good news, however. McLean confided, "The British and Palmer have, I feel, been reasonably well eliminated as ghosts which greatly simplifies matters and clears the road for progress."133

In the euphoria of this success, plans for ELEC's future were drawn up. The Conference recommended that (1) "that the English Language Exploratory Committee continue as a permanent organization" and (2) that an executive committee be established and authorized to employ a secretariat so that they could carry forward the program.134 Two major sub-committees were formed—"one for preparing teaching materials, and the other for planning a summer program for 1957."135

Work was to begin right away to prepare examples of first-year, oral practice material, which would be used for training the teachers in the summer. Every year thereafter, an additional "year" of textbook material would be produced and tried out. By August 1961, the first three Oral Approach books would be ready to be submitted to the Ministry of Education for approval and subsequent publication.136

Thus, the two major prongs of ELEC's attack on the traditional Japanese ELT system were defined: (1) training teachers and (2) producing Oral Approach materials. Efforts, successes, and problems in each of these areas will be discussed below.

First, however, the story of Charles C. Fries' work with ELEC will be discussed separately. Although the period of his involvement was relatively short (Fries did not
actively participate in the ELEC campaign after 1959), he helped lay ELEC's ideological foundation. His ideas and his activities in ELEC's early days continued to affect the campaign for many years after he was no longer personally involved in it.

Charles C. Fries' Involvement with ELEC

As noted above, Fries was impressive at the Specialists Conference and his influence was substantial. Shigeharu Matsumoto reported to Donald McLean,

I am convinced that what contributed most to the successful results was the presence of Dr. Fries himself. I believe also that what will sustain the concerted efforts of the Japanese specialists hereafter most effectively is our expectation that Dr. Fries is revisiting us next March. 137

In turn, Donald McLean reported to John D. Rockefeller 3rd,

As Matsumoto has already indicated to us in a recent letter, Fries' performance was outstanding and is probably responsible for whatever success may have been achieved in the past. I think he has a very significant role to play in the future along with Professor Twaddell of Brown....A strong desire has been expressed by the Japanese for them to return.138

Rockefeller himself wrote to Fries,

I could not resist writing you this note not only because of my satisfaction as to the results but also because I realized that they were so largely due to your own participation and leadership in the conference. Also I was most happy to learn that you had agreed to go back to Japan next spring for a period of several weeks. The enthusiasm generated by the conference is liable to diminish as they face the hard facts of the job to be done. The anticipation of your return will give them an incentive which will be I think most important in the launching of their program.139

Fries did return to Japan a number of times and served as "senior USA consultant to ELEC" for several years. Following the 1956 Specialists' Conference, he remained in Japan for nearly three weeks, until August 28, traveling throughout the country, visiting many universities and secondary schools, and giving lectures. In March of 1957 on his way back from a UNESCO conference on the teaching of modern languages held in Sydney, Australia, he stopped in Japan and stayed until June 18, working on the preparation of materials. In 1958 (from April 10 to June 21)140 and 1959 (April through May) he was involved in similar ELEC-sponsored activities in Japan. In 1960 and 1961 he returned to Japan again, but this time he went as a consultant for the Asia Foundation,
which was setting up a college-level English course at the Japanese Defense Academy.\textsuperscript{141} In 1966, he made his final visit to Japan, but it was only a short one as he was passing through.\textsuperscript{142}

During the years of his involvement with ELEC, Fries was involved in three types of activities: lecture tours, materials and "corpus" preparation, and planning for the Summer Program for teachers.

**Lecture Tours**

During the first three years he came to Japan, Fries traveled all over the country giving lectures on the Oral Approach to Japanese teachers of English. He was a powerful, persuasive speaker and was "very popular."\textsuperscript{143} There were "great audiences wherever he went."\textsuperscript{144} Hundreds of English teachers would gather to hear him speak on the Oral Approach.

In 1956, after the Specialists' Conference, he traveled as far as Osaka and Fukuoka. On August 21 he also gave a lecture at the prestigious University of Tokyo.\textsuperscript{145}

In 1957 he toured as far as Yamaguchi-ken where he was well received. A professor at Yamaguchi National University expressed the feelings of many when he heard that Fries was coming:

> In the Educational Faculty I am teaching on [sic] your *principles* and *approaches* [italics in original], and not only the students but all the teachers of English in junior and senior high schools hereabout are so serious, so earnest studying your Michigan Approaches. And that great news that you are coming is a great stimulus indeed.\textsuperscript{146}

In 1958, his lectures and discussions took him to Hiroshima and then to the island of Shikoku. Upon returning to Tokyo he spoke with several large groups, including one at the Tokyo University of Education.\textsuperscript{147}

**Materials and "Corpus" Preparation**

One of Charles C. Fries fundamental beliefs was that
only with satisfactory basic materials can one efficiently begin the study of a foreign
language. No matter what happens later, the ease and speed of attainment in the
early stages of the learning of a language will depend primarily upon the selection
and sequence of the materials to be studied. 148

From the start of his work with ELEC, Fries emphasized the importance of
materials. In his pre-conference contacts with Rockefeller representatives, he stressed
"time and time again" the point "that the method is not what is important but that what is
important are the materials which are developed through the use of linguistics." 149

A related, and equally critical point for Fries was that

"Foreign" language teaching is always a matter of teaching a specific "foreign"
language with its special structural features to students who have a specific "native"
language background with fundamentally different structural features. To be
efficient, separate and differing sets of materials for learning English must be used
for those of each different linguistic background. 150

In other words, "a different set of teaching materials must be prepared for each
linguistic background." 151

It was not surprising, then, that one of the recommendations made at the end of the
Fries-dominated Specialists' Conference was that a set of Oral Approach textbooks
designed especially for Japanese students be prepared by ELEC.

The plan was to make the two parts of ELEC's double emphasis (materials
preparation and teacher training) work together by preparing Oral Approach materials for
Japan and then using them with the teachers in the Summer Program. Given his
predilection toward materials and the limits on his time in Japan, Fries naturally placed his
major emphasis on materials production and left the teacher training of the Summer
Program to Twaddell, Patricia O. Connor (an assistant professor at Stanford University
who worked primarily with Twaddell), and others.

Fries' major work was in producing what he called a "corpus" ("a detailed outline
of English structure, vocabulary, and content") which was "not intended for classroom
work but as a basic guide to future textbook writers and publishers." 152 It undergirded
the ELEC Summer Program courses and also became the foundation for the textbooks
ELEC produced.

Fries was most involved at the early stage, when the first-year materials were being
written. Progress came only after he had overcome a number of difficulties. For
instance, he traveled to Tokyo in March of 1957 expecting to help polish up what the
materials production sub-committee had produced. Upon arrival, he was disappointed to find that very little work had been done. He wrote to Twaddell, "Miss O'Connor did everything she could but they didn't even get together until January and then the subcommittee met every 3 weeks to talk about it." He also encountered problems finding adequate personnel in Japan and admitted to Twaddell that "there is difficulty getting real help on whipping the rough material into shape." Furthermore, in the beginning, ELEC had no physical facilities to speak of, so "from 1957 to 1958, the work of compilation was carried on at Dr. Yasaka Takagi's house in Shibuya." Despite these problems, the materials for the 1957 Summer Seminar did get prepared and, according to an optimistic Fries, the program "succeeded brilliantly"

The following year, 1958, when the second-year materials were produced, better help was secured and success came more easily. In fact, although Fries (who was in Japan for a shorter time period, from April 10 to June 21) drafted the materials and "contributed greatly to the project," the real load was passed to a number of newly recruited ELEC workers—Dr. Ernest Haden (a professor at The University of Texas), Dr. Einar Haugen (a professor at The University of Wisconsin), Dr. Mary Lu Joynes (an instructor at The University of Wisconsin), and Dr. Everett Kleinjans (a recent graduate of Fries' program at Michigan and a faculty member at International Christian University).

In 1958, however, additional challenges also arose. There were some serious disagreements between Fries and Twaddell (discussed in detail under "harmony" in chapter five). This "friction" was—to say the least—discouraging for both men, and although they were eventually able to work around their differences, both Fries and Twaddell nearly abandoned the project at this time. In addition, after working so strenuously, both men were very tired. The burden was especially heavy in the case of the older Fries. In light of these factors, it was concluded "that although the contribution of Professor Fries had been an indispensable one to date, he should not be permitted to be involved in any operational sense in the development of materials lest he hold up progress since he has lost a considerable amount of his vigor in recent months as a result of his advancing years." Fries himself admitted, "I was not in very good shape as I left Japan" and was worried about a possible gall bladder operation in January. He later
wrote to ELEC, "Those who have been concerned with my physical welfare [realize] that I must not continue to push myself as vigorously as I have in the past." \(^{161}\)

Besides these reasons for Fries' diminishing involvement, the Japanese leaders of ELEC\(^{162}\) as well as the Japanese junior trainers\(^{163}\) were beginning to take on more responsibility. Such being the case, it was agreed that "there would be no ranking American professor."\(^{164}\)

By this time also, Fries' attention was being drawn to other areas of the world also. For example, in October of 1958, he traveled to England and then on to India to conduct "consultations concerning linguistic programs."\(^{165}\)

Nevertheless, Fries was not yet out of the ELEC picture. When in late 1958 it looked as if he might not travel to Japan in 1959, the ELEC executive committee wrote, "We would like to assure you that your forthcoming visit next spring is vital to ELEC's work and we crave your continued support."\(^{166}\) He was also asked "to prepare a corpus for the third-year material similar to the corpus prepared for the first and the second year, provided that this could be accomplished by the end of 1958."\(^{167}\) When he responded (from India) that it would be impossible for him to do the corpus work by that time, the deadline was extended to May 31, 1959.\(^{168}\)

In the spring of 1959, Fries did return to Japan, although his schedule (and his desire not to overlap with Twaddell) required him to leave by June 1.\(^{169}\) During this time, Akira Ota and Vernon Brown worked on the third-year materials "with the cooperation of Dr. Fries."\(^{170}\)

By mutual agreement, 1959 was to be the last year Charles C. Fries would come to Japan under the auspices of ELEC.\(^{171}\) (He did, however, return to Japan in 1960 to work on an English teaching project for the Japanese Defense Academy.\(^{172}\)) After 1959, Twaddell, who found it "difficult to be away for three consecutive summers,"\(^{173}\) did not continue to work with ELEC either.

Fries' final work for ELEC was a guidebook for producing materials for teaching English in Japan. In late 1959, the ELEC executive committee expressed their view that the corpus materials, which Fries had produced to provide guidance for those producing the soon-to-be-published ELEC textbooks, should also be published in book form.\(^{174}\) As Fries himself expressed,
 Such a book should provide a guide to writers of textbooks, not only for the first three years of the Japanese secondary schools, but also for those who wish to make materials for teaching the English language to Japanese speakers at other levels—intensive courses or slower courses for adults or for students in the colleges or universities.\textsuperscript{175}

Given approval to proceed, Fries (and his wife) compiled and polished the work of the previous years into a large "corpus." The book was published by ELEC in 1961 under the title \textit{Foundations for English Teaching: A Corpus of Materials upon Which to Build Textbooks and Teachers' Guides for Teaching English in Japan}. It was the culmination of Fries' years of work in Japan, and ELEC was pleased with it. It is impossible to tell how much this publication influenced ELT in Japan, but there is no doubt that it added to ELEC's reputation and prestige. Shortly after it appeared, Overton reported to Rockefeller, "We are now the proud possessors of a first-rate Fries book."\textsuperscript{176}

**Planning for the ELEC Summer Program**

Fries never actually taught in the ELEC Summer Program for teachers. That aspect of the ELEC effort was left primarily to Freeman Twaddell and others, while Fries worked on materials.

Nevertheless, Fries played an important role in planning and preparing for the Summer Program—partly because he usually arrived in Japan first (several months ahead of Twaddell) and partly because the "scripts" for the summer courses were based heavily on his materials and "corpus" work. This preparatory work was not always pleasant, for Fries and for those who worked with him.

As noted above, the initial plans for the first ELEC Summer Program for teachers were made at the close of the Specialists' Conference in 1956. On the basis of these plans and his experience conducting similar training programs in other countries, Fries had certain expectations regarding how it would be handled. Nevertheless, when Fries arrived in Tokyo in March of 1957, he was in for a shock. The plans for the Summer Program had been made contrary to his expectations. In fact, he felt strongly that if these plans were followed, ELEC's goal of reforming ELT in Japan along the lines of his Oral Approach would be jeopardized. First of all, as he explained in a letter to Twaddell, the training course was to be held at International Christian University and would be
"dominated by ICU personnel," who had been "very vocal and insistent concerning the abundant and completely satisfying virtues of their own program." Furthermore, "lectures on English literature in Japanese" were planned. Finally, the Summer Program teachers were to consist of "one participant selected from each prefecture, by the prefecture authorities." He confided to Twaddell, "Somehow this didn't strike me as a good training program to [teach] 7th grade teachers to handle successfully the kind of materials I had planned to write."177 Feeling that it was essential for the first Summer Program, which would serve as a model for subsequent ELEC teacher institutes, to be carried out according to his plan, he "got to work and had some changes made." In spite of the late date, he announced, "We're not going to ICU and we'll have our own staff without ICU assistance." [italics in original]178 In retrospect, it is difficult to decide whether he did the right thing. Whatever good this "rescue" may have accomplished, it also offended some important people (both in ELEC and at ICU) and damaged relationships that would have otherwise been helpful to the ELEC effort.179

Nevertheless, according to an optimistic Fries, the revised Summer Program "succeeded brilliantly," demonstrating that "even in a brief three weeks English teachers with firmly fixed habits could not only learn to understand and use a new approach to their teaching but could greatly improve their own English."180

As noted at the beginning of this section, Charles C. Fries' official relationship with ELEC lasted only about four years. Moreover, his impact was probably the greatest at the very outset, at the 1956 Specialists' Conference, and tended to diminish as time went by. His involvement in ELEC activities also decreased with the passage of time. Nevertheless, his influence on the direction ELEC would take was undeniably great, and long after he was no longer officially connected with ELEC his Oral Approach principles continued to form the methodological foundation of the ELEC campaign.

General ELEC Activities

After holding the Specialists' Conference, ELEC became involved in activities in three general areas: "compiling efficient English textbooks based upon the results of
modern linguistic science, sponsoring in-service training seminars for teachers of English every summer, and establishing a permanent English Language Institute."\textsuperscript{181}

Textbook Production

The idea of a "new series of textbooks to correct some of the inappropriatenesses of existing texts" was suggested as early as July 1956, in a planning session for the ELEC Specialists' Conference.\textsuperscript{182} After the conference, one of ELEC's two sub-committees was devoted to producing teaching materials, and the production of Oral Approach textbooks for junior high school English classes became one of ELEC's major projects.

Interestingly, the ELEC textbooks were not the first Oral Approach books to be published in Japan. In 1956, before Fries arrived in Japan for the Specialists Conference, Tamotsu Yambe—who had studied at Michigan under the GARIOA program, learned about Fries' Oral Approach while there, and returned to Japan in 1953—produced a book (published by Kairyudo) entitled \textit{Pattern Practice and Contrast}. It has the distinction of being the first Oral Approach book in Japan.\textsuperscript{183} Nevertheless, because it was a pioneering effort done by a relatively unknown individual, it was not ever widely used.

Production of the ELEC textbooks was done by a joint working group of Americans and Japanese. (funds from Rockefeller's Council on Economic and Cultural Affairs made the involvement of the American consultants possible by providing U. S. dollars for their salaries and travel expenses .)\textsuperscript{184} As noted above, Charles Fries was the most prominent of these Americans, but Ernest Haden, Einar Haugen, Mary Lu Joynes, Everett Kleinjans, Patricia O'Connor, W. Freeman Twaddell and Vernon Brown were also involved at one stage or another. The Japanese members of the group included Kotaro Ishibashi, Akira Ota, Katsumasa Ikenaga, Kenzo Ito, and Tsutomu Makino.\textsuperscript{185}

After the texts had been designed and work on them was well under way, a problem arose. In 1958, the Japanese Ministry of Education published its \textit{Revised Draft of the Course of Study}. It was feared that this would necessitate a complete revision of the work to date\textsuperscript{186} since book inspection and approval were in the hands of ministry officials\textsuperscript{187} and books that did not meet Ministry guidelines could not be used in Japanese
public schools. Nevertheless, after Fries examined the new Monbusho syllabus guidelines, he reassured the committee that "the basic 'corpus' as it was planned will cover quite satisfactorily the materials which are suggested." Furthermore, Fries was confident that the plans for Book II and Book III "would satisfy the most critical of the Board of Examiners for the Ministry." After a more exhaustive examination, he later wrote that "practically every one of the five hundred and fifty vocabulary items listed in the Mombusho Tables as required is already in our three corpora. Altogether, the vocabulary requirements of the Ministry should certainly give us no real problems."

Another problem which arose at about this same time was the need to test the ELEC textbook materials on "actual secondary school pupils in the actual classroom environment" and not just on secondary school teachers in the Summer Seminar. Since ELEC (at that time at least) had no formal association with any secondary schools, this problem was not so easily resolved as the one concerning the revised Mombusho syllabus requirements.

In 1960, the "three English textbooks for junior high schools were completed with the co-operation of Professors Takashi Kuroda of the Tokyo University of Education, Fumio Nakajima of the University of Tokyo, Kotaro Ishibashi of Nihon University, Dr. Kleinjans, Dr. Haugen and Dr. Haden." They were dubbed New Approach to English.

Once written, the textbooks could not simply be printed and sold. In the Japanese system, although local boards of education were allowed to choose their own textbooks, they had to choose them from among a list of titles approved by the Ministry of Education. The control the Ministry thus exercised over textbooks did not go unchallenged (and continues to be controversial in Japanese schooling even today), and it occasionally vexed the ELEC workers—especially the Americans. Nevertheless, the fact of the matter was that before the new ELEC textbooks could be sold they had to first be approved by the Ministry of Education.

Consequently, the New Approach books were submitted for examination, and all that the materials producers could do was wait for the verdict. The books they had produced were truly new and revolutionary, and no one really knew how the textbook examiners would react.
Fortunately, the reaction was not negative, although the Ministry of Education officials did suggest some changes in the books. Even though it upset some members of the ELEC production team to have to "compromise" their genuine Oral Approach textbooks, "they were obliged to conform to the requirements," and the textbooks underwent "some modifications to our dissatisfaction." Nevertheless, the changes were not major, and once they had been made the books were approved. Finally, after nearly five years of effort, the New Approach textbooks appeared in print, published through Taishukan Shoten.

English teachers in Japan had been hearing about the Oral Approach for many years. As early as 1958, the ELEC executive committee had reported,

The Japanese teachers of English are getting more and more interested in the oral approach and the ELEC project, but this enthusiasm will not keep long unless we feed it with new fuel. The best fuel we can supply is the appearance of our textbook everybody is looking forward to.

Finally they had an Oral Approach textbook series created especially for Japan.

The books naturally created quite a stir, and many people were interested in them. Nevertheless, in 1961, they were adopted by only 130 junior high schools and sales totaled 76,000 copies. These figures might appear reasonably healthy, but considering the fact that at the time there were approximately 6,000,000 pupils studying English in 13,622 lower secondary schools in Japan, this number of books represented only about one percent of ELEC's potential audience. Worse still, in subsequent years sales failed to increase substantially.

Work on revising the textbooks was started almost immediately, in 1962, by Mabell B. Nardin. In 1963, the revision continued, "with the co-operation of Professor Grant E. Taylor, Director of the American Language Institute, New York University." The three revised textbooks were authorized by the Ministry of Education in 1964 and published in 1965 through Gakken Shoseki.

Unfortunately, once again the New Approach books "did not enjoy large circulation" as they were adopted by only 101 junior high schools. Neither did the number of adoptions increase with time. Eventually, in 1972, publication of the New Approach to English books was discontinued.
This inability to penetrate the Japanese textbook market was undoubtedly a great disappointment to the people at ELEC. But, from an optimistic perspective, it was not necessarily a failure. Although, according to some, the books were "too revolutionary," "too progressive for that time, and teachers could not follow them," with the passage of time they had an indirect influence on other books. In fact, some ELEC supporters claim that this "by-product" was very great. As one expert put it, "The ELEC books did not last, but others were influenced by them." ELEC personnel took solace in the fact that "although they seemed like a failure, they left a permanent impression. They were imitated by other publishers." As one of the more poetic ELEC stalwarts put it, "Thus with a dying fall, they quickened a good many others to the new note of Oral Approach."

(Re-)Training Teachers

Unlike many countries in the world, Japan has had an established school system for centuries. Neither is English teaching in Japan a purely modern phenomenon. As a nation, the Japanese have studied foreign languages for many centuries, and they been studying English for well over 100 years. (This history is described in considerable detail in chapter four.) Naturally, in the course of this history, powerful pedagogical traditions developed, such as, a "bookish" style of learning, and an emphasis on formal study and memorization.

Such traditions change slowly. In many ways schools are self-duplicating institutions, and the old saying "Teachers teach the way they were taught" is true to a discouraging extent. This state of affairs is fine if teachers were taught with good methods and materials, but it can also mean an unfortunate "reproduction of a bad tradition."

The members of ELEC recognized this problem, and their "highest priority" was to re-train teachers, improving their linguistic abilities and teaching methods, and thus bring about desired reform. This was accomplished primarily through their ELEC Summer Programs for teachers, the first of which was held in 1957 at Toyoeiwa Jogakuin.
The purpose of this (and subsequent) ELEC Summer Program was best explained by Fries himself:

Through this course we expect, first, to make these teachers competent to teach the materials of this new approach, both by improving their own practical control of English and by giving them a thorough grasp of the patterns to be taught and the linguistic basis underlying the whole work. We expect, second, to test the teaching materials themselves and to carry on daily revision and supplementation. We hope that this group of teachers will come from this summer of work with considerable competence and real enthusiasm.210

The trainees consisted of "young teachers, who were regarded by competent judges as 'promising' on the basis of their performance in the classroom....Their preparation usually included a standard language-and-literature major, and a prescribed complement of courses in Education. They had a fair-to-excellent reading knowledge of English; their writing in English was fair-to-good." Yet, "their oral control of English ranged from poor to fair; they frequently failed to understand and were frequently incomprehensible in conversation." Most importantly, "they were unfamiliar with (and hesitant to attempt) the methods appropriate to an oral-approach beginning classroom, since they rightly distrusted their oral command of English."211

The course consisted of "fifteen days of six hours each."212 Trainees experienced and participated in "oral presentation and structure drills, pronunciation drills, controlled conversations, lectures on linguistics and teaching methods, practice teaching and other activities,"213 all aimed at giving them the skills and knowledge they needed to implement the Oral Approach in their English classes.

An important feature of these ELEC Summer Programs was that they utilized "native speakers of English exclusively as instructors for drills in English."214 In these early days, this feature, along with the "scientific materials" employed, made ELEC's program "unique in its quality."215

After the first Summer Program, a favorable newspaper article reported:

The fundamental purpose was to improve the quality and the skill of lower secondary school teachers, and concurrently to try out the teaching materials prepared for the 7th graders by an ELEC committee. Emphasis was laid on intensive drill of the oral approach and the use of Japanese was prohibited throughout the program, even at recreation hour or meals...The three-week intensive course gave the trainees confidence in teaching and handling their pupils. Their English was remarkably improved....They are really well-trained teachers.216
The number of 1957 trainees (22) was small, but plans were made for a much larger group (of about 80) the following summer.\textsuperscript{217} Nevertheless, progress was not made without difficulty. A seemingly perpetual problem was that "there were not in Japan enough trained technical people able to carry as much of the load as had been originally anticipated. As a result in 1957 and again in 1958 progress was slow until the American consultants arrived in the spring."\textsuperscript{218} The resultant rush to prepare for the Summer Seminar meant that the production of the textbooks suffered.

Despite these problems, the 1958 ELEC Summer Seminar, held at Sophia University, still met with success. According to reports, it featured "a galaxy of scholars of modern linguistic science."\textsuperscript{219} Eighty-two trainees "representing prefectures and five major cities all over Japan, ranging from Hokkaido to the north down to the Ryukyus to the south"\textsuperscript{220} participated.

In 1959, there were 95 trainees, only a few more than in 1958, but in 1960, the number tripled—to 296—with ELEC Seminars being held in three locations: Tokyo (International Christian University),\textsuperscript{221} Kyoto (Doshisha Women's College), and Sendai.

The following year, 1961, the number of ELEC Oral Approach trainees almost doubled and the geographical coverage of the Summer Program also increased. A total of 514 teachers received training at ICU; Doshisha University; Tsurugi, Ishikawa-ken; Shimoda, Shizuoka-ken; Sendai; and Nagoya.\textsuperscript{222}

In 1962, the ELEC Summer Program's peak year, participation really ballooned! In eight widespread locations—Toyoeiwa Jogakuin; ICU; Kawatabi, Miyagi-ken; Shizuoka; Nagoya; Niigata; Ebino, Miyazaki-ken; and Asahikawa—1,169 teachers were (re-)trained. This, however, was the peak year, and the number of trainees in successive years declined—to 844 in 1963, 732 in 1964, and 418 in 1965. Equally discouraging, by 1965, almost all of the seminars were held in the Tokyo area.\textsuperscript{223} From that point on, for the next few years at least, the number of trainees averaged "400 teachers per year."\textsuperscript{224}

Despite this drop in the number of trainees, the ELEC Summer Program for English teachers continued. Unlike the publication of the New Approach textbooks, this aspect of the original ELEC purpose was never abandoned. In fact, it continues even today. The Summer Institutes are small (in 1984, a total of only 187 teachers were enrolled) and
generally lose money, but they are subsidized by income from ELEC's year-round English Language Institute program.\textsuperscript{225}

Over the years, an impressive number of Japanese teachers have attended these summer seminars. From 1957 to 1965, a total of 5,889 teachers benefited from the ELEC Summer Program.\textsuperscript{226} By 1984, this total had risen to 10,028.\textsuperscript{227} Of course, this cumulative total is still small relative to the total number of English teachers in Japan (estimated in 1956 at 62,000 in the junior high schools and 22,500 in the senior high schools).\textsuperscript{228}

Fortunately, other organizations—including the Ministry of Education—have also been involved in the work of re-training Japanese teachers of English. Nevertheless, a discouraging observation, made by a Monbusho official, is that "the teachers of English who need in-service training, seminars, or workshops,...rarely or almost never attend them."\textsuperscript{229} This unfortunate state of affairs in teacher-training seems to prevail virtually everywhere. Those who need help the most are the last ones to come to such seminars. They comprise a "hard core" obstacle to change that is next to impossible for to overcome.

\textbf{The ELEC Institute}

The third major activity of ELEC began several years after the preparation of its \textit{New Approach} textbooks and the Summer Programs for teachers started. It was also the least revolutionary. Nevertheless, ELEC's English Institute proved to be the most successful of its activities in terms of popularity.

In March 1961, ELEC set up an "experimental" English language institute. Night classes were held at Toyo Eiwa Jogakuin Junior College in Tokyo, 294 students (teachers of English and others) signed up for the six-month course. The second session enrolled 355 students. All paid tuition, for by this time ELEC was working toward "full self support."\textsuperscript{230} The curriculum was designed by Professor Archibald Hill, of the University of Texas at Austin, who had started his teaching career at the University of Michigan. Its faculty consisted primarily of "eight young American and Canadian trainers residing in the Tokyo area." From the beginning, it was a success and attracted capacity
The biggest problem it encountered was physical. The Toyo Eiwa Jogakuin location (in Roppongi, near International House) was inconvenient for the students, and the facilities were expensive. Later, these problems were solved when the ELEC building was constructed. Today, this Institute is the primary ELEC activity although the audience has broadened beyond English teachers. As mentioned above, profits from the Institute courses subsidize the Summer Program for training teachers.

**ELEC "At the Crossroads"**

In 1962, Yasaka Takagi wrote to Donald H. McLean, Jr. that ELEC was "at a crossroads." His words were reflective of the mixed feelings and questioning attitude toward ELEC held by the trustees of the Council on Economic and Cultural Affairs (CECA) at that time.

A lot of money had already been spent on the ELEC effort. Nevertheless, realizing the enormity of the task before them (re-training the nearly 100,000 teachers of English in Japan), they also recognized that the summer seminars and institute could go on "indefinitely." After spending nearly $100,000 annually on ELEC for the past several years, however, the members of the CECA board were becoming more realistic and less willing to fund ELEC endlessly. They encouraged consultations to "determine what can be done to broaden ELEC and ELEC's base of support." They advised ELEC to "work out plans for its long-range support...with a view to minimizing ELEC's continuing dependence on the CECA." They even made the point that "teacher training on the scale required in Japan should be a large-scale governmental operation." CECA had no intention of making "a precipitate withdrawal of CECA support," which might bring the ELEC program "to a premature halt." Nevertheless, the Japan Society advisory committee to ELEC (Borton, McLean, and Overton) believed "that the time has come to undertake a full review of the ELEC program, with particular reference to the role of the CECA."

This review resulted in a mixed picture of ELEC's successes and problems.
Successes

"ELEC's specific accomplishments during the past five years" included...

1. The completion and publication of the New Approach textbooks for English classes in the first three years of junior high school.

2. A series of Summer Seminars "in various parts of Japan every year since 1957, which provided valuable in-service training for Japanese teachers of English.

3. A growing ELEC Institute for English teaching, which provided instruction in oral English to approximately 800 Japanese teachers (and others) each year.236

Problems, Opposition

Nevertheless, these successes were not unqualified. As explained above, the textbooks did not sell well. The Summer Program, although still increasing in size at this point, required a proportionately larger CECA grant to pay for the expensive "foreign trainers," who made it valuable and popular. The English Language Institute required larger facilities, preferably a special ELEC building, which would require more CECA funding.

With the expansion of ELEC's activities and the passage of time, the forces in opposition to its ELEC movement had become more pronounced also. For instance, the early appearance of cooperation with the Ministry of Education later gave way—in the case of a few key individuals—to feelings of rivalry and resistance, and—more generally—to a lack of support for ELEC programs.

By this time, at least some of ELEC's leaders were beginning to recognize the need for a plan with a diffusion-of-innovations orientation (although they didn't call it that). For instance, after discussing the past and future of ELEC with Donald McLean, Herbert Passin outlined a plan which took into account the different ELT interest groups in Japan, how these groups divided up along conservative-progressive lines, what the "key pressure points" (e.g., entrance exams) were, and how the progressive interests could be "harnessed" to put pressure on the conservative interests. Passin's plan included working with business, leading Japanese universities, and educational radio and
television, as well as studying the experiences of other countries in reforming their ELT programs.237

Planning for the future

Fortunately for ELEC, the CECA's verdict was favorable. In balance, the judgment was that ELEC's successes and promise for the future outweighed the problems. One of Overton's confidants set forth his conclusions on ELEC this way:

I think everyone is agreed that a good job has been done to date and that a solid 'bridgehead' has been established. It seems to be generally agreed that ELEC has served effectively as a pioneer and as a leader and that those responsible for this are the most influential group ever assembled in Japan in relation to this problem. It is also clear that the most able educators in the field from the United States have been made available to ELEC to work on the problem for sustained periods of time. The results from these influences have been significant and everyone seems to be agreed that ELEC should be encouraged and assisted in its future efforts.238

Donald McLean, Jr. wrote to John D. Rockefeller 3rd,

I think we all agree that the English Language Exploratory Committee has served as a very effective pioneer and gadfly in relation to the teaching of English in Japan. Not only have they made considerable progress in the publication of materials, but their work has also been responsible for influencing others who were already concerned with the subject. In short, I feel that our investment to date has had consequential results.239

Another memo to Rockefeller agreed that

the work of the English Language Exploratory Committee has been effective directly and indirectly in creating a greater awareness of the need to teach English through the oral approach which has resulted in a liberalization of the attitude of the Ministry of Education and improvements in the textbooks of other publishers.240

Sensing renewed support, Minoru Toyoda, chair of the ELEC executive committee, after considering the alternatives of going out of business and simply marking time, urged that ELEC "assume the leadership and forge ahead...on the basis of our own original principles...[and] apply a massive effort to the critically important problem of language teaching."241

Toyoda outlined four major steps required "to meet this challenge":

1. Reorganization. By this he meant "official incorporation" as well as "adding to our present group new members from the fields of government, radio, television, press,
and business." (It is interesting to note how this proposal evidences his realization of a need for strong channels of communication to support the ELEC effort—a basic diffusion of innovations principle.)

2. Training activities. Although "to date ELEC's own seminars have been the best," Toyoda proposed that ELEC go beyond its rather limited role and "accept the fact of its leadership in this field." He urged that ELEC assume "the role of a central agency prepared to offer all kinds of training courses to Japanese teachers of English at all levels...[and] of all types."

3. Materials and research. Toyoda also proposed not only the revision and republication of the New Approach textbooks prepared by ELEC for junior high school English classes, but also preparation of a new set of materials for senior high school students. He also insisted that ELEC keep its "hand in research activity in order to refine and improve constantly the quality of English teaching in Japan."

4. Promotion. Finally, Toyoda recognized the importance of promoting ELEC's methods and materials through speakers, demonstrators, bulletins, and other promotional literature. Here again, his proposals indicated the need for a proper diffusion of innovations plan to overcome the "well entrenched" publishers of "the old-line English texts.

To accomplish these objectives, Toyoda boldly appealed for CECA support in two areas: a central headquarters building and foreign trainers and consultants. The action that was taken in both of these areas will be discussed below.

The English Language Education Council, Inc.

Incorporation

The English Language Exploratory Committee was a "voluntary organization," but as early as 1958, plans had been made for its incorporation. In fact, funds were reserved to have the necessary capital to do so. Nevertheless, this move did not take place for
several more years. Finally, in May 1962, Genji Takahashi wrote to Douglas Overton: "We are going to take steps at long last to incorporate ELEC as the English Language Education Council."  

The English Language Exploratory Committee was officially dissolved at a conference held at the International House of Japan on December 3, 1962. It was succeeded by another conference to officially establish the English Language Education Council, Inc. (abbreviated ELEC, as before). At this meeting, "the prospectus of its incorporation, Articles of Endowment, officers and other necessary matters were decided. The application for incorporation was submitted to the authorities concerned on January 14, 1963.... On February 26 of the same year the establishment of the corporation was authorized by the Minister of Education.... ELEC was thus placed on a legal basis firm enough to promote its activities more powerfully than ever."  

### Headquarters Building

Although always in Tokyo, the ELEC offices lacked both adequacy and permanency for many years. From 1957 to 1963, they were located in Suzuya Kaikan, Iigura, Minato-ku. Later, in 1963-64, they were moved to the Suzuki Building, Yotsuya, Shinjuku-ku. Moreover, most of the major ELEC operations (such as the Summer Program for teachers) were conducted in rented or loaned facilities.  

In 1960, when the ELEC Institute was just starting at Toyo Eiwa Jogakuin, the idea of constructing and equipping a special ELEC building ("If the experimental institute proves a success") was first proposed to the CECA board. Gaining approval for this proposal would definitely be an uphill battle. Merely procuring a favorable site on which to build was a considerable challenge in crowded Tokyo. The 1960 report to CECA noted, "Land is no small item—$100,000, at least, in this instance." That amount was greater than ELEC's total expenditures on all its projects for the year 1959.  

A year later, when the success of ELEC's English Language Institute was apparent, Shigeharu Matsumoto wrote to Douglas Overton:  

For the past several weeks, our ELEC friends and myself have devoted most of our time to hunting for a good premises as the permanent headquarters of ELEC...
present institute...is somewhat handicapped in its location. We are now inclined to choose a site or a premises nearer to the center of Tokyo, more accessible to most of prospective trainees, students and young business people. In our thinking the question of location has become of paramount importance, especially because we shall start morning and afternoon classes as well as evening classes.  

Matsumoto went on to describe how "urban sites are rising in price" and how "the plight of Japanese economy has become quite bad" making the idea of raising the money for the purchase of land and construction of the building "taboo." He therefore appealed to CECA for ¥90,000,000 ($250,000), with the balance of costs coming from Institute and rental income once the building was finished. Such action, he explained, would "solve the major problems in ELEC's future finance once for all."

Minoru Toyoda also appealed for funding to procure a "central headquarters." He noted problems such as "minimum space for a central office," "no room for a library or study room," the poor location of the Toyo Eiwa site, the inavailability of the Toyo Eiwa facility for ELEC Institute courses during the daytime, and the "exorbitant" rent Toyo Eiwa Jogakuin charged for ELEC's use of the building. Projecting income and expenditures for the next five years, he concluded, "whereas we will always run a deficit for our office, seminars, and publications, the building and the training institute within the building will be money-makers. In fact, from the very beginning the Institute will yield a profit, and by 1964 that profit will amount to some ¥19,000,000, or nearly $60,000."  

Nevertheless, in the questioning, review period of 1962, CECA determined to "take no action on ELEC's request for help with respect to a permanent building until a further study is made of its exact purposes, location, cost, maintenance, and management."  

During this same period, however, after several unsuccessful attempts to locate a good site for the desired building, the undaunted ELEC executive committee reported exciting news:

We have...recently located a very good site for the ELEC building. It is a square lot of 202 tsubo (about 800 sq. yd.) located at 3-8 Jimbo-cho, Kanda, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, just next to Senshu University. It is very conveniently located in terms of transportation, because it is quite near either to Suidobashi Station of the National Railway or to the streetcar stops—Senshu Daigaku Mae, Kudan Shita and Jimbo-cho. The owner of the lot is Mr. Toko Kaneda. He would like to offer his land for construction of a building on condition that he should continue to own the land and should be allowed to use a part of the building....Since this is really a rare good chance for ELEC to have its own building we would like to solicit the special financial assistance of the CECA.
Excited about this prospect, Genji Takahashi, an ELEC stalwart, wrote to Douglas Overton,

As you know, we are firmly convinced that if the ELEC activities are to be continued, it is urgently needed to make ELEC self-supporting and the only means we could think of to achieve that purpose is to have our own building constructed. We also believe that we should not miss this godsent chance, because it would be almost impossible to find another landowner like Mr. Kaneda in the near future, who would offer his land for the building.  

Takahashi went on to note that the Japanese side hoped to be able to raise and borrow ¥205,000,000 and therefore would need only ¥45,000,000 ($125,000) from CECA, half of what had been requested previously.

At last, CECA opinion began to turn in favor of providing money for an ELEC headquarters building. In April of 1962, McLean recommended to Rockefeller that "serious consideration should be given to the strong feeling of the Japanese that they need a permanent headquarters building."  

Finally, to make a long story short, approval was given and construction commenced. About two years later, on January 5, 1965, the impressive building (located at 3-8 Jimbo-cho, Kanda, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo) was completed. It was seven stories high, of ferro-concrete construction, with an auditorium, its own recording studio, two language laboratories, twenty classrooms, two research rooms, one faculty room, one conference room, three office rooms, and even a restaurant.  

"The construction costs totaled two hundred forty-nine million yen. Of this amount, approximately one half was paid by a grant-in-aid from the Agricultural Development Council [the successor to CECA] and the other half was paid partly through a bank loan and partly with funds contributed by financial circles in Japan." The "ELEC Supporters Association" had been established many years before, in 1958, and despite difficulties created by a sagging economy, ELEC experienced success in its drive to raise funds locally.

The dedication ceremony was held on February 23, 1965, and congratulatory addresses were given by Mr. Kiichi Aichi, Minister of Education; Mr. John D. Rockefeller 3rd (representing the Japan Society); Edwin O Reischauer, then the United States Ambassador to Japan; and a number of other prestigious individuals.
The main function of the building was to house "the ELEC Institute, which had been offering evening courses in English in eight classrooms rented at Toyoeiwa Jogakuin Junior College." It also provided office space for the ELEC staff and the growing ELEC library of ELT publications. And, of course, it became the primary site of the ELEC Summer Program for (re-)training teachers although a few local seminars outside of Tokyo continued to be conducted.

Stability, Losing Momentum, and Becoming Self-Sufficient

With the stability brought about by ELEC's incorporation and new headquarters building, one might have expected its influence to increase. Unfortunately, the opposite seemed to occur. ELEC's influence on ELT in Japan began to wane. For example, the number of teachers in the Summer Program dropped off considerably—from 1,169 in 1962 to only 418 in 1965—and it never went back up. Shimizu observed, "With the exception of 1967...there was a gradual decrease in the number of the ELEC teacher-training programs, until there were no more than two Tokyo seminars held at the ELEC Building from 1969 through 1972. Thus the once far flung front was drawn back to its headquarters alone."258

There were cutbacks in area of publications for teachers also. The ELEC Bulletin, once published quarterly, now comes out only twice a year.259

The present-day opinion of ELEC is that it "is not strong now." Its ELEC Institute has flourished, enrolling 1,000 students in both day and night classes, but most of the students are not teachers but businessmen, who are able to pay the tuition. The 1984 Summer Institute for teachers enrolled only 187.261 In brief, ELEC has become little more than "another English school."262

There are several explanations for why this decline occurred. It is likely that each of them has some validity.

One probable reason for ELEC's decline is the fatigue its promoters must have felt after exerting such a strenuous effort to reform English language teaching in Japan. One report was that "The ELEC staff had aged more than five years in the five years they had been in office. They were tired and caught in routine." Furthermore, the revolution
they had hoped to bring about was occurring very slowly (if at all) despite the energies they had devoted to it. Opposition and problems (explained in detail in chapter five) seemed to crop up everywhere.

The same report noted another problem. "There was no longer any lively interchange with scholars from other countries, and the staff was reluctant to undertake challenging experimental projects of their own." As noted in the "harmony" section of chapter five, this situation came about for two reasons.

First, the conflict between Fries and Twaddell and the problems it created soured the ELEC leaders on the desirability of involving high-powered experts in their campaign. Yet without them, the spark of new ideas was lost.

Secondly, there was a fundamental conflict between the desire, on the part of some of ELEC's Japanese leaders, for stability and continuity, and the desire, on the part of the American funding organizations, for innovation and change. Thus, as ELEC pursued self-sufficiency—and achieved it (in the form of incorporation, a popular English Language Institute, and an impressive building)—it became less experimental and innovative and thus lost the support of its American backers. Once this cycle began, it spiraled inevitably downward. Under financial pressure, ELEC (like any business operation) naturally cut or reduced its more expensive, less profitable operations, such as publications and institutes for teachers. The result was a successful commercial enterprise which had virtually abandoned its original revolutionary goals.

**Shifting Support to Other Organizations for Improving ELT in Japan**

Another possible reason for ELEC's decline was the rise of other organizations in Japan dedicated to similar purposes. As already mentioned, the Ministry of Education itself formed its own Council for the Improvement of English Language Teaching in 1960. Its goal, similar to ELEC's, was to enable teachers to "lead their students to proficiency in oral English." To accomplish this end, this Council "planned to conduct the [sic] in-service training program to strengthen the hearing and speaking abilities of the teachers of English in the lower and the upper secondary school throughout the nation for
five years starting from 1961 fiscal. Similar programs carry on this work today, reducing the need for private teacher-training programs such as those provided by ELEC.

Other private foundations also got into the act. The Ford Foundation became interested in improving English language teaching practices in Japan and, taking a top-down approach, sponsored "a project to establish and strengthen programs for the training of teachers of English and other foreign languages in selected Japanese universities." This ACTT (Advisory Committee on the Training of Teachers of Foreign Languages) ran from 1959 to 1964. Its purpose overlapped with ELEC's, and thus made ELEC's continued existence less critical. The Ford Foundation's increasing involvement with ELT in Japan also led to another development that further contributed to ELEC's decline.

In mid-1962, it was recommended to John D. Rockefeller 3rd that CECA and the Ford Foundation "work out some arrangement" for a cooperative effort toward improving English teaching in Japan. Initially, the Ford Foundation contributed to the operation of ELEC, and during ELEC's expensive building construction period, this support was very welcome.

As time went by, however, in light of the problems which the approach employed in the ELEC effort had encountered, the inclination—of both sides, Ford and Rockefeller—was to start afresh with a new approach. They hoped that a new organization would offer an "effective means of renewing foreign scholars' interest in Japan's language problems, and of using that foreign interest as a means of revitalizing Japanese willingness to consider new approaches." Consequently, a new organization, the Committee for Cooperation on English in Japan (CCEJ) was formed in October 1967. Its general purpose was "to promote the development of English as a second language in Japan." Funded in equal parts by the Ford Foundation and the John D. Rockefeller 3rd Fund, one of its twenty-four goals was "continued close cooperation with ELEC." In fact, unlike ELEC—which tried to maintain its distance and independence from other institutions and organizations, and eventually developed some rivalries with them—the CCEJ hoped "to work closely with existing organizations."
John Brownell, a professor of education at the University of Hawaii, became chairman of the new body, and Everett Kleinjans, then chancellor of the East-West Center (and former vice-president of ICU and ELEC worker) served as the CCEJ’s vice-chairman. The board consisted of scholars such as Leroy J. Benoit of Cornell, John Carroll of Educational Testing Service, Herbert Passin of Columbia, and Edwin O. Reischauer of Harvard. Floyd Cammack, administrative secretary, ran the Tokyo office of the CCEJ. Unfortunately, the CCEJ did not succeed as intended. To explain why would require another dissertation. For the present study, it is sufficient to note that after two years, funding was reduced, and the CCEJ was finally terminated at the end of 1973.

"Phasing Out" ELEC Support

In 1968, the Ford Foundation, which had joined the Agricultural Development Council (CECA’s successor) in subsidizing ELEC, "decided it did not want to continue its support; and the JDR 3rd Fund (which had by then entered the picture in place of the ADC) had already reached the same conclusion." Nevertheless, the Rockefeller side, which had provided the impetus for establishing ELEC, felt "some special obligation—not to continue for much longer but at least to use special consideration in working out the termination of our support." When the topic of termination was brought up, "the ELEC board and staff were literally horrified at the prospect of what they regarded as a sudden and unexpected end of support." Nevertheless, seeing the handwriting on the wall, they suggested a generous terminal grant of $1,000,000. When they were told that such an amount "could not even be considered," they submitted a request to the JDR 3rd Fund for $250,000 for the year beginning in 1968. This proposal was approved only after the amount had been reduced to $100,000. "That grant was accompanied by a statement of the possibility of two more grants of $100,000 each, in 1969 and 1970, if such grants should be recommended by the CCEJ, which had just been organized." Unfortunately, for reasons that can only be surmised, "the CCEJ declined to recommend any further general-support grants for ELEC."
ELEC was finally on its own financially, and fell back on its own resources (primarily income from the ELEC Institute courses) to survive. As an institution, ELEC did continue, but not with the same power and purpose as before. Meanwhile, Rockefeller-supported efforts to improve ELT in Japan entered the new "CCEJ period."

Retrospective Evaluation of ELEC's Accomplishments

A final May 1974 summary report to John D. Rockefeller 3rd from Datus C. Smith, Jr. marked "a final end of the Fund's (and [JDR 3rd's] own) long and interesting involvement in the whole question of English in Japan." Rockefeller's contributions to ELT in Japan (directly and through other organizations) had been substantial. Between 1963 and 1969 alone he had provided $1,112,250.00. Given the size of this investment, the questions that naturally arose were "Was it all worthwhile? Were [Rockefeller's] goals achieved?"

ELEC was certainly beneficial to numerous individuals as it changed their careers. Reflecting back on "ELEC's early days," a panel of individuals commented on how ELEC revolutionized their lives. One noted, "Twenty-five years ago I had a chance to attend the first ELEC seminar held here and that has changed my way of teaching English a great deal." Another remembered his experience after attending an ELEC seminar, "I saw a movie and surprising to say I could understand English. I could understand English dialogue. That was a great joy."

In a broader sense, ELEC was also judged to have been successful. For example, Glicksberg reported that it had been... of incalculable aid in the up-grading process. It has brought prominent American linguists to Japan and has produced texts and accompanying audio-visual materials for the three years of junior high school English. Although not as widely used as some other books, these texts have certainly influenced the development and revision of many of the others. In addition, ELEC has a large-scale program of adult English classes at its Tokyo school where much of the teaching is of truly exceptional caliber. ELEC also has a very active summer seminar program which, since its inception, has involved several thousand Japanese English teachers."
ELEC's "ultimate goal," however, stated as early as 1955 and as late as 1962, was "the transformation of English language teaching methods in schools and universities throughout Japan." 284

Regarding ELEC's success in achieving this grand goal, in a 1974 report to John D. Rockefeller 3rd, Datus C. Smith, Jr. admitted: "It must be said frankly that ELEC failed to achieve its main objective....ELEC was not able to change the grand strategy of English-language teaching in Japan or to bring overall improvement in teaching methods." 285 Smith hastened to add: "That is by no means to say, however, that ELEC was a boondoggle or not useful."

Others agree with Smith's first assessment. Robert Lado, Fries' foremost disciple and a participant in the ACTT program, commented, "ELEC was defeated. They were sidetracked." 286 Even Tamotsu Yambe, probably the staunchest supporter of Fries in Japan and long-time ELEC worker, admitted, "I don't think ELEC succeeded in overcoming Mombusho resistance." 287

Another, lowered view of ELEC's purpose was to be "leaven in the whole mass," 288 a "pacesetter." In this respect, ELEC did enjoy many successes: its impact on the Ministry of Education, which contributed to the formation of the "Council for the Improvement of English Language Teaching;" the influence of the New Approach textbooks on those produced and published by others; the substantial number of teachers retrained in its Summer Programs; and the popularity and example of its English Language Institute. Smith reassured Rockefeller that "Everyone I have consulted seems to agree that there were many incidental benefits from which Japan continues to profit." 289

The real question, of course, is not whether or not ELEC was a success. As already noted, success is not a simple dichotomy. It usually comes in degrees rather than absolutes. Furthermore, it is normal for a campaign to be successful in some areas and not others, and (as chapter five explains) such was certainly the case with the ELEC campaign.

A better question (modeled after Coleman's 290) is "What factors were associated with the various successes and failures of the ELEC effort?" Along with that question
comes another: "What were the obstacles to ELEC's success, and how did ELEC personnel deal with them?"

Knowing the answers to these questions is useful for several reasons. For educators of today (in ELT as well as other fields) the ELEC story is more than history. Many of the obstacles that ELEC encountered are still in existence. Some of them are unique to Japan, but others are found virtually everywhere.

An analysis of these many obstacles is found in chapters four and five. First, however, chapter three will develop and explain the diffusion-of-innovations model employed in the analysis.
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CHAPTER 3

ANALYTICAL MODEL

The aim of this chapter is to develop and explain the model which will be used in the following chapters to analyze the ELEC effort. After noting the characteristics of a model, the chapter discusses the challenges involved in analyzing the implementation of innovations in education systems due to the complexity of such phenomena. It then outlines several criteria for an analytical model adequate to explain the ELEC campaign. Thereafter, following a general-to-specific approach, a number of general ideas, theories, and perspectives regarding change are discussed, leading to the conclusion that diffusion theory utilizing a linkage model is most appropriate to the ELEC case. Various models which have been proposed for explaining diffusion-of-innovations phenomena are then considered. Nevertheless, inasmuch as these models fit the ELEC case poorly, they are modified and combined into the special "hybrid" model used in this study to analyze ELEC's effort to reform English language teaching in Japan. A major concern of this model is the various factors that encourage/discourage change, so a discussion of these factors follows, divided into four major categories: characteristics of the innovation itself, characteristics of the resource system, characteristics of the user system, and inter-elemental factors. The chapter concludes by stressing the importance of planning in implementation efforts and considers a number of systems for classifying the stages in the change process as well as various strategies for facilitating change.
Characteristics of a Model

Since *model* is such a widely (and loosely) used term, some definition and explanation of what it is intended to mean in this study is in order. It is not unusual for reports on attempted reform to conclude with a list of lessons learned, but in several important respects a model is more than a list of suggestions or factors to consider.

The most basic definition of *model*, as the term is used in this study, is a design which shows the structure of something. It is systematic, while lists may be random. In addition, a model is based on a controlling idea which relates the various elements to each other in a logical, meaningful way. The diffusion-of-innovations model developed in this chapter satisfies both these criteria as it systematically outlines the structure and elements of the change process which ELEC experienced and relates them to diffusion/linkage theory.

Another pertinent meaning of *model* is a description used to help visualize something that cannot be directly observed. While many of the elements involved in a change process are observable and can be listed, the change process itself and many of the forces which affect it are intangible and cannot be directly observed. In this sense, the hybrid model used in this study is valuable inasmuch as it depicts not only the forces which affect the change process but also the process itself.

A third distinguishing feature of a model (as opposed to a mere list) is its ability to show the inter-relationships and inter-dependencies of elements. The various factors which compose the model affect each other and do not exist only as independent, individual elements. The hybrid model developed in this chapter captures the inter-relatedness of various elements in the change process quite well as, for example, it relates a number of antecedent factors to innovation-implementation processes and a variety of implementation factors to each other.

Yet another characteristic of a model is abstractness, a quality which allows it to represent phenomena in a general (and thus more widely applicable) fashion. Rogers and Kincaid emphasize this characteristic, as they define a model as "a representation of real-world phenomena in more abstract terms," which "can be applied to other cases at other times." Of course, although lists do not possess the other characteristics mentioned
above, some do consist of abstract elements. Thus, while abstractness is not necessarily a unique characteristic of a model, it is still an important one. Without it, a model becomes little more than a description. To the degree that it is abstract, its usefulness increases. Because of the abstract nature of the model developed in this study, it promises to be useful for analyzing and understanding other change efforts as well as the ELEC attempt to reform English language teaching in Japan.

Some models are predictive in an "if...then..." fashion. Nevertheless, in a highly complex system of interdependent variables, the prediction of overall outcomes is virtually impossible. It is possible, however, to make predictions regarding particular variables. For instance, one might predict that if the promoters of an innovation enjoy powerful and favorable support networks, then their chances of success will increase. If other forces work against the innovation, however, the final outcome may still not be what was desired. As explained later in this chapter, no single implementation variable can predict the success or failure for an innovation. It is only the cumulative effect of many variable forces, either pro or con, which ultimately determines the outcome. That realization brings up another question, which is "How many elements/forces must work in favor of an innovation in order for it to catch on and spread?" Here again, it is not possible to give an answer, since the final outcome depends not only on the number of favorable forces but on their weight and power. Since these elements vary in power and importance from one setting to another, those that are critical to implementational success must be determined locally, on a case by case basis, after a thorough investigation of the current and antecedent situations. Thus, while it is possible (and important) for implementation planners to increase their predictive power by identifying the key variables in a particular setting, to do so at the level of the model itself would reduce its general and abstract nature and thus limit its applicability.

The Challenge of Analyzing the Implementation of Change

Roberts-Gray and Gray emphasize, "No innovation, no matter how promising, produces any benefits until it is used [italics in original]." Nevertheless, as was pointed out in chapter one, in contrast to the high hopes of their creators, disappointingly few
innovations in education are ever implemented and utilized—often to the detriment of those who would benefit from a particular innovation and to the frustration of those who promote its diffusion and utilization. "It would seem, therefore, that the implementation phase of planned change should receive at least as much careful planning and attention as the research, development, and technology transfer phases which precede it." In spite of warnings that "attention to change processes is crucial," implementation is typically "a low visibility activity." As Fullan and Pomfret lament:

There is a singular lack of curiosity about what happened to an innovation between the time it was designed and various people agreed to carry it out, and the time that the consequences became evident. Once an innovation was planned and adopted, interest tended to shift toward the monitoring of outcomes. The assumption appears to have been that the move from the drawing board to the school or classroom was unproblematic, that the innovation would be implemented or used more or less as planned, and that the actual use would eventually correspond to planned or intended use. The whole area of implementation... was viewed as a "black box" where innovations entering one side somehow produce the consequences emanating from the other.

Ignorance of this implementation process leads to several problems, as discussed in chapter one. Without question, guidance is needed "to close the implementation gap and secure the highest possible return on investments in innovation." Unfortunately, those who have probed inside the "black box" of implementation hoping to find some guiding principles (e.g., Lortie, Miles, Sarason, and Fullan and Pomfret) have found that the change process is an extremely complex phenomenon, consisting of numerous elements, stages, and strategies. An understanding of how and why certain implementation strategies succeed is important, but "successful implementation is much more complex and difficult than one might expect." This surprising complexity is typically encountered when change is attempted in the school system. As House explains: "The public schools are composed of substances so common that their study is a bore.... Only when we try to change them do we realize that we really do not understand their structure. Suddenly we encounter complexities we never envisioned."

This complexity presents a considerable challenge to researchers and planners concerned with the implementation of educational innovations. "Given the complexity of
the phenomenon of implementation, the factors that could plausibly influence it are potentially enormous in number.\textsuperscript{10} Fullan and Pomfret counsel,

\begin{quote}
Implementation is a highly complex process involving relationships between users and managers, and among various groups of users, in a process characterized by inevitable conflict and by anticipated and unanticipated problems that should be prepared for prior to attempting implementation, and continually addressed during it.\textsuperscript{11}
\end{quote}

Although this complexity makes analysis difficult, it also makes a proper and thorough analysis more important than ever. As Mackey points out in his analysis of language teaching: "Problems before being solved must first be analysed. The more complex the problem, the more is its solution dependent on a sound analysis."\textsuperscript{12}

**Criteria for an Adequate Analytical Model**

As stated at the outset, this chapter is devoted to a discussion of this complex of factors, toward the end of coming up with a model that can be used to analyze and understand the successes and difficulties of the ELEC campaign. In order to be effective, such a model must be "appropriate to the setting in which the desired change will [was to] be affected [sic]."\textsuperscript{13} In other words, to apply to the case of the ELEC effort, it must satisfy the following criteria:

**Completeness**

The model should have all the parts necessary to recognize and account for the complexity of the phenomenon of implementation. Although it may not be possible for a model to account for every single factor, large or small, that affects implementation, it should at least include all the major ones.

Unfortunately, many overly simplistic diffusion-of-innovations models do not do this. Gordon and Lawton, for instance, ignore a multitude of powerful implementation variables when they state that in order for a curriculum innovation initiated by an individual to be successful, the promoter merely "requires access to a wide audience and the ability to express clearly the changes advocated."\textsuperscript{14} Pratt, Thurber, Hall, and Hord
present an equally simplistic model of the school improvement process, which consists of only three stages: school review, selection/development of a solution, and implementation.\textsuperscript{15}

In contrast, putting the multitude of factors involved in the implementation process together in a model creates a picture of considerable complexity. Unfortunately, for those who might hope for a simple formula for analyzing the process of implementing an innovation, such complexity seems to be necessary. Pelz reports, "In analyses to date, no single predictors of innovation effectiveness have been found."\textsuperscript{16} He later concludes, "Perhaps any single-factor explanation of effectiveness is bound to fall short."\textsuperscript{17} What is needed is a multiple element model which considers a constellation of related factors.

Cross-Cultural Applicability

As attempts at change cross cultural boundaries, the complexity of the implementation process increases. Therefore, the model should allow for this increased complexity by including additional appropriate factors.

Nevertheless, many of the explanatory models found in the diffusion-of-innovations literature fail to do this and are therefore suitable for use only in monocultural (usually American) contexts. For example, King, whose research dealt exclusively with an urban middle school in the southern United States, ignored socio-cultural factors entirely and concluded that failure of a curriculum development project was due to absence of leadership, lack of communication, and failure to give precedence to curriculum change activities.\textsuperscript{18} Likewise, Gee's model (presented later in this chapter) attempts to identify factors that explain the process of applying educational research to instructional practice, but it concerns itself only with agencies, forces, and personnel within the school system.\textsuperscript{19}

A comparative, cross-cultural perspective requires a broader approach which considers a variety of differing socio-cultural factors. When Rogers and Shoemaker wrote their book on "a cross-cultural approach" to communicating innovations, they found it necessary to break from "traditional diffusion research [including Rogers' own] which has always emphasized the 'individual' adopter of innovations" and instead focus
on "the informal social group and the formally organized system, assessing their influence on the adoption behavior of their members."

Relevance to Directed Change

As explained in chapter one, there are several types of social change, depending on whether the origin of the innovation and the recognition of the need to change come from within or outside of the affected social unit. Different types of change involve different implementation processes.

Martin and Saif, for instance, propose a "grass-roots" approach to curriculum reform which begins with teachers, not outside curriculum change agents. Such a perspective may be appropriate for what Rogers and Shoemaker call "immanent" social change. However, it is hardly applicable to a case of directed contact change, such as the ELEC campaign, which promoted the adoption of an American language-teaching model by a generally reluctant Japanese audience.

Directed contact change inevitably encounters more obstacles than the types of change that emanate from within a system. Naturally, the model used for analyzing the ELEC effort must reflect this fact. Therefore, an adequate model for the present purpose must take into account the numerous "barriers" to implementation which originate in the intended user system as well as the strength and capacities of the implementation-promoting resource system.

Coherent Framework

Reports by many implementation researchers consist of mere lists of disconnected "implementation lessons," with no reference to a larger framework or model for analysis. Parish and Arends, for instance, provide only a list of guidelines such as the following: "extend time for training teachers," "develop a two-level school site implementation plan," and "expect, encourage, and assist with adaptations." A booklet published by The American Psychological Association to guide those who wish to reform psychology courses consists of little more than a lengthy checklist. Almost ironically, while calling
for the design "of an educational system that gives educators the time, protection, encouragement and support they need to improve schools [italics mine]." Corbett and D'Amico propose no system for bringing about such change, only a list of suggestions based on experiences. In discussing the implementation of new curriculum guidelines and policies, Cavanagh and Styles fall into the same trap. They present "twenty frequently heard objections—and responses to them" and a list of "potential activities" in the implementation process, but no overall framework or model for understanding, analyzing, or planning the implementation of new curriculum. Likewise, in his examination of the problems of implementing English language teaching syllabuses in the People's Republic of China, Maley lists a variety of factors, carefully categorized, and provides checklists "which syllabus and programme designers can use as a starting point," but he fails to provide a cohesive model or framework that relates the various elements to one another, indicating their interrelationships and the direction(s) of influence.

Nevertheless, more is required than mere lists of suggestions. Therefore, the remainder of this chapter will work toward a model that meets the criterion of coherency—as well as those of relevance to directed contact change, cross-cultural applicability, and completeness. Following a general-to-specific pattern of development, the procedure will be to consider a wide range of ideas but progressively narrow the focus, eliminating factors that are not relevant and focusing on those that are. The outcome will be a model/framework that will be useful and appropriate for analyzing the ELEC campaign and other efforts dedicated to creating directed, cross-cultural change.

Terminology and Definitions

Change is a word with many meanings and numerous synonyms. All of them share the general meaning "to make or become different," but their meanings also vary considerably and reflect different perceptions of the process. For instance, change used intransitively (e.g., This town has changed a lot.) implies that the process proceeds on its own, while the transitive usage (e.g., He changed his mind.) suggests the need for an agent to do the changing. Alter means for a thing to become different without losing its
identity, and when a slow, almost imperceptibly gradual series of alterations occurs the process is called *evolution*. On the other hand, *transform* refers to a process which makes a thing radically different, and a sudden and radical transformation is termed a *revolution*. Change of this final sort, rapid in pace and dramatic in scope, is what the early ELEC planners intended to bring about.

The ELEC revolution was based on an innovation—another term which warrants defining. According to Miles, "Innovation is a species of the genus 'change.' Generally speaking, it seems useful to define an innovation as a deliberate, novel, specific change, which is thought to be more efficacious in accomplishing the goals of a system." Miles adds that an innovation is usually "willed and planned for, rather than...occurring haphazardly."27

**Thoughts on Change**

Thinkers have long been concerned with the topic of change (how to achieve it, whether it can be prevented, etc.). As early as the fifth century B.C., Heraclitus alleged, "Nothing endures but change."28 This idea has been repeated down through the centuries. In the second century A.D., Marcus Aurelius Antoninus maintained, "The universe is change."29 A millenium and a half later, in the seventeenth century, Honorat de Bueil, Marquis de Racan, reiterated, "Nothing in the world lasts save eternal change,"30 and in 1647 Abraham Cowley penned, "The world's a scene of changes, and to be constant, in nature were inconstancy."31

The opposite point of view, that true change is either rare or non-existent, has also been widely espoused. For instance, in 1849 Alphonse Karr contended (and many have since repeated), "The more things change, the more they stay the same."32

Others have warned about the dangers of change. Shakespeare penned, "Striving to better, oft we mar what's well,"33 and, in 1776, as the American revolution was getting under way, John Adams wrote, "All great changes are irksome to the human mind, especially those which are attended with great dangers and uncertain effects."34

Thinking about change is by no means confined to the past. In our own twentieth century, Reinhold Niebuhr's prayer, "O God, give us serenity to accept what cannot be
changed, courage to change what should be changed, and wisdom to know the difference,"\(^{35}\) has gained wide circulation.

**General Theories of Social Change**

As the foregoing discussion illustrates, considerable thought and attention have been devoted to the topic of change, but little agreement has been reached. Nowhere is this more true than in the case of social change, where a variety of different theories have developed. Appelbaum proposes a grouping of theories according to their assumptions about the degree of stability underlying society, resulting in the categories of equilibrium, evolutionary, and conflict theories, as well as rise and fall theories.\(^{36}\)

**Equilibrium Theory**

Equilibrium theory "emphasizes stability at the expense of change."\(^{37}\) Society is seen as a highly complex but smooth running organism which is inherently stable. In other words, society is "homeostatic" and it possesses "mechanisms designed to restore equilibrium once the latter is upset."\(^{38}\)

In this sort of theory, it is only natural that little attention is given to change. In fact, Appelbaum claims that equilibrium theory has "a conservative bias against endogenous structural change."\(^{39}\)

For these reasons, relative to the purpose of this dissertation, equilibrium theory has little to offer. Appelbaum declares that "equilibrium theory...can neither explain the occurrence of radical changes in society nor account for the phenomena which accompany them."\(^{40}\) It may, however, serve as a possible explanation for the commonly encountered resistance to the implementation of innovations.
Evolutionary Theory

One of the oldest and most widely accepted views of social change is that it takes place naturally, slowly, and inevitably. This continual, smooth process of internal adaptation to the social environment is based on the evolutionary principle originally popularized by Darwin to explain biological change.

In line with this evolutionary approach, Francis Bacon wrote, "It were good therefore, that men in their innovations would follow the example of time itself, which indeed innovateth greatly, but quietly and by degrees scarce to be perceived."41

The great physicist Max Planck expressed a contrasting (but still somewhat evolutionary) opinion on the subject of innovations: "An important scientific innovation rarely makes it way by gradually winning over and converting its opponents; it rarely happens that Saul becomes Paul. What does happen is that its opponents gradually die out and that the growing generation is familiarized with the idea from the beginning."42

There are many variations on the classic model of social evolution, including "multilinear evolution"43 and "modernization" theory.44 These diachronic theories of gradual, unilinear change have been both widely accepted and widely criticized.

Evolutionary theory has been applied to the process of "successful change in ESOL [English to speakers of other languages]." Smith, who uses the analogy of a sculptor who created amazingly lifelike figures of elephants by starting with a big rock and chipping away until he had "eliminated everything that doesn't look like an elephant," urges English-language teachers not satisfied with the present "state of the art" to "begin chipping away."45

For the purpose of this study, however, an evolutionary model is inappropriate for two reasons. First, evolutionary theory views the change process as instinctive and natural, arising from chance mutations,46 whereas the type of change under examination is directed change, with a definite guiding force behind it. Secondly, the change ELEC hoped to create was radical and sudden, not gradual, smooth and inevitable47 as the evolutionary model presupposes.
Conflict Theory

"Conflict theories conceive of social organization as arising in response to a scarcity
of desired resources."48 Based on Hegel’s thesis-antithesis-synthesis idea and Marx’s
"without conflict no progress" postulate, "conflict theory looks everywhere for sources of
instability" and defines change as "the working out of conflict."49 In other words,
change is created by conflict among the polarized groups in society.

Encouraging change among English teachers by producing conflict within them has
been proposed. To solve the problem of teachers who do not want to change, who "just
want to survive, somehow, until retirement," Thompson and Williams advocate creating
"dissonance" among the ranks.

Supervisors must not assume that teachers want help, that they want to improve,
that they want to change to make their instruction more effective....Instead,
supervisors need to take another approach....Teachers who are no longer learners
must, by whatever means, be led to a point where they recognize that what they are
doing in the classroom is not in the best interest of their students or themselves.
Until such dissonance is created, any attempt to change them or to teach them
something new is likely to fail. It is a paradox, but only when teachers are led to a
state of confusion do supervisors have a chance to change teachers’ attitudes and
restructure, at least in part, the way teachers go about teaching.50

Havelock admits that a conflict model has potential for analyzing the diffusion and
implementation of innovations,

Certainly the historical dialectic of Hegel and Marx suggests the rudiments of an
alternative perspective on D&U [diffusion and utilization]; we have said little about
the conflict of opposing innovative and non-innovative social groups as a pattern of
movement toward social change, but undoubtedly it is. Such a ‘conflict’ model of
D&U seems especially appropriate to our turbulent contemporary scene...51

He also notes, however, that "no one has proposed such a perspective in considering
D&U phenomena." This factor, among others, makes conflict theory a weak base for the
current study.

Rise and Fall Theory

Rise and fall theory takes an approach entirely different from that of the three
others. Instead of concerning itself with the stability of society, it focuses on fluctuations
in the direction of change.52 Using the analogy of the human organism, it points out the
possibility of decline as well as progress and growth. This distinctive view sees change as being cyclical rather than cumulative.\textsuperscript{53} Moreover, rise and fall theorists are typically "characterized by a grandiose vision" that covers large expanses of time. In addition, they focus on "cultural systems as well as social systems."\textsuperscript{54}

Although there has been a definite, cyclical "ebb and flow" in Japanese interest in learning foreign languages over the years (described in chapter four), rise and fall theory has little to offer in terms of the purpose and topic of this dissertation. The theory says nothing about the process or problems of creating change. Merely waiting for the next "wave" of change to arrive is not an efficient implementation strategy.

**Diffusion/Communication Theory**

A fifth theory, which Appelbaum mentions only as an alternative to evolutionism, emphasizes "the empirical interrelations among societies and how societies as a consequence 'borrow' from one another."\textsuperscript{55} This classic diffusion theory views the process of change in terms of the discovery of an idea, its transmittal from the source to the potential user, and its eventual adoption.

Because it allows for the "dynamic" of change to be an outside force, diffusion theory seems to offer the most appropriate theoretical base for analyzing the implementation of educational innovations, such as the ELEC effort to spread Charles C. Fries' Oral Approach in Japan. Nevertheless, in its classic form diffusion theory is very general and is minimally concerned with social-system contexts. A more up-to-date, linkage version (discussed below). shows greater promise.

**General Perspectives on the Diffusion of Innovations**

Regarding the diffusion and implementation of innovations, there are also a number of differing perspectives. In keeping with the general-to-specific organization of this chapter, they will be discussed before the more specific models or frameworks proposed by individuals.
Havelock explains that ideas about the diffusion and utilization of knowledge can be grouped into three major categories: the research, development, and diffusion perspective; the social interaction perspective; and the problem solver perspective. He then proposes a "linkage perspective" which "incorporates important features of all three."56

**Research, Development, and Diffusion**

The research, development, and diffusion (RD&D) perspective has five important features: "(1) rational sequence, (2) planning, (3) division of labor, (4) defined audience, and (5) high investment for maximum pay-off." Figure 2 shows how these are related. Basic research leads to applied research. Following development and testing of prototypes, the "innovation" is mass produced and packaged. Mass dissemination activities take it to the user who accepts it. Such thinking lies behind many industrial research and development and agricultural research and extension systems.

Unfortunately, this model suffers from a number of drawbacks. First, it is little more than a sequential list of steps and shows little if any interaction between its parts. Secondly, it is clearly oriented toward material innovations and therefore is not suitable for many non-material educational innovations. Furthermore, it assumes a far-from-real "passive consumer," and is "over-rational, over-idealized, excessively research oriented and inadequately user oriented."57 For these reasons it fails to consider the "real-world" obstacles to change and is incapable of explaining failures in implementation efforts which are based on this RD&D perspective.

Similar to the RD&D perspective is the discovery-transmittal-adoption view. This "Better Mousetrap" idea—that discovering or inventing something "better" and then simply telling others about it is enough to ensure its adoption—is one of the most widely held views about the creation, diffusion, and utilization of knowledge. Nevertheless, the discovery-transmittal-adoption approach suffers from a number of problems, primary among which is that it frequently does not work. As Roberts-Gray and Gray explain:
Figure 2
The Research, Development, and Diffusion Perspective

Source: Havelock, Planning for Innovation, chapt. 11, p. 6.
Knowledge creators tend to have great faith in the "Better Mousetrap Theory" which contends that "if it works and if it's needed, then it will get used."...If there is some problem with utilization, it is most often perceived as a user problem. Knowledge creators are reluctant to intervene in the affairs of users (except, of course, to convince them that the innovation really will work and really is needed). They are, therefore, reluctant to engage in implementation planning, expecting instead that the user will invest the necessary time and energy to ensure effective implementation. The evidence, however, argues both against the "Better Mousetrap Theory" and against the assumption that users will solve implementation problems on their own.58

In spite of this evidence, educators seem especially prone to subscribe to a discovery-transmittal-adoption approach. This is because those who work in schools typically hold "common and deeply rooted assumptions," such as "people can be changed" (education is a way of accomplishing this change) and "people are rational" (if they are provided with more information they will modify their behavior accordingly).

Unfortunately, these beliefs may lead to failure if they are used as the basis for campaigns to implement educational innovations, for "even in an 'educational' mode, change raises fundamental questions of values and power."59 Thus, as Mann points out, "the peculiar disadvantage of change agents in education lies in applying methods that are largely educational to situations that are fundamentally political."60

Those who have studied the process of change in schools usually come to the conclusion that a simple discovery-transmittal-adoption model is inadequate. Sarason, for one, criticizes this simple "delivery of the curriculum" approach. He claims that the reason why "in the university and school cultures the more things change the more they remain the same" is that educational planners seldom operate with either an adequate knowledge of "the setting in which the desired change will be affected [sic]" or "an explicit theory of change."61

Social Interaction

The social interaction (SI) perspective (see figure 3) is quite different from the research-development-diffusion or discovery-transmittal-adoption views. The S-I perspective is "rooted in anthropological studies of diffusion of cultural traits" and "is relatively indifferent to the value of the innovation or to the type of scientific and technical
Figure 3
The Social Interaction Perspective

know-how that might have gone into its original development and manufacture."

Instead, it focuses on "the pattern of flow [of an innovation through a social system over time] and the effects of social structure and social relationships and groupings on the fate of innovations." In other words, researchers in the S-I tradition focus on the "complex and intricate set of human substructures and processes" that "must be operative before diffusion will succeed."

The major distinguishing points of the S-I perspective are "(1) the importance of the social relations network, (2) the importance of the user's position in that network, (3) the significance of informal personal relationships and contacts, (4) the importance of reference group identifications, (5) the essential irrelevance of the size of the adopting unit, and (6) the differential significance of different types of influence strategies at different stages in the adoption process." The S-I perspective has several advantages. Firstly, it recognizes the fact that "individual human beings are embedded in and inextricably connected to a social network made up of other individuals." Perhaps that is an obvious point, but it is one which the RD&D perspective ignores. In addition, the S-I perspective takes into consideration at least one important factor that discourages/encourages implementation of innovations—the individual's group identity and group loyalty. Furthermore, it also "permits analysis of patterns and flow regardless of size of the adopting unit." Nevertheless, it also has some serious weaknesses. One is that it "ignores psychological processes inside the user-adopter." Another is that most S-I research focuses on "innovations which appear in a concrete, 'diffusable' form, such as a type of fertilizer or a new prescription drug." This is because for most S-I research "if the innovation is a stable element which we can easily identify as a constant, the task of measuring its flow through a social system over time is made considerably easier." Nevertheless, many educational innovations (such as the Oral Approach to ELT which ELEC promoted in Japan) do not consist of such "stable elements."
Problem Solving

A third perspective on the process of implementing change is that it "begins with a need and ends with the satisfaction of that need." This problem-solving process (see figure 4) consists of six stages involving a user system and an outside process, consultant, or change agent:

1. Need sensing and articulation
2. Diagnosis and formulation of the need as a problem to be solved
3. Identification and search for resources relevant to the problem
4. Retrieval of potentially feasible solutions and solution-pertinent ideas
5. Translation of this retrieved knowledge into specific solutions
6. Behavioral try-out or application of the solution to the need

If the solution does not satisfy the need, then the cycle begins again.

This problem-solving perspective is based on five "very solid points": (1) the user is the starting place, (2) diagnosis precedes solution identification, (3) the outside helping role is non-directive, (4) the importance of internal resources, [and] (5) user-initiated change is the strongest.

Nevertheless, it is not without problems. It places excessive strain on the user and minimizes the role of outside resources. For these reasons, it is not appropriate for understanding directed contact change, where an external source applies a preconceived solution to a foreign setting.

Linkage

For the purposes of this study, Havelock's linkage perspective (see figure 5) offers the best of all three of the above perspectives. This linkage model begins with the user (as a problem solver) but "stresses that the user must be meaningfully related to outside resources." In addition, change is viewed as the product of "collaborative interaction" since the linkage relationship between user and resource systems is reciprocal. Each interacts with and affects the other. Furthermore, while a linkage perspective allows for
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The Problem-Solving Perspective

Source: Havelock, Planning for Innovation, chapt. 11, p. 12.
Figure 5
The Linkage Perspective

research and development of an innovation, it does not assume that RD&D is all that is required for an innovation to be implemented.

For the purposes of this study, a linkage model is a definite improvement on traditional diffusion theory. Change is planned, coordinated, and pursued through "a series of two-way interaction processes, which connect user systems with various resource systems." This allows for the "dynamic" of change to be an outside force and makes such a model appropriate for explaining directed contact change. It can also be applied to cross-cultural implementation situations. Of course, it also leads to the challenging complexity mentioned earlier in this chapter. Nevertheless, complex accuracy is to be preferred over misleading simplicity.

In its basic form, however, this linkage model is still inadequate, for it fails to take into account many of the important "barrier" factors that work for and/or against change. A later section of this chapter explains some specific linkage-type models which take steps toward overcoming this inadequacy. Nevertheless, before they are discussed, an additional criticism of linkage theory should be considered.

**Criticisms of Linkage Theory**

Rogers and Shoemaker do not use the label "linkage," but they still present a clear picture of a basic linkage model as they discuss the role of the change agent (see figure 6). In this simple view, innovations flow from the "change agency" to the "client system" by means of a change agent. The agent also carries back to the change agency information regarding the client system's needs and the effectiveness of the innovation.

Many variations on this basic model have been developed, but Rogers himself later became critical of such "linear" models of communication, claiming that they were based on mistaken assumptions about the nature of information and how it is transmitted. He and Kincaid wrote,
Innovations flow to clients...

Clients' needs and feedback about change program flow to change agency.

Innovations flow to clients.

Figure 6
Rogers and Shoemaker's Basic Linkage Model
Showing the Role of the Change Agent

Source: Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 228.
In our daily experience there is a tendency to treat information as if it could be carried from a source to a receiver like "a bucket carries water" (Diaz Bordenave, 1972), like a dump truck carrying sand across a city, like a hypodermic needle injecting a vaccine, or like a "bullet" shot at a target (Schramm, 1973). All of these analogies were created to criticize the treatment of information as if it were entirely a physical entity which could be moved around like other material objects.76

Rogers and Kincaid charge that such a model ignores the "context of human communication" and is subject to various biases. The first of these is the "view of communication as a linear, one-way act (usually vertical), rather than a cyclical, two-way process over time."77 Rather, they claim that "human information systems are fundamentally cybernetic," characterized by "mutual causation."78 Accordingly, they propose a "convergence model of communication." In this convergence model, "communication is a process in which participants create and share information with one another in order to reach a mutual understanding. This cyclical process involves giving meaning to information that is exchanged between two or more individuals as they move toward convergence."79

Another criticism of the basic linkage/communication model is that it employs a vertical rather than horizontal approach to diffusion. Although widely used by government agencies and other diffusion of innovations programs, the vertical model is based on the (often incorrect) assumption "that the innovation was basically perfected prior to its diffusion, and that it moved out from the 'center'... via vertical spokes, to the 'periphery' of local governments and the public through a carefully planned, well managed diffusion process."80

While allowing that such an approach may be feasible in the case of technological innovations, Rogers and Kincaid argue that "policy innovations, which often entail changing the social structure and the nature of organizations, often spread in a quite different manner."81 To allow for adaptation and "customization" at the local level, they propose "horizontal networks for information-exchange about innovations."82

The ELEC reformers, however, took an approach which was essentially linear and vertical. Consequently, Rogers and Kincaid's convergence model fits the ELEC experience poorly. While it is possible to argue that ELEC's failings came because it employed an inappropriate approach to diffusing the Oral Approach in Japan, it is also possible to argue back that the innovation was primarily "technological" in nature, and
therefore the older, linear model was appropriate. Regardless of the outcome of that
debate, it is readily apparent that a form of Rogers and Shoemakers' earlier, linkage
model fits the case of directed contact change which ELEC promoted better than Rogers
and Kincaid's convergence model.

Nevertheless, in light of the above criticism, it is also apparent that Rogers and
Shoemaker's basic linkage model needs amplification and modification to allow for the
complexity of the diffusion/implementation process. Fortunately, a number of models
have been proposed which attempt to deal with this complexity and from which ideas can
be profitably borrowed.

**Models of Stages in the Diffusion/Implementation Process**

Many conceptualizations of the stages in the process of diffusion and
implementation of innovations exist. Some are simple, while others demonstrate
considerable complexity. "Many diffusion researchers have conceptualized a five-stage
process:

1. Awareness (first knowledge of the idea)
2. Interest (gaining further knowledge)
3. Evaluation (gaining a favorable or unfavorable attitude)
4. Small-scale trial
5. Adoption or rejection decision.83

In this very simple conceptualization, change is a gradual process of natural growth.
The user's involvement with the innovation increases progressively until it is either
adopted or rejected, at which point interest in it ceases.

**Michaletz's Stages**

Michaletz proposes a planning model which illustrates a more deliberate approach.
It consists of seven sequential steps considerably different from the above five-stage
listing:
1. Identification of the change
2. Formation of a support group
3. Assessment
4. Future awareness
5. Analysis
6. Action plans

Interestingly, these stages bear considerable resemblance to those taken by ELEC. Nevertheless, in many respects the ELEC campaign still failed, and this model is unable to explain those failures. A more robust model that includes stages where innovators cope with barriers to implementation is called for.

**Roberts-Gray and Gray's Stages**

Roberts-Gray and Gray emphasize the developer's roles, but they discuss only three stages in implementation, beginning with an orientation, proceeding through an initiation or "trial use" stage, and culminating with an integration stage. "During the orientation stage the developer's task is to orient the user to expected benefits and demands of using the innovation." In the initiation stage, "the innovation is installed or is handed off from developer to user. During this stage the developer provides support and encouragement for start-up in order to ensure that the innovation can and will be used." During the final, integration stage, "the developer's task is to cultivate the user's own processes for maintaining the changes that have been made." The point that the developer's role changes from one stage to another is an important one. Beyond that, however, this model is exceedingly simple—to the point of being virtually useless.

**Havelock's Stages**

Havelock, on the other hand, outlines the most complicated series of steps in the change process:
1. Building a relationship
2. Diagnosing the problem
3. Acquiring relevant resources
4. Choosing the solution
5. Gaining Acceptance
6. Stabilizing the innovation and regenerating self-renewal.86

Although such a model might be appropriate for some cases of attempted change, it fails to fit cases of directed change where "choosing the solution" is the first (not the fourth) step. Also, the fifth step, gaining acceptance, is overly simple and thus misrepresents the difficult and challenging process of bringing about change.

Rogers and Shoemaker's Stages

Rogers and Shoemaker, in contrast, "prefer to conceptualize four main functions or steps in the process:
1. Knowledge
2. Persuasion
3. Decision
4. Confirmation87

Although quite simple, this conceptualization is also powerful inasmuch as it recognizes the potential of external forces—as providers of knowledge as well as obstructors of change that must be overcome through persuasion. More than the other models discussed above, it lends itself to illustrating and explaining the ELEC campaign even though it still requires supplementation—primarily in the form of a more detailed consideration of the barriers to change.

Specific Linkage-Type Models for the Implementation of Change

The diffusion-implementation process involves more than a series of stages, however. Therefore, a more comprehensive and specific model is called for. Fortunately, there are several specific models and frameworks which are based on a
linkage perspective. For purposes of illustration and comparison, several are presented in this section.

**Gee's**

Gee presents a model which shows the interaction between various agencies and factors which affect "the process of the application of research on effective instruction." Although it captures the linkage relationships between these different elements rather well, it is concerned with forces, agencies, and personnel only within the school system. (See figure 7) Its narrow range of concern forms quite a contrast to the much broader and more complex model developed in this dissertation to analyze the process of implementing cross-cultural directed contact change.

**Roberts-Gray and Gray's**

In Roberts-Gray and Gray's model of implementing change, there are four sequential steps. The first (and the most complex) is the above mentioned "fit analysis." Once the fit between innovation and user has been analyzed and appropriate modifications made, the remaining steps are (deceptively) simple:

1. Identify specific needs for change—i.e., to set objectives for each of the 'determinants' of implementation. These objectives can then be used to select appropriate implementation strategies and tactics to facilitate necessary changes and develop a plan for implementation support.
2. Apply the plan to facilitate change and establish conditions that foster successful implementation.
3. Obtain feedback about actual implementation processes, determinants, and support at each stage of implementation.

**Leithwood's**

Leithwood puts forth a similarly flawed model for implementing curriculum innovations. It consists of three main phases and eight steps. In the "Diagnosis" phase,
Source: Gee, p. 8a.
goals for implementation are identified and decisions regarding which ones to pursue are made. Then, discrepancies between the innovative and the current curricula are identified and certain ones are targeted for reduction. The final step in this phase consists of identifying the obstacles to discrepancy reduction. In the next phase, "Application," procedures for overcoming lack of knowledge and skill as well as procedures for restructuring incentives and rewards are all designed and carried out. Then, the necessary material resources and organizational arrangements are provided. The "Evaluation" phase, which consists of both formative and summative evaluation, is ongoing and may result in a return to the diagnostic phase.90

Regarding obstacles to implementation, Leithwood mentions only "inadequate knowledge about the innovation and skill in its implementation," "ineffective organizational control structures," and "lack of material resources and compatible organizational arrangements in the classroom or school."91

Richards'

One of the few in English-language-teaching circles who has written about implementation factors and their effect on methodological innovations (except for those, such as Maley and Rodgers, who limit themselves to checklists) is Jack C. Richards, a professor at the University of Hawaii. The dearth of ELT-oriented research on these implementation factors and English language teachers' general lack of awareness of their influence led Richards to label them the "secret life of methods."92

Richards acknowledges that "methods have a life beyond the classroom, beyond the questions of content, philosophy, and procedure which characterize them"93 (and which are the focus of virtually all methodological studies). He points out that success in endeavors to implement a new language-teaching method is highly dependent on "a variety of factors extrinsic to a method itself and often reflects the influence of fads and fashions, of profit-seekers and promoters, as well as the forces of the intellectual marketplace."94

Although Richards provides no overall model of the change process, he discusses a number of "implementation factors" that encourage/discourage the spread of English
language teaching methods. His framework fails to consider many of the diffusion-of-innovations factors discussed elsewhere in this chapter, but it does relate to some of them and also contributes a few new ideas to the existing pool. For the purposes of this study, Richards' view is particularly valuable because of its focus on ELT implementation experiences.

Richards considers several ways of "validating" an innovative method. In a conference address on this topic, he grouped implementation concerns into three categories: "the quest for legitimacy, publish or perish, and sanctions from on high." When a revised version of Richards' address was published, the elements in this framework were modified and renamed: "the form a method takes, publish or perish, and support networks."96

Under "the quest for legitimacy," Richards discusses the value of "appealing to facts." Facts that come from research is one way of validating a method and persuading people to adopt it. According to Richards, this may be "true" research (based on an experimental design) or pseudo-research. The important thing is that intended users perceive the innovation as being supported by research.

Richards notes that in the quest for legitimacy a common alternative to research is authority. There are two types of ELT "authority": current theoretical constructs and recognized experts in the field. Either of these can be a powerful supporter of a methodological innovation.

Although Richards makes no reference to the work of diffusion of innovations researchers, his first two implementation factors fit in well with factors which form part of the hybrid model (to be discussed later in this chapter). "Facts" relate to relative advantage and observability, while "authorities" are important elements in the resource system's capacity which can increase the status of the innovation.

At least one diffusion of innovations expert, Havelock, agrees that these two factors can be important. He explains:

One of the most important variables that determines whether or not a sender will be able to influence a receiver is the extent to which he is perceived as a reliable and believable source of information....A number of well-known experiments have shown that when a source (a sender) is considered by an audience (receiver) to be prestigious and trustworthy, there is a strong tendency for the audience to change their attitude in accordance with the attitudes of the source.97
Richards' third implementation factor is the form a method takes—whether an innovation results in a publishable textbook or is merely an instructional philosophy. This factor is not commonly considered by experts in the diffusion of educational innovations, yet experience shows that it plays an important role—at least in language teaching. For this reason "form" is included in the hybrid model's section on characteristics of the innovation which inhibit or facilitate change.

The fourth and final, but by no means the least important of Richards' "secret life" implementation factors was originally called "sanctions from on high," but he later renamed it "support networks." There are various types of support networks: professional teaching organizations, universities, professional journals, and educational agencies, and all would seem to be important for promoters of innovations to consider.

Other researchers agree with Richards that support groups, as features of the capacity and structure of the resource system, can be extremely influential. Gordon and Lawton, for instance, discuss the success of "pressure groups" in influencing policy and legislation. Such pressure groups can be either protective, defending a segment of society, or promotional, promoting a cause.98

Because of their importance, "support networks" are included in the inter-elemental linkage portion of the hybrid model developed in this chapter, and various types of support groups are considered in the analysis of the ELEC effort.

In a more recent discussion of this subject, entitled "The Context of Language Teaching," Richards mentions a number of additional "factors affecting the success of a language program" which "go beyond the mere content and presentation of teaching materials."99 These are grouped under four headings: "sociocultural factors," "teaching and learning styles," "learner factors," and "program characteristics." Sociocultural factors are related to the role English plays and the status English proficiency has in different societies. The "teaching and learning styles" factor recognizes that "education in different countries reflects culturally specific traditions of teaching and learning that may substantially shape the form and content of much school learning." Learner factors include profiles of talents, interests, learning habits, purposes, print-orientation, tolerance of ambiguity, shyness, etc., which also vary from one setting to another.100 The most complex group of factors, however, is "program characteristics," which is subdivided
into a number of other characteristics: "degree of preparation of teachers," "validity of existing curriculum and testing procedures," "characteristics of the student population," "software and materials," "coordination of resources," and "testing and evaluation procedures." Many of these learner, teacher, and school-system factors are highly relevant to the ELEC case and relate to elements in the hybrid model, so much more will be said about them later.

Rogers and Shoemaker's

Rogers and Shoemakers' conceptualization of the diffusion-implementation process involves two main components. One deals with the process of diffusion and treats it as primarily a communication problem. The other part pictures the forces and factors of importance in the innovation-decision process. Since this model forms the framework upon which the hybrid model is based, it will be discussed here in considerable detail.

Rogers and Shoemaker maintain that diffusion, "the process by which innovations spread to the members of a social system," is "a special type of communication." Consequently, they analyze diffusion with a communication process model consisting of five elements: (1) source, (2) message, (3) channel, (4) receiver, and (5) effects (SMCRE). The corresponding elements in the diffusion of innovations process are...

(1) "inventors, scientists, change agents, or opinion leaders"

(2) the innovation and its perceived attributes (such as, relative advantage, compatibility, etc.)

(3) "communication channels (mass media or interpersonal)"

(4) "members of a social system"

(5) "consequences over time" (such as, knowledge, attitude change, behavioral change, etc.)

In diffusion, the channel of communication is important. Communication of the innovation may be accomplished through either mass media or interpersonal channels. Each has its particular advantages, and the choice should be made in light of (1) the purpose of the communication act, and (2) the audience to whom the message is being sent. If A wishes simply to inform B about the
innovation, mass media channels are often the most rapid and efficient, especially if
the number of Bs in the audience is large. On the other hand, if A's objective is to
persuade B to form a favorable attitude toward the innovation, an interpersonal
channel is more effective.\textsuperscript{104}

Rogers and Shoemaker's paradigm of the "innovation-decision process" (see figure
8) attempts to portray "the mental process through which an individual passes from first
knowledge of an innovation to a decision to adopt or reject and to confirmation of this
decision."\textsuperscript{105} Although one of the older models, it is still one of the best and regarded as
a classic by diffusion-implementation researchers. For the purposes of this study, its
focus and many of its elements seem particularly appropriate.

It consists of three main elements: antecedents, process, and consequences.
"Antecedents" are given considerable prominence. They consist of receiver variables
(such as personality characteristics, social characteristics, and the perceived need for the
innovation) and social system variables (social norms, tolerance of deviancy, etc.). The
"process" component is complex and involves communication sources and perceptions of
the innovation acting on the four stages of (1) knowledge, (2) persuasion, (3) decision,
and (4) confirmation. "Consequences" include adoption or rejection of the innovation,
but are not limited to such a simple dichotomy; confirmation, discontinuance, later
adoption, and continued rejection are also represented in the model.\textsuperscript{106}

Rogers and Shoemaker also distinguish among various types of consequences. The
consequences of an innovation may be functional or dysfunctional, meaning that they
may have desirable or undesirable effects on the functioning of the system in which it is
implemented. Consequences can also be either direct or indirect, "depending on whether
the changes in a social system occur in immediate response to an innovation or as a result
of the direct consequences of an innovation." And finally, consequences can also be
manifest or latent, "depending on whether the changes are recognized and intended by the
members of a social system or not."\textsuperscript{107}
**Figure 8**

Rogers and Shoemaker's Paradigm of the "Innovation-Decision Process"

Source: Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 102.
"Hybrid" Analytical Model Used in this Study

It would be tempting to merely adopt one of the foregoing models and use it "as is" to analyze the effort of the English Language Exploratory Committee/Council to reform English language teaching in Japan by introducing and promoting the innovation of Charles C. Fries' Oral Approach. Nevertheless, none of the models mentioned above meets all the criteria previously established: completeness, cross-cultural applicability, relevance to directed change, and coherent framework.

Inadequacies of Other Models

Rogers and Shoemaker's "paradigm of the innovation-decision process" comes closest to satisfying these criteria. Compared to the others it is much closer to being complete, i.e., taking into account all of the important factors that affect the process of implementation, including antecedents (tradition). It also goes beyond the simple listing of stages or factors and shows how these elements relate to each other in a coherent whole.

Unlike some of the others, Rogers and Shoemaker's model can be useful for analyzing/understanding cross-cultural efforts to implement directed change. Most of the other models were designed for a single-culture setting (usually the United States) and ignore many of the important socio-cultural factors which a comparative, cross-cultural perspective reveals and which must be included in any model that attempts to explain the campaign to implement an American language teaching method in the Japanese school system. As the analysis in the following two chapters will bear out, these factors are critical to understanding the ELEC campaign.

As it stands, however, Rogers and Shoemaker's innovation-decision paradigm is still inadequate for the purpose of this dissertation. Although it forms the basis for the "hybrid" model which is used as a framework for the analysis of the ELEC effort in the following two chapters it requires supplementation and modification in several ways.
Description/Explanation of the "Hybrid" Model

Figure 9 illustrates the supplemented and modified hybrid model and shows how its various components are arranged and interrelated. The "antecedents" section is expanded to include not only social system and receiver variables but an emphasis on the traditional, historical practices which form the background against which change is attempted. This change is motivated by the conclusion that "the school culture reflects and is a part of a larger society" and "like the larger society, and because of it, [the school culture] is far from static; and its present characteristics have a history." Traditional is especially important in Japan and any attempt to change educational practices in that country cannot afford to ignore it.

Rogers and Shoemaker's "perceived characteristics of innovations" section is also expanded to include a much greater variety of factors that encourage/discourage the implementation of change. These include Havelock's (and others') "barrier" factors and Richards' "secret life" factors. Because of their number and complexity, these factors are arranged in four categories depending on where they are found: within the innovation itself, within the resource system, within the user system, or between elements.

"Social system norms" and "receiver variables" appear in two different places in the model—in the antecedents section and as characteristics of the user system affecting the innovation-decision process. The first location recognizes their nature as relatively constant, pre-existing factors. The second position, however, is where they receive major emphasis since it is as facilitating/inhibiting factors that system norms and other receiver variables (new or old) have the greatest effect on the implementation of an innovation.

Since these facilitating/inhibiting factors are so varied and so important, each of them will be discussed individually in the following section.

Factors that Encourage/Discourage Change

Of critical concern to any implementation strategy are those factors which encourage and/or discourage change. Evans notes that a fundamental question underlying studies on
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The "Hybrid" Model
the diffusion of innovations is "What factors contribute to the prompt diffusion and rapid adoption of one particular innovation, while another—introduced at the same time into the same social system—is rejected or requires far greater time for its adoption?" Although these factors are many and varied, especially in cross-cultural implementation efforts, they cannot be overlooked. In fact, a consideration of these "implementation factors" and how they can work for or against the intended innovation should take precedence over the other aspects of planning. As Dow and others report, "Research suggests that the process of implementation requires careful attention to myriad concerns; the identification of these concerns is necessary before strategies for overcoming the concerns can be determined. [italics mine]"

And once initial plans have been drawn, these factors cannot be forgotten. They have a way of popping up unexpectedly and foiling the best laid plans. Williams wisely warns, "Always think about implementation problems, and always worry that others are not thinking about them." The following sections of this chapter consider a number of these factors. To avoid confusion, they are grouped into four general categories based on their location or origin: within the innovation itself, within the resource system, within the intended user system, and/or between these other elements.

**Characteristics of the Innovation Itself**

Miles insists that "innovations are almost never installed on their merits. Characteristics of the local system, of the innovating person or group, and of other relevant groups often outweigh the impact of what the innovation is." This, of course, does not mean that the characteristics of the innovation itself are unimportant. On the contrary, these characteristics—especially as they are perceived by the intended adopters of an innovation—are crucial both in and of themselves and as they interact with other implementation factors.
**Originality**

One of "certain properties of the innovation itself," which Pelz regards as critical to implementation is its "originality." First of all, the degree of originality in an innovation determines the nature of the change process—whether it is categorized as **origination** ("the innovation is invented locally without benefit of a prior model"), **adaptation** ("the innovation is modified from external examples"), or **borrowing** ("a standardized model is copied with little change"). Others make a similar distinction although the labels vary. Mintzberg, for instance, categorizes solutions as "custom-made," "modified," and "ready-made."114

The originality of an innovation is important for another (and perhaps more important) reason also. Particularly in some settings, originality may lead to problems with incompatibility between the innovation and the intended-user system. This problem can have devastating effects, as discussed in the "compatibility" section below.

**Complexity**

The complexity of an innovation is an important factor. It comes first on Dow, Whitehead, and Wright's list of barriers to change. They recommend that implementers carefully consider the amount of change that is expected and how many people will be involved.115

Rogers and Shoemaker define complexity from a somewhat different perspective as "the degree to which an innovation is perceived as difficult to understand and use." They agree, however, that it is a crucial determining factor and state that "in general, those new ideas requiring little additional learning investment on the part of the receiver will be adopted more rapidly than innovations requiring the adopter to develop new skills and understandings."116

Fullan and Pomfret agree that "complex changes in teachers' behaviors are usually more difficult to bring about and, therefore, less likely to occur.117

Pelz is another who devotes considerable attention to the characteristic of "complexity." He reports that among seven studies with appropriate data, "six reported a
negative relationship between the complexity of an innovation and its adoption." In other words, the greater the complexity of an innovation, the smaller the likelihood of adoption.

Things are not so simple, however. Pelz notes that "on closer scrutiny, complexity is seen to embrace multiple concepts." These he calls "technical complexity," "organizational complexity," "sophistication or intellectual difficulty," and "radicalness."118

Although complexity is a factor in its own right, it is also related to other factors. For example, it affects explicitness, since the "greater the complexity, the more difficult it is to be explicit about the operational characteristics of the innovation."119

Explicitness

Explicitness refers to more than the clarity with which the innovation is described. It also involves the degree of its development or formulation. Regarding this characteristic Dow, Whitehead, and Wright suggest that implementers ask, "Is there a rationale? Is the philosophy apparent? Are the goals and objectives specified?"120

In their discussion of "determinants of implementation," explicitness is one of two characteristics of the innovation which Fullan and Pomfret list as being most important (complexity is the other). A low degree of explicitness can lead to user confusion, a lack of clarity regarding what is desired, and frustration among those who receive the innovation. These problems, of course, result in a low degree of implementation.121 Unfortunately, many desired educational reforms are characterized by generalities and vagueness. To increase the likelihood of their implementation, "some process of developing greater explicitness or specification" is called for.122

Relative Advantage

Rogers and Shoemaker hold that "the greater the perceived relative advantage of an innovation, the more rapid its rate of adoption."123 This important characteristic is defined as "the degree to which an innovation is perceived as better than the idea it supersedes."124 It may be measured in terms of economics, social prestige, convenience,
and/or user satisfaction. Of course, "objective" advantage (as measured by an outsider) is not nearly as important as "perceived" advantage (in the eyes of the intended user).

**Trialability**

"Trialability" is a factor mentioned by Rogers and Shoemaker but few other diffusion-of-innovations authors. Nevertheless, it is worth considering. It refers to "the degree to which an innovation may be experimented with on a limited basis. New ideas which can be tried on the installment plan will generally be adopted more quickly than innovations which are not divisible." This is undoubtedly because small-scale experimentation is less risky for the adopter.

Havelock concurs that an innovation should be "open' in allowing potential users to try out and sample its effects prior to an all-out commitment to adopt."

Of course, some innovations are more difficult to try out than others, and some may not even work on a piece-meal basis.

Also, it should be noted that this characteristic decreases in importance with the passage of time. It is most important for early adopters, those who have no precedent to follow. Innovation "laggards" can observe the experiences of their colleagues who have already adopted the innovation and judge its results without experimenting with it themselves.

**Observability**

Rogers and Shoemakers' final determining characteristic, "observability is the degree to which the results of an innovation are visible to others. The easier it is for an individual to see the results of an innovation, the more likely he is to adopt it." They give an example from agriculture in which a weed killer which was sprayed on fields before the weeds had a chance to sprout. It was slow to catch on "because there were no dead weeds which the farmers could show their neighbors." Because of this factor, material innovations, which are more observable than non-material ones, generally catch on more readily.
Status

Status refers to association with a higher social level which can impart legitimacy and attract attention to an innovation.\textsuperscript{129} It is not the same as "power" to implement although it can be a powerful influencing factor—especially in academic circles.

Practicality

The factor of practicality is frequently overlooked, perhaps because it is obvious. Nevertheless, it is crucial for implementers to consider whether the demands of an innovation can be met by the intended user system. Dow, Whitehead, and Wright suggest asking questions such as the following: "Are expectations for students realistic? Are their aids for planning instruction? Is there adequate reference to resource materials? Is the expectation for teachers to cover material realistic? Are the other expectations for teachers realistic?"\textsuperscript{130}

Flexibility/Adaptability

Another factor mentioned by Dow, Whitehead, and Wright (and many other implementation researchers) is the adaptability or flexibility of an innovation in order to fit a particular situation. Havelock calls this characteristic "openness," rather than flexibility, but agrees that an innovation should be "adjustable and adaptable to the special circumstances of different users."\textsuperscript{131}

Primacy

The relative timing of an innovation is also important. Primacy, or "being first" often carries "inordinate weight in human affairs. We cling to the first resource systems (our mothers) the longest, and we tend to color our dealings with all later resource systems with our feelings about that first one."\textsuperscript{132} Especially in societies where tradition and loyalty are valued, previously adopted practices are a serious concern to those who wish to implement an innovation.
Form

A final important characteristic of the innovation is the form which it takes. Most diffusion-of-innovations models ignore this factor, but in his discussion of the factors that influence the "rise and fall" of language teaching methods, Richards' considers "form of the method proposal" to be extremely important. As already noted, Richards later renamed this factor "Publish or Perish," but the idea remained the same—that is, a critical factor relative to the successful spread of a language teaching innovation is whether it takes the form of a publishable textbook or remains merely an instructional philosophy.

Richards notes that "methods that lead to texts have a much higher adoption and survival rate than those which do not."133 This is primarily because textbook sales create profits for publishing companies. Therefore, "publishers promote texts at conferences, book exhibits, and through direct visits to schools and institutions and they finance workshops and lectures by authorities whose names lend credence to the philosophies behind the texts." 134 Miles makes a similar point (regarding the teaching of reading) that "materials have exerted far more influence on practice...than has the available research."135 Richards' frank conclusion is that "anyone who has an innovative instructional philosophy to market had better make it dependent upon the use of a student text."136

Characteristics of the Resource System

The resource system, change agent, and/or implementer also have characteristics which affect the course and success of implementation efforts. Although they are fewer in number than those of the innovation itself, they are important determining factors.

Capacity

A factor which accounts "for much of the variance in diffusion studies," is capacity, "the capability to retrieve and marshall diverse resources." This factor, like many of the others, applies to the user, the message, and the medium as well as to the individual or
unit behind the implementation of the innovation. In the case of the resource system, it is one of the most telling factors, as Havelock explains:

Generally speaking, the more power, prestige and capital possessed by the resource system, the more effective it will be as a resource and as a diffuser. If the resource system collectively possesses a high degree of intelligence, education, power, and wealth, it will then have the ability to summon and invest diverse resources; it will be able to plan and structure its activities on a grand scale over a long time span to produce "high performance products."\textsuperscript{137}

One of the major tasks of an implementer is communication of the innovation, and "a 'high capacity' medium...can convey a large quantity of information to a user in the shortest possible time." It can also "store a large amount of knowledge for the user...in such a way that it is readily retrievable." Furthermore, such a resource system also has "a high power to influence the potential user, to monopolize his attention, to involve and to captivate [italics in original]."\textsuperscript{138}

**Structure**

Structure means many things, all of them important. The resource system "needs a degree of structure in terms of meaningful division of labor and coordination of effort." It also needs to have "a structured and coherent view of the client system; it should be able to understand the various subsystems of the client system and how they are interrelated." Finally, the resource system also "should be able to plan D&U activities in a structured sequence [italics in original]."\textsuperscript{139}

Relative to the media of communication employed by the resource system, structure is also important. Havelock considers it of critical importance to "have a structured program for getting the message across to the user....Coherent multi-media programs for diffusing innovations and/or solving problems have a high chance of success..."\textsuperscript{140}

**Openness**

Openness, already discussed in relation to the innovation itself, where it meant flexibility or adaptability, is also a characteristic of the resource system. For the resource system, however, openness means "a willingness to help and a willingness to listen [italics in original] and to be influenced by user needs and aspirations."\textsuperscript{141}
In another sense of the word, resource systems should also "renew their skills and their competence by continuously remaining open to the newest developments of science and technology."

**Harmony**

In their discussion of innovation problems in developing countries, Havelock and Huberman mention a factor which would seem to be critical to change efforts anywhere. The problem is poor social relations or disharmony within project Harmonious relations among the different people and elements of the resource system cannot be taken for granted. Planners/managers of implementation projects who ignore the problem of poor social relations until it reaches the critical stage may find their efforts crippled by this internal "barrier."

**Characteristics of the User System**

The adopting unit also has multiple characteristics. In this section they are categorized generally as geographic location, system norms, organizational climate, capacities, school system factors, learner factors, teacher factors, and size.

**Geographic Location**

Geographic barriers to successful diffusion and implementation of change are mentioned only by Havelock and Huberman in their discussion of innovation-implementation efforts in developing countries, and they use the term to refer to problems such as the slow transport of materials. Nevertheless, the location of the intended user system can play a critical role in any change campaign. The geographical isolation of some countries affects not only their access to innovations but also socio-cultural attitudes toward outsiders. In directed contact change campaigns, such as the one ELEC conducted, which cross cultural boundaries and involve a widely separated user and resource system, both of these factors proved to be important.
System Norms and Values

The norms of society and its institutions are fundamental considerations. As House declares,

The schools are as pounded as a windward shore, and...they take their shape from the social winds and waters....There is an implicit order in ... society basic to all else—the order of the institutions. The schools do not exist freely outside that order; they are an integral part of it. Education can deviate only in the direction and to the extent that society allows.145

According to Havelock, values are an extremely important factor. They are "the basic stop-and-go signals for human behavior." "Messages which clearly contradict pre-existing values will not get anywhere and those which appeal to them will get far." In addition, "a perception of shared values will bring resource and user systems together and...perceptions of disparate values will drive them apart."146

Rogers and Shoemaker agree that system norms "affect an individual's innovation-adoption behavior....They define a range of tolerable behavior and serve as a guide or a standard for the members of a social system."147

Havelock also considers various characteristics of the society/organization within which innovation is to take place to powerful determinants of success in implementation. His "inhibitors" include the need for stability, fear of malevolence of outsiders, local pride, status differences among organizations, economic condition, and size. Facilitating factors include reward value, perception of crisis, awareness, training, capacity, and professionalism.148

Maley calls "cultural factors" "the most powerful factors in the implementation of any language programme."149 His examples of things to consider include the following:

"the attitudes of a given society toward the learning process, towards books, towards teachers,"

"attitudes to authority: whether people naturally conform or diverge from a norm"

"the degree to which learners cooperate or operate individually"

"the importance of 'face,' and whether conflict is solved by confrontation or compromise"

"attitudes to effort; whether it is esteemed or disparaged"
"whether the society is elitist or egalitarian (or whether, professing the one, it is in fact the other!)"

"whether the society is based on seniority or on merit." 150

Cultural factors are obviously both numerous and complicated. A thorough discussion of all of them could consume much time and space. In this chapter, the discussion will be limited to a few major "system norms"—group identity and loyalty, traditional/modern tendencies, and openness. Even these overlap and are strongly interrelated, but for the sake of analysis each will be discussed separately.

**Group Identity and Loyalty.** The individual's group identity and group loyalty are important factors. As Havelock explains, "People tend to adopt and maintain attitudes and behaviors which they perceive as normative for their psychological reference group." 151 In societies where the tendency toward group identity and loyalty is strong, the power of all of the following characteristics increases correspondingly.

**Traditional versus Modern Tendencies.** Whether innovation is welcomed or obstructed depends to a considerable extent on where a social system lies on the traditional-to-modern continuum. Traditional social systems can be characterized by a "lack of favorable orientation to change," "a social enforcement of the status quo in the social system...," "little communication by members of the social system with outsiders," and "lack of ability to empathize or to see oneself in others' roles..." In contrast, modern social systems are typified by "a generally positive attitude toward change," "a well developed technology with a complex division of labor," "a high value on education and science," "rational and businesslike social relationships," "cosmopolite perspectives," and "empathic ability on the part of the system's members." 152

Maley echoes, "There are societies which are essentially outward-looking, and which welcome innovation. And those which look inward, seeking their inspiration from deeply-rooted traditional values." 153

In the case of English language teaching in foreign countries, this characteristic becomes even more important. Maley explains,

In highly ethnocentric societies, the language is usually a powerful cohesive force. There is often a belief in the intrinsic superiority of one's own language over others, and tenacious pride in it as a badge of identity. This is often reflected in an ambivalent attitude to foreigners and to their language. Such attitudes will clearly
have profound effects upon the teaching of a foreign language. It may be publicly confessed, but privately regretted, that English is necessary. And this will affect the deep-seated motivations of learners."\textsuperscript{154}

Such attitudinal problems are also related to the next characteristic—openness.

**Openness.** Openness" refers to "the readiness to give and to receive new information," and is "a vitally important quality." As Havelock explains, "closed systems and closed minds are, by definition, incapable of taking in important new messages from outside; if they cannot take in, then they cannot utilize knowledge for internal change."\textsuperscript{155}

For the user, "openness" is more than "passive receptivity." "Rather it is an active faith that outside resources will be useful and an active reaching out for new ideas, new products, and new ways of doing things. In addition, it is a willingness to take risks and to make an effort to adapt innovations to one's own situation [italics in original]."\textsuperscript{156}

Havelock adds, "the user should also be open internally to himself, willing and able to make objective self-diagnosis....Research studies have shown that 'age' of adopter is negatively correlated with innovativeness. In other words, youthfulness is related to effective D&U [italics in original]."\textsuperscript{157}"

Organizational Climate

Fullan and Pomfret recognize organizational climate as one of four major "characteristics of the adopting unit" that determine the course and degree of implementation.\textsuperscript{158}

For instance, "several studies suggest that the existing 'organizational climate' of adopting units plays a critical role in whether and how implementation occurs. In fact, many would claim that the organizational capacities of the adopting unit are more important for implementation than the product (the innovation)."\textsuperscript{159}

Capacities

System norms and organizational climate are undoubtedly important, but perhaps most important is the intended users' capability to do what the innovation requires. Fullan and Pomfret note that implementation "depends on the capacity, skill of users to
perform in new ways. Even when inner desires and external pressures are strong, it is difficult if not impossible for educators to change their methods unless they have the capacity to do so, and sometimes they do not.

"Capacity" also serves to distinguish two different kinds of change which innovations may require of users: "changes that make the user capable of using the innovation and changes that commit the user to the innovation." Roberts-Gray and Gray explain, "User capability" takes the form of "individual know how and organizational arrangements." "User commitment" may also involve decisions at both the individual and organization levels.

This distinction highlights the point that alone, neither commitment nor capacity is enough. Expressed very simply, "capability determines what can be implemented, and commitment determines what will be implemented." To achieve success, change agents must address both the user's capability (or capacity) to use the innovation and the user's commitment to using it.

Capacity also has a critical physical dimension. Speaking from experience, Maley warns that "material factors" can be a serious problem for educational reformers unless the physical capacities of the adopting unit are sufficient to support the desired innovation. Unfortunately, despite their obvious nature, these factors are "consistently overlooked." Maley cites specific examples of

- a major language programme which had to start without hardware, and with very little software either, because orders had not been placed in time; an institution with three language laboratories in crates because the buildings to house them had not yet been constructed; a photocopier rendered unusable because no paper had been provided for it; sets of text-books on listening skills without the cassettes which perform an essential role in their use; video equipment which was incompatible; a language laboratory which caught fire after being used once and which could not be repaired since the nearest qualified technician was in Norway; equipment locked away and unused on the grounds that it was too valuable to use.

He urges anticipatory consideration of a number of capacity factors (from budgetary provisions to servicing of hardware) to avoid such problems when programs are implemented.
School System Factors

Although the schools exist within and are influenced by society, they also form a separate system with its own set of implementation factors to consider. In this section, these factors are grouped into several general categories: educational philosophy, authority and administration, examinations, learner factors, teacher factors, and size of the adopting unit.

Educational Philosophy. Maley considers "educational factors" to be of prime importance to language-teaching reformers. One of the most fundamental of these is the "prevailing educational philosophy." For example, is schooling provided for primarily egalitarian, or elitist purposes? Whatever the philosophy may be, if the innovation is not in harmony with the prevailing principles it will have little chance of success.

Authority and Administration. Another set of "educational factors" important to language-teaching reformers relates to the way the school system is administered and controlled. Is the tendency toward local, or central control? Is administration authoritarian in nature, or is it more participatory? When control is exercised by a central, authoritarian body, a critical implementation factor is whether the top-level administrators "understand, and are...in sympathy with, the declared objectives" of the innovation-implementation process.

When those in authority in such a centralized system are not in sympathy with the objectives of reformers, their opposition constitutes a serious barrier. Havelock and Huberman discuss "opposition from key groups (ruling elites, special interest groups)" in developing countries. This factor turned out to be crucial in the case of the ELEC campaign also.

Speaking of the diffusion of educational innovations in general, Havelock noted, "One of the major stumbling blocks in the effective dissemination and utilization of innovations and new knowledge is the power of vested interest groups." Nevertheless, these interest groups and the power they wield varies from country to country. Consequently, when attempts at cross-cultural innovation are made, an
innovator from one country may not even be aware of these powerful groups in the target setting, much less be prepared to deal with them.

There are, of course, a number of tactics for dealing with these types of resistance:

One possibility is presenting the innovation in such a way as not to arouse the vested interests of a powerful group. This sounds simple but unfortunately assumes ignorance on the part of the interest group, which is often not the case.

A second more commonly used strategy is the inducement of the vested interest groups to accept the innovations in return for some desired resources.

A strategy that has proven effective in some settings is the involvement of the vested interests in the decision-making process.

Examinations. Still another important school system factor is "the role of examinations in a given educational system." Reflecting on experiences in several Asian countries, Maley notes, "Many a good scheme has been drowned in the washback from an intractable examination system."

The "examination factor" is typically overlooked by American educational reformers. Of course, given the decentralized, credit-oriented nature of the U.S. school system, this neglect is only natural. Nevertheless, it is of critical importance and great strength in many other nations.

From an historical, British perspective, Gordon and Lawton claim that "examinations present us with some of the most powerful indicators of curriculum change in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It is fashionable today to blame examinations for many of the ills of the educational system, but this is far too simple a generalization. Examinations have at times restricted curriculum development, but at other times they have certainly been a progressive influence on the educational system."

Learner Factors

Would-be reformers of the school system typically concern themselves with teachers, materials, administrators, etc. but frequently overlook the students. Nevertheless, the expectations, behaviors, and feelings of learners are another crucial factor that must be considered. As Maley explains, "Learner expectations may or may not be in tune with the programme as planned."
When an attempt is made to implement an innovation designed for use in one cultural setting in another, the socio-cultural characteristics of the learners take on added importance. These, of course, include the learners' values and behavioral norms—especially those that differ from those of learners in the innovation's "home" culture. Implementors of innovations ignore such differences at their peril.

Teacher Factors

In most cases of educational innovation, "the real change expected is at the classroom level. The teacher, then must be considered of primary importance in the development of plans for implementation. If teachers are not committed to the change, it is unlikely to occur."172

Teacher factors are not limited to commitment. They also include the "training and experience of those who will have to carry out any previously devised program," their "degree of understanding," the "availability of teacher training," and their expectations about the nature of the teaching/learning experience.173

Not to be forgotten are the teachers' capacities. Dow, Whitehead, and Wright question: "Do teachers...have the skills necessary to implement the guidelines?" If not, "Have adequate workshops and inservice programmes been provided to develop the knowledge and skills necessary for implementation."174 In the case of English language teaching, one of the most important skills teachers must have is proficiency in English. When, as is frequently the case, their English skills are inadequate to handle the proposed innovation, they must be developed. Otherwise, the innovation will have to be heavily adapted (compromised) if not abandoned entirely. Nevertheless, English skills can seldom be built up sufficiently in an afternoon in-service meeting or a weekend workshop. Improving in English takes a considerable investment of both time and effort.

Unfortunately, as House points out, teachers "must meet the demands of coverage, mastery, affect, and management with limited resources."175 In most situations—especially those where improvement is most needed—teachers are extremely busy and overburdened, with multiple preparations and large class sizes. This, of course, leaves little time, energy, or motivation to take effective steps toward innovation.
Teachers are among the first to recognize this problem. According to Fullan and Pomfret, "lack of time and energy, teacher overload, and multiple demands are...frequently cited by teachers...among the major implementation problems they face." Of course, recognizing the problem is one thing; doing something about it is quite another. This is where change agents can (but often do not) play a critical role. As Fullan and Pomfret conclude (quoting House), "reducing the costs of the innovation—the personal time and difficulty in learning new skills—may be 'one of the most efficient ways of promoting innovation.'"

Size of the Adopting Unit

Despite statements by some diffusion-of-innovations researchers (especially those who take a social-interaction view of change) that size makes little difference, others maintain that the size of the adopting unit is a factor that affects implementation in many ways.

Fullan and Pomfret note that "the larger the scale of the program, the more prominent the role" played by "macro sociopolitical units" or "political agencies outside the adopting organization." These "range from local school system boards, local government, and community agencies, to national and federal organizations. of these types of factors." The involvement of these additional agencies greatly increases both the scope and the complexity of the implementation process.

A related factor is the type of innovation-decision that is to be made. When "authority decisions" rule, the size of the affected unit makes less difference than when the decisions are of the "collective" type. In the latter case, as Rogers and Shoemaker propose, "the more persons involved in making an innovation decision, the slower the rate of adoption." In such cases, the rate of adoption and implementation may be speeded up by altering the size of the "decision-unit," but such alteration is frequently not possible.
Inter-Elemental Factors

Up to this point, the factors considered have all pertained to only one element or unit involved in the diffusion and implementation of educational innovations (e.g., the innovation itself, the user system, the resource system). Nevertheless, there are a number of critical factors that exist "between" rather than "within" these elements. Five of these inter-elemental factors are compatibility, linkage, reward, proximity, and synergy.

Compatibility

Compatibility is a complicated factor involving all the elements of a diffusion and implementation effort. Because of the element of choice, the resource system and the innovation are usually compatible. Compatibility between the innovation and user or between the resource system and user system, however, cannot be taken for granted.

Innovation-User. According to Evans, one important type of "compatibility of an innovation concerns the degree to which potential adopters feel it is consistent with their existing values and past experiences." Compatibility efforts can encounter serious problems when the innovation is incompatible with the values and/or current practices of the intended users. As Rogers and Shoemaker explain, "An idea that is not compatible with the prevalent values and norms of the social system will not be adopted as rapidly as an innovation that is compatible." In fact, it may not be adopted at all. They give the example of unsuccessful attempts to raise the nutritional level of people in India by increasing their consumption of beef (i.e., "sacred cows").

"When such mismatches occur, there are two approaches that can be taken to improve the "fit" between innovation and user and so foster successful utilization." "Adaptive implementation" is one of these approaches. It involves modifying or adapting the innovation so that it is more easily assimilated into user practices and values. "Programmed implementation" attempts to "bring about changes in the user so that characteristics of the innovation are accommodated."
Roberts-Gray and Gray go to considerable length explaining the need and process of "analyzing the 'fit' between innovation and user." They not only mention several "checklists" designed to assist in conducting such an analysis; they also link them with strategies for implementing change (usually of the "programmed" type). Very generally, the characteristics of the innovation and the characteristics of the user can be grouped into four categories as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of the Innovation</th>
<th>Characteristics of the User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource Demands</td>
<td>Organizational structures and facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept of Use</td>
<td>Organizational policies and regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Demands</td>
<td>Individual abilities and behavior patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Benefits</td>
<td>Individual attitudes and values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each of these four areas, the degree of "fit" is analyzed, and "when misfits are detected, needs for change are identified." Regarding the first characteristic, resource demands, "the user organization must have structures to obtain and manage resources to support use of the innovation." In the second category, "the concept of use for the innovation must be consistent with policies and regulations that control activity within the organization." Relative to task demands, "to acquire the know-how to perform with the innovation, individuals must have abilities and behavior patterns that will allow them to integrate the new task requirements into existing routines." And respecting the final set of characteristics, "to obtain personal commitment to its use, the innovation must offer benefits that are compatible with attitudes and values held by individual users [italics in original]."  

**Resource-User.** Particularly in cross-cultural implementation efforts, there may be incompatibilities between the resource system and the intended users of the innovation. The homophily-heterophily distinction, made by Rogers and Shoemaker, provides terminology and concepts useful in discussing and understanding such problems:

Homophily is the degree to which pairs of individuals who interact are similar in certain attributes, such as beliefs, values, education, social status, and the like. In a free-choice situation, when a source can interact with any one of a number of receivers, there is a strong tendency for him to select a receiver who is most like himself....One of the most distinctive problems in the communication of innovations is that the source is usually quite heterophilous to the receiver....This
heterophily gap in diffusion is much wider when source and receiver do not share a common culture.186

A heterophily gap can spell problems for implementors of innovations. Among other things, it "creates role conflict and problems in communication."187

Linkage

In his classic book, Planning for Innovation through Dissemination and Utilization of Knowledge, Ronald Havelock notes that in his review of reports on diffusion of innovations, "certain things seemed to keep coming up, regardless of the area of focus and regardless of the level of analysis." He lists these "unifying themes, as "factors which help in explaining diffusion and utilization phenomena," and the first factor he lists is linkage (two others, discussed below, are proximity and synergy).188

Linkage refers to "the number, variety, and mutuality of contacts between the Resource System and the User System." It reflects the "degree of inter-personal or intergroup connection" that exists in a given situation. Generally, "the more linkages there are and the stronger these linkages are, the more effective will be the day-to-day contact and exchange of information, hence the greater will be the mutual utilization of knowledge."189

Reward

Reward refers to "the frequency, immediacy, amount, mutuality of, planning, and structuring of positive reinforcements."190 Innovations can provide rewards to their users, and resource systems can reward (or reinforce) user systems.

Such reinforcements can take various forms—profitability (for commercial systems), recognition by colleagues, satisfaction in creating something that works, or feedback from a satisfied client, to mention only a few.191

Unfortunately, unless steps are taken to change the typical situation, in many school systems, the rewards for implementing an innovation are few if they exist at all. In fact, it is not uncommon for innovations to be negatively reinforced.
House calls this sad state of affairs "the teacher's predicament." The rewards for teachers who try innovations are few, and the personal costs are frequently high. Costs include the energy, time, difficulty, and trauma involved in learning skills. Sadly, in most "delivery of the curriculum" situations, teachers receive little support or encouragement. In fact, teachers are typically expected to go through this process "at their own personal expense." For this reason, Dow, Whitehead, and Wright recommend a clear channel of rewards to create motivation for change. In evaluating the prospective effectiveness of an implementation effort, they ask: "Are there clear means for consultants/co-ordinators to motivate principals and teachers to implement? Are there other means for principals to motivate teachers to implement?"

**Proximity**

Another "powerful predictor of utilization" is the proximity of the resource and user systems. Proximity refers to their "nearness in time, place, and context," their "familiarity, similarity, recency." Havelock explains how this factor affects change in a natural, almost unavoidable way:

> When we live as neighbors, when we bump into one another and have the chance to observe and stimulate one another by reason of being in the same place at the same time, we will inevitably learn from one another. Hence, users who have close proximity to resources are more likely to use them. Anything which is "handy," i.e., easily accessible, is more likely to be used.

Of course, in cross-cultural implementation efforts, proximity seldom exists. This distance reduces the likelihood of success, and special efforts must be made to overcome this barrier.

**Synergy**

The term "synergy" refers to "the number, variety, frequency, and persistence of forces that can be mobilized to produce a knowledge utilization effect." When a variety of forces exert pressure together, in combination, upon the same point, the total effect can be greater than the sum of the parts. Because it is rather nebulous, Havelock
uses this term with "reluctance," yet he recognizes that it captures a critical idea or force in the innovation-diffusion-implementation process.

Planning for Implementation

Although it is frequently neglected, planning for implementation, including a consideration of the types of decisions the intended users may make and the strategies that the resource group can employ, is important

The Importance of Planning

Because of the great variety of factors involved in the change process, it is foolish to hope that they will all "fall into place" naturally. For this reason, regardless of the particular strategy employed, diffusion of innovation researchers generally agree that effective planning is critical if the implementation effort is to have any chance of meeting with success.

Pratt, Thurber, Hall, and Hord state that it is important to "develop an intervention game plan in advance. Thinking out the overall design of interventions that will be needed to support a school improvement effort and doing this in advance is critical."\textsuperscript{198}

Michaletz maintains that

"the most important and time consuming phase in bringing about curriculum change is the planning phase....When the planning phase is carried out effectively, both the implementation and evaluation phases will follow more readily. If the planning phase is not dealt with adequately, the other phases could be ineffective."\textsuperscript{199}

He explains that the planning should be deliberative, determinative, collaborative, future-oriented, and structured yet flexible. \textit{Deliberative} means that the planning involves careful thought, \textit{determinative} means that it serves to decide or resolve issues beforehand, and \textit{collaborative} means that all interested, affected parties are involved in the planning. By \textit{future-oriented} Michaletz intends that planners should aim at the setting for change as it will become, not merely as it presently is. \textit{Structure} in a plan indicates that it is composed of sequential steps, but \textit{flexible} means that this structure is still capable of being altered if necessary.
Havelock agrees that structure in planning is important. This factor "strongly affects the utilization process" since "effective dissemination and utilization must take place within a coherent framework." In Havelock's experience, "successful utilization activities tend to be structured activities, and useful knowledge is structured knowledge. The extent to which structuring takes place in the sender and receiver and in the message seem to be important correlates of successful dissemination and utilization."\(^{200}\)

Lamentably, however, "The literature on innovation and planned change is replete with examples of programs heavily invested in research and development without an accompanying plan for implementation."\(^{201}\)

**Types of Innovation Decisions**

A critical concern of implementation planners is the type of decisions that the intended users of an innovation can make. As Rogers and Shoemaker explain, user decisions may be of four types: optional, collective, authority, and contingent.

**Optional** decisions are not dependent on other members of society. An individual (or individual group) may choose to implement an innovation regardless of the decision made by others.

**Collective** decisions, on the other hand, are made only by consensus agreement among all the parties involved.

**Authority** decisions come from "above." They are forced upon individuals by someone in a superordinate power position, perhaps a school administrator or government official.

**Contingent** decisions are chained to other, preceding decisions. They are made only after a prior decision and depend on the nature of that decision.\(^{202}\)

Different types of decisions vary in both the speed with which they can be made and the effectiveness or duration of their outcomes.

Generally, the fastest rate of adoption of innovations results from authority decisions....In turn, optional decisions can be made more rapidly than the collective type. Although made most rapidly, authority decisions are more likely to be circumvented and may eventually lead to a high rate of discontinuance of the innovation.\(^{203}\)
Of course, different types of change and different types of user decisions also require different change strategies on the part of the resource system.

**Strategies for Bringing About Change**

Success in implementing an innovation requires more than simply deciding what kind of innovation-decision is needed and going through a series of stages leading up to it, and planning for implementation involves more than determining what these stages will be. Various strategies for bringing about change must also be considered and employed. Not unsurprisingly, just as there are many different conceptualizations of the stages in the implementation process, so there are many different ideas about the strategies that can/should be used to bring about change.

Some strategies are simplistic. According to House, for instance, "most innovation is dependent on face-to-face personal contacts." Following this line of thought leads to the conclusion that bringing about change requires more frequent and more effective interpersonal contacts. Although interpersonal contacts may be important, such a strategy is woefully inadequate—especially when directed contact change on a large scale is the goal.

Another basic strategy used by change agents is to work through "opinion leaders" in the system of intended users. As Rogers and Shoemaker explain,

Very often the most innovative member of a system is perceived as a deviant from the social system, and he is accorded a somewhat dubious status of low credibility by the average members of the system. His role in diffusion (especially in persuading others about the innovation) is therefore likely to be limited. On the other hand there are members of the system who function in the role of opinion leader. They provide information and advice about innovations to many others in the system....These influential persons can lead in the promotion of new ideas.

Opinion leadership can be a very powerful force in promoting the implementation of an innovation, especially when the society has a modern orientation. On the other hand, the opinion leaders in a conservatively oriented society most likely "reflect this norm in their behavior," and "can head an active opposition" to an innovation. When this occurs, they constitute a serious barrier to change.
Roberts-Gray and Gray take a more complicated stance and describe four general strategies to facilitate change: assistance, education, power, and persuasion.

Assistance strategies "provide technical or fiscal support for making organizational arrangements to receive and use the innovation. Education strategies provide individuals with information and training needed to use the innovation and integrate it into their routine performances. Power strategies are applied to establish rules and sanctions to force the innovation into place and provide organizational control over its use. And persuasion strategies shape people's attitudes and values to foster personal commitment to the innovation [italics in original].207

Mann provides a basic typology of strategies for promoting change which has several similarities with Roberts-Gray and Gray's. Reinforcing change is a strategy in which the change agent intensifies or extends the original impetus for change. Forcing change can be done (at least attempted) by those who are in positions of power. An example is legislators' prohibition of racial discrimination. Buying change is a strategy wherein users are given rewards for complying with the desired change. Persuading change involves a rational approach which utilizes logic and/or evidencing the superiority of an innovation. Manipulating change consists of creating a "new self interest in the other party."208

Although their ideas are quite different from Mann's and Roberts-Gray and Gray's, Fullan and Pomfret also discuss strategies for bringing about change in education. These consist of (1) in-service training, (2) resource support (the time and materials needed to implement the innovation), (3) feedback mechanisms (which stimulate interaction and are useful in the identification of problems), and (4) participation (in decision making) "by those who are expected to implement the new program."209

Summary

In developing and explaining the analytical model to be used in this study of the ELEC campaign, this chapter has discussed a variety of aspects of the diffusion of innovations—from general perspectives to particular planning strategies. It has built upon Rogers and Shoemaker's paradigm of the innovation-decision process and borrowed ideas from a variety of other sources to create a "hybrid" linkage model that satisfies the criteria of adequacy set forth at the beginning of this chapter.
This "hybrid" model will form the framework of the next two chapters of this dissertation. First, the "antecedent" variables, including the development of pedagogical traditions associated with foreign language teaching, will be discussed. After that, the "process" that the ELEC campaign went through will be considered—not chronologically as it was in chapter two, but according to the elements in this model. From this perspective, the story of ELEC's actions, successes, and failures will be more revealing and of greater value to those who might hope to bring about the same type of change in similar settings.

When that is done, the story of the English Language Exploratory Committee/Council's effort to revolutionize English language teaching in Japan will be truly useful. As Parish and Arends advise, "We can learn from our efforts,… if we view our failures not as resulting from stubborn resistance or bad intentions but instead as ingrained in the complex relationships found in schools."^{210}
Notes


2 Roberts-Gray and Gray, p. 213.

3 Roberts-Gray and Gray, p. 213.


5 Roberts-Gray and Gray, p. 213.

6 Fullan and Pomfret, p. 337.

7 Roberts-Gray and Gray, p. 215.

8 Parish and Arends, p. 62.

9 House, p. 1.

10 Fullan and Pomfret, p. 367.

11 Fullan and Pomfret, p. 390.

12 Mackey, p. v.

13 Sarason, p. 19.


15 Harold Pratt, John C. Thurber, Gene E. Hall, and Shirley M. Hord, Case Studies of School Improvement: A Concerns Based Approach (ERIC ED 251 491).


17 Pelz, p. 289.


19 Elsie W. Gee, Applying Effective Instruction Research Findings in Teacher Education: Six Influencing Factors (ERIC ED 246 037), pp. 14 and 8a.

20 Havelock, Huber, and Zimmerman, p. 37

21 David S. Martin and Philip J. Saif, Curriculum Change from the Grass Roots (ERIC ED 254 913).
22 Parish and Arends, p. 65.


26 Maley, pp. 90-111.


29 Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, Meditations II, 3, in Beck, p. 141.


31 Abraham Cowley, Inconstancy, in Beck, p. 357.


33 King Lear I.iv.346.


35 Reinhold Niebuhr, Prayer [1934], in Beck, p. 1024.


37 Appelbaum, p. 123.

38 Appelbaum, p. 132.

39 Appelbaum, p. 167.

40 Appelbaum, p. 72.


42 Max Planck, The Philosophy of Physics (1936) in Beck, p. 847

43 Appelbaum, p. 56.

44 Appelbaum, p. 36.

46 Appelbaum, p. 16.

47 Appelbaum, p. 19.

48 Appelbaum, p. 133.

49 Appelbaum, p. 134.


52 Appelbaum, p. 126.

53 Appelbaum, p. 121.

54 Appelbaum, p. 134.

55 Appelbaum, p. 120.


58 Roberts-Gray and Gray, p. 214

59 Mann, p. xii.

60 Mann, back cover.

61 Sarason, p. 19


64 Havelock, *Planning*, chapt. 11, p. 7.


68 Havelock, *Planning*, chapt. 11, p. 11.


70 Havelock, *Planning*, chapt. 11, p. 11.

71 Havelock, *Planning*, chapt. 11, p. 11.
72 Havelock, Planning, chapt. 11, pp. 13-14.
73 Havelock, Planning, chapt. 11, p. 15.
74 Havelock, Planning, p. 4.
75 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 228.
76 Rogers and Kincaid, p. 38.
77 Rogers and Kincaid, p. 38.
78 Rogers and Kincaid, p. 39.
79 Rogers and Kincaid, p. 65.
80 Rogers and Kincaid, p. 337.
81 Rogers and Kincaid, p. 337.
82 Rogers and Kincaid, p. 338.
83 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 25.
85 Roberts-Gray and Gray, p. 218.
87 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 25.
88 Gee, p 14.
89 Roberts-Gray and Gray, p. 224.
91 Leithwood, p. 347.
98 Gordon and Lawton, p. 205.
102 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 12.
103 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 20.
104 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 23.
105 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 25
106 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 102.
107 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 17.
113 Pelz, pp. 262-263.
115 Dow, Whitehead, and Wright, p. 2.
116 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 22.
117 Fullan and Pomfret, p. 371.
118 Pelz, p. 264.
119 Fullan and Pomfret, p. 371.
120 Dow, Whitehead, and Wright, p. 3.
121 Fullan and Pomfret, p. 367.
122 Fullan and Pomfret, p. 370.
123 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 22.
124 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 138.
125 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 155.
126 Havelock, Planning, chapt. 11, p. 25.
127 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 23.
128 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 156.
129 Havelock, Planning, chapt. 11, p. 31.
130 Dow, Whitehead, and Wright, p. 3.
131 Havelock, Planning, chapt. 11, p. 25.
132 Havelock, Planning, chapt. 11, p. 31.
135 Miles, Innovation in Education. p. 637.
137 Havelock, Planning, chapt. 11, p. 25.
139 Havelock, Planning, chapt. 11, p. 23.
140 Havelock, Planning, chapt. 11, p. 24.
141 Havelock, Planning, chapt. 11, p. 24.
142 Havelock, Planning, chapt. 11, p. 24.
144 Havelock and Huberman, p. 222.
145 House, p. 5.
146 Havelock, *Planning*, chapt. 11, p. 31.
147 Rogers and Shoemaker, pp. 30-31.
148 Havelock, *Planning*, chapt. 6, pp. 7-ff.
149 Maley, p. 91.
150 Maley, pp. 91-92.
152 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 32.
153 Maley, p. 91.
154 Maley, p. 91.
158 Fullan and Pomfret, p. 368.
159 Fullan and Pomfret, p. 383.
160 Fullan and Pomfret, p. 371.
161 Roberts-Gray and Gray, p. 217.
162 Roberts-Gray and Gray, p. 219.
163 Maley, p. 97.
164 Maley, p. 92.
165 Maley, p. 92.
166 Havelock and Huberman, p. 239.
169 Maley, p. 93.
170 Gordon and Lawton, p. 179.
171 Maley, p. 95.
172 Dow, Whitehead, and Wright, p. 4.
173 Maley, p. 96-97.
174 Dow, Whitehead, and Wright, p. 4.
175 House, p. 80.
176 Fullan and Pomfret, p. 388.
177 Fullan and Pomfret, p. 388.
178 Havelock, Planning, chapt. 11, p. 7.
179 Fullan and Pomfret, p. 386.
180 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 159.
181 Evans, Resistance to Innovation, p. 17.
182 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 22.
183 Roberts-Gray and Gray, p. 216.
184 Roberts-Gray and Gray, p. 223.
185 Roberts-Gray and Gray, p. 223.
187 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 229.
188 Havelock, Planning, chapt. 11, p. 20.
189 Havelock, Planning, chapt. 11, p. 21.
190 Havelock, Planning, chapt. 11, p. 20.
192 House, p. 73.
193 House, p. 97.
194 Dow, Whitehead, and Wright, p. 7.
195 Havelock, Planning, chapt. 11, p. 20.
196 Havelock, Planning, chapt. 11, p. 27.
197 Havelock, Planning, chapt. 11, p. 20.
198 Pratt, Thurber, Hall, and Hord, p. 67.
199 Michaletz, p. 2.
200 Havelock, Planning, chapt. 11, p. 23.
201 Roberts-Gray and Gray, p. 214.
202 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 37.
203 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 37
204 House, p. 3.
205 Rogers and Shoemaker, pp. 34-35.
206 Rogers and Shoemaker, p. 35.
207 Roberts-Gray and Gray, p. 220.
208 Mann, p. 288.
209 Fullan and Pomfret, pp. 368 and 375.
210 Parish and Arends, p. 62.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS—ANTECEDENTS

This chapter deals with "antecedents," the first part of the model explained at the end of the preceding chapter. It describes the historical foundations of the Japanese school system and the pedagogical traditions related to English language teaching that ELEC attempted to change. It also deals with certain "receiver variables" and "social system norms" as they relate to this history (insofar as they facilitated or inhibited ELEC's implementation of the Oral Approach in Japan, however, these variables will be discussed in chapter five).

The Importance of an Historical Perspective

The historical antecedents of the ELEC campaign are important to understand. They affected the way English was taught in Japan in the 1950's and influenced the ELEC attempt to change these methods. As Richards notes, "Education in different countries reflects culturally specific traditions of teaching and learning that may substantially shape the form and content of much school learning."1 Beauchamp agrees, and adds a warning to would-be reformers who seek an externally produced solution to internal problems: "There is virtually unanimous agreement that an educational system is essentially an organic outgrowth of a society's unique history and culture and therefore transplantation into a foreign environment is fraught with danger."2
Although the learning of English by the Japanese is by no means a purely modern phenomenon, modern-day critics and would-be reformers of the Japanese English-teaching system (including many involved in the ELEC campaign) typically confine themselves to the present-day situation. This historical myopia is widespread in ELT circles. As one ELT professional in Japan confessed, "It is one of the minor scandals of our profession that until recently it was possible to complete a degree in ESL without knowing a thing about anything that happened before World War II." This myopic perspective fails to take into account the cultural factors and historical trends which over the years have shaped English teaching in Japan and continue to influence its form and direction today. As Suzuki explains, "Our lack of proficiency in English may be ascribed to certain national traits developed over a long period of historical and geographical isolation." And, as Harasawa maintains, the major challenge of ELT reform in Japan is to "modify a nation's 2,000-year-old mental habit or psychological complex."

Thus, if those who wish to reform an existing educational system are to succeed, an adequate historical perspective is essential. That is why (as discussed in the preceding chapter) Rogers and Shoemaker included "antecedents" as a prominent element in the innovation-decision model which they advocated and which was adapted for use in this dissertation. Many others agree. For instance, speaking of English-language-teaching programs, Hino maintains, "In developing or selecting teaching methodology suitable for any EFL [English as a foreign language] country, it is essential to investigate its indigenous educational tradition." Professor Kiyoshi Shioiri sums it all up neatly: "In order to understand the present we must understand the past."

**Characteristics of the System ELEC Attempted to Reform**

In the 1950s, the Japanese school system was characterized by a number of important traits, all of which had a historical basis. Although the country was still recovering from the devastation of World War II, schooling was widespread, and the Japanese school system was large and bureaucratic. Although recent "democratic" reforms during the Occupation had expanded educational opportunity in Japan, formal schooling in that country already had a long history—one of the longest in the world, in
fact—and school attendance had been compulsory for many years. Corresponding attitudes toward the desirability of education and the way it should be attained were already firmly established.

The typical English class of the time also displayed a number of characteristics which were by no means new. These traits had developed over a period of centuries and included an emphasis on reading and writing (to the exclusion of speaking and listening) and heavy reliance on a Japanese-style "grammar-translation" approach called *yakudoku*. The power of the senior high school and university entrance examinations was also firmly established, and the system which offered them was well entrenched.

The system for preparing English teachers and the institutions for doing so have a historical basis also. In the 1950's, a serious obstacle for the ELEC reformers was that the kind of training Japanese teachers of English received was already a well established tradition with deep roots. Of course, because the demand for teachers of English during and after the Allied Occupation of Japan exceeded the supply, many poorly trained or untrained individuals were also pressed into service teaching English, creating a problem of a different sort.

Enthusiasm for learning English was strong in the Japan of the 1950's although this was definitely not the first time such a wave of "English fever" had swept the country. This cyclical, "love-hate" pattern with its bursts of strong enthusiasm for studying a foreign language is a very noticeable characteristic of the history of language learning in Japan. It began, not just recently with English, but long ago with Dutch and Portuguese (and even before that, with Chinese), as this chapter explains.

**The Need to Understand "Roots"**

Contrary to what many may think, the learning of English by the Japanese is not a purely modern phenomenon. The widespread study of English in Japan began nearly a century before the 1956 ELEC Specialists' Conference. Moreover, foreign languages other than English had been studied for many centuries, laying down a formidable foundation of pedagogical traditions.
In order to understand with the requisite degree of adequacy the situation ELEC faced, it is necessary to view it from an historical perspective. Unfortunately, to a discouraging extent, the ELEC reformers lacked such a perspective. For example, although it was claimed that "all of the important problems of English teaching" in Japan were discussed at that first ELEC conference, the topics discussed were limited to the "present situation." A critical question, which ELEC failed to address, is "What are the roots of the learning of English in Japan?"

The purpose of this chapter, in accord with the "hybrid" model presented in chapter three, is to respond to that question. It will examine the historical and cultural foundations of English language teaching (ELT) in Japan. Thus, it shares with Koike the hope that "by examining the cultural and historical influences in Japan, the role of English teaching in Japan may be better understood." This examination reveals that the roots of ELT in Japan go back much farther than is commonly thought.

Studies of the history of English teaching in Japan typically begin with the Meiji Restoration in 1868 when "English attained a special role...as a tool to facilitate the westernization of the country." Although there was an obvious and unprecedented "explosion" of English study during the first part of the Meiji period, the roots of English teaching in Japan extend back much farther than 1868.

Others maintain that the beginning of English teaching in Japan was marked by the Phaeton Incident of 1808 (when a British warship, the HMS Phaeton, landed at Nagasaki and created quite a "stir"). Nevertheless incidents equally important to the history of ELT in Japan had occurred prior to that time, and the socio-cultural influences that "set the stage" for the rapid expansion of English teaching in nineteenth-century Japan had been developing for many centuries.

If one takes only a limited historical view, then the "swift introduction of foreign language and culture" into Japan in the Meiji days appears to be almost miraculous. This myopic perspective might lead reformers of ELT in Japan to believe that pedagogical practices can be changed with equal rapidity—a false hope in light of the true length of the history of the development of foreign language teaching practices in Japan.
Four Important Questions

Only if one takes a long-range view of Japanese cultural and educational development can this Meiji-era "miracle" and the subsequent widespread study of English in Japan be understood. A key to comprehending the rapid expansion of ELT in Japan during the Meiji period and again following World War II is found in the answers to two important questions: (1) What conditions had developed in the Japanese system of formal schooling? and (2) What cultural attitudes had evolved among the Japanese regarding the importation of knowledge from extra-national sources and the learning and use of a foreign language of wider communication to obtain it? Two other questions lead to an understanding of the nature of the methodological practices commonly employed by Japanese teachers of English and the difficulties associated with changing them: (3) What pedagogical traditions developed in the course of this history? and (4) What was the nature of the hierarchy of power and influence which developed among the various elements of the Japanese school system? Before launching into the history per se, each of these questions will be explained briefly.

1. What conditions had developed in the Japanese system of formal schooling by the beginning of the Meiji period?

To have a successful foreign language teaching program, a number of obvious and not-so-obvious pre-requisites must be met, such as, a functioning school system, basic literacy in the mother tongue, and prepared teachers. Prior to the Meiji Restoration an operating network of schools had been established throughout the country and at virtually all strata of Japanese society. The levels of basic education and literacy among the general populace were relatively high, and favorable attitudes toward schooling were a long-established tradition.

One important respect in which mid-nineteenth century Japan differed from its Asian neighbors...[was that] Japan already had a developed system of formal school education...it was class-ridden, formalistic, backward looking, out-of-date. But it was also intellectually sophisticated, disciplined, occasionally stimulating, and politically relevant,... Nearly every fief had its fief-endowed school and there were hundreds of private schools for samurai....In the towns a good proportion of the population could read and write Japanese.¹⁴
Widespread English language teaching "would not have been possible without the generally high level of literacy already present the country at that time," but this condition did not develop overnight. In fact, as will be explained later in this chapter, it had its origins in pre-Tokugawa days.

2. What cultural attitudes had evolved among the Japanese regarding the importation of knowledge from extra-national sources and the learning and use of a foreign language of wider communication to obtain it?

One of the major points in the Imperial Charter Oath of 1867 was that "knowledge shall be sought throughout the world." Although this dramatic reversal of the Tokugawa policy of national seclusion seems startling, it is not at all unusual when viewed in a larger historical context. "One of the outstanding characteristics of the Japanese has been their eagerness to learn from others. This tradition of cultural borrowing is deeply embedded in Japanese history."

The development of a national attitude recognizing the need to borrow knowledge from extra-national sources and learn through non-Japanese languages began well over one thousand years ago with the adoption of a large portion of Chinese culture, including the Chinese writing system. The process continued through the years of Portuguese and Dutch influence, when Japan was first exposed to, among other things, European languages and the Roman alphabet. It culminated in the nineteenth century with the Japanese' enthusiasm for English which became their most widely studied language of wider communication.

Relative to this pattern, the Japanese have long recognized and often overreacted to the fact that "the study of language exerts influences upon the moral, political, and religious ideas of the student." Foreign language teaching in Japan has commonly been associated with other foreign influences such as Christianity and Western commerce and technology. In this respect it is also important to note the cyclical pattern of attraction to and rejection of foreign ideas and languages that has characterized Japan's history. There has been a clear pattern of strong "swings from nationalism to internationalism" and "Japan's relations with other countries have dramatically affected her [foreign language teaching and present-day] TEFL policy, alternating between waves of nationalization and westernization."
3. What pedagogical traditions developed in the course of this history?

As Tripp notes, "The teaching of modern languages has always been somewhat influenced by the teaching of the classical languages." In the Western world, these classical languages were Greek and Roman. The practices used for teaching these "dead" languages in American and European schools became the object of numerous reform efforts in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In fact, several methods (including Fries' Oral Approach) developed in reaction to the classical grammar-translation and reading approaches. Nevertheless, many of these traditional practices persist today in foreign language classrooms throughout the Western world.

In Japan, reformers have encountered an additional set of traditions based on a Chinese rather than a Greco-Roman tradition. Many of these teaching practices were developed by the Japanese centuries ago as they studied Chinese as a foreign language. For instance, in Japan, starting with Chinese in the fourth century and later with Dutch, "there is a long tradition of learning foreign languages without necessarily being able to converse in them."22 Like their Western counterparts, these traditions have demonstrated a remarkable power to persist in spite of reformers' efforts.

4. What was the nature of the hierarchy of power and influence which developed among the various elements of the Japanese school system?

In a large, complex system, there naturally exists a hierarchy of power among its different elements. From country to country, this "ladder of influence" varies, in its nature and in the strength of its constituents. In Japan, the relationships among the different elements in the school system certainly were not the same as those that existed in the United States in the 1950's. For example, in the Japanese system during ELEC's early days, the Ministry of Education had recently regained (or re-centralized) power to a degree which the federal Office of Education in the United States had never wielded. The power of key Japanese universities (and their entrance examinations) was also radically different from that held by their counterparts in the United States. In light of these differences, it was not entirely unexpected that American reformers would misunderstand and underestimate the power of certain elements in the Japanese system, such as the high school and university entrance exams. The power of Japanese universities, especially prestigious universities, both as examining bodies and teacher-training institutions was
another factor which Charles Fries and many of his ELEC colleagues failed to appreciate. Sadly, this failure to recognize and understand the power of key elements in the Japanese educational-system hierarchy led to numerous other failures in the ELEC campaign. This hierarchy of power relationships had its foundation in the history of Japanese education.

**Time Frames**

In the following review of forces and developments in Japanese culture and history which provided the foundation on which English language teaching in Japan rested as the ELEC effort began, nine general time frames will be employed. Their beginnings and ends coincide with events of particular importance in the history of ELT in Japan:

1. **Early contacts with China**, especially during the Nara period (710-874) and the Heian period (794-1192).
2. **Early East-West contacts**, from 1543, the year that the first Portuguese ship landed in Japan, to the highly nationalistic and anti-Christian edicts of Hideyoshi Toyotomi in 1587.
3. **Repression of Western influences**, from 1588 until the end of the Shimabara Rebellion (the Christians' "last stand") in 1638.
4. **National seclusion**, from 1639, the year after the Shimabara Rebellion, until 1852, the year before the arrival of Commodore Perry's fleet.
5. **Official re-opening of Japan to Western influences**, from 1853, when Commodore Perry's squadron of "black ships" first sailed into Edo Bay, until the coup which overthrew the Tokugawa Shogunate and ushered in the Meiji Restoration in 1867.
6. **Meiji period**, from 1868 through 1911, and including the following Taisho period, but focusing particularly on the language-education related efforts of such notables as Arinori Mori and Yukichi Fukuzawa.
7. **Reform Attempts by Harold E. Palmer**, during his years in Japan (1922-1936).
8. **Militarism and World War II**, beginning in the 1930's and ending with Japan's surrender in 1945.
9. The Allied Occupation and Its Aftermath, from 1945 to 1952, as well as the "reverse course" years (1952-58) that immediately followed the Occupation and during which the ELEC campaign was officially started (in 1956).

Early Contacts with China

Despite its insular location and character, from early times Japan has looked beyond its own shores for useful information. Balancing Japanese leaders' attitudes of protectionism and caution has been their recognition of the need for contact with the outside world. Whenever such contact has taken place it has also created a realization of the need for proficiency in a language of wider communication.

In the early days of Japanese history, the "outside world" consisted primarily of China, so naturally, the language which the Japanese learned was Chinese. This contact dates back thousands of years. In fact, as Lombard explains,

> It is quite impossible to say when the Chinese language and literature were first known in Japan. As early as the reign of Kaika (157-97 B.C.) there is evidence of intercourse with China and, according to Nakano in his Nihon Kyoikushi, the latest time to be assigned for the introduction of letters must be the reign of Sujin (97-29 B.C.): but at the [sic] date they can have been known only as the forms of a foreign speech understood by a few interpreters, if at all.23

Although the Chinese linguistic influence was slight at first, it grew steadily, along with the ascendancy of other aspects of the Chinese culture. The introduction of Buddhism to Japan in 552 A.D. marked the beginning of the Asuka epoch in the Age of Reform.24 There followed more than two centuries of heavy cultural borrowing from China which did not diminish until after 838, during the Heian period, as Fujiwara rose to power and terminated official relations with China.25

During this period of cultural borrowing, a number of Japanese missions journeyed to China. In the years between A.D. 600 and 614, there were four missions to Sui China, and between 630 and 838 there were fifteen missions to T'ang China. "The trip was exceedingly dangerous, and the fact that so many risked it attests to the avidity with which the Japanese of this age sought to acquire the learning and culture of China."26
The Japanese borrowed freely from China, and not only Buddhism but Confucianism was imported to the land of the rising sun.27

The reforms of A.D. 646 ushered in the Hakuho epoch (645-710) during which the influence of the Chinese language in Japan increased—especially in the limited but growing school system. "Chinese was acknowledged as the official written language, and it was the only medium of instruction in schools,...In the school system organized under the reform there were approximately 800 schools for the training of civil officers and several priest schools."28

At this time, T'ang China was "the greatest empire in the world," and during the Nara period (710-784) the Japanese continued to be "eager pupils of Chinese civilization."29 Chinese words were imported to Japan along with the concepts they were associated with. So great was the Japanese dependence on the Chinese written language that "there is no archeological or other evidence to indicate that the Japanese ever independently attempted to devise a script of their own."30

This dependence extended to the area of the arts also. The Japanese court in the early years of the Heian period (794-1185) was even more enamored of Chinese civilization than its predecessor at Nara a century earlier. Chinese poetry was in particular the rage among Emperor Saga (reigned 809-23) and his intimates, who held competitions in Chinese versemanship, compiled anthologies in the manner of the Kaifuso, and virtually ignored the tanka.31

At least among the nobility, the desire was to make Japan a "miniature model of China."32

Nevertheless, although the borrowing from Chinese culture and language was extensive, the imported items were generally "Japanized" in the process. For instance, "when Chinese literature was first introduced it was Chinese only in its content...no Chinese word-order or pronunciation was ever introduced."33 Since virtually all of the Chinese linguistic influence was limited to the domain of the written language (face-to-face, oral communication with the Chinese was not even a remote possibility except for the very few Japanese who travelled to China), particular Japanese ways of studying and reading foreign literature without regard for oral proficiency were developed.
There were very few Japanese, mostly Buddhist students, who went over to China, and very few Chinese came to the country. Thus, there was little opportunity for oral communication of ideas between these two nations; Chinese did not pass from the mouth of the native speaker to the ear of the Japanese student, nor was the sound imitated by the latter. Gradually the Japanese became accustomed to reading the characters in a Chinese text by jumping back and forth to make the ideas implied in them compatible with the order of their own ideas, and that in their own pronunciation... This long standing custom of reading foreign literature, inherited from generation to generation for several hundred years, could not be got rid of even when the necessity of oral practice for a foreign language came to be recognized.\textsuperscript{34}

In other words, in this laborious \textit{yakudoku} approach, "the target language is first translated word-by-word and the resulting translation reordered to match Japanese word order."\textsuperscript{35} This traditional approach to reading Chinese literature, begun in those early days, continued to be used when the study of European languages began in later centuries. In fact, this process is still commonly employed today by Japanese learning English.

\textit{Yakudoku} has been criticized severely.

The \textit{yakudoku} habit clearly is a severe handicap to the Japanese student. It limits the speed at which the student reads, induces fatigue, and reduces the efficiency with which s/he is able to comprehend. The meaning of a text is obtained via Japanese translation, and is only an approximation to the original.

\textit{Yakudoku} also has detrimental effects on the other language skills—listening, speaking, writing. Students who have been trained in \textit{yakudoku} reading employ a similar strategy in listening comprehension. They attempt to understand speech by translating every sentence into Japanese (Tazaki 1978). As a consequence, they cannot follow speech unless it is delivered very slowly, and they find comprehension a tiring, imprecise, and ineffective process. In speaking and writing, the \textit{yakudoku} process is applied in reverse. A Japanese sentence is composed, translated into English word-by-word, and then the words are reordered according to English syntax (Matsumoto 1965). The result is seldom idiomatic English sentences, which are produced very slowly.\textsuperscript{36}

As early as 1727, objections were voiced to this approach to language study. In his book \textit{Gakusoku (Rules of Learning)}, the Confucianist Sorai Ogyu wrote: "The traditional method of reading Chinese is a misleading one, which should be avoided. You cannot truly understand Chinese in this way."\textsuperscript{37}

When the Japanese began studying European languages, \textit{yakudoku} continued to be employed.\textsuperscript{38} "In the 18th century it was used for the study of Dutch, and in the 19th century the Japanese produced texts for the study of English in which the \textit{yakudoku} technique was used."\textsuperscript{39} It also continued to be criticized. In 1911, Yoshizaburo Okakura...
published a book on English language teaching entitled *Eigo Kyoiku*, and in it he voiced his objections to yakudoku.

In the teaching of English in our country, students are taught to translate word-by-word, with forward and regressive eye movement. This is a strongly established convention. I think this comes from our traditional method of reading Chinese, in which Chinese words are reordered to match Japanese word order. This is a wrong method, which treats Chinese not as a foreign language but as a kind of Japanese. We should not use this method in studying English. It is a pity that everyone considers this to be the only way of reading foreign languages. 

Despite these criticisms and disadvantages, yakudoku has been widely used by Japanese foreign language learners. In fact, it still prevails in Japanese English classes today. It is a persistent aspect of the legacy of the early Japanese scholars of the Chinese language.

This is not to say that the Chinese legacy is entirely negative. There is much of a positive nature that also comes from this period of Japan's history of foreign language study. Perhaps most important is the acceptance of the long standing tradition of looking beyond Japan's borders and using a foreign language to do so.

**Early East-West Contacts**

For centuries the only foreign influences on Japan came from elsewhere in Asia, but the sixteenth century saw the beginning of European influence in Japan. At the same time, the interest of the Japanese in the larger world was also aroused. In the cultural interchange that ensued there was a large influx into Japan of foreign products and ideas—including Christianity, Western-style education, European languages, and Western technology. Probably the most desired of these by the feudal lords of Japan was the technology—especially as it pertained to new types of weapons with which they could defeat their enemies, for the medieval period in Japan's history was characterized by almost continual civil wars. Western languages and western learning became important tools in the process of obtaining this technology, and both were connected with the "new" Western religion, Christianity.

As in the case of the Chinese influence, it is difficult to trace the Western influence back to its beginnings. A reasonable place to start, however, is with the Renaissance in
Europe. This period of intellectual and artistic awakening led to great developments in the arts and sciences. The frontiers of knowledge were extended dramatically, and the borders of the leading European nations' spheres of influence and territory were also pushed outward. It was an age of great exploration and fierce territorial competition among European nations. But land was not the only thing they argued about. In the 1500's, Europe was "aflame with the fervor of the Counter-Reformation."42 The Catholic Spanish/Portuguese were at war with Protestant England. Both competing powers had a highly international outlook and each fiercely guarded its own share of the globe. For this reason, since Japan fell outside the English sphere of influence, the Japanese' early contacts with European powers were limited to the Spanish and Portuguese. Only much later were the Dutch allowed into Japan, with the British and Americans arriving last of all. The small island of Tanegashima, off the coast of Kyushu, was the scene of Japan's first contact with Europe. It was there that a Portuguese ship landed in 1543.

"With this incident Japan's relations with Europe began. Japan first awakened to the power of Western science in the form of the cannon. The next importation was Christianity, and the knowledge and culture it brought with it. From 1543, albeit for less than a century, the Japanese were under Portuguese (and Spanish) influence. The learning and the cultural influence of the Portuguese and Spaniards are known as "the culture of the Namban."43 Instrumental in the spread of this knowledge were the members of the "recently formed and militantly aggressive Society of Jesus."44 John III of Portugal asked Loyola, the founder of the Jesuit mission, to send missionaries to the Orient.45 These early Jesuits viewed science as a missionary tool. "New knowledge came with Christianity. European science being for the missionary a means of spreading the faith."46

Thus, the Namban kagaku (learning of the Southern Barbarians) of this age "consisted of the forms of Western technology, culture, and general knowledge introduced to Japan by the Jesuits."47 It was, therefore, quite natural that the Japanese connected Western learning with Western religion. Throughout this period of early contacts, as European knowledge was introduced to Japan, there was "a real or imagined bond with Christianity."48 Francis Xavier (1506-1552) was one of the most famous Jesuit "pioneers" in Japan. In 1549, he arrived in Japan with two other Jesuits and one Japanese disciple.
He also brought with him a number of gifts, including "a musical clock, long distance glasses, satin damask, a mirror, a three-barrelled gun, [and] crystal glass." The interest of the feudal lords was immediately aroused, and they expressed a desire to trade with the Portuguese. Hideyoshi was "keenly interested in foreign trade and, through courtesies extended to the missionaries, sought to lure an ever greater number of Portuguese ships to Japan." Nobunaga also welcomed to Jesuits, but for an additional reason. He apparently saw in them and Christianity a prospective counterforce to "those Buddhist sects of the capital region that opposed his advance to national power."

With the rulers' permission and encouragement, Xavier encountered considerable success in his work of propagating Christianity. In his first year in Hirado he gained one hundred converts in spite of opposition by Japanese priests. Since he spoke little or no Japanese on arrival (and the Japanese could hardly be expected to understand Portuguese or Spanish), his preaching was translated by Anjiro, a Japanese Christian who had gone to Malacca "to confess his own crime of the murder committed in Kagoshima, his native place." (An interesting question whose answer is apparently lost to history is how Anjiro initially came into contact with Christianity.)

Xavier's success increased with time. During a four-month stay in Yamaguchi, he converted over five hundred Japanese to Christianity. Encouraged by this success, Xavier decided to travel to China and preach Christianity there, but he died on that journey in 1582.

Xavier's death did not spell the end of Christian missionary endeavors in Japan, however. Others continued the work. Luis Frois (1532?-97), a native of Lisbon, joined the Jesuits in 1548 and heard of Xavier's success in Japan. He studied what was then known about the Far East and the South Seas at São Paulo, Brazil in 1563 and gained some proficiency in the Japanese language. For these early Jesuits, an accurate knowledge of Japanese was considered to be absolutely necessary in fulfilling their duties in those days when there were very few or none in Japan who could understand European languages....It would be better for a missionary if he preached in the language of the people whom he had close contact with.

Consequently, rather than teaching the Japanese to speak Portuguese, most Jesuits studied Japanese. To aid in this process, many of them wrote primitive Japanese grammars and dictionaries for use by the incoming Jesuits.
One of the first to deviate from this pattern was Alessandro Valignano (1537-1606), an Italian padre who arrived in Japan in 1579. He set up a college for the study of European languages which met with considerable success.

The students made progress in any subject of studies more rapidly than the foreign teachers had expected. Even in the study of European languages which greatly differed in grammatical structure from their mother tongue, they were proficient enough to read and write well in the course of several months. They also studied Latin, the language which was regarded as a difficult one by Europeans themselves.56

The instruction provided in Valignano's college is the first known instance of the teaching of European languages in Japan, but it was only the beginning. In the decade which followed its establishment, the Japanese' thirst for knowledge of the West became nearly insatiable.

In 1582, the Jesuits in Japan selected four young Japanese to go to Europe and be presented before the Pope in Rome. They were gone over eight years and came back so changed by time and their European experiences that they were hardly recognized by their friends. Two were not even recognized by their own mothers!57

Imagine how greatly the people at home were surprised to hear about their European experiences! How intoxicated they were in listening to the heavenly music played on the instruments brought home from the opposite side of the world! According to Frois, the listeners were "spell bound."58

Following the return of these young voyagers, the Japanese "craze" for Western things accelerated, and in the mid-1590's it reached its height.

The most frivolous aspect of the craze for things Western in the 1590's was the aping by Japanese, including Hideyoshi himself, of the Portuguese style of dress and personal adornment. The degree to which these became fashionable can be seen in a letter written by a Jesuit father about this time.

"Quambacudono (i.e., the Kwambaku, Toyotomi Hideyoshi) has become so enamored of Portuguese dress and costume that he and his retainers frequently wear this apparel, as do all the other lords of Japan, even the gentiles, with rosaries of driftwood on the breast above all their clothing, and with a crucifix at their side, or hanging from the waist, and sometimes even with kerchiefs in their hands; some of them are so curious that they learn by rote the litanies of Pater Noster and Ave Maria and go along praying in the streets."59

Of course, the use of Latin in this manner could hardly be labelled true language learning, but neither should its effect on people's attitudes towards European languages be underestimated. It must also be recognized that by this time there must have been a
number of Japanese who could speak European languages with some fluency (at least the four who travelled abroad and various others who studied in the Jesuit college). Their numbers were small, but, given the Western fads of the time, they must have been influential. Nevertheless, this influence was to be shortlived.

Repression of Western influences

"In 1587, without warning or intimation, Hideyoshi declared the 'nationalization' of Nagasaki and ordered the Jesuit missionaries to leave the country within twenty days." Although the decree was never fully implemented, it presaged worse times to come in Japan for the Christians, Western influences, and the languages that went with them. In 1597, the ban on Christianity was enforced and twenty-six Christians were burned at the stake on a hill near Nagasaki. Many more Christian martyrs followed.

Following Hideyoshi Toyotomi's death in 1598, the ban on Christianity was relaxed as the more moderate Ieyasu Tokugawa came to power. During his reign, a Jesuit press with movable type was put into operation and "some fifty books in Latin, Portuguese, and Japanese (in both the Romanized and native orthographies)" were printed. The subject matter of these books ranged from Aesop's Fables to The Tale of the Heike. Some were used as language-learning aids for the missionaries, but it is reasonable to assume that many of them were also used by Japanese learners of Portuguese and/or Latin. The Japanese books in the Roman alphabet (initially intended to help the Jesuits learn Japanese) undoubtedly also served the purpose of exposing many Japanese to the Western writing system. This exposure to the Roman alphabet further prepared them for the study of European languages.

During Ieyasu Tokugawa's rule, a second mission of Japanese Christians, much larger than the first one, was sent to Europe. This time, 180 Japanese journeyed to Spain by way of Mexico and Cuba. Leaving in 1613, they visited Philip III in Madrid in 1614 and the Pope in Rome in 1615. Upon their return to Japan they must have created quite a stir, with their new knowledge of the Western world.

The next year, however, with the death of Ieyasu Tokugawa, things took a decided turn for the worse for Christianity and Namban learning in Japan. When Hidetada
secceeded Ieyasu as ruler, the persecution of Christians (both European and Japanese) heightened. "Wholesale massacres of Christians took place," and "more than 200,000 Christians suffered martyrdom in ways too excruciating for description."65 Because of the perceived connection between Western learning and religion, when Christianity was proscribed, so were Western learning and languages. "With the seclusion policy of the Kan-ei period (1624-1644), Namban learning, along with Christianity, was virtually destroyed."66 Christians were forced to go underground to avoid police surveillance and persecution. The climax came in 1637 when the Shimabara (or Amakusa) Rebellion broke out. Besieged in the Hara Castle, the rebel Christians were finally overcome and eliminated in 1638, the year that marks the end of this historical period.

Before going on to the next period, however, mention must be made of the first Englishman in Japan. In 1600, William Adams (recently fictionalized into John Blackthorne of Shogun), an English pilot of a Dutch East India Company ship, arrived in Japan after a difficult voyage down the Atlantic, through the Straits of Magellan, and across the Pacific, eventually landing at Bungo (near Nagasaki).67 Only he and a few members of the crew survived the trip, and since the ship, the Liefde or Erasmus, was no longer fit to sail they had no choice but to remain in Japan. At first forced to rely on an unfriendly Portuguese missionary to translate for him, Adams soon developed some proficiency in Japanese. It was not long until he had gained favor with the Shogun and was taken into Ieyasu's service. In 1611, Adams wrote "To my unknowne Fronds and Countri-men," [sic]

So in processe of four or five yeeres the Emperour called me, as divers times he had done before. So one time above the rest he would have me to make him a small ship...now beeing in such grace and favour, by reason I learned him some points of geometry, and understanding of the art of mathematices, with other things.68

Although Adams probably used Japanese for teaching the Shogun, it is highly likely that a number of new English technical terms were introduced into Japanese by this process. Beyond that, "no record exists that Adams taught him English."69 The matter is open to conjecture. Nevertheless, if nothing else, the realization that there were other advanced "barbarians" besides the Spanish and Portuguese was itself novel to the Japanese and further prepared the way for future developments that eventually led to the widespread teaching of English in Japan.
In 1613, an English ship, the *Clove*, entered Hirado and initiated Anglo-Japanese trade. By this time Adams had learned Japanese quite well and acted as the intermediary between the Japanese ruler and the English captain. To Adams also goes the distinction of being the first person to translate Japanese to English and English to Japanese. The captain carried with him a letter from James I of England, and Adams translated both the letter and Shogun Ieyasu's reply.70

With Ieyasu's death in 1616, Adams' influence began to wane (he himself died in 1620), and the anti-Christian, anti-Namban feelings of the new rulers intensified. Soon severe restrictions were applied to all the European powers trading in Japan—even the Portuguese. In fact,

The Dutch won a monopoly on Japan's foreign trade with the closing of the country, and the work of the interpreters thereafter shifted to Dutch. In addition to their language studies, they explored medicine and science.... The interpreters later came to occupy themselves exclusively with the Dutch language and Dutch science.71

The Spanish, Portuguese, and English were excluded entirely. The Dutch were limited to the island of Deshima off Nagasaki, on the western extreme of Kyushu where they were far from the centers of population and power in Japan and where their influence on the country could be strictly limited and controlled. In addition, only one Dutch ship per year was allowed to enter Japanese waters.72 And Japanese were not allowed to leave the country either. In fact, in 1636, the death penalty was prescribed for any attempt by a Japanese to visit the outside world.73 In sum, although there were sporadic "leaks," the doors to Japan were effectively closed to European influences, and they were to remain that way for over two centuries.

**Proscription of Western Influences**

During the more than two hundred years of the Tokugawa Shogunate, the Japanese followed an official policy of seclusion from the outside world. Nevertheless, although a curtain was drawn between Japan and the rest of the world, this period can not accurately be portrayed as Japan's "dark ages." During the Tokugawa period, important advances
were made in consolidating the nation and improving living conditions for the Japanese. Great improvements were made in the provisions for formal education in Japan.

The Japanese system of formal education has a long history. "It was founded on an elaborate basis as early as the eighth century, at the time when Buddhist and Confucian influences were fresh and vigorous....It antedated Charlemagne's Ordinance of Education by nearly a century and the founding of Oxford by nearly two hundred years."74

Nevertheless, for the most part, this system existed on paper only. It was a "noble idea" which due to numerous difficulties, such as the seemingly unending series of feudal wars which racked Japan in the sixteenth century, was not fully implemented until much later.

Expansion of Educational Opportunity

It was not until the seventeenth century, when the Tokugawa family emerged as general overlords of the country, that the civil strife ceased and a sense of nationhood began to emerge. The new "national government" brought about by Tokugawa dominance combined with the policy of national seclusion to ensure a lasting peace that made possible a great upsurge in the domestic economy, especially during the first century of Shogunate rule. Agricultural productivity, for example, was increased markedly in the seventeenth century; transportation and communication facilities were extensively improved; urban populations in the key trading and administrative centers of the country rose dramatically; and commerce, stimulated by a sharp expansion in the use of money, spread at a rate that would have been inconceivable a century earlier when it had been largely confined to the central provinces and the foreign entry ports of Kyushu."75

Under Tokugawa rule, educational opportunity also expanded rapidly, although it still lagged behind growth in many other areas. The original impetus for this expansion came from Ieyasu Tokugawa himself in 1615. At the end of Japan's civil wars he issued the Buke Shohatto, a set of instructions for regulating military households.

Article 1 called upon the samurai to devote themselves to both learning and the military arts, learning, it should be noticed, being placed in the first position. The injunction was piously repeated over the succeeding centuries by later Shoguns, and then echoed on down by leading daimyo (feudal lords) to their own retainers. In 1629, Shogun Iemitsu repeated the injunction in his revised instructions to the
warrior class: "Learning on the left and arms on the right." In 1662, Shogun Ietsuna ordered that samurai "always be concerned with learning and arms." Shoguns Ienobu in 1710 and Yoshimune in 1716 again repeated the same sentiments.76

These instructions were taken seriously and quickly put into practice with official support. In 1630, the Tokugawa family itself sponsored education for the governing classes with the establishment of the Shoheiko, a Confucian academy.77 Subsequent Shogunal institutions followed the same pattern, as did schools at lower levels of society.

Tokugawa Japan was divided into approximately 280 feudal domains (han), both large and small, under the rule of their own feudal lords, or daimyo. Almost every one of them, except possibly the very smallest, had at least one school (hanko)—generally modeled after the Shogunal schools. In the course of time, about one-half became active in extending education to the commoners.78

As time passed, additional educational opportunities for the lower classes opened up also. As the Tokugawa period drew to a close, local schools (gogaku) developed rapidly.

Educational institutions, and with them literacy, expanded slowly throughout the seventeenth century. But from the end of the eighteenth century growth was rapid in all types of schools in Japan. Between 1781 and 1871, perhaps 200 domain schools were established. Commoner education started later but snowballed even more spectacularly. Of the 416 gogaku (local schools) for commoners in 1872, 7 had been established before 1789, 104 between 1789 and 1867, and 305 in the five years before the establishment of the modern school system.79

The bottom rung of the hierarchy of educational institutions of Tokugawa Japan was occupied by the terakoya, which became "the most important and widespread institution for commoners' education."80 The word terakoya means "temple-child-house," a clue to the schools' origins.

In the middle age or before the feudal age children were sometimes taught 3R's at a temple. Therefore a pupil came to be called "Terako" namely temple-child. Afterwards "Terakoya" meant only a school and a layman taught children reading and writing. It was at first a school for the children of merchants or townsmen. As times went on, however, farmers began to send their children to the "terakoya"; they realized the necessity of 3R's through contacts with merchants and their economic ability was now enough to send their children to school.81

The terakoya typically provided instruction for three or four hours per day for four or five years. The basic core curriculum was reading, writing, and arithmetic.

In the nineteenth century, a great common school movement swept the country.

Schools were started by public-spirited citizens either as an expression of their own conviction of the need for public education or in response to growing demand from the urban and rural commoner classes. Shrines, temples, vacant buildings, or
private homes were used. As often as not, the teacher simply gathered pupils into his own home for instruction.82

"Of the lower-level commoners' schools, the terakoya, 558 were established before 1803; then between 1803 and 1843, another 3,050; and between 1844 and 1867, 6,691 more."83

Thus after the middle of the feudal age the number of "Terakoya" increased very much. It is said that there were about 30,000 "Terakoya" in the whole country about 20 years before the Restoration, while there are about 26,800 primary schools in Japan now. [in 1963]84

Encouragement of Western Learning

In addition to this steady growth in the "sheer amount of schooling provided," schooling in Japan in the Tokugawa period also experienced an evolution in its content and purposes.85 Prior to this time, although there had been a number of institutions for studying foreign learning, they had all operated on a very small scale and they had been exclusively for nobility, interpreters, or selected Christian converts. But under Tokugawa rule, as educational opportunity eventually reached virtually all classes in Japanese society, the study of European languages and learning also came to be widespread.

The acceptance of Western science in Tokugawa Japan was made possible by the work of a famous Confucian scholar and statesman named Hakuseki Arai, who in 1708 "separated Western science from religion and recognized its practical worth, and as a result opened the way for fresh importations of Western learning!"86 Conceptually, this was a giant leap, and it paved the way for much progress in the future. Later scholars, such as the famous Shozan Sakuma could speak of "the morals of the Orient and the crafts of the Occident," while Sanai Hashimoto would say: "We shall take the machines and techniques from them, but we have our own ethics and morals."87

With the barrier of cultural association (between Christianity and Western learning and languages) out of the way, Japan began, once again, to seek after rangaku, Dutch learning. The reforms of the Kyoho period (1716-1736) encouraged productive industry,
and for this purpose the eighth Shogun, Yoshimune Tokugawa, encouraged the importation of Western knowledge. In order to gain this knowledge, the Japanese needed the appropriate linguistic tools, so the study of the Dutch language was encouraged also. In this matter, the Shogunate took the lead. By 1740, two Japanese retainers of the Shogun were studying the Dutch language under Dutch teachers. Soon after this, there appeared several books for assisting the Japanese in their study of Dutch: Konyo's *Short Treatise on Dutch Writing (Oranda Moji Kyakko)* and *Translating from Dutch (Oranda Buryaku)*.

As might have been anticipated, there followed a "Dutch fever" during the 1764-1789 period. "The taste for things foreign had a considerable following among the merchants, while victims of the Rampeki, 'the Dutch craze,' were to be found in the ruling classes." In the schools generally, the curriculum remained Confucian in nature, focusing on education for character, but toward the end of the era Western studies were added—especially for the students from the lower ranks of society. The prevailing view was that "Western learning was quite appropriate to practical matters....but it was entirely unsuitable for the realm of wisdom and virtue, and therefore not for the governing classes." For the Japanese of lower birth, however, Western learning often was sought and used as an important key to social mobility. "A good many poor men were able to get themselves a surname and two swords in a daimyo's service simply by virtue of their mastery of some kind of *gakumon*—of Chinese, or of Western, learning."

For this reason, to the basic Confucian curriculum, "some schools added vocational or moral subjects such as etiquette, morals, and accounting. Some of the *terakoya* added more academic subjects, such as Chinese (*kambun*), history, geography, and composition; and later, occasional Western subjects, such as science, military arts, and in a few cases *even English*, were added. [italics added]"

The fact that these schools occasionally provided instruction in Western subjects ("even English") is significant. Nevertheless, their major contribution to the later expansion of English study in Japan was to provide basic schooling for people at nearly all levels of society. With a significant portion of its people educated and literate at a
basic level and with increasingly favorable attitudes toward Western learning, Japan was ready to take the next step toward modernization (and Westernization).

In addition, as time went on, it became increasingly apparent that Japan's policy of national seclusion could not continue indefinitely. "From the end of the eighteenth century Japan was becoming increasingly aware of the West, and increasingly restive about it." 96

Recognition of the Importance of English

By this time also, the pattern of dominance among the nations of Europe had changed substantially, and the relative status and usefulness of their languages had shifted accordingly. Further complicating matters was the existence of a new power in the West, the United States of America.

Japan's first contact with Americans came in 1798. At this time the Dutch and English were at war in Europe. When the English fleet blockaded Holland, the Dutch were unable to send their yearly ships to resupply their base in Japan, so over the next four years they chartered American ships to carry on their trade with Japan. "The visits of these four New England ships aroused a great deal of interest both in America and Japan." 97 Among other things, the Japanese were surprised to find that the Americans spoke the same language as the English. 98

The interest of the Japanese in the English language was further stimulated by the Phaeton Incident in 1808. The H.M.S. Phaeton was a British warship which arrived in Japanese waters in search of the annual Dutch ship. After taking two Dutch hostages, "English sailors landed at Nagasaki and rioted throughout the day,... [One of the big problems was that] they could not make themselves understood in English." 99 The ship soon left, but its brief visit was to have far-reaching consequences. "The Tokugawa Government was taken by surprise by this incident and ordered Nagasaki Tsuji (interpreters) to study English in addition to the Dutch, French, and Russian languages." 100

This short drama at Nagasaki awakened the Japanese to the situation that the foreigners were coming nearer and nearer to this island as days went by. It greatly
stimulated the interest of the Japanese in Western affairs, with the result that the Government seriously began to consider the necessity of establishing an institute for teaching English.\(^{101}\)

This idea had not always been popular with the Tokugawa rulers. In fact, a few years before, the leading advocates of a plan to open an institute for the teaching of English in Japan "were executed for their pains."\(^{102}\)

With the government's approval, the Nagasaki interpreters began to study English almost immediately. The "first English teacher was Jan Cook Blomhoff of the Dutch factory."\(^{103}\) Little is known about him or his English proficiency. The only judgement that can be made is based on two books (in manuscript form) he produced for teaching English, which appeared in 1811. An examination of his *Angeria kokugowage* (*English Lessons for Beginners*) and *Angeria gorintaisei* (*English Vocabulary*) reveals that his English was quite limited.\(^{104}\) Nevertheless, he was still the first officially authorized teacher of English in Japan.

In other ways, the English influence on Japan was also being felt. Often it was subtle and went unnoticed. For example, in 1810 a Japanese version of Shakespeare's "Romeo and Juliet" (*Kokoro no Nazo Toketa Iroito*) was presented at the Ichimura-za theater in Yedo. Few if any of those in attendance realized they were seeing an adaptation of one of the best known of English plays.\(^{105}\)

In these early days, although the English influence was beginning to make itself felt, it was still extremely unusual to find a native of the Japanese islands who could speak English. Such a rarity was a liaison official named Madera. In 1816, Captain Basil Hall, a British explorer, spent forty-two days in the Ryukyu Islands, "and in that short time taught his native liaison officer Madera to converse in English."\(^{106}\) With little or no formal instruction, Madera picked up enough English to be able to communicate fairly well.\(^{107}\) The fact that through observation and imitation he was able to learn to use English is a powerful reminder that, given adequate exposure to the language, the learning of English can take place without formal instruction. Thus, while this paper has focussed on the provisions made for the formal teaching of English and other languages in Japan, it is quite possible that at least some Japanese learned English through associations with the Americans and English who, with ever increasing frequency, were visiting the islands of Japan during this period.
One of the early visits of the English to Japan took place in 1818 when the English ship *Brothers* entered Uraga. The English whaler *Saracen* visited the same port a few years later, and in 1824 another English whaler landed in Kagoshima. In all these cases, unfortunate problems occurred due to the lack of either side's ability to communicate with the other. As it turned out, "the Japanese interpreters of the Dutch language...who had been placed in charge of diplomatic negotiation had a very poor knowledge of English. [and] The insufficiency of the knowledge of English on the part of Japanese interpreters" led to a series of "unhappy incidents."

The climax was reached in 1837 when the American ship *Morrison* came to Uraga on a mission of mercy, trying to return seven shipwrecked Japanese to their homeland. Instead of being rewarded, the Morrison was fired on and turned away. Eventually it had to return to America with the seven Japanese still aboard. Needless to say, when the facts were made known, the result was a considerable amount of embarrassment for the Japanese government.

In 1844, King William II of Holland wrote a letter to the Shogun in which he cautioned the Japanese leader that continuing the policy of national seclusion was "both unwise and untenable." Although considerable debate on this matter was already taking place in Japan, nothing concrete was done.

Meanwhile, the American presence drew ever closer to Japan. In 1844, the conquest of California extended the United States' boundaries to the west coast. Although Hawaii was still an independent nation, the American influence in the island kingdom was growing also. In sum, for Americans, Japan was no longer a distant nation at the end of the earth but almost a neighbor, just across the Pacific. Sooner or later the two nations would have to deal with each other.

In 1848, Ranald MacDonald, an American from Oregon, sought adventure and the chance to play an important part in the unfolding of American-Japanese relations by feigning shipwreck on the shores of Hokkaido. Things didn't turn out quite as he had planned, however. He was quickly arrested and sent to Nagasaki where he was imprisoned. It was there that he was put to use by the Japanese and came to play an important role in the history of English teaching in Japan. During his confinement, the government, realizing the growing importance of English, ordered him to teach it to the interpreters in Nagasaki. According to Minakawa, "the outstanding event in the history
of English teaching in Japan was that fourteen interpreters of Dutch took lessons in English directly from an American called Ranald MacDonald for seven months from October, 1848, to April of the following year.\textsuperscript{110}

He was then returned to the United States on an American ship which visited Nagasaki. His students, of course, remained in Japan, and some of them became "the best scholars of English in the latter part of the Tokugawa Shogunate."\textsuperscript{111} In 1851, a number of MacDonald's students, under orders from the Shogunate, even compiled an English-Japanese dictionary.

Despite the strict prohibition against it, a few Japanese also left Japan to learn more about the Americans. Many of them were to later play prominent roles in U.S.-Japanese relations. For instance, "in the 1840's a Japanese lad named Hiko drifted in a damaged fishing boat to the United States and remained there to be educated, returning in 1853 to act as Commodore Perry's interpreter."\textsuperscript{112}

At the age of nineteen, another adventurous young Japanese, Jo Niishima, swam out to an American whaler anchored in the harbor of Hakodate, Hokkaido, and asked the crew members to take him to the United States. The captain of the whaler took him to New England, where he studied at Amherst College and Andover Theological Seminary. He came back to Japan, an ordained Congregational minister, to found Doshisha University, the oldest Japanese Christian college, in 1866.\textsuperscript{113}

\textbf{Japan's Doors Reopen}

As has been shown, during the latter years of the Tokugawa Shogunate, Japan and the West were coming into contact more and more frequently. Nevertheless, the doors of Japan still remained officially closed until 1853, when Commodore Matthew C. Perry paid his first visit to Japan. On July 14 of that year, he delivered President Fillmore's message inquiring about the establishment of diplomatic and commercial relations with the Japanese, and then left. Early in 1854, Perry returned, and the Japanese, with little real choice in the matter, signed a Treaty of Friendship.

The treaty called for an exchange of consular officials, and in 1856, the first American consul, Townsend Harris arrived in Japan. Although he eventually met with
much success in his diplomatic efforts, in the beginning Harris experienced considerable
difficulty dealing with the Japanese because of language problems. Work on the
American-Japanese treaty which opened Japanese ports to Americans was finally
concluded in 1859, but his successes were not achieved without considerable difficulty.
The problems were often related to language differences and the resultant
misunderstandings. For example, his diary entry for Wednesday, June 17, 1857 reads as
follows:

Today we signed the Convention, having been some nine days in setting the
wording of the Articles, which by the way is a work of much difficulty, as the
Dutch of the Japanese interpreters is that of the ship captains and traders used some
two hundred and fifty years ago. They have not been taught a single new word in
the interim, so they are quite ignorant of all the terms used in treaties, conventions,
etc., etc. This, joined to their excessive jealousy and fear of being cheated makes it
exceedingly difficult to manage such a matter as the present one. They even wanted
the words in the Dutch version to stand in the exact order they stood in the
Japanese! Owing to the difference of grammatical structure this would have
rendered it perfect gibberish.\textsuperscript{114}

As it became increasingly clear to the Japanese government that the future would
undoubtedly bring unavoidable contacts with the West, steps began to be taken to prepare
for this eventuality.

Several years before the Meiji Restoration, the government started sending
Japanese students abroad, allowed the hiring of foreigners to teach European languages,
and encouraged Western studies in various other ways.

In 1856, the \textit{Bansho Torishirabe-dokoro} (Institute for the Investigation of
Barbarian Writings) was set up to support the growing interest in Western learning. In
quick succession, a Western-style military school was started in 1854, and a naval school
in 1857. In the Meirindo at Nagasaki, emphasis was placed on the learning of foreign
languages—especially Dutch.\textsuperscript{115} Soon, however, the scholars' linguistic interests
broadened.

Language research, earlier limited to Dutch, began to move on to the study and
teaching of English, French, and German. The word \textit{Yogaku}, "European culture,"
came to be used beside the older \textit{Rangaku}... this new interest in languages was of
course partly a result of the opening of relations with England, America, France,
and Germany, but it was also a result of the fact that, with the progress of Rangaku,
Japanese scholars were no longer satisfied with Dutch alone. The demand rose for
the English, German, and French science that was for the most part the source of
Dutch science. English was already being studied in Nagasaki in the Bunka and
Bunsei periods, or the first third of the nineteenth century, chiefly because ships other than Dutch were beginning to appear. The study of English, German, and French thus flourished during the last years of the Shogunate, English being the most widely studied of the three.116

When the treaty opening Japan to the United States was signed, some of the first Americans to come to Japan under the new agreement were English-teaching missionaries. One of the first of these was Guido Fridolin Verbeck (1830-1897), an American of Dutch origin, who came to Nagasaki in 1859. He "taught English at the Bureau for European Studies there and at a similar institute of the Saga clan."117 He later moved to Tokyo and taught at the government's foreign language school there. This school later developed into the Imperial University of Tokyo.118,119

1859 was also the year that James Curtis Hepburn, another notable ELT missionary, arrived in Japan. A successful New York doctor who had previously served as a medical missionary in China, Hepburn became interested in Japan through reading Commodore Perry's memoirs about the new country just recently opened to foreigners. He went to Japan as a Presbyterian missionary, but "since Christians were still proscribed...he and several countrymen...set up a school of foreign languages, principally English, in a rented Buddhist Temple in neighboring Kanagawa. Here they worked with every-widening influence for eight years."120 In 1867, Hepburn published his English-Japanese Dictionary, and he later became a founder and the first president of Meiji Gakuin, which grew into a large Tokyo university.

One of Hepburn's English-teaching missionary colleagues in Japan was Samuel Rollins Brown (1810-1880). He opened a private school in Yokohama in 1862 and wrote a book entitled Colloquial Japanese, or Conversational Sentences and Dialogues in English and Japanese which was published that same year. It was unique for the time because it employed both Japanese kana and romaji to explain English.

Many other influential ELT pioneers, such as John Liggins, and William Elliot Griffis, came to Japan in the next few years and contributed much to the study and teaching of English. Besides teaching, they authored a number of textbooks and dictionaries to help the Japanese learn English.

But foreigners in Japan were not the only ones working to support the teaching of English. For instance, A Pocket Dictionary of English-Japanese Language (Eiwa...
Taiyaku Shuchin Jisho) was compiled and published in Yedo in 1862 "by the order of the Shogunate." The preface to this dictionary, written by the chief compiler, Tatsunosuke Hori, reveals the growing importance attached to English study in Japan at that time, as well as the strong Japanese desire to learn from the West:

As the study of the English language is now rapidly becoming general in our country we have had for some time the desire the publish a "Pocket Dictionary of the English and Japanese Languages" as an assistance to our scholars.

In the meantime we received an order to prepare such a Dictionary as soon as possible having in view how indispensable is the knowledge of a language so universally spoken to become rightly and fully acquainted with the manners, customs and relations of different parts of the world and its daily important occurrences and changes."

At the same time that the Americans were arriving in Japan, a considerable number of Japanese were going abroad—this time with permission. "In the last few years of the Tokugawa Regime envoys were despatched [sic] to America and Europe five times." The 1860 mission to America returned with two copies of Webster's dictionary. Reports that "those dictionaries were considered so valuable to the students of English that they crowded around them as ants swarming around lumps of sugar" give some idea of the "English fever" which was beginning to sweep the nation in those days.

Curiously, even the "unhappy incidents" which continued to occur during this period lent support to the growing English-study movement. For example, following the "notorious Namamugi Incident" in 1862, "an English squadron bombarded the city of Kagoshima. The overwhelming victory of the English sobered the proud clan and turned it friendly with England." Of course, the growing popularity and support of Western learning did not go uncontested. During the last years of the Shogunate there was resistance and "anti-barbarian agitation" by some acutely nationalistic Japanese. "There was a strong tendency to look upon Yogaku as an arm of 'Kirishitan,' the religion of the devils. Commerce, Christianity, and Yogaku were the three arms of the foreign invasion." Equally nationalistic was the government's defense of its English-teaching policy. Nariaki argued that "in order to 'know them' and 'fight them off,' it would be necessary to adopt 'their techniques,' to put forth a massive effort toward the strengthening of Japan's defenses."
With both the pro-Western and the pro-Japan factions arguing in favor of teaching English, and with a widespread system of schools available to do so, the stage was set for the rapid expansion of ELT in Japan. The words Rubinger uses to describe general Japanese education at this time also apply to the teaching of foreign languages and comprise a fitting summary to this point:

All this meant that when the country began its modern period a competent professional class, instilled with basic Confucian ideas of service and loyalty but also familiar with the language, technology, and culture of the West, well-travelled and experienced in political, military, and intellectual endeavors, and showing an acceptance of change already existed and had received extensive training.

The Meiji Restoration

After the coup of 1867, which overthrew the Tokugawa Shogunate and restored the Japanese imperial line in the person of the young Emperor Meiji, dramatic changes took place in Japan. The goal of the government was to convert Japan into a strong, modern, capitalist society. Since Western knowledge was perceived as the way to strengthen the nation, the latter half of the "Revere the Emperor! Expel the Barbarians!" slogan was quietly dropped and foreign language study was intensified and expanded under the new government.

That ELT programs were implemented so quickly and met with such rapid acceptance during the Meiji period is not really surprising. The foundation had already been thoroughly laid. The school system was already in place and operating; the Japanese possessed basic academic skills; and the idea that in order to progress Japan would need to reach beyond her borders and learn from other nations, through other languages, was almost traditional by this time. With this foundation in place and the momentum already built up, the major thing that needed to be done in the 1860's was to switch from Dutch to English. The foundations for this shift had also been put down previously, so it was accomplished with relative ease and speed.

As Western culture flowed into Japan, English deprived Dutch of the position it had occupied for more than two hundred years as the only medium by which the Japanese imported Western medical art and military science including gunnery. The more the international positions of Britain and America were generally recognized, the more was Holland, which was on the decline, disregarded. It was quite natural
that young Japanese students of English rushed to various foreign language institutes which were established in various parts of this country.

Even older people who had first studied Dutch sat side by side with them to study English. It was not rare that a man who had once kept a private school for teaching Dutch was, by the change of social conditions, compelled to study English with his former pupils.132

The story of how Yukichi Fukuzawa (1835-1901) switched from Dutch to English is well known:

Fukuzawa was a low-ranking, but personally ambitious and opportunistic, samurai who began the study of Western gunnery and the Dutch language as a youth under the patronage of his feudal domain. Later, when Fukuzawa visited Yokohama shortly after the signing of the Harris treaty in 1858 and observed the newly arrived foreigners at first hand, he learned a sad fact that was to cause anguish for all students of Dutch Studies: Dutch was practically useless as a medium for dealing with most Westerners. Fukuzawa, we are told, switched the very next day to the study of English; and, two years later, in 1860, he was selected to accompany a Shogunate mission to the United States.133

Fukuzawa went on to become the "patriarch of English in Japan and founder of Keio University."

The Growing Influence of the English Language in Meiji Japan

Another great promoter of the English language in Japan was Arinori Mori, who spent many years abroad, in England and the United States, and later became Japanese Minister of Education. Mori at one time even advocated that Japanese be abolished and that English become the national language of Japan.135 He wrote, "Our meagre language, which can never be of any use outside of our islands, is doomed to yield to the domination of the English tongue."136

In 1871 Mori was also "Superintendent of Japanese Students in America." These young scholars numbered over two hundred, and among them were such future notables as Umeko Tsuda, "founder in 1900 of Tsuda English College, the first institution of higher learning for women," and Naibu Kanda, who "believed in the possibilities of the English language as the future universal language of the world."137 Kanda was to become the "central unifying figure in English teaching in Japan" and later advocated the reform of English teaching in Japan by abandoning the traditional method (based on the method used for the study of Chinese classics).138
"The new Meiji government emphasized public education, and the Ministry of Education was organized in 1871. The Ministry planned a national system of universal education which was put into effect in 1872 and which emphasized the study of Western languages, such as English and German. Nevertheless, since so few Japanese had any knowledge of English, it was taught "chiefly by American missionaries and some Japanese who returned from the United States or England."139

The rapidly growing influence of English is evidenced by the fact that "in 1874 all foreign language schools outside Tokyo were renamed 'English Language' schools, since about 90 per cent of them taught English, which was also required in public secondary schools."140 A few years later, in 1880, the study of English was made compulsory in higher elementary schools and also introduced in lower elementary schools.141

English as a Medium of Instruction

But English quickly moved from subject of study to medium of instruction. Early in the Meiji period, "institutions of higher learning used textbooks imported mainly from the United States (therefore written in English) and employed many foreign teachers (British, American, French, German, etc.). Thus, in those days, instructions [sic] were often given in English and other foreign languages, and college and university students had to learn English."142

The lack of textbooks written in Japanese and the thirst for knowledge from the outside world, led to the formation of the Bureau of Translation for Foreign Books. Nevertheless, translation and republication of books was a slow process (and required highly proficient translators who were few in number). Consequently, during the 1870-1890 period, "in all the early Christian schools, such as Rikkyo, Doshisha, Aoyama, Meiji, and Tohoku Gakuin, English was the medium of instruction and spoken English was widely taught." Even "in the early Tokyo Imperial University days all lectures were given in English"143 and Englishmen and Americans were hired "to give lectures in English."144 In fact, it is reported that throughout Japan, "during a decade or two—say, roughly, 1877-1885—all higher instruction was imparted in English, French, or German.
Even Japanese professors lectured in Western tongues; technical terms had not yet been translated into Japanese.\textsuperscript{145}

The Later Decline of Oral English

Nevertheless, this state of affairs would not last forever, and English was not to always enjoy such favored status. Forces were operating that would "turn Japan back toward its own cultural inheritance."\textsuperscript{146} In large part, they were a counter-reaction to the "craze for western ways" which "in the early Meiji years had neared absurdity," threatening to "wipe out the old Japanese culture."\textsuperscript{147}

The Meiji Rescript on Education in 1890 marked the beginning of a period of nationalism. During this time, Japanese interest in foreign language learning declined and a large number of the foreign teachers of English were replaced by native-born Japanese, who were not always highly proficient in English—especially spoken English. "By the end of the Russo-Japanese War in 1905 Japan had only 41 schools with foreign teachers."\textsuperscript{148} In addition, "English in the universities became a content course."\textsuperscript{149} Increasingly, in language courses at Japanese universities, emphasis was placed on philology rather than on practical speaking skills.

At the same time, Japanese higher education was taking on an "increasingly pyramidal structure" with a few universities at the top acquiring great prestige.\textsuperscript{150} This led to keen competition to get into them and, subsequently, the examinations used by the universities and high schools to screen applicants began to grow in power and importance.\textsuperscript{151} Thus began the "examination hell" that is still the bane of many a Japanese student's existence. And the nature of the English portions of these tests began to affect the way English was taught in the lower schools. English became a means of sorting students rather than a path to communication. "Increasingly, the need to translate complicated passages from English into Japanese and from Japanese into English, to explain abstruse grammatical constructions, and to acquire a large English vocabulary, prevented students from learning to speak or read English with proficiency."\textsuperscript{152}

There are several reasons for the declining interest in English in Japan at this time. One was the fact that as Japan caught up with the Western nations, English was no longer
needed so desperately. As Ogasawara explains, regarding the Meiji-period universities that had used English as a medium of instruction, "as years went by, most textbooks were translated or integrated into textbooks in Japanese. Thus these institutions no longer had to employ many foreign teachers."\(^{153}\)

Another reason for the decline was rising spirit of nationalism in Japan and the country's increasing independence. "Enthusiasm for English study was slightly suppressed by the increasing nationalism towards the end of the nineteenth century, and gradually Japanese teachers took over the teaching of English."\(^{154}\) Throughout Japanese history, "in the Heian, Taisho and present periods, when Japan was strong and self-confident, foreign studies have tended to be criticized as no longer necessary."\(^{155}\)

Still another reason given for Japan's diminishing interest in English was the worsening of relations between the United States and Japan in the early part of the twentieth century. This problem was exacerbated by the formation in the United States of the "Japanese and Korean Exclusion league which forced, in 1906, the segregation of Japanese children in San Francisco public schools" and the Japanese exclusion clause in the United States Immigration Act of 1924. This "inflicted a wound on Japanese pride, the effect of which it would be difficult to exaggerate; Japan felt herself publicly classified as racially inferior....The symbolic effect upon the Japanese national consciousness was incalculable."\(^{156}\)

Furthermore, after the Russo-Japanese War, Japan's attention turned increasingly toward continental Europe (especially Germany) and away from the United States and Great Britain. In fact, in educated circles, because of the "popularity of continental European fiction," there was a revulsion against English among scholars" who came up with the "mistaken idea that English is the language for business men. The answer of Japanese English teachers was to stress the 'cultural' and disciplinary, and to deprecate the utilitarian value of foreign language study."\(^{157}\) Even Nitobe wrote:

For the Japanese, the advantages of studying foreign languages are of a higher and more intangible nature than are the so-called "practical" benefits. In some ways the most valuable advantage lies in its "unpractical" aspect, namely, in its hidden and unutilitarian effect on the mind....The age of Chinese classics is gone and with them the severe disciplinarian. His place is taken now by the English grammar, which with manifold rules and exceptions to rules, with its mysterious orthography and esoteric idioms, exacts of its neophyte the most strenuous use of his reason and
memory, together, as has been hinted before, with unbounded admiration for the people who have mastered its intricacies. This emphasis on the cultural, literary, disciplinary, and "unpractical" aims of ELT eventually led to a denial of the importance of conversational English in Japan. Nitobe commented that "Japanese teachers make no secret of their utter incompetence in oral intercourse; it is not expected of them. In fact, there is a deplorable propensity to boast of colloquial ignorance....A foreign language is thus made an exercise of the eyes and not of the ears. Its best helps are books and worst trials conversation." 

Thus, after a "fling" with spoken English, Japanese foreign language studies reverted to their former state, utilizing the methods developed for studying Chinese classics, although the object of study was English (and other modern languages). "In the nineteenth century students had read English textbooks in most of their classes, learning 'in English and through English, but never about English.' But in the twentieth century, studying from Japanese textbooks and having infrequent contact with native speakers of English, they had reached the stage of learning about English in Japanese [italics in original]." 

In this manner, Japanese English language teaching developed "two voices, one saying that cultural enrichment through reading is important in the traditional manner, the other saying that English is needed for international communication." As will be discussed in the next chapter, this cultural vs. practical conflict continued to plague Japanese ELT up to and beyond the ELEC era.

Harold E. Palmer's Attempt to Reform Japanese ELT (1922-1936)

After the early decades of the Meiji Era, when English was abandoned as a medium of instruction, reading-Translation was the only method employed until the direct method was introduced to Japan by Palmer in the 1920's. Just as the reading-translation method of teaching Greek and Latin was automatically employed in the teaching of modern languages in the Western world, the teaching method of the Chinese classics was adopted by the Japanese for teaching English....Most of the class hour the teacher speaks in Japanese, and there is no drill in speaking or hearing English....English is treated exactly as the Chinese classics are taught at school.
Of course, this classic approach did not lead to proficiency in speaking English. That was never its intention. Nevertheless, the lack of speaking ability in English sometimes proved embarrassing to Japanese who traveled abroad. After attending the Washington Naval Conference in 1921, Naibu Kanda remarked, "We make a poor showing at international conferences when compared with the Chinese." Others "complained that the nation needed at least a few representatives who did not speak pidgin English."\(^{163}\) Others complained that the nation needed at least a few representatives who did not speak pidgin English.\(^{164}\)

Other prominent Japanese were concerned about the general Japanese failure to learn to speak English, even studying it for so many years. A few took action, and because of the sour U.S.-Japanese relations of the time, they turned to England for the solution.

In 1920, Dr. Masataro Sawayanagi, president of the Imperial Education Association, who had been sent to Europe by the Japanese Ministry of Education as an educational observer, visited London. While at University College, he was impressed with the courses given by Harold E. Palmer, an expert in phonetics and language teaching methods. Subsequently, Palmer was invited to become linguistic advisor to the Japanese Ministry of Education.\(^{165}\) Palmer had long been interested in Japan and "jumped at the opportunity."\(^{166}\)

Interestingly, financial support for Palmer's visit came not from the Ministry but from a private Japanese citizen, Kojiro Matsukata, "a member of a distinguished satsuma samurai family, who made and lost two fortunes in business."\(^{167}\) Matsukata had gone to school in America and France and "considered a working knowledge of English to be an asset" of great worth.\(^{168}\) In his business dealings he had realized the importance to the Japanese of "a good practical knowledge of the English language." Nevertheless, he was distressed by the state of English teaching and learning in Japan. "He had been told by many of his compatriots, teachers and students alike, that the methods employed in Japanese schools were old-fashioned and inefficient."\(^{169}\) For this reason, he was interested in bringing about reform in Japanese ELT, and he was willing to provide financial support for educators like Palmer if they could create such reforms.
Palmer's Professional Background

Palmer was born in England in 1877 and passed away there in 1949. Nevertheless, the intervening years and his profession as a language teacher took him around the globe. As a teenager, he traveled to Boulogne and learned French. Later, in 1902, he began teaching in a Berlitz language school, but soon worked out a method of his own which he called the Oral Method and set up his own school of languages. He taught English in Belgium, at Verviers and the University of Liége. As World War I engulfed Europe, Palmer fled before the invading German armies in 1914 and returned to his native England.

There, he took a post as a lecturer in Spoken English under Daniel Jones in the Phonetics Department of University College, London. Palmer soon "established his reputation as an expert on phonetics and intonation and an authority on linguistic methodology." In the course of his career, he published over a hundred books, pamphlets, and articles, and lectured widely on the subject of language teaching. Perhaps the greatest experience of his life, however, began in 1921, when, in response to Sawayanagi's invitation, he travelled to Japan.

Palmer's Work in Japan

Arriving in 1922, Palmer let people know in no uncertain terms that his purpose was reform, and his emphasis was going to be on oral English. In a newspaper interview he stated,

I will mainly observe the practical side of the English teaching methodology at the high schools in various places, and...I intend to make the most of the good points and make up for the defects of the current teaching methods. My basic plan is to teach pronunciation first instead of teaching letters which have been taught first up until now.

In May of 1922, Palmer began his first series of lectures on "English Teaching Methodology" in an impressive way—to an audience of 500 at Tokyo Teidai (Imperial University). He later traveled throughout Japan giving lectures, but he realized that mere lecturing on his Oral Method would be insufficient.
In May of 1923, Palmer was appointed director of the recently established Institute for Research in English Teaching (IRET), founded by Dr. Masataro Sawayanagi, who had invited Palmer to Japan. In this Institute, he worked with a small staff in the Ministry of Education. The IRET had four main aims:

1. the compilation of English Language Courses;
2. the encouragement of reformed methods of language teaching;
3. the starting of research and experimental work in linguistic subjects; and
4. the training of teachers of English by means of lecture courses and demonstration classes.\(^{174}\)

Sensing the power of publications, Palmer also went to work as editor of *The Bulletin*, a journal published by the IRET dealing with methodological concerns. Its first issue came out in June of 1923, and it was published ten times per annum for many years.

In addition, Palmer produced a series of *Standard English Readers*, a full five-year course for middle school students. He even worked with the Columbia (Nipponphone) Company and produced "educational gramophone" records for English teaching.\(^{175}\)

Palmer also recognized the importance of professional gatherings, and his Institute held "annual conventions to which reports were submitted and at which discussions were held." According to Jones, these meetings "were an inspiration to the teachers who came to Tokyo from every part of the country."\(^{176}\)

The parallels between the conditions for successful implementation outlined by Richards (see chapter three) and what Palmer did to bring about the English-teaching reforms he desired in Japan are striking. There was little question about the legitimacy of his methodology. Palmer's Oral Method was based on the cornerstones of the best linguistic expertise and sound educational psychology of his day.\(^{177}\) As his influence grew, he himself could function as an established and well known authority to which the Oral Method could appeal for its legitimacy. (At the height of his influence during his fourteen years in Japan, he was even awarded an honorary doctorate by Tokyo Imperial University in 1935.\(^{178}\)) In addition, Palmer's Oral Method was backed by his Institute for Research in English Teaching. Moreover, he seemed to have enviable networks of support through official Monbusho channels as well as publications. In short, he seemed
to do everything necessary to ensure that his Oral Method would have a long and successful "life" in Japan.

Nevertheless, in retrospect, the commonly held conclusion is that his "attempt to initiate reform in methodology was not generally successful." For example, his books "gained their converts among Japanese Middle School teachers—but not all that many." Even those who praise Palmer's efforts agree that their effect on the ELT practices commonly used in Japan was minimal. A number of critical implementation factors, which Palmer either ignored or could not control, proved to be his undoing.

Socio-pedagogical factors comprised one obstacle which Palmer could not overcome. According to Tajima, "the soil of Japan was not well suited to bearing fruits worthy of his great efforts." Others are less poetic in their assessment, saying: "His enthusiasm for oral methods did not always suit the established patterns of relationships in Japanese classrooms," and his books were "not welcomed by some Japanese secondary school teachers" who criticized him as "one who is 'fond of novelty and who confuses learners.'" Furthermore, Palmer's connection with the Ministry turned out to not be strong enough. In fact, once he arrived in Japan, "the officials did not know quite what to do with him," and they were afraid that "reforms imposed, or even proposed, from on high would upset too many important apple carts." The solution was to put him in an advisory position only, hoping that his research work with the IRET would keep him busy and thus "prevent anything very drastic from happening." In this way, his role was "simply an advisory one" and his recommendations never became official policy.

Without doubt, unfavorable socio-political currents also diminished Palmer's influence. The diminished motivation of Japanese students to learn to speak English (mentioned earlier in this chapter) was a serious blow to his Oral Method for teaching English. As Bryant notes, "His method failed to resuscitate a motivation which had died when students were no longer face to face with foreign teachers and foreign books." Most importantly, the rising nationalism and militarism of the 1930's (discussed below) led to a general abandonment of English study in Japan and sealed the fate of Palmer's intended reforms.
Despite this apparent failure, the spark of Palmer's influence remained alive in Japan long after he left the country, and after the war some of his old disciples made attempts to revive it. Palmer had the power of "primacy," and, although his Oral Method and Fries' Oral Approach were "very similar," on more than one occasion his "ghost" proved to be a hindrance rather than a help to the ELEC reformers.

Rising Militarism and World War II

Beginning in the 1930's and ending with Japan's surrender in 1945, the rising Japanese militarism and nationalism, which culminated in the War in the Pacific, had a serious effect on the study of English by the Japanese.

During the 1920's and 1930's, "The proportion of Japanese students studying in the United States had progressively decreased... until, with an average of 127 per year going to Germany, only 17 or 18 went to the United States in 1932." In 1937, the Ministry of Education codified the new Japanese nationalism in Kokutai no Hongi ("The Cardinal Principles of the National Entity of Japan"). From that time, foreign language study "became optional in secondary schools after the first two years. Formerly, it was required throughout the five years. Then, with the outbreak of World II, even the study of English was suspected as a sign of disloyalty to the country." When war between the United States and Japan was declared "all but a few of the English speaking missionaries and teachers were repatriated or placed in detention, and as the war proceeded the study of English in secondary schools became suspect, until in 1944 it nearly vanished."191

The Allied Occupation,

When World War II ended, the previous decline in the study of English in Japan was dramatically reversed. From 1945 to 1952, the Allied Occupation of Japan, as well as Japan's other contacts with the outside world, resulted in great enthusiasm for the English language. One author states, "In no other period in the country's history have the
Japanese had such direct contact with English-speaking people and shown such keen interest in the study of English."192 Another exclaims, "With the beginning of the American Armed Forces occupation, a second Americanization took place rather rapidly with greater intensity in a number of fields and aspects than during the Meiji Restoration."193

The Occupation of Japan has been called the greatest attempt at social engineering in the history of the world. In that attempt, an important role was played by formal education. It was a tool with both an immediate and a long-range purpose: to "redirect the nation" while the Americans were in control and to ensure that these reforms would survive when the Occupation was over.

The Occupation had a number of goals. Those officially spelled out in the Potsdam Proclamation included eliminating the authority and influence of militarists, disarming the military forces, meting out stern justice to all war criminals, removing "all obstacles to the revival and strengthening of democratic tendencies among the Japanese people," establishing "freedom of speech, of religion, and of thought, as well as respect for fundamental human rights," and maintaining "such industries as will sustain her economy."

As events developed, these goals—and the means by which they were pursued—became increasingly complex. Nevertheless, it is possible to categorize the Occupation reforms under three headings: demilitarization, democratization, and economic reconstruction. Reforms in each of these categories involved and affected the Japanese system of formal education and produced conditions which were to influence the ELEC effort to reform Japanese English language teaching.

Space does not allow a thorough discussion of all the different reforms and related factors. Therefore, only those with direct relevance to the topic of this dissertation will be discussed here.

One step in the demilitarization process was a wide-ranging "purge" of "tainted" personnel. It included former military officers, police, political leaders, and leading businessmen. A SCAP directive of October 30, 1945 extended this purge to the school system. As a result, over a hundred thousand teachers and administrators either left the school system or were removed from it.194 The resulting shortage of teachers had long-
lasting effects on the system's ability to provide the English instruction desired by both
the public and educational administrators.

The "constructive" phase of the Occupation took longer to implement, but was
much more involved. Two key events took place in 1946—the First United States
Educational Mission to Japan arrived (in March), and the new constitution was passed by
the Diet (October 7) and promulgated (November 3). The constitution provided general,
authoritative guidance. The recommendations of the Mission served as the source for
future SCAP (Supreme Commander Allied Powers) and CI&E (Civil Information and
Education) policies regarding education in the "new Japan." The following year, The
Fundamental Law of Education and The School Education Law were passed with the
intention of cementing some of the reforms in place. As the following sections explain,
many of these reforms had at least an indirect effect on the way English would be taught
in Japan.

Expansion of Educational Opportunity and Desire to Learn English

Prior to the war, Japanese children were required to attend school for only six
years. In the "new Japan," compulsory education was extended to nine years.
Occupation reforms also promoted co-education at all levels of the school system.

In a Japan recently devastated by war, this expansion was accomplished only with
great difficulty. "Wartime loss, which amounted to 13 per cent of the total school
buildings, and also the raising of the school leaving age, which increased the number of
children of compulsory attendance age by half, led to a serious shortage of school
buildings and facilities, which were hard to supply under the financial constraints of the
time." 195

In addition to this general expansion of educational opportunity, in post-War Japan
there was great interest in learning English. Not only were there large numbers of
students enrolled at all levels of the expanded school system, but—because of the contact
with English-speaking peoples, or because of the entrance exams, or both—virtually all
of these students took English classes. As Bryant reported in 1956, "about 7,000,000
Japanese children from 12 to 18 years old are spending five hours a week studying
English....In the universities hundreds of thousands more are busy with their seventh, eighth, ninth, or tenth year of English."196 It was "officially estimated that more than 76% of junior high and 86% of senior high school students elect to study English."197 Bryant concluded that, compared to 1929 figures on students of English in Japan, "nearly 20 times as many children are now studying a second language as were doing so 25 years ago!"198

This situation was, of course, consistent with the traditional Japanese pattern of a "craze" for studying the language of foreigners who had demonstrated their superiority in some fashion (militarily, technologically, etc.). The widespread desire among the Japanese to learn English was supportive of ELEC's objectives—at least in one sense. It certainly increased the interest in English and the methods used for teaching it. Nevertheless, in conjunction with other aspects of the Japanese school system at the time, it also created numerous difficulties, which ELEC could not avoid.

Shortage of Teachers

One of the greatest problems in post-War Japan was a shortage of teachers—especially qualified English teachers. As already noted, school facilities and personnel were generally in short supply at this time. In few areas was the shortage of qualified teachers more severe than it was in English teaching. The number of Japanese teachers with any fluency in English contrasted dramatically with the size of this massive program for teaching English. As a result, many less qualified individuals were pressed into positions at the front of an English class. As Bryant explained, "They are taught by some 85,000 teachers, few of whom have ever heard the language spoken by a native—except, perhaps, over the radio."199 He went on to lament, "It is a serious fact that only about one-third of the lower secondary school English teachers hold regular English teaching licenses." Many individuals forced into becoming "English teachers" were actually trained in some other subjects, and "the output of teacher training institutions and university education departments is wholly inadequate."200

Unfortunately, there was no quick remedy to this situation. In 1962, Kimizuka reported,
About half of the present secondary school teachers of English received their college education before or during the war, and many among them received certificates for teaching simply because they earned a certain grade point in English at college or university. Many of those who majored in English had no professional training in teaching the language. Kimizuka blamed the "inadequate" methods used by English teachers on "the fact that only twenty per cent of teachers in English at middle and high schools have received professional education in teaching the language." ELEC attempted to address this problem, but given the large size of Japan's ELT program and most teachers' lack of any professional ELT preparation, equipping all (or even a majority of) the teachers of English with the skills and knowledge they would need to use the Oral Approach was a formidable, if not hopeless task.

Teacher Training and Professionalism

Under the reforms of the Occupation, teacher training was raised to the university level (normal school programs were extended to four years and provided both professional and liberal education. Nevertheless, as noted earlier in this chapter, university teachers of English in Japan had long demonstrated a tendency to emphasize literary studies, to the detriment of spoken English. Besides, few of the many thousands of practicing English teachers had the opportunity to undertake university-level studies in English during and/or after the Occupation.

For these reasons, the Occupation authorities established numerous in-service programs to re-educate teachers and administrators. These programs were typically short-term institutes dealing with new curricula and methods. At first, they were concerned with "democratic teaching methods," but they also served as a pattern for later in-service work concerned with improving teachers' English skills. In fact, the ELEC Summer Institutes were organized according to this established, Occupation-era pattern.

To assist teachers in the continuation of their professional development, the Occupation authorities also encouraged the formation of professional societies in various subject-matter areas. Some of these organizations lasted only until the Americans relinquished control, but others flourished and became powerful forces in post-Occupation Japan. There were several successful organizations of English teachers, and
cooperative relationships with them could have helped ELEC in its effort to reform Japanese ELT. Nevertheless, such contacts were never pursued, as will be discussed in the next chapter under "support networks."

**Decentralization**

Kawai states that "one of the major recommendations of the United States Educational Mission called for the decentralization of the Japanese educational system and the dispersal of its control among autonomous popularly elected local bodies." This objective was based on the American view that the centralized Japanese system was "a fundamental cause of the nationalist fervor underlying Japan's military aggression."

The Occupation authorities vigorously pursued decentralization of the school system. Steps were taken to elect local and prefectural boards of education, and leave the venerable Ministry of Education with only an "advisory and stimulating role."

Nevertheless, once the Occupation ended and the Japanese regained control, decentralization was one of the first reforms to be reversed. As Beauchamp sums it up, "The American efforts to foster decentralization failed, and today Japan once more possesses one of the world's most highly centralized educational systems." This, of course, meant that ELEC had to deal with this re-centralized bureaucracy, which at the time of the ELEC campaign seemed to be "flexing its muscles" somewhat in order to demonstrate what it had regained. ELEC never experienced much success in overcoming the resultant problems.

**Textbook Production**

Another change worth noting combined both curriculum reform and decentralization. In post-War Japan, as Oshiba and Adams note, "textbooks were no longer written in the Ministry of Education but by private authors to be published through private publishers." This change made it possible for ELEC to publish its own Oral Approach textbooks, although they still had to be approved by the Ministry.

Nevertheless, the greatest (unanticipated) problem relative to ELEC's textbooks was due,
not to the Monbusho, but to ELEC's choice of a private publisher (to be discussed in chapter five).

Higher Education

The First U.S. Mission report "deplored the early and narrow specialization in the semmon gakko which left no room for broad, humanistic studies."208 Other than that, the Mission did not make detailed recommendations regarding higher education in Japan, but CI&E did. Kawai explains these in considerable detail: All Japanese institutions of higher learning were to be made over into four-year colleges or universities (following the standard American pattern) in spite of the fact that many of these institutions did not have the facilities or faculty for this new purpose. In addition, every prefecture was to have a university (like the state universities in America). American-style graduate programs were also established. Later, (as the earlier insistence on four-year colleges abated) a system of junior colleges was set up.

Many of these reforms had disastrous consequences, arousing antagonism and scorn on the part of university personnel and lowering academic standards. The result of making all Japanese institutions of higher learning into four-year colleges or universities, whether they were truly ready for such a step or not, was a damaging drop in the quality of Japanese higher education. The total number of universities in Japan rose to more than 200. "No nation in the world except the United States has more universities." To bring this about, however, resources were spread extremely thin.209

These reforms produced conditions in the Japanese school system which created additional problems for the ELEC campaign. The unfavorable conditions included the antagonism and defensiveness of university professors toward American "innovations" and the stronger-than-ever hierarchical divisions among the many Japanese universities (to compensate for the lack of quality in many of the new ones). The negative results were (1) difficulty in establishing cooperative relationships with Japanese universities regarding ELEC's intended reforms and (2) an increased emphasis in English classes on preparation for college entrance examinations.
In spite of the increased number of universities in Japan, the number of individuals desiring a university-level education had increased even more because of the expansion in educational opportunity at lower levels and the new ideology of "democratic" education. This pressure, along with the increased disparity in the quality of education offered at different universities, led to increasing reliance on entrance examinations to sort out applicants. In this situation, English knowledge was put to a new use—not communication among individuals but discrimination among university hopefuls. The resulting examination "backwash" affected the way English was taught all the way down to the lower secondary school.

Since universities have more applicants each year than they can possibly enroll, entrance examinations are highly competitive. Consequently, the influence of entrance examinations upon the education of upper secondary schools is great. Since students tend to take only those subjects which are included in the entrance examinations, enrollment in such elective subjects as music, art, home economics, etc., is exceptionally low. Entrance examinations not only influence the selection of subjects of study but also the content and method of teaching such subjects. For example, translation from English to Japanese and grammatical analysis of complicated sentences are the main contents of English courses in upper secondary schools, because these processes constitute the most important part of the entrance examinations. It may not be an exaggeration to say that the success or failure of an English teacher at the upper secondary school depends on the number of students he can send to universities."

As the section on examinations in chapter five explains, the negative backwash from these entrance examinations seriously hindered ELEC's effort to bring about the teaching of oral English in Japan.

Mass Education

Although they lie outside the realm of formal education, a number of Occupation-era reforms dealing with mass education are worth mentioning briefly. Public libraries were established with the hope of helping create "an enlightened public opinion." Newspapers and magazines were also used to spread the gospel of democracy. In addition, radio programs were produced for similar purposes.

Besides spreading "democracy," many of these mass media were also instrumental in spreading English throughout Japan. For example, as already mentioned, the only
contact many Japanese students (and teachers) of English had with native speakers of the
target language was by means of the radio (and later, television). This was one factor that
encouraged the learning of oral English—at least the development of listening skills.

Reform of the Japanese Language

Although such a reform was strongly recommended as being "basic and urgent" by
the First U.S. Educational Mission, no official attempt was ever made to reform the
Japanese writing system. Hall devotes an entire chapter to this subject and justifies it
saying,

> An educated and literate citizenry is the fundamental prerequisite of any form of
> modern representative government or democratic society....Unless a citizen can
> read he cannot be informed. Unless he is informed he cannot intelligently make the
decisions which his self-government demands.211

Thinking along the same lines, the Mission report recommended "a drastic reform of the
Japanese written language," i.e., that kanji be abandoned in favor of a romaji, phonetic
system.

Interestingly, this recommendation was the only one made by the Mission which
was completely ignored in subsequent SCAP directives. In retrospect it is possible to see
SCAP's wisdom in not attempting such a reform. If other reforms of a much less drastic
nature created resistance among the Japanese, it is not difficult to imagine the rebellion
that an attempt to reform the Japanese writing system might have sparked.

Foreign (English) Language Teaching

For similar reasons, although many of the above mentioned reforms directly or
indirectly affected English language teaching in Japanese schools, the Occupation
authorities "largely ignored the subject of foreign language teaching in Japan."212

Bryant comments, "The occupation authorities were apparently reluctant to seem to
be forcing their language on a conquered people, and their decision appears to have been
wise." As a consequence, the post-Occupation demand for English "expresse[d] the
needs of the Japanese themselves"213 rather than an American dictum. Perhaps that is at
least one of the reasons why, after the Americans left, although many of the reforms initiated by the occupying Americans were abandoned or even reversed, the Japanese thirst for the English language continued to increase. "In postwar Japan need for the study of English became greater each year."\textsuperscript{214}

For example, in 1951, as the Occupation drew to a close, the Japanese Ministry of Education (\textit{not} CI&E or SCAP) proclaimed, "English...can contribute greatly to the development of social competence, by leading to an understanding of the worthwhile elements of the home life and social lives of English-speaking peoples, and to an understanding of the democratic heritage of the peoples of the world, which to an important extent was developed in English-speaking nations."\textsuperscript{215}

\section*{Conclusion}

As this chapter has illustrated, the situation which the ELEC reformers faced had a long and complicated history and a deep socio-pedagogical foundation. Widespread teaching of English in Japan would never have been possible without that foundation, which had been laid over a period of more than one thousand years. Yet, in other respects, the traditions regarding foreign language study that had developed along with that foundation, as well as additional developments during the Meiji and Occupation periods, comprised a formidable obstacle to the accomplishment of ELEC's objectives.

This constellation of antecedent factors created special challenges for the ELEC campaign to reform the teaching of English in Japan. The willingness to work with and around these factors was critical to ELEC's success. Nevertheless, as the next chapter will show, the ELEC reformers ignored many of them and defied others, resulting in problems as these factors interacted with ELEC's efforts. Such cases of negative interaction explain a number of ELEC's failures. In retrospect, it is possible to conclude that if these antecedent factors had been addressed properly (as the next chapter will explain in greater detail) at least some of ELEC's failures could have been successes.
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CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS--THE DIFFUSION/IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

To analyze the English Language Exploratory Committee's effort to reform English language teaching in Japan, this chapter uses the innovation-decision process model explained in chapter three. As previously mentioned, ELEC's successes in this campaign came in degrees and were mixed with numerous failures making it impossible to arrive at a simple success-or-failure verdict. Nevertheless, it is clear that many of the difficulties ELEC encountered could have been avoided or overcome if its leaders had planned adequately, taking into consideration the potential obstacles created by antecedent and concurrent factors which the following analysis addresses.

Of course with "20-20 hindsight," it is now much easier to see what the ELEC reformers should have done than it must have been for them to decide on an appropriate course of action. The purpose of this study is not to criticize or condemn them. Rather, it is to learn as much as possible from the errors they made. In this way, even ELEC's failures may help create successes for other educational reformers.

At the outset, it should also be noted that although he played a major role in the ELEC campaign, Charles C. Fries himself can not be blamed for many of ELEC's problems, except perhaps insofar as he ignored implementation concerns. As one of the Japanese men who worked closely with Fries said, "He was a scholar." Although Fries was not entirely unaware of potential implementation problems, he concerned himself almost exclusively with factors such as the soundness of the ELEC materials according to
his understanding of linguistics and his Oral Approach principles. He left implementation factors to others. In other words, Fries was above such things as implementation factors; they were beneath him.

The double meaning of that phrase, "beneath him," is intentional. In one sense of being "beneath him," implementation factors were not within the scope of Fries' (or ELEC's) concern. But in another sense, such as, "The floor is beneath me," these factors formed a foundation which eventually proved to be crucial to the success of ELEC's ELT "revolution" in Japan. As Tajima explains and as subsequent events bore out, "The key to success of the program is heavily dependent upon external conditions when it is executed rather than on the contents of the program itself."2

The Nature and Extent of ELEC's Planning to Implement the Oral Approach in Japan

At the 1956 ELEC Specialists' Conference, the remarks made by ELEC Chairman Eikichi Araki in his opening address reflected the importance of implementation. He warned those who would work together in planning ELEC's "revolution" that "the most important thing is the putting into practice of these plans when they are made."3

Unfortunately, although a lot of planning went into the methods and materials advocated by ELEC, little went into the way they would be implemented. At least in the Rockefeller camp, the feeling was, "It seems better to take one step at a time rather than to try to lay out a grand plan."4 Such feelings bring to mind the "Let's get started, and we'll find out just what we're doing as we go along" approach against which Sarason warns would-be innovators.5

In Japan, planning for diffusion-implementation was also minimal. That ELEC's leaders in Japan engaged in planning from ELEC's earliest days is evidenced by an organizational chart in which ELEC's central committee was pictured as receiving support from U.S. and Japanese sources, interacting with U.S. and British experts, and then initiating projects in cooperation with "existing universities, institutes, and societies."6 Nevertheless, that this chart was simply scrawled on the back of an agenda page and that
it did not take into account any potential obstacles to the ELEC campaign both indicate the lack of serious attention given to careful implementation-oriented planning.

Fries himself seems to have taken a rather idealistic (although simplistic) view of the change process. While acknowledging the complexity of the "problem" of ELT in Japan and its history, he expressed the hope that it could be solved by bringing "our experiences from various aspects of this problem together." As subsequent events demonstrated, it would take a lot more than that to bring about significant change in Japanese English language teaching.

Although subsequent events demonstrated that this *laissez-faire* communication of innovations approach was insufficient, ELEC personnel did not become seriously involved in careful planning for implementation until five or six years later. Unfortunately, by then it was too late. Now, thirty years later, it is possible to see that things might have happened quite differently than they did if, at the outset, the ELEC leaders had planned their campaign carefully, taking into consideration the variety of factors and variables discussed in this chapter.

**Types of Change**

A fundamental decision that must be made in planning for the implementation of an innovation is to determine what type of change is being pursued. For example, the tactics employed in an immanent change effort (with both the recognition of the need for change and the source of the innovation being internal to the social system) will be quite different from (and considerably less complex than) those necessary for accomplishing directed contact change. When the resource system is an outsider to the intended user system, its change agents may not even be aware of the character nor the importance of various socio-cultural and school system factors which can affect the course of the innovation's diffusion and implementation. In such cases, the innovation-decision process model developed for this study can be especially helpful since it outlines these factors and thus alerts reformers to them. Unfortunately, ELEC operated without such a planning model, and lack of awareness of these implementation factors led to a number of serious problems.
One common problem with directed contact change campaigns is that resistance to them is virtually inevitable if they are perceived as being of foreign origin. In such cases, it is wise for the foreign source to establish linkage with local forces, thus making the movement at least appear to promote immanent (rather than directed contact) change.

ELEC's leading figures were aware of and tried to avoid this potential problem. For instance, John D. Rockefeller 3rd operated "behind" ELEC. For instance, when Shigeharu Matsumoto made arrangements for a press release concerning the ELEC Specialists' Conference, he assured Rockefeller, "Utmost caution will be taken not to give any publicity to your own name." Reischauer also advised that "the American side, despite Mr. Rockefeller's great service in sparking the movement, should seem to be simply a response to Japanese proposals." From his experience in Puerto Rico, Charles C. Fries had also learned the importance of involving local colleagues in reform enterprises in order to transform such movements into more indigenous, immanent change efforts. Therefore, in Japan he wisely insisted on involving the Japanese. When this approach was questioned, his defense was lengthy and showed a considerable awareness of the setting in which ELEC was operating.

We, I believe, must remember that Japan was an "occupied" country and had a "foreign" educational reform imposed upon it by the US as conquerors. They have not been happy with many of these "reforms" and have gradually been able to nullify or eliminate some of them. Others still annoy them and are a constant reminder of certain "democratic" arrangements imposed on them....Many Americans have not realized that there is always such opposition to be dealt with.

Even after two years of cooperative work the ICA program of the U of Michigan with Waseda University is strongly opposed by one of Japan's largest labor unions...

The Palmer enterprise in the 1920's, designed to improve the teaching of English in Japan, was backed by Japanese money. But several of those who were connected with it have told me that one reason it was not really effective was that the products of that institute were too much "outside."

And so with this background I have felt that "the part of the Japanese colleagues" must be a fundamental consideration....The textbooks and the teachers guides must, I believe, be convincingly the work of the Japanese specialists themselves, in cooperation with the native speakers of English as consultants....I believe the Japanese collaborators must constantly contribute their full measure and they must really know the texts with the familiarity that comes from their own creation. They must know them so thoroughly that they can confidently and enthusiastically meet all opposers as well as the hosts of teachers who want to understand the new materials thoroughly in order that they may use them. I needn't tell you that every
new textbook for teaching English in a foreign country will meet opposition—often very bitter opposition as it displaces one or more texts out of which someone is making a living. If the new textbooks, no matter how good they are, are believed to be the creation of outsiders, they are especially vulnerable to attack [italics in original].

In some respects, these attempts to make the ELEC movement more immanent in nature (as well as in appearance) by enlisting the support of Japanese who also wished to reform English language teaching in Japan were successful. The involvement of the Japanese proved to be not just advantageous but essential. Nevertheless, ELEC still was not always able to entirely avoid being perceived as a U.S.-based attempt to impose American teaching methods on Japan. In such instances, such as the case of a key Ministry of Education official, the result was (as Fries and Reischauer had predicted) opposition.

**Types of Innovation Decisions**

The type of decision that is possible in a particular situation is another important consideration. As explained in chapter three, decisions may be of various types: optional (not dependent on other members of society), collective (made only by consensus), authority (imposed from above), or contingent (dependent on a prior decision). The type of decision affects not only the speed and the effectiveness of change but also the planning regarding the strategies and stages of the implementation of an innovation.

In the case of ELEC’s intended reform of ELT in Japan, although ELEC’s board consisted of a variety of important individuals in the business and academic communities, ELEC itself had no authority over teachers in the Japanese school system. Furthermore, as explained later in this chapter, it failed to establish linkage with those institutions which did. Therefore, authority decisions, the quickest and most powerful type, were not a possibility for ELEC. Consequently, its campaign was limited to persuasive, informative strategies, which proved to be much less effective. The cooperative nature of Japanese society and the recently re-centralized school system also contributed to the difficulty by increasing the tendency toward consensus-type decisions, which are probably the most difficult type to achieve.
Strategies for Bringing About Change

Two fundamental approaches to bringing about change (as discussed in chapter three) are "from the top down" and "from the bottom up" (also known as "grass roots" change). Unfortunately, the "top-down" approach used successfully by Fries in Puerto Rico, was not possible in Japan because ELEC had no power over Japanese teachers of English and failed to establish linkage with those institutions which did.

The opposite, "bottom-up" approach was not feasible in centralized Japan where "if you start at the grass roots, you don't get anywhere at all. You have to start at the top." Although one of the Occupation's goals was to decentralize the administration of Japan's school system, this reform was one of the first to be reversed once the Americans returned control to the Japanese.

Blocked in both vertical directions (up and down), ELEC had little choice but to utilize a less effective, (horizontal) communication approach, and even in this respect ELEC was slow to begin. Of course C. C. Fries traveled throughout Japan on lecture tours as early as 1956, and there were newspaper articles about ELEC conferences from the first, but it was not until 1962 that wide-scale promotion of ELEC materials began in earnest, with speakers, demonstrations, reports of research, and other bulletins.

Later that year, strategies for bringing about change were discussed. Herbert Passin wrote to Donald McLean suggesting various ideas for the promotion and pursuit of ELEC's goals in reforming Japanese ELT. He recognized the existence of "vested interests" in the system and noted both the conservative and progressive elements. Formulating a strategic plan, he identified a number of "key pressure points" where ELEC should concentrate its influence. These were company entrance examinations, university entrance examinations, and radio and television broadcasts. Unfortunately, by this time, ELEC's influence was already on the wane, and the realization that such a "massive effort" would be required came too late.

In the earlier stages, ELEC's leaders had planned the steps they would need to go through to become organized and operable, namely: "1. Organization of Central Committee, 2. Central Committee organizes technical group, 3. Central Committee establishes relationship...with Cooperating Group in the U.S. (probably Rockefeller
Foundation), 4. Technical group holds conferences (with invited American and British experts) to Decide on General Program, 5. Institution of Specific Projects.¹⁴ Nevertheless, this planning was very general, did not consider how ELEC might deal with barriers to its reform effort, and stopped short of providing for any specific action beyond ELEC's initial Specialists' Conference.

With these few exceptions, the ELEC leaders generally failed to formulate any specific plan regarding strategies and/or stages of change. They had lofty goals but seemed content in the hope that Japanese teachers of English would see the advantages of the Oral Approach and then naturally, almost automatically adopt it. By the time they realized that successful implementation of change would require more than communicating the news of a "better mousetrap," it was too late to remedy the error. They had failed to consider the factors that encourage/discourage change and fell victim to many implementation barriers. A discussion of this array of factors will comprise most of the remainder of this chapter.

Following the pattern established in chapter three, this discussion of factors that encourage/discourage change will be divided into four main sections: characteristics of the innovation (the Oral Approach) itself, characteristics of the ELEC resource system, characteristics of the Japanese ELT user system, and inter-elemental factors.

Characteristics of the Oral Approach Itself

As it was developed by Charles C. Fries and promoted in Japan by ELEC, the Oral Approach consisted of a complex of different characteristics. Many of these discouraged its spread while others facilitated its adoption by the Japanese.

Originality

The degree of originality in an innovation is a fundamental consideration inasmuch as it determines the nature of the change process: origination, adaptation, or borrowing. The Oral Approach was, without question, of American origin. Its creators and most prominent promoters were professors at U. S. universities, and its all-important
linguistic foundation came from the American structural school. In this sense, the Oral Approach was a ready-made (made in America) solution exported to Japan—and many other countries as well—as the answer to their ELT problems. Although the American backers of the ELEC movement kept out of the spotlight and attempts were made to portray ELEC as a Japanese campaign, there was no disguising the fact that the approach ELEC promoted was borrowed from America.

The Oral Approach presented a dramatic contrast to the traditional foreign language teaching methods which had developed in Japan. In this respect it was highly innovative, original, and foreign to Japanese teachers. In conservative Japan, however, ELEC might have enjoyed greater success in reforming ELT had it focused more on modifying existing practices and less on creating a full-scale pedagogical revolution. As Rogers advises, "Teacher re-training needs to focus more on extending and re-defining the familiar rather than attacking it." Nevertheless, given the great differences between Fries' Oral approach and Japanese ELT traditions, such an adaptive approach would not have been possible without abandoning the American approach entirely.

The foreign-ness and American-ness of the Oral Approach inevitably led to opposition from many tradition-oriented Japanese educators—especially in the reactionary "reverse course" years following the Occupation. It was incompatible with the existing Japanese system in many ways, as will be discussed in later sections of this chapter.

The foreign, borrowed nature of the Oral Approach in Japan created opposition for other reasons also. For example, one key Ministry of Education official never supported ELEC's campaign because he felt that a new, but particularly Japanese approach to ELT needed to be developed.

Interestingly, opposition to the ELEC campaign also came from those who saw it as less than original. In the eyes of some who remembered Palmer's pre-war campaign to reform ELT in Japan Fries' Oral Approach was merely an American version of Palmer's Oral Method. Palmer still had many disciples in Japan, and they often resisted this American "usurper." At the same time, many of those who had investigated Palmer's approach years before and found fault with it objected to the Oral Approach on the same grounds, without even giving it a chance.
Complexity

Diffusion of innovations theories are concerned with complexity of two types: the complexity of the innovation itself and the complexity of the change effort.

In both these areas, greater complexity generally leads to greater difficulty in bringing about the adoption and utilization of the innovation.

Complexity of the innovation refers to the degree to which it is perceived as being difficult to understand and use. Generally speaking, "those new ideas requiring little additional learning investment on the part of the receiver will be adopted more rapidly than innovations requiring the adopter to develop new skills and understandings." Unfortunately, adoption of the Oral Approach required a great deal of investment on the part of Japanese teachers of English. To use the Oral Approach they needed to increase their skills in spoken English as well as develop their understanding of new ideas about teaching and learning. Realizing this, ELEC started its summer institutes for teachers, which focused on the development of these capabilities.

Language, however, is one of the most complex of human phenomena, and good speaking proficiency is not easy to acquire. Developing linguistic awareness (the conscious knowledge of how language works) and an understanding of how people learn language takes even more time. Furthermore, the large number of teachers of English in Japan who needed to improve both their speaking skills as well as their understanding of language and language teaching far exceeded ELEC's limited resources for providing the training these teachers needed.

The complexity of the change effort refers to the amount of change desired and how many people will be involved in the campaign. Given the Oral Approach's high degree of originality and the large size of the English-teaching program in Japanese schools, the complexity of this task was formidable.

Explicitness

The explicitness of an innovation (the clarity with which it can be described) affects the resource system's ability to communicate it to the intended user system. Explicitness
also refers to the degree of an innovation's development or formulation. In either case, a low degree of explicitness may lead to confusion, misapplication, and frustration among intended users.

Because Fries' Oral Approach consisted of a set of principles rather than a collection of classroom techniques and procedures, it was relatively abstract and difficult to describe with precision. In other words, it suffered from a low degree of explicitness.

For these reasons, Fries' descriptions of the Oral Approach usually remained at the level of generalizations and were frequently misunderstood. Although Fries tried to simplify the Oral Approach to a few fundamental principles, his ideas were still frequently misinterpreted, and he was forced to expend considerable time and effort clarifying them. In his later years, he spent a lot of time explaining what he had really meant by earlier statements which his followers had misinterpreted. In fact, one of his purposes in going to Japan was to correct what he felt were misperceptions about the Oral Approach.18

Because of the low degree of explicitness in Fries' descriptions of his Oral Approach, many Japanese teachers (before and after Fries' visits) misunderstood his ideas or comprehended them only partially. In the minds of some, for instance, the Oral Approach consisted only of pattern practice drills—a thought that would have made Fries shudder. This, of course, was an implementational disadvantage.

On the other hand, the fact that the Oral Approach consisted of broad principles also allowed it to be more flexible and adaptable in particular situations. This feature (discussed in a later section of this chapter) would encourage the adoption of the Oral Approach.

Relative Advantage

Rogers and Shoemaker claim that "the greater the perceived relative advantage of an innovation, the more rapid its rate of adoption.‖ Methodological innovators in language teaching are usually aware of this principle, and they use it to promote their ideas. "Relative advantage" can take many forms. New methods are touted as being more effective, less stressful, more interesting for students, easier for teachers to use, etc. However, because "increased effectiveness" is so nearly universally desired and/or
claimed (Richards explains that "a claim that all methods make is that the adoption of a specific method will lead to higher levels of language achievement than the use of other methods."), this type of relative advantage will receive the most attention in this study.

Relative advantage of this sort can be established in various ways. One of the most common is to conduct research to show the effectiveness of a method and publish the results. Richards discusses how such "appeals to facts" can be used to promote a method. He also notes that these "facts" can come from research or "pseudo-research."

Regarding acceptable research, Richards sets a seldom met standard, that it employ a true experimental design. The resulting picture is rather discouraging. In his 1983 address, Richards stated, "There is not a single serious piece of research published to demonstrate precisely what learners learn from...[the] methods which countless journal articles advocate with such enthusiasm." In other words, research is one way of validating a method, but there is no "true" research to support any method.

In 1984, when Richards' speech was published (in revised form), the picture he painted was only a little brighter. He cited one study (by Wagner & Tilney on the effectiveness of "superlearning" techniques) which satisfied the criterion of using a true experimental design, but Richards noted that "studies of this kind are all too rare in the vast promotional literature on methods." He pronounced the majority of "research" reports on methods "largely anecdotal and poorly researched."

Such a charge could be leveled at Fries' Oral Approach. Even its supporters acknowledge that there was no experimental evidence for its effectiveness. Fries and his ELEC colleagues did not randomly assign students to groups, use the Oral Approach with one group and another method with the other, and then compare learners' test results.

It should be noted, however, that it is not really fair to expect such an experimental approach to have been used with the Oral Approach. In response to criticism concerning "the lack of empirical foundations for theoretical claims" made about the Oral Approach, Morley and her Michigan colleagues counter, "The tenor of the times did not require empirical investigations of the type which we have become accustomed to in recent work in applied linguistics." According to Robert Lado, one of Fries' foremost disciples, in the 1940's, 50's, and early 60's, a lot of research was done, but the use of social science, empirico-statistical methods was unheard of in the field of linguistics, or applied
linguistics. At that time, a different paradigm reigned. Therefore, while much linguistic research was done at Michigan, it was descriptive rather than experimental in nature.

In Japan, at ELEC, "research" was also conducted. Tamotsu Yambe carried out "experiments" at ELEC for twenty years, but his research on the Oral Approach began even before ELEC started. He went to Michigan in the early 1950's where he studied and met Charles Fries. When he returned to Japan he tried some of what he had seen in the English Language Institute in Ann Arbor—pattern practice and contrastive studies—and he liked the way it worked. That was his experiment. He tried it in his classes, and it seemed to work. Of course, anyone familiar with empirical research methods would recognize Yambe's approach as a one-shot case study, not a true experiment. If nothing else, however, it convinced Yambe, and he became a loyal supporter of Fries' Oral Approach.

Once the ELEC effort began, "research" evidence was used to promote it. For instance, a 1957 newspaper article on "The Oral Method of Teaching English" proclaimed that "Tests conducted over the past year and a half for the teaching of English through the oral rather than visual method have been so successful that the English Language Exploratory Committee (ELEC) has decided to launch a five-year program." Apparently, the reference made was to the progress made by the teachers who participated in the first ELEC summer seminar. Obviously, this "research," with its carefully selected subjects and other biasing factors, was far below the "true experimental" standard. Nevertheless, for the general public and even many English-language educators in Japan, such reports must have been, at the very least, of considerable interest.

Little else was done in the way of research on the effectiveness of the Oral Approach in Japan until 1962, when ELEC found itself "at the crossroads" and facing several serious challenges. At this point, ELEC's leaders began to recognize the need for large-scale promotion, and research was seen as a valuable tool in this effort. They proposed "experimental work on the effectiveness of our materials in the classroom and on the effectiveness of teaching methods." Dr. Shiro Hattori, a "distinguished linguist," was named to head ELEC's "research department," and plans were made to compare "the progress of pupils using ELEC materials and that of pupils using ordinary materials." A Rockefeller communiqué of this time "agreed that testing [the newly
completed ELEC materials] on students against other materials might help to provide solid evidence of the superiority of the materials" but cautioned against letting "the research side get too elaborate beyond this point for the present."\textsuperscript{30}

The promotional rather than investigative nature of this research is worth noting. It was not intended to discover which approach to ELT in Japan was best. Rather, its purpose was to demonstrate that the decision already made (to implement the Oral Approach) was correct and should be supported.

In 1962, the junior high school attached to the Japan Women's University\textsuperscript{31} became the first of ELEC's "experimental schools." These were previously existing schools where the ELEC materials were used on an experimental basis. Years later, in 1969, Yambe reported "data from the ELEC associated schools," which totaled six. Four of these had been "associated with ELEC for at least three years": Mitsukaido Junior High School (Mitsukaido City, Ibaraki Prefecture), Horobetsu Junior High School (Noboribetsu Town, Horobetsu County, Hokkaido), Asano Junior High School (private), Yokohama, and The Junior High School Attached to the Education Department of Saga University (Saga Prefecture). Nevertheless the data reported on the effectiveness of the Oral Approach, convincing though it may have been, was far from conclusive. Consisting primarily of "the percentages of the students graded A to E in each month,"\textsuperscript{32} it was rather subjective and did not allow for true comparison. It did show that in Oral Approach classes students' grades (assigned by their teachers) gradually improved, but that was not real proof of the Oral Approach's effectiveness.

Later, another Oral Approach "experiment" was conducted at a school in Toyonekko, and in 1979 ELEC published an entire book about it. It was titled \textit{Toyonekko's Class}, and describes the use of the Oral Approach in classes.\textsuperscript{33} The length of the report is impressive, and it even includes tables of statistics showing favorable results, but the research design was still not adequate to overcome threats to the study's validity. The students' improvement might have been due to Hawthorne effect or any number of intervening variables. By Richards' criteria this study would still be classified as "pseudo-research." Nevertheless, an entire book of "research" (of any kind) on the Oral Approach still had promotional value. It surely convinced at least some people of the Oral Approach's validity and encouraged its spread in Japan.
Trialability

As explained in detail in chapter three, trialability refers to the degree to which an innovation may be tried out or experimented with on a limited basis. If an innovation can be tried out in small portions, "on the installment plan," it will generally be adopted more quickly.

Unfortunately for the Oral Approach, it did not lend itself to easy trial in Japan. The main reason, of course, was the widespread inability of teachers to speak English fluently. Without such proficiency, they could not very well try out the Oral Approach on even a small-scale basis. Developing the necessary proficiency, as the existence and nature of the ELEC Summer Seminars acknowledged, was no simple task. Given other teacher-related factors, such as heavy teaching loads, and/or pressure to teach students what they needed to know to pass the English portion of the entrance examinations, Japanese teachers' opportunities for trying out the approach ELEC advocated were extremely limited.

Observability

Rogers and Shoemaker explain that "observability is the degree to which the results of an innovation are visible to others." Observability is greatest, of course, when the innovation and its consequences are tangible objects, such as fertilizer and crop yields. In the case of ELEC, the innovation was a set of principles for language teaching, and the expected results were proficiency in spoken English, which was not measured on the entrance examination questions and thus did not show up on test scores. This lack of observability certainly did not help the Oral Approach spread throughout Japan.

Status

Status, which can both impart legitimacy and attract attention to an innovation, typically refers to the new idea's association with a higher social (or, in the case of educational innovations, a higher academic) level.
Initially, when the ELEC campaign was just beginning, Fries' Oral Approach enjoyed considerable status in Japan. Although his ideas were not always understood, and had been tried only on an extremely limited basis, their preeminence in American language teaching was widely known and gave them status in Japan.

Nevertheless, in the 1960's, problems with the status of the Oral Approach developed. At this time, when ELEC was promoting Fries' Oral Approach in Japan, many of its undergirding ideas (such as structural linguistics and contrastive analysis) and the audio-lingual method with which it was associated were coming under attack in the United States. "Chomsky's attack's on the Oral Approach's foundation came at the time when the Oral Approach was just beginning to catch on in Japan." Thus, the supporting pillars of the Oral Approach were knocked out from under it, and many Japanese teachers lost confidence in the Oral Approach.

Practicality

Whether the demands of an innovation can be met by the intended user system is a critical implementation factor. Unfortunately, as the sections on capacities and teacher factors later in this chapter describe, the demands of the Oral Approach were heavy given the lack of training and limited English proficiency of most Japanese English teachers in the 1950's and 1960's. Furthermore, suffering under heavy teaching loads, they had very little time or inclination to meet the demands of implementing a new, orally based teaching method in their classrooms. In these respects, the use of the Oral Approach in Japan's schools in those days would have been decidedly unpractical.

Of course, ELEC also realized this all-too-obvious problem and set about trying to remedy it by providing summer seminars for re-training English teachers in Japan and giving them the oral proficiency they needed to teach using Fries' Oral approach. Nevertheless, given the large number of teachers (also discussed later in this chapter) this retraining effort was also far from practical.
Flexibility/Adaptability

Whether an innovation is adjustable to fit a particular teaching situation is an important factor influencing its adoption and implementation. When the idea is flexible, the implementation process can involve adaptation to make the innovation fit the local situation better. If the idea is both inflexible and (due to socio-cultural and other differences between the originator system and the user system) incompatible with the target situation, the result can be disastrous for the implementation effort.

The flexibility of Fries' Oral Approach is difficult to judge. In one sense, because it consisted of broad principles rather than particular applications, the Oral Approach could be considered quite adaptable, within the limits established by the principles.

In 1958, shortly after ELEC started, this flexibility was put to the test when the Ministry of Education announced new guidelines for English textbooks. Although books were published privately, they had to be approved by the Monbusho. Thus, the ELEC leaders realized that their textbooks would have to satisfy the new requirements in order to be authorized for use in secondary schools.37 Fearing the worst, they notified Fries of the new guidelines. He had been preparing a "corpus" upon which the ELEC textbooks would be based, and they were afraid that it would have to be re-done and the project started afresh. To their relief Fries replied,

I have gone over the revised syllabus from the Ministry and have been rather pleased with the content there given in detail. I believe the basic "corpus" as it was planned will cover quite satisfactorily the materials which are suggested and the reading selections which were planned for inclusion in Book I and for further development in Book II as well as those for Book III, would satisfy the most critical of the Board of Examiners for the Ministry.38

The Oral Approach was also flexible in another sense. Fries and his colleagues believed strongly that a special set of "separate and differing" materials had to be developed for each teaching situation which involved English learners from a different linguistic background.39 Thus, in Michigan they produced one textbook series for Spanish speakers learning English and another set of books for Chinese speakers. In Japan, the English-teaching books they produced were designed particularly for Japanese speakers. In this way, they demonstrated adaptability, at least in reference to the linguistic situation.
On the other hand, any attempt to modify the basic principles of the Oral Approach met with stiff resistance from Charles Fries. They were not flexible and were not to be compromised. For example, when attempts were made to modify the approach's heavy dependence on oral practice to make it more compatible with Japanese students' goals in studying English, Fries reiterated,

The final goal of the learner may be the full control of English for speaking and understanding spoken English in meetings, or in college and university classes. Or the learner's final goal may be the limited one of reading scientific books and articles. Or his final goal may be the reading of English literature with real understanding. Or his final goal may be merely the passing of an examination for a university,—an examination in which translation is the only requirement. No matter what the final goal of the person who starts to learn English, I believe we can now demonstrate that what we have called the "oral approach" is the most efficient, the most time-saving way to begin the study of English.40

Primacy

As noted in chapter three, "being first" often carries great weight in human affairs, and in tradition-bound, conservative Japan, primacy seems to have been especially important. For instance, Dutch studies took precedence over the study of English for many years, long after the usefulness of Dutch had declined, simply because the Dutch influence had become established in Japan, and institutions and scholars specializing in Dutch studies resisted any change to English. Of course, as explained in chapter four, when the need to switch to English finally became extreme the change was made rather quickly. The point here is that such a change was resisted for so long by so many.

Respecting language-teaching methodology in Japan, primacy has also been extremely influential. Japanese teachers of foreign languages still cling to methods developed over one thousand years ago for studying Chinese as a foreign language. When Harold Palmer went to Japan early in the twentieth century, he found such pedagogical traditions to be major obstacles. Nevertheless, as the first English language teaching expert of any stature to visit Japan, Palmer also enjoyed the advantage of primacy. That factor, among others, made his influence on Japanese ELT especially strong. Also worthy of note is the fact that "in many ways" Palmer's Oral Method was
similar to Fries' Oral Approach. Thus, Fries was not only second, but also perceived by many to be an "imitator" rather than an original.

Although the effects of Palmer's work nearly disappeared during the war years, they began to re-appear once the learning of English again became popular in Japan. In fact, followers of Palmer's Oral Method came to constitute an obstacle to the implementation of Fries' Oral Approach in Japan.

At the close of the first ELEC Specialists' Conference, when the ELEC campaign was just getting started, McLean rejoiced, "Fries and Twaddell so impressed the Japanese that Palmer and Hornby were overshadowed completely. In the process the British and Palmer have, I feel, been reasonably well eliminated as ghosts, which greatly simplifies matters and clears the road for progress." Unfortunately, as later events evidenced, his joy was premature. Yambe, for one, found that as he tried to spread the Oral Approach, "there was a strong tendency among the conservative school of teachers either to stick to the old grammar-translation method or to be loyal to and defend Palmer's oral method against the oral approach."

Form

Form proved to be critical in the ELEC effort and would seem to be important in other language teaching reform campaigns also.

In support of his contention that the "form of the method proposal" is a decisive factor in determining its spread, Richards mentions the failures of The Silent Way and the Direct Method, instructional philosophies which do not utilize textbooks. In contrast, as an example of success, he uses the case of Fries's Oral Approach materials in the United States.

Fries himself always emphasized the preeminence of materials, although not for implementation reasons. Time and again, he stressed the point that, to ensure effective language learning, methods were not as important as the use of materials developed through the use of linguistics. Consequently, the "Michigan method" was highly dependent on the carefully prepared "Michigan materials." In the United States, as Michigan's reputation in language teaching spread, the early "rainbow" series (red, green,
yellow, and blue) books by Fries and Lado were circulated widely, and they helped spread the doctrine of the Oral Approach through the country.

Robinett, one of Fries' graduate students at Michigan and an instructor in the early English Language Institute there, notes that the program consisted of much more than the textbook materials. "It was clear to Fries that learning a language was not just something that happened in the classroom; the learning process had to go beyond the classroom into the use of language in real-life communicative situations" [italics in original].46 As a result, he set up an "English House," and the experiences ELI students at the University of Michigan had there were very important to their learning and the Institute's success. Nevertheless, evidencing the importance of form to diffusion, in most cases only what appeared in print was exported and adopted at other institutions.

Later, other language-teaching books based on principles similar to Fries' Oral Approach and the ASTP program materials were also published, and they contributed to the dominance of the audio-lingual method in American foreign language teaching for so many years.

In Japan, the story was quite different. Some of Fries' early disciples tried to use the Michigan books, but they soon found that they didn't work too well. The reason given for this problem was that the books had been designed for speakers of Spanish. Thus, in those days when contrastive analysis reigned supreme, it seemed essential to have English books designed specifically for Japanese speakers. For this reason, one of the major purposes of ELEC was to produce special Oral Approach materials for teaching English to the Japanese.

After many years of careful and laborious production, the books were eventually published. If things were really as simple as "publish or perish," then the appearance of these books in print would have ensured the spread of Fries' Oral Approach in Japan. Nevertheless, implementation was not so simple, and another complicating factor, which will be discussed below under "structure," entered in.
Characteristics of the ELEC Resource System

Besides the characteristics of the innovation itself, various characteristics of the ELEC resource system were of critical importance.

Capacity

*Capacity* refers to the resource system's "capability to retrieve and marshall diverse resources." With Rockefeller funding, the English Language Exploratory Committee was able to do things which few other ELT-oriented organizations in Japan could accomplish in the 1950's. Primary among ELEC's resources were the native-speakers of English whom ELEC (with its resources in U.S. dollars) was able to recruit and bring to Japan. Many of them were instructors in its summer program and later in its year-round English Language Institute. Most notable among these expatriates, however, were the authoritative experts such as Charles C. Fries, W. Freeman Twaddell, A. S. Hornby, and others. Their authority and ideas played an important role in the ELEC campaign to reform English teaching in Japan.

As Richards explains, appealing to authority is a common alternative to showing relative advantage through research. There are two types of authorities to which reference can be made: popular theoretical constructs and recognized authorities in the field. Although it encountered difficulties in many other areas the Oral Approach enjoyed considerable capacity in terms of popular ideas and recognized experts.

Popular Theoretical Constructs

Regarding the first type of authority, Richards explains, "Methods are promoted and justified through reference to intuitively appealing assertions and theories." The Oral Approach rested on three of these: structural linguistics, behaviorism, and efficiency.

One of the foundations of the Oral Approach was structural linguistics, the new, "scientific study of language." Of course, in the 1940's and 50's, anything that was "scientific" was viewed as being unquestionably good. Nowadays, being scientific might
not carry so much weight. We are a little more skeptical of science's ability to save us, but at the time Fries's Oral Approach was being promoted, "scientific" was a very appealing term.

Of course, this "scientific" foundation was not merely concocted for promotional purposes. The Oral Approach materials were indeed based on a careful, analytical, scholarly study of language. As noted earlier, this was one of Fries' great achievements: the application of linguistic science to language pedagogy.

Another theoretical construct which promoted the Oral Approach was its compliance with the learning theory zeitgeist of the day, behaviorism. Fries frequently mentioned the building of automatic habits, though a careful reading reveals that he was not nearly as mechanistic as many scholars in his day were. (Peter Fries has recently defended his father's "non-mechanical" view of human behavior. Still, Fries largely conformed to the then popular theories of learning, and that was a "plus" for his Oral Approach in those days. Later, of course, as learning theories changed and behaviorism fell into disfavor among language teachers, the Oral's Approach's association with it became a liability.

Another important aspect of the Oral Approach was its efficiency, a widely attractive idea. Americans have long considered efficiency to be a desirable characteristic. In the early part of this century, "scientific management" was an exciting new field of study, and efficiency experts were highly paid professionals. They were hired, for example, to go to factories and observe the motions of workers and see how their behavior could be improved and production increased.

In an attempt to make education more efficient, scientific management procedures were also applied to school operations. This went on for many years until educators finally reacted against the "cult of efficiency." Efficiency still remained a widely regarded virtue, however, and as Fries and his colleagues in the United States promoted the Oral Approach they referred to this quality. Lado calculated,

In pattern practice, the student produces a sentence after each cue at normal conversational speed. A class may produce 20 to 30 different sentences per minute following as many cues supplied by the teacher. This represents 1,000 to 1,500 recitations in a fifty-minute class. Compare this with a grammar-translation class where each student takes one minute to give his part of the translation. This gives only 50 recitations compared with 1,000. With group recitation in pattern practice,
the number of student responses in a class of 10 students would be 10 times 1,000 or 10,000.\textsuperscript{51}

In post-war Japan, a nation trying to rebuild its industries and businesses, efficiency was a popular concept. In this environment, Fries and his supporters wisely proclaimed the efficiency of the Oral Approach as one of its virtues. Fries called the Oral Approach "the most efficient, the most time-saving way to begin the study of English."\textsuperscript{52}

In his efforts to promote the Oral Approach, Yambe asserted that it provided "a maximum amount of oral practice within a minimum of time"\textsuperscript{53} and was, therefore, "the most efficient teaching technique that has ever been devised."\textsuperscript{54}

Recognized Authorities

Besides referring to \textit{what} is professionally popular, method promoters also frequently refer to \textit{who} is professionally popular. The support of recognized authorities for a new learning theory can be its lifeblood. As Richards says, when assertions are "repeated by those in positions of authority, [they] assume the status of dogma."\textsuperscript{55} In the shadow of sufficient authority of this sort, people may not even notice that an innovation's research support is shoddy or absent.

In this respect also, the Oral Approach did very well in Japan. The Japanese members of ELEC were powerful and important people whose authority lent credibility to the ELEC campaign. The foreign experts—Fries, Twaddell, and Hornby—served a similar purpose. It was anticipated that the weight of all these prominent figures would help ELEC achieve its goal of revolutionizing ELT in Japan.

Gaining the support of prestigious authorities was at least one major purpose of the first ELEC Specialists' Conference. In his post-conference report to John D. Rockefeller 3rd, Donald McLean rejoiced that this purpose had been achieved. He triumphally noted: "The Japanese participants in the conference included the outstanding men in the field in this country. It also had a representative from the Ministry of Education....Fries and Twaddell were enthusiastically received by \textit{all} [italics in original] as men of professional distinction."\textsuperscript{56}

Although it might have been a relief, the fact that Fries was well received in Japan should have come as no surprise. In his day, Fries was recognized as the greatest
authority in American applied linguistics. Rockefeller personnel recommended him to ELEC as "the outstanding man in the United States on the teaching of English as a foreign language."\textsuperscript{57} As explained in chapter two, this recommendation came only after Rockefeller personnel had done a considerable amount of searching and checking. Without question, their effort paid off. Involving Fries in the ELEC effort was definitely a wise step. His presence in Japan lent weight to the ELEC cause. In addition to Fries, the other ELEC experts, such as Hornby and Twaddel, were also seen as "giants" by the Japanese. Among English teachers in Japan, these three men were regarded as "kings."\textsuperscript{58} Their involvement in ELEC's activities was widely publicized\textsuperscript{59} and lent great credibility to its campaign to revolutionize English teaching in Japan.

Fries' lecture tours throughout Japan were designed to have a similar effect. Given his professional stature, Fries' Oral Approach did not have to rely on others for its support. He himself could function as its validating authority. As he traveled the length and breadth of Japan, teachers in all parts of the country could see and hear the authority first hand, and they flocked to his lectures.

Although in the course of the ELEC campaign many errors were made, the use of "authority figures" to bolster the reform effort was definitely something that ELEC did right. This aspect of the ELEC campaign can serve as a model for other reform efforts.

ELEC continued to use authority-based implementation strategies for many years. In the early 1960's, when it was becoming apparent that ELEC would not achieve the goal of revolutionizing English language teaching in Japan, John D. Rockefeller 3rd, himself, employed such a strategy in a final attempt to overcome the obstacles ELEC faced. As if the authorities ELEC had relied on to this point had not been powerful enough to counter the forces which opposed its campaign, Rockefeller went straight to the top and contacted the Prime Minister, Mayato Ikeda, hoping to gain his support for the ELEC movement. In a follow-up note to Ikeda, Rockefeller wrote, "As to the English language matter which we discussed (ELEC),...it would be most helpful to us to know if the program has the backing of yourself and your Government."\textsuperscript{60} The response of the prime minister, if there was one, is not available. However, this interchange demonstrates (1) the extent to which Rockefeller was personally concerned with ELEC's
campaign, (2) his reliance on authority-based strategies, and (3) the lengths to which he was willing to go in order to use this strategy in support of ELEC.

ELEC's problems, in spite of its use of powerful authorities, also demonstrated that this factor alone is not sufficient to bring about change.

Structure

Regarding the resource system, *structure* has many meanings. It can refer to division of labor and coordination of efforts as well as to the resource system's view of and relationships with the user system. In another sense, *structure* refers to the resource system's ability to plan and carry out diffusion and implementation activities in a structured sequence.

In most of these respects, the ELEC effort was deficient. ELEC was organized rather loosely as a committee, and it was never absolutely clear whether the head was in Japan or in the United States. Officially, of course, it was a Japanese organization but it relied heavily on U.S. financial support and thus took direction from the (Rockefeller supported) Japan Society, Council on Economic and Cultural Affairs, Agricultural Development Council (which replaced CECA), and John D. Rockefeller 3rd Fund.

As has already been noted, the ELEC campaign also suffered from the belief that it would be sufficient to provide a "better mouse trap" and let things take their natural course. Careful planning for implementation of the Oral Approach was not carried out until more than five years after the campaign commenced.

Another major error was made relative to the publication of ELEC's *New Approach* textbooks. The result was a severe handicap in ELEC's ability to spread the Oral Approach gospel throughout Japan. Although this problem severely damaged the ELEC campaign, ELEC's textbook publishing experience can still be helpful to others, for it teaches an important lesson: In the secret life of a method, to publish or not to publish a textbook is not the only question. There's more to it than that. A very important consideration is *who* publishes it. The publishing house becomes part of the resource system, and the structure and strength of its diffusion network is a critical implementation factor.
The ELEC experience in this regard also illustrates how things which are not normally within the scope of scholars' concern are still fundamental to the achievement of their objectives. The choice of a publisher was certainly not Fries' responsibility. It was one of those things that was "beneath him." In fact, it doesn't seem to have been a concern of any of the high-level ELEC leaders. Who actually made the arrangements regarding the publisher of the New Approach textbooks remains a mystery.

Unfortunately, whoever it was "did not know that the choice of publisher was so important." Apparently, the simple "better mousetrap" philosophy prevailed in ELEC circles. Shigeharu Matsumoto, one of the leaders of ELEC reported, "We thought better textbooks would sell better." Unfortunately, as subsequent events illustrated, that was a mistaken assumption.

Because of his experience and previous involvement in textbook publication, Fries very realistically foresaw opposition to ELEC's New Approach books when they entered the textbook market. He warned:

All new materials for teaching English as a foreign language will meet opposition—opposition that is most likely to be very bitter and to stimulate many detractions and criticisms, some published and many whispered, that are unfair and false. Every adoption of a new text displaces one or more texts out of which someone is making a living, often one who needs this increment to support his family. At the very least, it takes away the potential market for another's textbooks.

Nevertheless, Fries did not grasp the complete nature of the situation in Japan. His advice was that "to be successful against the inevitable opposition in Japan the textbooks built up must be convincingly the work of the Japanese [italics in original]." Although this advice was good, it was still insufficient. The textbooks which the combined American and Japanese team produced for ELEC still failed to penetrate the Japanese market.

Years later, and wiser for the experience, those who worked on the production and publication of ELEC's textbooks acknowledged, "We made a mistake in selecting the publisher." The sad lesson, learned the hard way, was that during and after the Occupation, textbook publishing had become a "lucrative enterprise." By the time the ELEC books appeared in print, publishers of the old texts were "well entrenched." Not only that, these publishers also went to great lengths to maintain strong relationships with
teachers and the other people in charge of choosing textbooks. "At textbook selection
time, the publishers would send their representatives around the country, inviting teachers
to parties, and getting them obligated. Then they would 'choose' the textbooks."68 In
this situation, the sale of textbooks depended not only on the quality of the books
themselves but also to a large extent on a "publisher's connections and influence."69
Thus, for a textbook to succeed (that is, to sell well), the "publisher must have sales
agents all over Japan" and "these agents must have good relationships with the people
who choose textbooks for the various prefectures and city wards."70

Unfortunately, the original publisher of ELEC's textbooks (Taishukan) specialized
in linguistics, not secondary school English,71 and thus didn't have the proper
connections. As one experienced Japanese professor put it, "The publisher of the ELEC
books didn't have such good salesmen."72 Regarding the parties publishers put on for
the educators who selected textbooks, Kleinjans noted, "Taishukan didn't have the
resources to do that."73 In sum, they were not successful in making inroads against the
major English textbook publishers who had already established the right connections.
ELEC later switched to another publisher (Gakken) but that did not remedy the problem,
perhaps because it came too late and because other difficulties, such as most Japanese
teachers' inability to speak English, created additional obstacles to the books' acceptance.
Eventually, publication of ELEC's New Approach to English textbooks was
discontinued. Given the amount of time, effort, and money that had gone into producing
the books, this outcome was, to say the very least, disappointing. In retrospect, it is
possible to see that an awareness of the importance of the structural capacities of
publishers could have resulted in a happier ending to this episode in the ELEC story.

It should be mentioned, however, that publications by ELEC were not limited to the
New Approach texts. In addition to the ELEC Bulletin, ELEC published an impressive
collection of books and pamphlets including...

Addresses and Papers at the Specialists' Conference (Kenkyusha, 1957)
Lectures by C. C. Fries and W. F. Twaddell (Kenkyusha, 1958)
"On the Oral Approach" (pamphlet) (Taishukan, 1959)
ELEC Publications, Vol III. (Kenkyusha, 1959)
ELEC Publications, Vol. IV. (Kenkyusha, 1960)
Although their influence was limited primarily to scholars, these publications helped spread the doctrine of the Oral Approach throughout Japan (and the world).

Openness

Openness is similar to flexibility (discussed above in relation to the Oral Approach itself) but instead of being concerned with the innovation it refers to the resource system (in this case, ELEC) which promotes the innovation. As previously stated, openness refers to "a willingness to help and a willingness to listen [italics in original] and to be influenced by user needs and aspirations." This definition actually encompasses two major characteristics, each of which will be discussed separately.

There can be little question about ELEC's willingness to help reform the ELT system in Japan and bring about more effective teaching of oral English. Whatever his reasons might have been (political, commercial, or philanthropic) John D. Rockefeller 3rd demonstrated the extent of his concern for the teaching of oral English in Japan most convincingly, by providing large sums of money for the ELEC project. Though not so well endowed financially, ELEC's other supporters were equally willing to help. Some formed ELEC's financial support network. Others dedicated their professional careers to the ELEC campaign.

The second aspect of openness, willingness to listen, was also a characteristic of ELEC, but only during the first stages of its campaign. While there never seemed to be much doubt that a problem with the teaching of oral English in Japan existed, no preconceived solutions to it were promoted, at least not until the 1956 Specialists' Conference. Instead, ELEC personnel contacted experts (both Japanese and American) for advice on how to proceed. One purpose of the Specialists' Conference was to provide a forum where the opinions of experts on the subject of English language teaching and their solutions to the Japanese "problem" could be presented and discussed openly before arriving at a solution.
As time went on, however, ELEC's course became more and more set and rigid. The "Conclusions and Recommendations" arrived at during the Specialists' Conference formed ELEC's "backbone" for years to come, and Fries' Oral Approach became the ELEC method. From this point on, less and less flexibility was demonstrated. A great deal of effort was expended to implement ELEC's solution (through training teachers at summer seminars; publishing books, pamphlets, and a journal; etc.) and relatively little was dedicated to trying to determine if the Oral Approach really was the best solution.

It is also worth noting that the input provided to ELEC regarding the solution to Japanese problems in this area came primarily from high-level experts. Had the ELEC leaders consulted with regular classroom teachers of English regarding their needs and ideas instead of (or in addition to) conducting a conference of and for specialists, they might have arrived at a more comprehensive understanding of the problems Japanese English teachers faced. They might have even pursued a different "solution."

Nevertheless, immediately after the Specialists' Conference, the Oral Approach was chosen, and ELEC promoted it unstintingly from that point on.

ELEC's lack of openness in this regard is best illustrated by Fries' intransigence in response to comments regarding Japanese entrance examinations in English. Regardless of the fact that learner needs varied, the solution was always the same: "No matter what the final goal of the person who starts to learn English,...the 'oral approach' is the most efficient, the most time-saving way to begin the study of English." 76

It would not be correct, however, to conclude that ELEC was an organization with no flexibility. "User needs and aspirations" were taken into account by at least some individuals, who made suggestions for adapting the Oral Approach to be more consistent with a Japanese style of learning. Yambe, for instance, noted that "mere imitation of the type of classes given at the [English Language] Institute [at the University of Michigan] does not necessarily work in Japanese schools." 77 Nevertheless, rather than abandon the Oral Approach as many critics advocated, he countered,

It seems that many people do not realize that the oral approach...consists of a set of fundamental principles and techniques to be followed in making language teaching efficient. Neither do they realize that the type of classes given at the English Language Institute, University of Michigan, is only a particular type of the oral approach designed for teaching a particular group of students with a particular
native language background placed under particular circumstances and not the only type of the oral approach [italics in original].

Yambe then went on to outline his ideas for creating "a new Japanese type of the Oral Approach." This attempt to modify the pre-packaged Oral Approach to better fit the Japanese setting demonstrates both the Oral Approach's flexibility and ELEC's openness.

Harmony

Another important characteristic of an effective resource system is harmony. Of course, in any project that involves various individuals working together minor differences and disagreements, which require negotiation and compromise, are normal. ELEC was no exception to this rule. There were occasional disagreements among the teachers, their trainers, and the materials producers about the form Oral Approach principles would take at the level of technique and procedure in the Japanese setting.

Unfortunately, in one important case, disharmony went considerably beyond this normal level. Serious "conflicts" developed between Fries and Twaddell, and their disagreements became so severe as to threaten to destroy the ELEC campaign. As Fries' wife put it, "It got nasty at the end."

Twaddell was a professor at Brown University, but he and Fries worked together at Michigan for several summers prior to becoming involved in ELEC. Evidence that they worked together well comes from the fact that Fries himself recommended Twaddell to fill the second American expert position at the 1956 Specialists' Conference.

In the course of the year 1957, however, conflicts between the two men started and grew increasingly worse. Twaddell wrote disparagingly of Fries in a letter to Donald McLean about Fries' refusal to hold the first Summer Seminar at International Christian University. Nevertheless, by dividing up the work so that each could operate in his separate domain (Fries headed up the materials production work and Twaddell conducted the Summer Seminars), the two men managed to work together reasonably successfully.

The disharmony between Fries and Twaddell only increased, however, and by 1958, their disagreement had reached crisis proportions. In early January, Don McLean arranged a special meeting between Fries and Twaddel at Dearborn, Michigan, but it
failed to defuse the situation. In his correspondence with others, Twaddell's remarks about Fries became insulting, and Fries' communications with Twaddell, although always gentlemanly, grew increasingly icy.

Apparently resentful of Fries' attempts to control the entire ELEC effort, Twaddell accused him of various faults, from a "Michigan üüber alles" fixation to a lack of awareness of how the ELEC work was really being done or who was actually doing it for him. Fries responded imperiously, "Please remember that we have at the ELI been producing and revising materials for the teaching of English as a foreign language for a number of very different linguistic and cultural backgrounds for 17 years."

The possible reasons for this conflict between Fries and Twaddell were many. First of all, there were fundamental differences in their teaching principles. Fries emphasized the importance of materials, while Twaddell considered methods to be primary. Furthermore, Fries and Twaddell came from fundamentally different schools of linguistics. Kleinjans explained, "The Twaddell-Fries conflict was not merely a conflict of personalities but of paradigms." In addition, both men seemed to be dangerously over-extended in their work (in the United States, in Japan, and elsewhere around the globe) and after working feverishly to meet ELEC deadlines, both were becoming over-tired and irritable. Also, on the part of each of the two experts, there seemed to be a fear that the other was trying to control him, and that led to defensiveness and resentment. In addition, as the ELEC operation developed it became apparent that Fries and Twaddell differed on a fundamental point—the extent to which ELEC operations should involve the Japanese.

This last reason was the one most often given by Fries to explain the schism. To McLean, he explained, "The conflicts which presently exist between Professor Twaddell and me seem to me to stem from fundamentally different beliefs concerning the kind of consideration to be given the native professors and teachers." Fries had always insisted that a dominant role be reserved for the Japanese in ELEC projects, lest ELEC be perceived as a foreign enterprise and thus engender undesirable resistance. He accused Twaddell of making increasing demands for greater American involvement in the Summer Seminars, up to "three full professors and at least three juniors." Although he claimed to have yielded to these demands "against my belief as to what would be really best for the
success of the project," Fries insisted that the Americans should work only "as technical consultants and co-workers."86

Nevertheless, Fries considered himself to be the exception to this rule. He even complained that although it had been announced that he was "chairman" and "in charge" his proposals had been "brushed aside" as "something irrelevant."87 Fries also charged Twaddell with violating clearly marked channels of communication,88 failing to complete assignments given to him and with encouraging others to ignore Fries' directions.89

All of this was personally upsetting to Fries and counter-productive in terms of ELEC's progress. To other ELEC workers, he confessed: "This break has grieved me more than anyone can ever know."90 "Never in my life have I faced anything like the suspicion and insinuations concerning motives that have increasingly characterized Freeman's conduct toward me."91 "I have struggled hard against such a break and, during the last four months, have devoted much of my working time (and many of the hours I should have been sleeping) to efforts to understand the causes of the attitude which he was developing, and to discover some way of relieving the tension."92

In light of these problems, Fries finally concluded, "I believe that for Freeman and me both to go to Japan to work together on this project would be most unwise. I believe that a blow-up there of some sort would be inevitable and that that would be the worst possible thing for the whole project."93 Regarding the materials development work, his ultimatum was,

Either the Japanese are to do the textbooks, with us as technical consultants and co-workers in that capacity or we shall be doing them and handing them over completed for their use. I myself can have no part in the latter procedure for it will not only jeopardize this enterprise but it will endanger the advisory work I've been doing in several other countries.94

He closed on a noble note: "I have not and do not intend to develop on my part a corresponding attitude of hostility. The important matter in all of this is the ultimate success of the project as a whole."95

A few days later, calling the task "one of the hardest things I've had to do in my life," Fries wrote directly to Twaddell, explaining that his efforts to "push the plans and activities in a direction entirely contrary to [Fries'] fundamental beliefs concerning international cooperation" made "a break" necessary. Fries pointed out that his and
Twaddell's approaches were "irreconcilable" and then, hoping that "the separation [could] be accomplished without personal animus and without any damage to any person or to the project as a whole," delivered the ultimatum: "If I am to continue I must ask you to withdraw."96

When the news of the break between Fries and Twaddell reached ELEC headquarters in Japan, the effect was devastating. After they got over the shock, the ELEC leaders responded that Twaddell's resignation would create great difficulties for the program and refused to accept it. Of course, they wanted Fries to continue also. In a telegram, they insisted that both "Professors Fries and Twaddell must participate ELEC activities in Japan this spring and summer as already nationally publicized or else ELEC future substantially jeopardized [sic]."97 Nevertheless, fearing the inevitability of an open confrontation between the two and the damage which it could cause, but "in order to assure ELEC's future,"98 they proposed a solution in which Fries and Twaddell could make "separate but complementary" contributions at different times.

The "separate but complementary" solution proved to be acceptable. Despite his own "decision to withdraw" in June,99 Fries left for Japan on April 21 and worked on the materials until June 10, leaving just before Twaddell arrived to conduct the 1958 Summer Seminar.100 In this way, the 1958 program met with success.101

The ELEC leaders had skillfully managed to avoid a disastrous, open confrontation between Fries and Twaddell, while maintaining the continuity of the project. Unwilling to trust their luck a second time around, however, they began reducing ELEC's dependence on both Fries and Twaddell. As they made plans for the future,

It was agreed that Professor Fries would have no hand in...these ventures but that he would be asked to prepare a corpus for the third-year material...provided this could be accomplished by the end of 1958. It was also agreed that in the future there would be no ranking American professor but that the American professors would be serving as consultants.102

Fries had already expressed his intention to withdraw after June, but he agreed to work on the materials as requested, although he did not complete them until the next year, 1959, the last year he would travel to Japan under the auspices of ELEC.

"Professor Twaddell expressed doubt as to whether it would be possible for him to be available next summer and fall. He said this would depend upon circumstances at
Brown after he returned having been away at Princeton for a year." According to one report, he was "extremely tired," but it was hoped that he might be persuaded to rejoin the ELEC effort later. Nevertheless, this hope never materialized.

From this point on, with both Fries and Twaddell effectively out of the picture, other, "junior" workers, such as Everett Kleinjans, were asked to take over. ELEC had weathered the storm of disharmony, but not without damage. Two of its key authority figures had been lost, and without their vision ELEC began to slide from its revolutionary role toward becoming a more conventional English language school.

Aside from the Twaddell-Fries conflict and other minor methodological quarrels, there were other sources of disharmony within the ELEC resource system. Although they were not so serious as to threaten ELEC's immediate future, in the long run they had a telling effect which contributed to ELEC's decline as a force for reforming English teaching in Japan.

At first, the hope that ELEC would play a revolutionary role in Japanese ELT was shared by virtually all ELEC workers, Japanese and American. Nevertheless, with the passage of time, other concerns grew in importance and divided ELEC's managers. Afraid that, following the historical pattern, the Americans would soon depart and leave the Japanese "holding the bag," at least some of ELEC's Japanese leaders began worrying about long-term stability and profitability.

The American funding agencies continued to be interested in research, innovation, and reform. In addition, most of the American teachers had only a short-term commitment to ELEC anyway, and never saw their work in Japan as a lifelong career. Following the American pattern, most of them would eventually use their ELEC experience as a stepping stone to a better position somewhere else.

In contrast, but in accordance with the typical Japanese corporate management and employment pattern, the Japanese leaders of ELEC took a longer range view. Yambe, for one, became concerned about how ELEC would assure continuity for its employees. Others pressed for incorporation, an ELEC building, and a year-round, money-making English Language Institute.

As explained in chapter three, the fears that American funding would eventually be withdrawn turned out to be justified. After 1968, ELEC received no further funding
from the Rockefeller or Ford Foundations. Nevertheless, from another point of view, the Japanese leaders' apprehensions had been self-fulfilling prophecies. As ELEC moved more and more toward scalability, it became less and less the kind of organization that the American foundations were interested in supporting. When ELEC finally became little more than just another commercial English conversation school, its U.S. benefactors saw no reason to continue their support.

**Characteristics of the Japanese ELT User System**

"The dynamic ecology of another cultural situation" is always complex. Nevertheless, an understanding of the target culture's political, social, economic, philosophical, and geographical dimensions is crucial to any attempt to bring about directed contact change across cultural boundaries. Because these many inter-related elements can vary dramatically from one setting to another, "what worked back home" may not produce the same effect in another cultural setting.

Consequently, various characteristics of the intended users of the Oral Approach (that is, Japanese teachers and students of English), such as their norms, values, capacities, and motivations, were of critical importance to ELEC's campaign. They helped determine the direction it would take and many of its eventual successes and failures. Nevertheless, in many respects, the ELEC leaders were unaware of or ignored these factors. As a result, the campaign suffered accordingly.

It is probably not fair, however, to fault the ELEC personnel for not paying attention to many of these factors. Although those in charge of planning ELEC's reform movement could have (and should have) been aware of some of the characteristics of the Japanese socio-cultural-educational system, many others did not come to the attention of experts on Japanese society until long after the ELEC campaign started.

Ignorance is no protection, of course, and whether or not the people in charge were aware of them, these factors influenced ELEC's efforts to reform ELT in Japan. As the following sections will illustrate, many of these factors are understood much better today. An understanding of the role they played relative to ELEC's reform movement reveals their importance to would-be ELT revolutionaries in Japan today.
Antecedents

All of chapter four is devoted to a discussion of the historical antecedents to the ELT situation which Fries and other ELEC reformers encountered in Japan in 1956. An additional section will not be devoted to discussing those antecedents again here, although (as they are relevant) many of them will be mentioned in sections that follow. It should be noted, however, that antecedent factors were generally ignored by the ELEC reformers—in spite of Bryant's emphasis on them in his 1955, pre-ELEC report to the Japan Society.

This is not to say that ELEC personnel never made reference to the historical antecedents of the situation they were trying to reform. At the Specialists' Conference, for instance, Sanki Ichikawa spoke of the "tradition and influence of Chinese studies" in Japan. Nevertheless, such an awareness was apparently not very widespread among the ELEC workers—especially the American ones—and any influence it may have had on the ELEC materials was not noticeable. If the ELEC "revolutionaries" took antecedent factors into account at all, they viewed them primarily as "enemies" to be defeated rather than as characteristics of the Japanese setting which might require some adaptation in the Oral Approach doctrine ELEC promoted or with and through which ELEC might operate.

Geographic Position

One of the most prominent characteristics of Japan is its location. An island nation with strong natural boundaries, just off the far edge of Asia (from Europe's perspective) and an ocean away from America, Japan has had relatively few contacts with foreigners in the course of its history. Japan was the last nation the Portuguese explorers discovered in their ventures around Africa and throughout southern and eastern Asia. Furthermore, even after contact with the western world was made, during the Tokugawa era Japan was officially closed to foreigners for hundreds of years. Although Japan eventually did open its doors to the world, the effects of its long isolation were still strong. Respecting language, for instance, insular Japan has been "thoroughly monolingual from time
immemorial."  Even today it remains one of the most ethnically, culturally, and linguistically homogeneous countries in the world.

A natural consequence of Japan’s insularity and linguistic homogeneity has been the need to learn foreign languages in order to communicate with the rest of the world. As Suzuki explains, in modern times, "Our insularity has made it almost imperative for us to study English in order to communicate with other nations." 109

Another outcome of Japan’s location and history of isolation has been that when the Japanese have studied foreign languages they have most often placed emphasis on reading rather than speaking skills. In light of the fact that face-to-face contact with foreigners has been rare and the most important purpose of foreign language study has been to learn from the outside world, such an approach has been most practical. As Ichikawa explained at the ELEC Specialists' Conference,

A university graduate, after taking up employment, does find it necessary to read English, but seldom has an opportunity of associating with foreigners. So if he has had lessons at school in speaking English, his English will soon get rusty, since no opportunity arises after his graduation to speak it. Thus the opinion gains ground that to drill the students in speaking and writing English at school is but a waste of energy and that we ought rather to encourage the reading of books instead [italics in original]. 110

Fries and others blasted away at this argument, repeatedly stating that even if a reading knowledge were the only goal of language learning the Oral Approach would still be the best way to arrive at it, but—for this historical/geographical isolation reason, as well as a number of others discussed in later sections of this chapter—they were never able to overcome the Japanese resistance to speaking English.

Socio-Cultural and School System Factors

A number of characteristics of the Japanese social, cultural, economic, and school systems proved decisive in the ELEC campaign. Although in some cases they overlap with the learner and teacher factors to be discussed in separate sections later in this chapter, as general system factors they also warrant discussion here.
Norms and Values

The ELEC experience illustrates several reasons why the norms and values of a socio-cultural system are important for the implementers of educational innovations to understand.

First, when they are aware of these norms and values, which to a considerable extent determine the behavior of students, reformers can choose educational innovations appropriately, or at least adjust the innovation to fit the setting. The result may be both greater ease in implementing change as well as change that is more lasting and effective.

On the other hand, failure to consider certain social norms and values when selecting and/or adapting methods and materials, can lead to the promotion of classroom procedures which are resisted because they create discomfort rather than successful learning among Japanese students.

For instance, in Japan, group orientation is strong and maintaining group harmony is an important social goal. Nevertheless, some methodological procedures in the Oral Approach (such as pattern practice) required individual oral responses, which—because of Japanese social norms—could be threatening and embarrassing to Japanese students. Consequently, as will be discussed later in this chapter (under "learner factors"), such procedures were not welcomed in Japanese classrooms.

In contrast, "equipped with a better understanding of the basic cultural patterns that make Japanese students behave in ways they do, the EFL teacher can guide them toward successful learning experiences." As LaForge notes, "Cultural mechanisms are a valuable means, if coupled with a pertinent methodology, for removing affective blocks to learning. A form of learning close to their social milieu could provide Japanese students a supportive learning experience..."

Another reason for being aware of system norms and values is that they not only influence students' classroom behavior but also affect the course of the implementation effort. To use a nautical analogy, it is important to realize where "the wind that fills the sails" comes from and what direction it is blowing. In short, system norms and values can promote or inhibit the implementation of an innovation.
An example of this is the value that is attached to tradition or modernity in a particular society. Generally speaking, the implementation of innovations seems to be accomplished more easily in social systems with a "modern" orientation. Unfortunately for ELEC, in Japan's conservative, patriarchal society, the young are dominated by the old, making tradition especially valued and strong. Furthermore, in the "reverse course" years following the Occupation, the forces favoring a return to more traditional Japanese ways were especially powerful. For this reason, Reischauer cautioned that the ELEC movement simply had to have "the sympathetic support of influential members" of the "old-fashioned" professors of English in Japan. The fact that this support was often withheld hindered the ELEC effort considerably.

Organizational Climate

As mentioned in the preceding section, the conservative tradition in Japanese education created an organizational climate in the school system which was far from conducive to innovation. This proved to be a serious barrier to the ELEC effort to bring about the adoption of Fries' Oral Approach.

Furthermore, the way Japanese society in general is organized and operates, there is little encouragement for students to develop oral skills in English. In fact, as one teacher of English in Japan recently complained, "The educational system as a whole suppresses communicative skills in language because those who learn to communicate tend to become dangerous, 'rocking the boat' rather than making good bureaucrats."

Another organizational climate problem which ELEC faced was that its campaign to promote the teaching of spoken English in Japan came at a time when anti-American feelings were on the rise. The Japanese had just been through seven years of American occupation, during which many reforms—educational and otherwise—had been imposed on them. In the mid-1950's, the sentiment among most Japanese educators was that they had had enough of American ideas. It was time to return to more traditional Japanese ways of doing things. As a result, ELEC fought an uphill battle.

Interestingly, the spirit encountered in the "reverse course" years was nothing new. It had a number of parallels in Japanese history, most recently in the nineteenth century.
As explained in chapter four, following the dramatic reforms of the early Meiji years there was a counter-reaction to the previous "craze" for modernization and Westernization. The decades following 1890 were a period of traditionalism and growing nationalism during which interest in foreign languages—especially in gaining speaking proficiency in a foreign language—declined.

If nothing else, an awareness of this historical pattern of attraction followed by rejection might have alerted the ELEC reformers to the resistance they were apt to encounter in their implementation efforts. In retrospect, at least, it is clear that they should have entertained no illusions about riding a wave of popular sentiment for reforming English language teaching in Japan, at least not along the lines of an American methodology.

Capacities

As explained in chapter three, a most important consideration for those who would implement the work of idealistic innovators is whether the intended users are capable of doing what the innovation requires. Though they may be willing to change or persuaded to change, users must have the capacity to put the innovation into practice if implementation is to meet with success.

In this regard, Beeby states that two factors determine the ability (as distinguished from the willingness) of an educational system to move from one stage to another:

1. The level of general education among teachers, and
2. The amount and kind of training teachers have received.\textsuperscript{116}

Teachers, as front-line users of an innovation, are definitely key figures in the change process. In fact, they are so important that a separate section later in this chapter is devoted to discussing teacher factors.

Realizing that many Japanese teachers' were not capable of doing what the Oral Approach required, ELEC sponsored its long-running series of Summer Seminars for teachers. Unfortunately, ELEC's effort in this regard fell fall short of being sufficient due to another characteristic of the Japanese ELT system, its large size (also discussed in a separate section below).
Capacity involves more than capability, however. As Roberts-Gray and Gray explain, it also has a "commitment" dimension. Although its concern with teachers' capability was considerable, ELEC did little to build teachers' commitment to the Oral Approach or to the need to reform Japanese ELT. ELEC's efforts in this regard were mostly restricted to communicating information about the Oral Approach to teachers and administrators and informing them of its purported advantages through lectures, demonstrations, and publications. Perhaps the assumption was that once teachers and administrators saw the advantages of ELEC's "better mousetrap" they would automatically adopt it. Further use would then result in commitment. If that was the assumption, it was a mistaken one.

While the capabilities and commitment of teachers and administrators are undoubtedly important, capacity can also refer to material factors, such as physical facilities. In Japan in the 1950's, physical facilities were in short supply. Occupation reforms encouraged more Japanese to go to school and for more years. Unfortunately, many school buildings had been destroyed during the war resulting in a shortage of classrooms. After the war, even though schools were built as quickly as possible, this construction would take large amounts of both time and money.

Thus, for many years—including the years during which ELEC was trying to reform Japanese ELT—schools in Japan were extremely overcrowded, classes were large, and physical facilities were spartan. Most English teachers could only dream of language laboratories like those that were being installed in many U.S. schools during these years. The cost of creative new textbooks was often prohibitive, while supplementary materials for teaching English were virtually non-existent. In light of these material conditions, the likelihood of English teachers' changing to the Oral Approach was low.

Educational Philosophy

Another important factor to consider in any innovation-implementation campaign is the educational philosophy that intended users adhere to. In Japan, even today, teachers
generally divide into two camps regarding the purpose of English teaching, just as they
did in the days of ELEC's campaign.

Many teachers, administrators, and even students in Japan feel that the proper aim
of English study is cultural, and they "despise anything practical," which are
consequently ignored. In this philosophy, students' purposes in studying a second
language are to develop their intelligence and to help them understand their own native
language grammar and culture, as well as the target language's literature, even if they
never actually speak the target language. For such aims, an oral approach may not be as
suitable as the traditional grammar-translation method.

Others argue that the proper aim of English study is practical, providing students
with the language skills they need to communicate in real-life situations. In this case,
speaking skills are paramount, and an oral orientation is most appropriate.

Similar debates regarding the proper purpose of foreign language study occurred in
the United States in the nineteenth century. The debate was still raging in Japan when the
ELEC campaign began, and it continues today.

Unfortunately for ELEC, the cultural side predominated in the 1950's and 1960's.
At the Specialists' Conference, Ichikawa reported, "The prevailing idea among the
teachers of English, and especially among university professors, is that we teach and
study English in order to elevate our culture."

According to a recent survey conducted by the Japan Association of College English
Teachers (JACET), however, the practical side now seems to be gaining—even at the
university level.

The major purpose of TEFL [teaching English as a foreign language] according to
60.1% of the students is international communication...40.4% of the students feel
that gaining knowledge of Western culture is the most important purpose...29.1%
of the students also believe that TEFL is important for cultural and intellectual
training in order to become international minded...These figures suggest that the
students seem to regard TEFL as training for communicative ability in English in
order to be ready to undertake international activities. They are not so interested in
TEFL training for polishing an intellectual mind.

Although modern-day Japanese professors of English are not as concerned about
teaching English for communication as their students are, the percentage is growing. In
the same JACET survey, 47.0% of the teachers felt that the major purpose of learning
English is international communication. "A comparison of the teachers' surveys in 1968 and 1983 shows a stronger inclination [in 1983] to emphasize communicative skills."\textsuperscript{121}

Encouraging though they may be, these changes are taking place about thirty years too late for Fries, ELEC, and the Oral Approach in Japan. On the other hand, ELEC may have helped bring them about.

**Authority and Administration**

In spite of American attempts to de-centralize control in the Japanese school system during the Occupation, the administration was rapidly re-centralized once control reverted to the Japanese. Although the post-Occupation Ministry of Education never regained all of the power it exercised earlier in the century, it still remained an important force to be reckoned with. It controlled educational policy and educational budgets, subsidized budgets for non-government schools and colleges, determined the content of courses of study in schools, and authorized textbooks for schools.\textsuperscript{122} Maley's modern-day warning to educational reformers could have been equally appropriate to ELEC: when control is excercised by a central, authoritarian body, a critical implementation factor is whether the top-level administrators "understand, and are...in sympathy with, the declared objectives" of the innovation-implementation process.\textsuperscript{123} Or, as King explains, "there are many ways of penetrating a decentralized system" (such as the one found in U.S. schools), but in a highly centralized school system like Japan's you get "only one shot," win or lose.\textsuperscript{124}

Because of the centralized nature of school-system authority and administration in Japan, the support of the Ministry of Education is essential to any reform campaign. From the example of "earlier struggles to introduce innovations without regard to proper channels," William Cullen Bryant, II learned how important it was to make "just the right approach" to the Ministry. For instance, in spite of the fact that Harold Palmer was invited to go to Japan by prominent individuals and spent fourteen years there attempting to change ELT practices, even his disciples recognized that his "failure to influence official policies was due to his being brought to Japan by private individuals without sufficient groundwork having first been laid in the Ministry of Education."\textsuperscript{125} Although
Palmer's IRET office was physically within the Ministry building, he failed to fit into the bureaucracy and was always regarded as an outsider.

Therefore, in his report to the Japan Society regarding the challenges and possibilities of reforming ELT practices in Japan, Bryant repeated and emphasized the advice of Japanese experts whom he met on his tour of Japan—that "it would be a fatal mistake not to work through the Ministry of Education." 126

The founders of ELEC recognized the importance of Ministry support and attempted to involve Monbusho officials in ELEC's activities whenever they could. Tamon Maeda and Tatsuo Morito, both former ministers of education, and Yoshio Tanaka, vice-minister of education, accepted invitations to be members of the ELEC's original central committee although their involvement was primarily "ceremonial." In addition, at the 1956 Specialists' Conference, Mr. R. Shishido, an administrative official in charge of the secondary education section of the elementary and secondary education bureau of the Ministry of Education was an invited observer. 128 ELEC's apparent purpose in making these invitations was to court the favor of these key people.

Despite the importance of involving the Ministry of Education in the ELEC campaign, going through official channels was not without risks. Primary among them was the possibility that any reform attempt would be stifled or compromised as it passed through the bureaucracy. Others expressed "fear of centering any program in government agencies" because local or prefectural boards of education, as well as private schools and colleges, were jealous of their autonomy and suspicious of Monbusho initiatives. 129 In addition, it was reported that the Ministry had a new method of its own which emphasized "ability in hearing and speaking." 130 Although the Ministry's proposed methodological changes were primarily nominal, and "nothing fundamental" was attempted, they could have been used as an excuse to not act on ELEC's proposal to implement the Oral Approach.

Faced with this decision, ELEC chose to go it alone, attempting to circumvent the Ministry of Education and avoid the bureaucracy with all its "red tape." 131 After all, the ELEC revolutionaries had their new ideas. They had their Rockefeller money. Why should they get bogged down in the bureaucracy?
In the United States, such an "end-run" approach might have worked, but given the power of the centralized Ministry of Education in Japan this tactical error virtually doomed ELEC to failure. The intention was to speed up the process of implementing the Oral Approach in Japan. Instead of speeding things up, however, it led to serious problems.

In this regard, Rodgers warns, "External agencies need to be informed about and, perhaps, directly involved in discussion of syllabus changes... Feelings of being left out or uninformed create the adversary stance that representatives of such agencies often take with regard to new programs." He could have been talking about the ELEC case.

A rivalry developed between ELEC and the Monbusho. As one ELEC worker recalled, "At the beginning, ELEC and Monbusho fought." In this scenario, "The worst enemy of ELEC was the Monbusho," and ELEC got the worst of the fight. In the end, "the Monbusho won." Even Yambe, the one who fought most staunchly for the Oral Approach admitted that ELEC did not succeed in overcoming Monbusho resistance. Another ELEC insider, reminiscing about the battle, concluded, "That was a tragedy—for ELEC."

Others claim that the Monbusho was more neutral. While it was "not too sympathetic," the "Monbusho was fair" (except for one key individual). According to policy, even today, "The Ministry officially refuses commitment to any particular methodology and forbids its imposition." In ELEC's time, "teachers were expected to examine the merits and disadvantages of each method and decide which one would be optimal for their classrooms." Admittedly, this was difficult for them to do considering how poorly most English teachers of the time had been trained. And it can also be argued that, in a way, the Ministry's failure to approve innovative methods gave tacit approval to the traditional ones. Nevertheless, the Monbusho officials could still claim that in not promoting the Oral Approach and/or ELEC's reform movement, the Ministry of Education was merely following its standard procedure of not endorsing particular teaching methods.

Whatever the case may have been, there is no doubt that the Monbusho personnel were in an extremely powerful position—controlling budget appropriations, officially
"giving advice to all the junior high school teachers," deciding which teachers would go abroad to study, etc.

ELEC was innovative and well endowed, but it had no real power over the teachers except the power of persuasion. In the face of Monbusho resistance and/or neglect, that was not enough.

As ELEC's campaign started, Ministry officials were cautiously and politely accommodating. As previously noted, both current and former leaders in the Ministry were in attendance at the Specialists' Conference, and ELEC courted their favor.

At least in the case of Mr. Shishido, who was in charge of secondary-school English language teaching, this ploy backfired. Shishido became antagonistic toward ELEC and because of his position he was able to hinder and block many of its advances.

Some say that Shishido was a disciple of Palmer. For this reason, he faithfully and staunchly defended Palmer's method, and was "antagonistic toward ELEC." Others (within the Ministry of Education) argue that even Shishido was "neutral, and not necessarily a follower of Palmer." He merely wanted to leave teachers free to choose their own techniques.

Another point of view is that this key Monbusho official was a valiant defender of the nation, guarding against American pedagogical imperialism. He "believed that there should be a Japanese way of teaching English."

Whatever the nature of the quarrel may have been and whether the Ministry was antagonistic or merely neutral, the most important and unarguable point is that the Monbusho failed to support the ELEC movement in any official or otherwise meaningful way. Virtually everyone who worked with ELEC agreed that this lack of support was a heavy blow to its reform campaign.

One cannot help but wonder what might have happened in Japan if ELEC had somehow been able to work through the Ministry, or at least had received its support.

The only thing that can safely be concluded without resorting to conjecture, however, is that ELEC's failure to operate through official channels proved to be a major handicap. In his final report on "JDR 3rd and the English Language in Japan," Datus C. Smith, Jr. placed the blame for ELEC's failure to achieve its main objective at the
doorstep of the Ministry of Education. Smith wrote, "No doubt many factors played a part in [ELEC's failure], but I am inclined to accept the judgment of those who say the failure resulted from the opposition of vested interests—chiefly people in the Ministry of Education and in the teaching profession who were scared of new methods which would render their own professional training obsolete."\textsuperscript{147}

Yambe, the ELEC stalwart who did battle with the Ministry most often, was even more direct in his accusation. Contending that the Ministry first misunderstood and then misrepresented the Oral Approach, he concluded, "This is the greatest damage done to the development of the Oral Approach in Japan, and, moreover, the damage was done by none other than the Ministry of Education itself which is supposed to help the education [sic] in Japan."\textsuperscript{148}

Size of the Adopting Unit

A factor which affects many others is the size of the program to be changed. As previously noted, since the end of World War II, Japan's English language education program has been massive. In 1967, Brownell noted, "Perhaps no other country in the world has a program involving as high a percentage of its youth...for as many years in a foreign language."\textsuperscript{149}

Some feel that it is foolish to expect anything more than poor quality from such a mass-education system. Trying to teach English to virtually everybody in Japan almost ensures widespread mediocrity in instruction and learning.

Others are not so pessimistic, but they are not optimistic about changing such a large system either—especially with limited time and resources. In his report, Bryant noted that English teaching in Japan constituted an "immense problem," and it was "unlikely that a single project [would] solve it."\textsuperscript{150} As an experienced Japanese educator put it, "The greatest obstacle to change in English teaching in Japan is the large number of people studying and teaching it."\textsuperscript{151}

The problem of "largeness" has many sources. One is the American ideal of "democratic" education (education for all) implanted in Japan after World War II. Another is the popularity of English, which "exploded" in the post-war years, true to the
historical Japanese pattern of ardent interest in the language of foreigners who have convincingly demonstrated their superior force or technology. Still another reason for the large number of Japanese students of English is Japan's very real need to be able to communicate with the outside world, and in the years following World War II English became the unquestioned international language.

Whatever the cause(s), the rapid expansion of Japan's ELT program after World War II unquestionably led to several serious problems in its school system: large classes, poorly qualified teachers, and powerful entrance examinations, which became strong determinants of what was taught. Many of these factors affected ELEC's ability to bring about the reforms it desired and still plague any attempt to bring about the teaching of oral English in Japan's schools.

The large number of students who flooded English courses in Japan after World War II created a problem of large classes. For language learning, as Otani notes, the ideal class size is less than twenty. Nevertheless, the average size of a public school English class in Japan ranges from forty to sixty, and sometimes goes beyond one hundred.\(^1\) This teacher-student ratio necessitates severe compromises in the teaching of oral English, if it can be attempted at all.

Another problem created by the sudden flood of English students during and after the Occupation was a lack of qualified English teachers. As Brosnahan notes, "Where could or can Japan find within itself—and it seems determined to find them within the country—the 65,000 teachers competent to teach the English language?"\(^1\) This situation will be discussed further in the "Teacher Factors" section of this chapter. Here it will only be noted that the large number of teachers in the Japanese ELT system plus the need to train (or re-train) the majority of them added up to a truly formidable task. As Kleinjans noted, "If ELEC had taught a hundred teachers a month [more than its peak rate], it still would have taken 75 years to get through all of them."\(^2\)

The large size of Japan's English teaching program not only contributed to the heavy reliance on examinations but also encouraged the use of non-communicative examination formats which test language skills other than speaking. The effect of these examinations, however, is the subject of the next section.
Examinations

In any instructional setting, final examinations exert an important influence on what is taught, but this influence is particularly strong in Japan. In fact, as Harasawa notes, "The greatest motivation for [Japanese high school students'] study of English is to pass the final entrance examination."\textsuperscript{155} For this reason, and because of their nature, Goto calls these examinations, "the worst obstacle"\textsuperscript{156} to the teaching of spoken English. Consequently, no discussion about reforming English language teaching in Japan along the lines of the Oral Approach would be complete without referring to the infamous high school and university entrance examinations.

Richards claims that "the degree to which tests relate to course content and program objectives is crucial in successful program development, yet testing is often regarded as an optional component of a language program rather than fundamental to its operation."\textsuperscript{157} Given the traditional American emphasis on relatively open admission and the accumulating of credits for graduation, it is perhaps natural for Americans unfamiliar with the Japanese system to overlook the effect of examinations in that country. That, however, is a serious mistake. Entrance examinations are of critical influence in Japan. In fact, according to some reports, passing these exams is "the whole 'purpose' of Japanese primary and secondary education."\textsuperscript{158} In Japan, nowadays as well as in 1956, "the university entrance examination rules over the upper secondary English teaching."\textsuperscript{159}

The fact that knowledge of English is tested in the high school and university entrance examinations is a major reason why virtually all Japanese students study English\textsuperscript{160} (it is officially an elective). Nevertheless, the exams focus on points of grammar and translation and do not test proficiency in spoken English. "Backwash" from these examinations affects English teaching in a powerful way. One commentator on the modern-day Japanese ELT situation who wished that English conversation would be encouraged more, noted sadly, "The fact, however, is that grammar and translation play the most important role in English classes because English is taught as one of the key subjects of entrance exams."\textsuperscript{161} In fact, some go so far as to claim that the tests "are designed to actually stifle oral ESL work."\textsuperscript{162} Whether or not that is true, there is general agreement that "a junior or senior high school teacher who spends time on oral English
would actually be doing a disservice to his students." This state of affairs, of course, spells trouble for a language-teaching approach whose orientation is predominantly oral.

Laments about the problems created by the nature of these English examinations are by no means new. As long ago as 1914, the chairman of a Conference of Experts on the Teaching of English in Japan placed the blame for the lack of oral English skills among Japanese students squarely on the examination system:

Middle school graduates cannot grasp by an [sic] ear the general meaning of even simple sentences. It is true that pupils could not express their ideas in English and neglected the study of the colloquial [sic]. But for that the higher schools were responsible. It would be easy to remedy that defect if only the higher schools would have oral tests bearing on hearing and speaking besides the written examination.

As plans for the ELEC effort were being discussed, Y. Takagi made a similar proposal:

The kind of questions asked in entrance examinations has a tremendous bearing upon teaching methods and the attitude of the students towards learning English in secondary schools. It is very desirable that these examination questions, while serving as a good means of testing the ability of the candidates, also encourage the adoption of salutary methods of learning English in secondary schools.

At first, however, "Fries did not concern himself with 'problems' such as the exam system." Speaking of the university entrance examinations, Agnes Fries (his wife, executive secretary, and constant companion) later said, "I don't think he even knew about them." Eventually, however, Fries did realize the necessity of addressing this concern. Speaking of learner's goals, he said:

Or his final goal may be merely the passing of an examination for a university [note the merely; that doesn't sound like anything someone familiar with the power of Japanese entrance examinations would say]—an examination in which translation is the only requirement [italics added]. No matter what the final goal of the person who starts to learn English I believe...that what we have called the "oral approach" is the most efficient, the most time-saving way to begin the study of English.

Other ELEC front-liners were not so optimistic. They found they could not ignore examination "backwash." For instance, although Takahashi called the effect of the entrance examinations "the most pitiable thing," his conclusion was that "for the present, until the exams change, grammar-translation teaching is 'a necessary evil.' That necessity continues today, as many English teachers in Japan are still trying to overcome this obstacle to the teaching of oral English skills. Of course, many of the
The relationship between the size of the Japanese ELT program and the type of examination questions is strong. Administering oral tests to the millions of Japanese students who take the entrance exams every year would be next to impossible since such tests cannot be given en masse, as written exams are, and a serious manpower shortage would result.

This situation challenged ELEC thirty years ago. As early as 1956, Ichikawa noted that "more than 10,000 apply for entrance to the University of Tokyo" every year.

Since it is impossible to test such large numbers in hearing and speaking, questions are limited to translations (into Japanese or into English) and other tests requiring writing. The scope of tests in entrance examinations being thus limited, it is natural that applicants should prepare in such a way as to meet these requirements. [italics in original].

The nature of the questions in the English portion of the entrance examinations remains perhaps the greatest obstacle to the promotion of oral English in Japan today.

But the difficulty of testing the English speaking ability of large numbers of Japanese students in a short period of time is not the only reason for not changing the English portion of the examinations for university entrance. Many complain about the exams, but the way they are constructed serves a very important purpose. Recently, in a discussion about why English is taught to junior and senior high school students in Japan and why the exams test such difficult, obscure, and useless points of English grammar, one teacher concluded that the purpose of English teaching in Japanese schools was "to stratify, not to educate—i.e., to separate the smart from the stupid, the diligent from the lazy. Content, thus, is not important; having students memorize the telephone book would be just as useful." 

Although this realization must come as a shock to many expatriate teachers of English in Japan, it is by no means a startling new discovery. In July of 1956, as the agenda for the Specialists' Conference was planned, one topic of discussion was university entrance examination questions. At the Conference, several speakers pointed out that the "sole objective" of the examinations appeared to be "the determination of some simple methods of sorting and elimination." The "conclusions and
recommendations" drawn up after the Specialists Conference addressed the problem of university entrance examinations and noted the "problem" that they "tend to become a means of selection only." The ELEC reformers asserted their "earnest desire to have the achievement test conducted always as a means of evaluation rather than as a means of selection." 176

Nevertheless, it was not enough to recognize the problem and discuss it. Action was called for. As early as 1955, Bryant had recommended,

An early objective should be the modification of university and senior high school entrance examinations in conformity with the modern curricula being developed in the training program, but the examiners must first be convinced of the value of such revision and shown how it can be effected without lowering educational standards. 177

Unfortunately, ELEC never took such action. In fact, despite their strong feelings about this matter, the authors of the ELEC recommendation that the nature of the examinations be change did not mention how such an objective might be achieved. Neither did they seem to realize the repercussions such a change might have throughout the Japanese ELT system. In fact, after the end of the Specialists' Conference, ELEC actions seemed to ignore the problem of examination questions. Committees were set up to develop materials and train teachers, but no one dealt with the examination system. Given the fact that ELEC had no linkage with Japanese universities, maybe there was nothing that ELEC could do.

Of course, ELEC might have tried to work with the Japanese universities. This would have been extremely difficult. Japanese university professors had been most resistant to (and most alienated by) American attempts at reforming Japanese education during the Occupation. Moreover, ELEC had pledged to remain an independent force, without compromising ties to any universities, Japanese or American.

Nevertheless, if ELEC had made the necessary effort and established relationships with even a few key universities and somehow persuaded them to modify their entrance examinations so as to test communicative use of oral English (and maybe even assisted them in doing so), the overall outcome of the ELEC reform campaign would undoubtedly have been quite different. The task of getting schools to adopt the Oral Approach would have been infinitely easier if the examinations had been modified in this manner.
For modern-day reformers still desirous of encouraging the spread of oral English in Japan, a glimmer of hope is on the horizon. Tape-recorded listening comprehension sections, which can be delivered \textit{en masse} and which encourage the development of oral English skills, have appeared in a number of entrance examinations in recent years. "About 30 prefectural boards of education and 36 universities now use tapes."\textsuperscript{178} These small changes are undoubtedly the result of many forces. Nevertheless, some ELEC workers find solace in the thought that "ELEC may have contributed a little—in the impetus."\textsuperscript{179}

**Learner Factors**

Of all user system factors, the characteristics of the Japanese learners are perhaps the most influential. As Ogasawara exhorts,

\begin{quote}
We should remember that along with universal problems of foreign language teaching and learning, Japanese learners of English have their own unique problems. Researchers should be geared to these problems and more flexible and effective methods should be developed to meet the unique problems of English learning in Japan.\textsuperscript{180}
\end{quote}

Some Japanese learner characteristics, such as their strong academic orientation, have always been quite obvious. During the time of the ELEC campaign, however, many other important characteristics of Japanese learners, the intended users of the Oral Approach promoted by ELEC, were poorly understood. In fact, until recently, a number of these characteristics had no names and were not even recognized as existing.

Despite language teachers' ignorance of these factors thirty years ago, they still influenced the way Japanese learners of English behaved, both in and out of the classroom, and thus affected ELEC's effort to promote the learning of oral English in Japan. Since that time, years of research and experience have helped reveal a number of these factors, and it is now possible to see more clearly their effect on Japanese learners of English and on the ELEC campaign.
Academic Orientation

One advantage English teachers in Japan have enjoyed for at least a century is their students' favorable orientation toward schooling and good academic preparation. In contrast to many of the world's nations, Japan has a long history of schooling (as outlined in chapter three). Consequently, as Japan tried to rebuild its economy and its school system after the devastation of war, it could count on an "accumulated expertise" in things academic. Dillon and Dillon explain further,

Japan's is a highly literate society that places great value on learning and achievement....[The typical student of English] has grown up in a world of books and facts, of language used both for artistic and communicative purposes....The rigorous Japanese educational system and constant contact with the written word have left [the Japanese student] better prepared than students from many other countries to succeed in an academic program of English studies. Dillon and Dillon explain further,

Nevertheless, rigorous academic preparation is only one learner factor. Others, which are not so conducive to students' success, are of equal, or greater importance and take on special meaning when the object of study is a foreign language.

Traditionally, approaches to language teaching (and to teaching in general) have focused on individuals as mere "perceptual beings" whose emotions, experiences, and desires were irrelevant. In recent years, however, some educators have come to realize that before we can solve problems such as those experienced by Japanese learners of English, the individual must be viewed as part of a broader context—as an emotional, dynamic, active, and social being. It is to that broader context—outside of and within the individual—that this investigation now turns as it considers cognitive, physiological, social, and psychological characteristics of Japanese learners.

Learning Style

Learning style is a very broad, multi-faceted term. This study will focus on several different aspects of learning style relevant to foreign language learning by Japanese students: reliance on visual (rather than aural) signals, the value accorded to silence, comfort with personal disclosure, and over-monitoring.
Reliance on Visual Signals. An important feature of Japanese students' language learning style is the tendency to rely on visual, rather than aural, signals and to consider the written form the only "true" language. This point of view is diametrically opposed to the beliefs held by Fries and his American foreign-language-education colleagues, who emphasized oral practice and stressed that speech is the primary form of any language.

Many blame this Japanese learning pattern on the tradition of Chinese studies and the many hours Japanese pupils spend learning kanji. For instance, as the ELEC effort was just beginning, Ichikawa warned, "Born and bred in such [a] peculiar linguistic environment, it is but natural that the Japanese become a visual-type people rather than an auditory-type, and in learning a foreign language fall into the habit of relying on the eye and not on the ear." This tendency is reportedly still strong today. Ogasawara recently noted that one of the obstacles to the teaching of spoken English in Japan is that "Japanese people are letter-oriented."!

Value Accorded to Silence. Another aspect of Japanese language-learning style is reflective of Japanese communicative style. In his discussion of Enryo-sasshi communication, Ishii explains, "The Japanese have traditionally placed a high value on silence, believing that a person of few words is thoughtful, trustworthy, and respectable." Tajima adds, "In Japan silence is golden, and a talkative person is regarded as superficial."!

The type of behavior that is acceptable according to this cultural norm would definitely not be compatible with the rapid and frequent oral responses students were expected to produce in an Oral Approach classroom. Brosnahan agrees that a problem in getting Japanese students to speak in the English classroom is the "high value placed on silence, particularly in the dignified male."!

Degree of Comfort with Personal Disclosure. Japanese and American communicative styles contrast in other important ways also. Barnlund investigated the amount of personal disclosure which American and Japanese speakers felt comfortable with and found that the Japanese "prefer an interpersonal style in which the self made accessible to others, that is, the 'public self,' is relatively small, while the proportion of the self that is not revealed, the 'private self,' is relatively large." This was the
opposite of the pattern found in Americans. Barnlund concluded that "Americans should, since threat is proportional to the extent of self-concealment, be defensive with fewer persons and in fewer topical areas. When threatened they should favor active-aggressive over passive-withdrawal techniques." Once again, the reverse pattern was found among Japanese.

The implications for conversation classes, indeed almost any language class where overt, oral responses are expected, are obvious. Typical Japanese students will not feel comfortable in such an environment. Unfortunately, many activities common to Fries' Oral Approach demanded such behavior. The not unexpected result, as discussed further under the section of this chapter devoted to such factors, would be severe cases of "language shock" and "cultural reserve" on the part of Japanese students.

**Over-Monitoring.** Stephen Krashen has described a cognitive process involved in language use which he calls "monitoring." His argument is that learners gain productive competence in a second language in two ways:

The first is through *acquisition*, which is a nonconscious process fostered by exposure to and interaction with linguistic input in the natural environment. The second route is through *learning* which results in the "conscious presentation of pedagogical rules." Monitoring takes place when the learner uses his conscious knowledge of target language rules to modify his performance in the second language. Monitoring can occur only when the learner has time to modify his performance (as in writing) and when he is focusing on correctness of grammatical form rather than communicative function. Due to the fact that monitoring is constrained by time and focus on form, it also becomes limited by situation. Monitoring is most likely to occur on grammar tests and is least likely to occur in free conversation.

The typical Japanese approach to English study stresses conscious knowledge of grammar rules and memorization of long lists of vocabulary items. Edamatsu explains,

One of the causes of the difficulty the Japanese have in learning English is that they are too bookish; they try to learn English the way they learned other subjects in school such as history, by reading about it, by memorizing facts, by poring over rules of grammar and pronunciation in textbooks (the way dead languages like Latin are studied), instead of using "live" practice the way a living language should be learned.

Language learning experts (such as Carroll) agree that this typical Japanese approach to learning English will never lead to fluency. Following Krashen's theory,
one might conclude that the reason the typical Japanese learner experiences problems in using English for communication is because what he has learned in school English classes consists of only a conscious knowledge of the rules of English. This knowledge may be useful for monitoring, but its value in the production of language is very limited. Also, inasmuch as monitoring requires processing time and focus on form, students who possess only learned knowledge about the target language find it next to impossible to communicate in the oral modality since they must speak at a rapid pace and concentrate on content. Due to the way they have studied English, many Japanese students seem to be monitor "over-users," "whose overconcern with conscious rules prevents them from speaking with any fluency at all." Thus, monitor theory (combined with knowledge of the typical Japanese classroom teaching/learning style) provides one explanation for why so many Japanese students can perform very well on discrete-point grammar tests but still fail miserably in a simple conversation.

**Inter-lingual Interference**

A widely recognized factor in language learning is inter-lingual interference. Very simply, interference means that students' first language "gets in the way" when they are learning a second language.

Common sense dictates that where the learners' native language and the target language are different, interference will be greatest and learning will be most difficult. As experts have noted, the linguistic differences between Japanese and English are considerable, and the result is difficulty for Japanese learners of English.

Japanese does not belong to the Indo-European family of languages...and...this fact makes learning English more difficult....English syntax differs radically from Japanese and therefore the construction of thought differs. Compared with English, the Japanese has a simple phonetic system.

As a matter of basic linguistic structure, Japanese is related to no modern language, except Korean....[For Japanese students of English] There is almost no common ground to begin with as there is, say, for an American studying French or German.

These arguments ignore the fact that English and Japanese do have a rather extensive "common ground" in the large number of English words that have been
borrowed into Japanese over the years. Much of this borrowing took place during the Meiji years, but a second, larger wave of English linguistic influence engulfed Japan after World War II and thousands of English words made their way into Japanese. Lexical overlap, however, does not eliminate interference, or even reduce it in the areas of syntax and phonology.

Among language acquisition researchers, however, the extent and the nature of linguistic interference is still a topic of debate. Whitman and Jackson, for example, found little evidence of interference in the errors made by Japanese learners of English at the University of Hawaii (although they dealt only with written English at a rather advanced level). Taylor found evidence to support his hypothesis that interference errors occur more frequently among language learners at the beginning level and that other processes are more responsible for errors at later stages.

Much research in this area still remains to be done before this debate will be settled. Nevertheless, even if its influence is strong, interference does not explain why Japanese learners of English would have more difficulty than learners from other language backgrounds (Samoan, Arabic, etc.) which are also radically different from English. Nor does it account for the fact that ELEC's New Approach textbooks, which were designed specifically for Japanese learners of English (after a careful linguistic analysis and comparison), still failed to enjoy much success in Japan.

**Physiological Differences**

A traditionally popular explanation for the difficulties experienced by Japanese learners of English and other foreign languages is the physiological differences between Japanese and Occidentals. In a letter to the Japan Times which created quite a furor, Mr. T. Miyazawa referred to the "well known fact" that Japanese are incapable of acquiring perfect English pronunciation due to "the difference in physical constitution between Occidentals and Japanese."

Other readers were quick to reply that this "fact" can be easily shown to be false "since second-generation Japanese Americans have no such difficulties," but the traditional idea still persists.
In the past few years, a new twist on this classic explanation for Japanese learners' difficulties with English has enjoyed considerable popularity in Japan. It is the brainchild of Tadanobu Tsunoda, a Japanese scientist, who, in his book *Nihonjin no No* (The Japanese Brain), advances the hypothesis that "Japanese brains function differently from other people's."203

Such fundamentally physiological differences, Tsunoda argues, make it particularly difficult for Japanese to learn English. He further claims that foreign language acquisition may be detrimental to the development of creativity. Japanese who manage to achieve fluency in English are said to run the risk of developing warped personalities.204

Since Tsunoda claims that the differences in the way the Japanese brain functions are due "not because of inheritance or conditioning but because of the peculiarities of the Japanese language,"205 his argument cannot be disproven by reference to second-generation Japanese who have grown up speaking English. In fact, he has conducted laboratory experiments which he claims prove that this difference exists. Nevertheless, their validity and replicability are questionable. One investigator of this work concludes that "new research into neurological systems may allow us to discard the theory totally. Until then, however, researchers need to be skeptical of the implications of Tsunoda's research."206

Perhaps the most impressive thing about these theories is the popularity they enjoy among the Japanese, in spite of their shallow, if not patently false nature. "While discreet skepticism about Tsunoda's research methods appears among some of his colleagues, the overall framework of his ideas is tolerated and even welcomed."207 In fact, *Nihonjin no No* has been a best-seller in Japan. It belongs to a "genre of popular and semi-academic writings known as *Nihonjin-ron*, which may be loosely translated as "Theorizing about the Japanese people."208

Explanations for language learning difficulties based on physiological differences may be spurious (maybe even laughable if they weren't taken so seriously by so many Japanese), but this "intense preoccupation on the part of the Japanese with their own ethnicity"209 should not be overlooked. Nevertheless, it will be treated in a later section of this chapter since it is a psycho-social rather than a physiological factor.
Social Factors

More important than physiological factors are the social factors which form an important part of the context of language learning. In this regard, Schumann has surveyed a variety of factors, such as social group dominance, integration strategies, enclosure, congruence, cohesiveness and size. Nevertheless, only two major social factors will be discussed here, and each of these will be considered only briefly inasmuch as they relate to factors already considered or to be discussed below.

Enclosure and Isolation. As already discussed in the preceding "geographic position" section, in Japan, where native speakers of English are a rarity, contact with the English-speaking community is virtually non-existent. The fact that Japan is "an isolated and inward-turning nation" is often given as an explanation for the Japanese "ethnocentrism and xenophobia" (to be discussed in greater detail in the psychological social-psychological factor sections that follow).

Nowadays, compared to the years when the ELEC campaign was under way, a much larger amount of contact with English can be obtained through television, radio and recordings, than was possible thirty years ago, but even this can hardly be called communicative interaction.

The high enclosure and isolation of the Japanese people has thus created a situation where, for the most part, English must be pursued only in a classroom. Whether it is possible to achieve communicative proficiency in a foreign language through this means alone, without any social contact with the target language group, is an important question. Certainly, most Japanese students of English cannot be expected to interact regularly with English speakers as foreign students did in the English House at the University of Michigan.

Carroll suggests that it may be possible for a learner to imagine a "live communication situation" as a substitute for real contact. English teaching methods employing or encouraging such an approach may be the best (or only) way of providing "enclosed" learners with the interaction in English which they need. In an Oral Approach class as promoted by ELEC, an attempt was made to imitate real-life communications through teacher-to-pupil pattern practice and pupil-to-pupil dialog practice. Many have
questioned the success of these endeavors, however, and even Oral Approach proponents admit that a sense of "live communication" was difficult to achieve in Oral Approach classes, even with the most willing and imaginative learners.

**Group Cohesiveness and Congruence.** Schumann limits the applicability of these factors to situations in which students learn a target language which is spoken all around them, where cohesiveness and congruence may either encourage or discourage inter-group contact. Nevertheless, it is likely that psychological factors resulting from the strong cohesive nature of Japanese society and the lack of congruence between Japanese and English-speaking cultures affect the individual learner of English in Japan in various ways. Because they relate to psychological factors, however, their effects will be discussed in the next section.

**Psychological Factors**

Psychological factors within the student are another part of the "broader context" in which language learning must be seen in order to gain a comprehensive view of the factors responsible for the difficulty experienced by Japanese students of English, both today and in the days when ELEC was starting its Oral Approach campaign. These factors, which operate inside students' minds, are the least understood and most controversial of all those considered in this chapter, but an awareness of them may be essential to account for the general Japanese failure to become fluent in spoken English as desired by the founders of ELEC.

Of course, acknowledging the importance of these psychological factors does not mean that they are the only reasons for the Japanese failure to learn English. Nevertheless, these elements cannot and should not be overlooked when an explanation for Japanese difficulties with English is sought.

It is important to mention the likelihood that many of the psychological factors about to be discussed apply only to adolescent and adult learners (not young children). This is not a serious limitation, however, since students in these age groups constitute the great majority of English learners in Japan. In addition, it was at English classes of adolescent-and-older students that the ELEC movement was aimed.
It should also be noted that, even though this study relates these psychological factors to the Japanese culture in particular, they probably exist to some degree in most cultures. They can thus be expected to manifest themselves in many other settings where English (or some other foreign language) is being learned.

Although a number of inter-related psychological factors are discussed in this section, it will be divided into three general areas only. First, language shock and related inhibiting factors common to Japanese learners of English (such as cultural reserve and language ego) will be considered. Then the role played by motivation and attitudes is examined. Finally, psycho-social factors such as Japanese ethnic identity and group loyalty are analyzed insofar as they relate to the learning of English. After these three areas have been covered, the final section will consider the tension that develops when the multitude of forces within and outside of a student come into conflict. How that conflict is finally resolved becomes crucial in determining whether a Japanese student of English will experience success or failure in learning to speak fluently.

Language Shock. Language shock is not a term with which most people are familiar. Drawing a parallel with a related term may help make it clear. Those who deal with cultures and languages are generally familiar with the concept of culture shock (a product of social incongruence) and how it can disrupt the normal functioning of an individual. Language shock has a similar potential for interfering with the language learning process. Although it is not a new concept, it is rarely encountered in discussions of learners' problems. Nevertheless, it deserves to be considered more often.

In discussing what can be called language shock, Stengal (1937) points out that when learners attempt to speak a second language they often fear that they will appear comic. He compares the use of a second language with wearing fancy clothes. The adult learner may want to wear his fancy clothes, but he also fears criticism and ridicule. The child, however, sees language as a method of play and finds communication a source of pleasure. Thus, he doesn't fear his fancy clothes; he enjoys wearing them. Stengal states, "The adult will learn the new language more easily, the more of these infantile characteristics he has preserved."213

Narrowing the scope of concern to foreign language pronunciation, Fries himself declared that language learners must "throw off all restraint and self-consciousness as far as the making of strange sounds is concerned."214 Nevertheless, throwing off inhibitions is easier recommended than done. The fear of being ridiculed is a strong force
in the minds of many adolescent and adult foreign language learners, especially in Japan, and is not easily overcome.

To make matters worse, a learner may be subjected to embarrassment not only for incorrect pronunciation but for a "too correct" pronunciation as well. Stevick recounts how members of a Hebrew class had difficulty with the "hard h" (voiceless velar fricative) sound—even though they could pronounce it "with a high degree of accuracy." The problem occurred because it was a strange, "embarrassing" sound.

with each voicing of the phrase, there was uneasy laughter, bordering on the hilarious. One person said, "When I pronounce it right, I get tingly all over." Others joked about the need to get a drink of water. One person was gently kidded about how good his pronunciation was. Stevick concludes his account by referring to "the emotional price that some . . . students had to pay for sounding foreign." He summarizes, "This incident illustrates what I have said about the interpersonal and intrapersonal price of success in pronunciation."

Thus, even though learners know they must practice speaking the language if they are ever to learn it, language shock may get in the way. This is especially the case when students are particularly sensitive to rejection, as most Japanese are.

In most modern language classes, including Oral Approach classes, a student is expected to use the target language orally in various ways. . . . In all these activities there is the possibility that the learner's performance will bring on negative reactions from the teacher or the other students. The learner who is sensitive to the negative reinforcing behavior of others would be made particularly anxious in such situations.

Carroll explains that

Willingness to try using the language, and to make errors, is somewhat connected with the learner's personality—not necessarily with what is commonly called "extroversion," but with a kind of self-control and confidence whereby the learner can attempt self-expression without feeling self-conscious or threatened by making errors and being corrected.

But he concludes with the reminder that "in some cultures classroom errors are extremely embarrassing." He could very possibly have been thinking of the Japanese, for they live in "an astonishingly shame-conscious society," and, consequently, "they are characteristically hypersensitive about making mistakes in public, calling undue attention to themselves, or committing themselves prematurely to a position which may be
wrong."219 As a result, in foreign language classes they typically "elect to remain silent rather than use the language and experience the embarrassment of making mistakes."220

Behind this hypersensitivity is an important characteristic of Japanese culture—group mindedness or group dependence.221 In contrast with American society, which is characterized by "competitive individualism,"222 Japanese society values harmony and group-orientation. "The individual functions only as a member of and in concert with a group. . . . Individual autonomy is suppressed, and loyalty is emphasized."223 "The Japanese are extremely sensitive to and concerned about social interaction and relationships,"224 and group support is important to an individual's security.225 "Dare he flee to the domain of a maverick, ostracism will immobilize the self-willed soul...and thus coerce him back to the fold where a life of conformity awaits him."226

Harker provides examples of how group-mindedness and the resultant language shock can have a detrimental effect (which he calls "cultural reserve") in a conversation class for female Japanese students of English.

Even if students do have ideas that they might be prepared to express in class, the fact that in a class they are always part of a group can be a formidable barrier in a society where the pressure is against individual assertiveness (Reischauer, 1977:127). The individual tends not to feel free to make a statement without getting group approval. For one student to show that she knows the answer to a question or has an idea of her own to offer seems to mean that she is showing herself to be better than those who do not have anything to say.

Many times one sees a person who wants to volunteer first look around or even confer briefly with those nearby before venturing to speak out. The person who might want to speak up when others are silent fears that this might gain the disapproval of others.

This group-mindedness has another aspect. From childhood, one of the chief sanctions used in disciplining children is laughter...The fear of making a mistake and being laughed at can create a paralysing state of mind that can inhibit the best of students.227

Harker's experience is not rare. English teachers in Japan (especially those who try to get their students to speak) generally agree that "cultural reserve" is an important and difficult barrier to overcome. Although it has been recognized by some modern-day English teachers in Japan,228 unfortunately, no promoter of the Oral Approach in Japan seems to have ever considered it.
Another, related psychological phenomenon is language ego, a notion developed by Guiora to explain the ability of some people to acquire native-like pronunciation in a second language.

In the course of general ego development the child acquires body ego by which he becomes aware of the limits of his physical being and learns to distinguish himself from the object world around him. In a similar fashion... the child acquires a sense of the boundaries of his language. The sounds, words, syntax and morphology of his language become objectified and develop firm outlines and boundaries. In the early stages of development, language ego boundaries are permeable, but later they become fixed and rigid.\(^{229}\)

Language ego... refers to self-representation with physical outlines and firm boundaries: "Grammar and syntax are the solid structure on which speech hangs, lexis the flesh that gives it body, and pronunciation its very core. Pronunciation is the most salient aspect of the language ego, the hardest to penetrate (to acquire in a new language), the most difficult to lose (in one's own)."\(^{230}\)

In a well-known experiment designed to determine the effect of "language ego," Guiora et al. reasoned that if language learners' levels of inhibition were lowered, ego rigidity would be reduced and ego permeability enhanced. To test this hypothesis, they gave subjects varying amounts of alcohol and then tested the subjects' pronunciation in a foreign language. They found that subjects who ingested a small amount of alcohol (one and one-half ounces) had pronunciation that was better than that of either the no-alcohol or more alcohol (two or three ounces) groups. The important implication is that inhibitions and language ego boundaries can be lowered and, in the process, pronunciation improved.

Given their high degree of group mindedness, it is likely that the language ego of Japanese students is typically very rigid and affects their pronunciation ability in English. One observer of English teaching in Japan recently wrote,

It is interesting that women, who tend to be less hungup [sic] on their Japaneseeness and asserting themselves, tend to be better at language acquisition than their male counterparts. Could it be that the biggest obstacle to English learning (following the education system itself) is that Japanese, while admittedly not eager to assert themselves aloud, actually house extraordinarily large egos which make it difficult to let go and absorb a foreign language on its own terms?\(^{231}\)

In order for Japanese students to learn to speak English well, their ego boundaries may need to become more permeable. Of course, serving drinks in all English language classrooms in Japan is not a feasible solution. However, other ways of lowering
students' language inhibitions should be explored. Perhaps Japanese students could thus become "good language learners [who] are not afraid of making errors." Discussing these points, Stevick expresses the opinion that "intelligent awareness of factors such as these will do more to improve the teaching of pronunciation than all the charts, diagrams and mechanical devices that we have often depended on in the past." An encouraging sign that such an awareness is growing in Japan is the appearance of books such as Barbieri's *Fool's Dance: A Communicative Text for Japanese Students*. The author recognizes that "the uniqueness of his culture and language are major obstacles for the Japanese learner of English," and takes them into consideration in the design of the book. Referring to the book's title, Barbieri explains,

> A festival is a marvelous opportunity for us, as human beings, to interact. We let down our hair. We relax. We forget our inhibitions. We don't worry about making fools of ourselves....Herein, I believe, lies the answer to helping the Japanese speak English better. This is a culture of reticence. For that reason, the Japanese are held in respect as perhaps the most polite and courteous people in the world. This reticence is also, unfortunately, an obstacle in speaking foreign languages. Instead of playing it safe by studying grammar until he is so worried about making mistakes that he can't speak anymore, the Japanese speaker, I believe, would be far better off "getting out" and talking.

The book concludes with the reminder: "Some fools play it safe and watch./ While other fools get out and dance./ The greatest joy, the dancer knows,/ comes only if you take a chance." Although such developments are encouraging, it must also be acknowledged that this awareness began to develop long after it was needed to help the ELEC campaign. Nevertheless, other language-teaching reformers in Japan may be able to benefit from it.

**Motivation and Attitudes.** The attitudes which learners hold toward the target language group are crucial. "Negative, prejudiced attitudes and stereotypes about another ethnolinguistic group, quite independent of language learning abilities or verbal intelligence, can upset and disturb the motivation needed to learn the other group's language." Students attitudes toward other groups and individuals, such as their teachers, peers and parents have also been found to be important, but discussion in this chapter will be limited to discussing the relationship between attitudes toward the target language group, motivation, and proficiency.
"As early as 1949, W. R. Jones demonstrated that attainment of proficiency in Welsh as a second language was correlated with attitudes toward the study of Welsh."238 In the more than thirty years since that time, the research questions posed by Jones have been amplified and refined, "and continue to generate a lively interest."

Gardner and Lambert, a pair of leading researchers in this area, reason "that some process like identification, extended to a whole ethnolinguistic community and coupled with an inquisitiveness and sincere interest in the other group, must underlie the long-term motivation needed to master a second language."239 They hypothesize "that second-language achievement might be facilitated by a favorable and accepting orientation toward ethnolinguistic groups different from one's own."240 They argue further that "the student's attitudinal orientation toward that [target language] group...will influence his progress and efficiency in adopting these novel and strange linguistic habits into his own repertoire."241 After conducting considerable research on language attitudes, Spolsky concluded similarly, that "a person learns a language better when he wants to be a member of the group speaking that language."242

Of course, things are never quite that simple. As Schumann explains,

Researchers (Gardner and Lambert, 1972) have identified two motivational orientations for second language learning—an integrative motivation and an instrumental motivation. An integratively oriented learner wants to learn the second language in order to meet with, talk to, find out about, and perhaps become like speakers of the target language whom he both values and admires. An instrumentally oriented learner is one who has little interest in the people who speak the target language but nevertheless wants to learn the language for more utilitarian reasons such as getting ahead in his occupation or gaining recognition from his own membership group.

It has generally been thought that integrative motivation is the more powerful of the two because it implies a desire to integrate with speakers of the target language. A learner with an instrumental motivation would be expected to acquire the second language only to the point where his instrumental goals were satisfied....Recent research, however, seems to indicate that the motivational orientation associated with proficiency in the second language seems to vary according to the setting. An integrative motivation appears to be more effective in settings where it is neither necessary nor an accepted fact of life that the second language be acquired....[in other social situations] proficiency in the second language is associated with an anti-integrative motivation. So, while instrumental and integrative motivations are useful ways to think about success in second language learning, they are complex constructs that interact with both the social variables discussed earlier and the other psychological variables.243
In the Japanese context, things become even more complex. It is generally agreed that most high school students study English in order to pass the entrance examinations, but beyond that point, it becomes quite difficult to decide what the Japanese motivations for learning English and their attitudes toward English speakers really are.

A common, historical attitude toward Europeans (and later, Americans) has been to classify them as *gaijin* and "barbarians." Yet, Japan has also had a long-term love affair with the West. The modern-day social craze for things Western (and for merchandise with conspicuous, though often incorrect, English words as part of the decoration) is nothing new. As explained in chapter three, this pattern dates back at least as far as 1590 (not just 1950), shortly after the Portuguese first made contact with Japan. Following a cyclical pattern, the Japanese love-hate relationship for foreign things has continued to the present. Since the end of World War II, "English and all things American" have enjoyed a "characteristically exalted status," which would appear to encourage the learning of English by the Japanese. Yet, as history demonstrates, it is really a "vacillating, ambivalent feeling that often is only superficial."

Although the attraction to foreign things could almost be considered a Japanese tradition, there is little question about where the Japanese' true loyalties lie. This is reflected in the reasons they give for learning English. When Chihara and Oller surveyed 123 Japanese adults enrolled in English classes in Osaka, they found that the reasons which received the highest ratings were primarily instrumental in nature (to visit another country, to be an educated person, interest in the language, literature and culture, to fulfill a school requirement). The most integrative of reasons (to have English speaking friends) received the lowest rating.

Thus, an apparent paradox emerges. On the surface, the Japanese appear to be imitating English-speakers, but deep down their motives are not strongly integrative. This does not mean, however, that their attitudes toward Americans are necessarily negative. Of 30 personalities traits which Chihara and Oller investigated, Americans were rated more favorable than Japanese on 17, while the Japanese received more favorable ratings on only 10 scales. Apparently, on the one hand the Japanese admire Americans, but on the other they don't want to become Americans. At least within some individuals,
if not in Japanese society generally, these conflicting feelings must create considerable tension and blocks to English learning.

**Social-Psychology Factors.** Social psychology involves society and the role it plays in an individual's self-concept and identity. In this area, one encounters psychosocial phenomena such as ethnic identity and group loyalty, which constitute a third area of importance to language learning.

Both ethnic identity and group loyalty are especially strong in Japan. Lebra states that identity is established by belonging to a group and that among the Japanese "pure, unambiguous belonging" is desired. "Japanese who do not 'behave like Japanese' are thought deplorable; overseas Japanese such as Japanese-Americans are not easily trusted and may be ridiculed because of their apparent ambiguity of identity in terms of belongingness."247

This principle applies to language behavior also. In interethnic situations, individuals who adopt the speech markers of the dominant group as a "tactic of social mobility are often considered cultural traitors by other members of the ingroup and uncomplimentary labels are often attached to them."248 Such is certainly the case in Japan, where, for example, those Japanese who have lived abroad and acquired fluency in English may "arouse suspicion."249

But Japanese returning from abroad are not the only ones who suffer because of fluency in English. Brosnahan observes, the Japanese have "a traditional contempt for the bilingual person as probably a fool and certainly untrustworthy."250 Thus, even if they never leave the country, many Japanese may fear becoming "too good" in English. In fact, in spite of the time and effort expended on English study in Japan, there is an undeniable counter-current which implies that good Japanese are not supposed to learn English too well. Paul McLean quotes a senior Finance Ministry official as saying, "It doesn't do to be too proficient in English. If you are thought to be too 'international,' that is a mark against you in government offices and in some big companies too."251

Along these same lines, Jansen claims that "Japan remains parochial and insular in important respects, and the unique quality of Japanese culture combines with the limiting nature of the Japanese language to enfold the Japanese in a consciousness of social nationality that may have no parallel elsewhere."252 In fact, Harasawa explains, many
Japanese "consider Japan to be the only real country and Japanese the only real language." Reischauer agrees that there is a strong "Japanese sense of being somehow a separate people—of being unique. The line between the 'we' of the Japanese as a national group and the 'they' of the rest of mankind seems to be sharper for them than for most peoples who participate much in international life." This distinction is maintained in the Japanese language and is illustrated best in the Japanese vocabulary, where

things of foreign origin are frequently distinguished from their Japanese counterparts by the recruitment of nouns of foreign origin while vernacular words are assigned to native things....Rice served in a foreign-style meal is called raisu (from "rice") and is not served in a Japanese rice bowl; but if served in a Japanese-style meal, it would be called gohan and served in a traditional rice bowl, even though the two may be cooked exactly alike and even in the same pot.

Regarding the learning of English, this feeling of distinctiveness is important. Fishman et al. state that one of "the primary attitudinal contributions to predicting English acquisition [is] low national consciousness." Once more, Japanese learners face a difficult dilemma. They have no desire to lower their level of national consciousness, yet they need to learn English to communicate with the outside world.

In some countries, ethnic groups which find themselves in a subordinate relationship with the surrounding, dominant society encounter a similar problem. They must use the dominant group's language, but they also feel it important to maintain their own ethnic identity. Social psychologists have found that when using the majority language is perceived as threatening a subordinate group's sense of identity, there are still ways of preserving that identity. For instance, as Giles notes, "The use of an outgroup language, but with a distinctive ethnic accent, does not detract from the speakers' perceived ethnicity."

Hudson, a sociolinguist, has hypothesized that "syntax is the marker of cohesion in society...vocabulary is a marker of divisions in society...[but] pronunciation reflects the permanent social group with which the speaker identifies." If such truly is the case and if the theory can be extended to include international settings, then it is possible that many of the pronunciation problems Japanese learners of English experience when they speak English are due to a (subconscious) conflict with their ethnic identity. Assuming that this feeling would be particularly strong in the "reverse course" years after the
American Occupation of Japan, Japanese ethnic identity could have formed a formidable (but unrecognized) barrier to ELEC's oral English campaign.

Psychological identity relates to more than just pronunciation, however. For instance, after investigating factors which promote language learning, Snow and Shapira conclude, "Second language learners should have the desire to identify with the target group whose language they are learning." It seems to be a language-learning fact that fluency requires a psychological re-orientation to new ways of thinking. Furthermore, those who are disenchanted with their own culture are often the best foreign language learners,

These factors, of course, run counter to the strong Japanese feeling of native-group identity. Harasawa claims, of all people in the world, "the Japanese are unduly addicted to or intoxicated by their own language—so much so that neither English nor any other foreign language can ever succeed in invading their linguistic subconsciousness." Another, related problem is the common Japanese "belief that the acquisition of a foreign language will endanger one's native language and his native culture, which are generally viewed as very fragile and vulnerable." The result is a resistance to learning English by effective methods. McLean notes,

In spite of all the talk of learning English in order to become more internationally-minded most Japanese are still obsessed by the fear of somehow losing their 'ethnic uniqueness,' their Yamato Damashii or Japanese spirit. English, then, cannot be allowed to threaten this mental parochialism, and so it is taught in a very special way.

An illustration of this point comes from a response to a letter on English teaching in \textit{The Japan Times}, in which an experienced English teacher wrote:

What really hit me was Mr. Miyazawa's fear of "losing a 'Japanese' personality" if English is studied at too young an age....Such a limited and narrow view smacks of racism. It seems unnecessarily protectionist, almost culturally paranoic. It also reinforces something I have suspected from time to time with some of my students in the past 3-1/2 years in Japan—namely, that some Japanese put up psychological blocks to foreign language learning because they feel it is dangerous to their very "Japaneseness."

At least some of the ELEC personnel were aware of this problem. Kleinjans, for instance, recounts the story of two Japanese students who dropped out of freshman English at ICU because their friends called them "different." Speaking of Japanese
learners of English more generally, he summarizes, "The problem is that they're so afraid of losing their Japaneseness." If among the Japanese, years after the Occupation ended there was still a definite fear of losing one's "cultural identity or soul" by becoming too Americanized, this fear must have been especially strong in the first years of ELEC's operation.

In sum, a variety of factors—academic, social, cultural, and psychological—have combined to make Japanese learners generally unable to do what is necessary to learn oral English. This situation constituted a serious barrier to ELEC's implementation effort, just as it continues to make it difficult for Japanese students to learn to speak English today. Nevertheless, as Tajima notes, "These are the situations which are almost impossible to change for the better simply by improving instruction[al] methods and other external conditions."266

Teacher Factors

Teachers are frequent targets when accusations about "failures" in education are being hurled, and English teachers in Japan are certainly no exception to this rule. Regarding the reform of Japanese ELT, one formidable obstacle is the many native Japanese teachers of English who demonstrate a traditional "suspicion about innovation in learning and teaching." Dillon and Dillon, list a number of other teacher-related problems as reasons why most Japanese "fail to achieve dazzling proficiency in the English language." They point to "a lack of trained native-speaker instructors," a chronic unwillingness to weed out incompetent teachers," and "a traditional student-teacher relationship which is not conducive to the development of oral skills in a living language." Primary among these obstacles, however, is the widely recognized problem that "not many of the teachers themselves can really speak English." For a long time, the limited ability of Japanese teachers of English to speak the language fluently has been viewed as a handicap to the implementation of any sort of oral approach. During the days when Palmer was trying to get Japanese teachers to utilize his Oral Method, one of the major barriers was that "teachers could not pronounce correctly." Even today, the fact that many Japanese teachers of English "lack a
communicative ability themselves" is viewed as a serious handicap by those who would reform the Japanese ELT system.\textsuperscript{271}

Such was certainly the case in the early 1950's when the ELEC effort was getting under way. In a "Report on Japanese-American Cultural Relations" prepared for Mr. Rockefeller in 1953, which contained a section on the possibility of starting an English-language teaching program in Japan, it was noted, "Inquiry as to the Japanese inability to speak English even after six or eight years of study including 'conversation' usually elicited the reply that the teachers of English commonly could not themselves speak English with any real facility."\textsuperscript{272} Later, in 1956, this same observation was made, i.e., "that in Japan very little conversational English is taught since so few Japanese teachers are qualified to teach it."\textsuperscript{273}

Besides the many reasons mentioned in the preceding sections of this chapter, this pitiful situation had an additional explanation. In the years before and during World War II, most Japanese stopped studying English. The number of English users and their proficiency declined. Also, during the war, many English teachers went to the battlefield and never returned. Then, almost immediately after the war, because of the expansion of educational opportunity and the increased demand for knowledge of English during the American occupation, there was suddenly a great need for English teachers. The few Japanese who could speak English accurately and fluently, however, were needed as translators and interpreters, and thus were not available for the classroom. Those who remained to teach English were generally the oldest and the least proficient in the language.\textsuperscript{274}

Another problem was that people looking for teaching jobs who had majored in some subject other than English but had received passing marks in university English classes (which emphasized English literature rather than practical speaking proficiency in the language) were put into English-teaching positions in order to fill the teacher gap when educational opportunity and the study of English expanded so rapidly after the war. Later, when more qualified teachers became available, these "stop-gap" individuals refused to move over. As Ichikawa explained,

More than half of the chugakko teachers of English, who are said to number roughly 20,000, are those who have majored in other subjects than English, and
though they know themselves they are unfit for teaching English, they cannot and will not move to other places, on account of the difficulty of getting other jobs, with the result that they thus shut the door to younger and abler teachers.\textsuperscript{275}

Naturally, when John D. Rockefeller III became desirous of reforming English teaching in Japan in order to promote the teaching of spoken English, the lack of teachers who could speak English with any proficiency was a serious handicap.

Given the large and growing size of the Japanese ELT program, importing adequate numbers of native speakers of English was definitely out of the question. A report to Mr. Rockefeller emphasized, "It is clearly impossible to provide enough English-speaking teachers to change the situation."\textsuperscript{276} (Even today, it is reported that there is an "acute shortage of qualified native speakers of English in Japanese schools."\textsuperscript{277})

The only alternative was to provide a program to train new (and re-train old) Japanese teachers of English. As noted earlier, in addition to teaching them about the Oral Approach, a major purpose of the ELEC Summer Seminars was to build the teachers' oral English proficiency. Unfortunately, as noted elsewhere also, because of the large numbers of students and teachers of English in Japan, ELEC's re-training effort fell woefully short of being sufficient. And even if it had possessed capacity adequate to re-train the many thousands of Japanese teachers of English, other problems might have stifled ELEC's successes. For instance, due to the widespread educational philosophy which favored "cultural" aims, many Japanese teachers of English shunned anything that appeared too "practical," like speaking skills. Moreover, because of Japanese teachers' "academic scrupulosity" they typically showed an "excessive fondness for hair-splitting discussions of grammatical details,"\textsuperscript{278} which also would have precluded fluency in speaking.

Consequently, in trying to promote the Oral Approach, ELEC faced a situation where teachers who lacked speaking proficiency in English were unable to do what was necessary to learn and/or teach oral English. Informing them of the Oral Approach was far from enough. As Ishikawa lamented, "Our teachers cannot put into effect what they know it is best to do."\textsuperscript{279}
Inter-Elemental Factors

Of course, the user system, the resource system, and the innovation do not exist independently—in separate spheres. Rather, these elements are linked together. Consequently, the different systems need to harmonize with each other if the innovation-implementation effort is to be successful. In this section—the final one of this chapter to deal with forces that inhibit or facilitate the implementation of an innovation across cultural boundaries—various inter-elemental factors are examined: compatibility, linkage, reward, proximity, and synergy.

Compatibility

Compatibility can be a crucial, decisive factor—especially in directed contact change situations. Discussing cross-cultural implementation of an innovation, Rogers and Shoemaker claim that, if it is adopted at all, "an idea that is not compatible with the prevalent values and norms of the social system will not be adopted as rapidly as an innovation that is compatible."

In such a situation, two types of compatibility are of primary concern: (1) between the innovation and its intended users and (2) between the resource system and the intended user system.

To avoid or overcome potentially threatening mismatches, diffusion of innovations experts normally prescribe conducting a preliminary analysis of the "fit" between the systems concerned. Among other things, such studies examine the amount of homophily (the degree to which pairs who interact are similar in certain attributes) or heterophily that exists in a given situation and make recommendations accordingly.

Compatibility considerations are just as important in reform efforts concerned with language teaching as they are in other disciplines. In reference to homophily, Richards, for instance, points out:

The successful implementation of a language program may depend on how well it matches the expectations, learning styles, and values of the learners. Many contemporary methods of language teaching make culturally based demands on teachers and learners. It is not a cultural universal, for example, that students should be talkative and communicative in classrooms.
Of course, perfect matches are seldom found—especially when directed contact change campaigns cross cultural boundaries. For instance, when a U.S.-based resource system attempts to promote an American innovation in Japan, problems with heterophily should come as no surprise. Regarding the teaching of English to the Japanese, Otani notes, "The European and American cultural system behind English, which is utterly foreign to ours, also aggravates our difficulty in learning English." He goes on to claim that "the linguistic and cultural barriers to efficient learning of English are more formidable here [sic] than in almost any other country in the world." In such a case, planning and adaptation to increase compatibility would seem to be particularly crucial.

Unfortunately, at ELEC, especially in its early years, compatibility-related concerns were minimal. The decision to promote Fries' Oral Approach seems to have been based more on his prestige in America and his persuasiveness at the Specialists' Conference than on his proposal's compatibility with the Japanese situation. In fact, because of the revolutionary ideals held by key ELEC supporters, it seems probable that Fries' approach was chosen because it was so different from traditional Japanese practices teaching foreign languages. ELEC's approach to bringing about change was also incompatible with the Japanese school system in many ways.

The result, as discussed in various sections of this chapter (such as those dealing with the originality and flexibility of the innovation, or with Japanese students' learning style and related psycho-social factors), was frequently some type of conflict which reduced ELEC's successes. More concern with compatibility and planning to deal with incompatibilities, might have avoided many of these problems.

**Linkage**

One of the critical factors mentioned by Havelock, *linkage* refers to "the number, variety, and mutuality of contacts between the resource system and the user system." It reflects the "degree of inter-personal or intergroup connection" that exists in a particular situation. In diffusion of innovation campaigns, the strength and variety of linkages between the resource and user systems often determines their success.
Richards also recognizes the importance of this factor but he calls it "support networks." He discusses various types of support networks important to the successful spread of language-teaching innovations: professional teaching organizations, universities, professional journals, and official educational agencies. Unfortunately, in almost every one of these cases, ELEC and Fries' Oral Approach had trouble.

Part of the problem was that it was never clearly decided whether or not ELEC would establish relationships with other institutions. There were conflicting opinions in this regard.

On the one hand, it was recognized that to be successful, ELEC needed the support of established Japanese institutions. In 1956, McLean advised Rockefeller, "If this idea is worth doing, it must have the support of some established Japanese institution or institutions. It should not be something apart." Another idea was to place ELEC under some kind of American umbrella. After consulting with Fries and Twaddell, McLean recommended that ELEC "try to get a committee concerned with this project under either the American Council on Education or the American Council of Learned Societies." Still another recommendation, by Sidney Lamb, was to "discover who does the teaching and what organizations they have formed" and then work through them as opinion leaders. Later, as the ELEC campaign was just getting under way, its Japanese leaders hoped that "universities, institutes, and societies" would "cooperate harmoniously under the over-all-plan of the Central Committee."

On the other hand, over the years English teaching in Japan had developed a variety of "cleavages." Antagonism, to a greater or lesser degree, existed... between rival scholars of the same and different generations, governmental and private institutions, academic and business circles, rival organizations in the English language field, language and literature professors, lower and upper secondary teachers, American and British trained scholars, Japanese and foreign teachers resident in Japan, and between Japanese who have studied abroad and those who have not.

For this reason, ELEC did not want to become tied to any "school of thought" or get embroiled in any existing inter-institutional feuds. Therefore, it jealously guarded its independence. In 1960, Overton proudly noted that this was one of ELEC's "unique characteristics": "While it endorses the 'oral approach' in the teaching of English, it is bound to no particular school of linguistics. It has no special ties to any interested
groups, foreign or Japanese. It operates independently of the Japanese Ministry of Education."

In the end, the latter sentiment seemed to prevail, and ELEC established linkage with few (if any) other organizations. In retrospect, this seems to have been a serious mistake. Many of ELEC's problems might have been avoided, or at least been easier to overcome, if ELEC had enjoyed the benefit of appropriate Japanese support networks.

**Professional Teaching Organizations**

As early as 1955, before ELEC was officially organized, in a report commissioned by the Japan Society, William Cullen Bryant II recommended that "a realistic, long-range effort to improve English must therefore first consider which groups are most interested in its improvement and which would be most influential, and then try to insure their cooperation by offering them participation in the effort." In Japan today there are many organizations of English teachers. There were not so many in the 1950's.

JALT, the Japan Association of Language Teachers, did not exist at that time. In fact, neither did JALT's parent organization, TESOL (a U.S.-based international association of teachers of English to speakers of other languages, founded in 1966).

JACET, the Japan Association of College English Teachers, started in 1961, long before JALT but still well after Fries' initial visits and the founding of ELEC. Therefore, it was not available for ELEC to establish linkage with. Besides, as the next section discusses, because of American meddling in Japanese higher education during the Occupation, most university professors could probably not have been counted on to support a reform campaign promoting an American method.

Other Japanese English-teacher organizations, however, did exist at that time. There was the *Nihon Ebun Gakkai* (an association of college teachers of English literature and linguistics). It was founded in 1916 and was a very powerful organization. Nevertheless, it was also very traditional. As far as can be determined, ELEC established no contact with this association. Maybe that was wise. Besides consisting of college professors (generally resistant to American innovations) the *Nihon Ebun Gakkai* was
also radically different from ELEC in both its interests and purposes. Conflict with ELEC, rather than support, might have been inevitable.

The Institute for Research on English Teaching (IRET) established by Harold Palmer in the pre-WWII days and revived after the war, proudly claimed to be "the oldest progressive organization in the field." Nevertheless, it did not seem to be a likely candidate to provide support for ELEC either. Certain members of ELEC, such as Sanki Ichikawa, the IRET's director, argued that the IRET "should be the sponsor of any new program." Despite this initial jealousy, Ichikawa accepted an invitation to be a member of ELEC's central committee and even spoke at the ELEC Specialists' Conference. This connection was about as close as ELEC ever got to establishing linkage with any professional organization in Japan.

The National Federation of English Teachers' Organizations, Zen Eiren, a very widespread organization of junior and senior high school English teachers in Japan, with a membership of 60,000 in 1966, was founded in 1951, only a few years before ELEC. One of the founders of Zen Eiren was Genji Takahashi, who was also a member of ELEC. Given that connection, and because of ELEC's focus on reforming Japanese ELT beginning at the lower secondary level, a connection between Zen Eiren and ELEC would have been both natural and beneficial—especially to ELEC.

The possibility of cooperation with Zen Eiren and the IRET was discussed by ELEC leaders as early as 1956. However, with the exception of personal contacts (in which individual IRET and Zen Eiren leaders worked with ELEC), ELEC established no official relationships with any Japanese teacher organizations in its early years. The failure to establish this type of support network seriously damaged ELEC's chances of making any sort of impact on English language teaching in Japan.

Years later, ELEC seemed to have learned its lesson and began cooperating with other groups concerned with English teaching such as IRLT (Institute for Research in Language Teaching, Zen-eiren, Zen-eiren, COLTD (Council on Language Teaching Development), etc., by participating in conferences of joint sponsorship or by offering facilities for their activities. If ELEC had started such cooperative efforts earlier, the story of its campaign to revolutionize ELT in Japan might have been quite different.
Universities

Another type of support network is universities. In the United States, Fries and the Oral Approach were associated with the then highly prestigious University of Michigan program. In fact, the Oral Approach became known as the "Michigan method." This connection encouraged the spread of the Oral Approach in America.

In post-war WWII Japan, in large part because of reforms attempted by Occupation authorities (as discussed in chapter four), university prestige was extremely important. Unfortunately, however, Fries and ELEC had few connections with important Japanese universities, and no Japanese university officially supported the Oral Approach.

This was in contrast with Bryant's early (1955) recommendation that ELEC establish relationships with and work through prestigious Japanese universities.

The government's Tokyo University of Education (Kyoiku Daigakku), as the former higher normal school of greatest prestige in the country, should probably be the locus of a pilot program, as perhaps should Hiroshima University, which has merged with the second ranking normal school....I was politely warned that such new institutions as International Christian University, no matter how admirable their English teaching programs, are foreign in origin and have not proved their academic excellence in other fields; and that it would be unwise to make them central in an English teaching project. Nevertheless, Bryant's recommendation was apparently ignored.

A few private university campuses (Sophia, International Christian University, Doshisha—not nearly as important in Japan as the large national universities) were occasionally used as sites for ELEC summer seminars for teachers, but even they didn't have any official connection with ELEC.

It could have been different. As discussed in chapter two, the first ELEC Summer Program was scheduled to be held at International Christian University, and "the ICU people were enthusiastic to cooperate with ELEC." Nevertheless, Fries himself refused to go to ICU. His ultimatum, "We're not going to ICU and we'll have our own staff without ICU assistance [italics in original]," foreshadowed both immediate and long-term problems relative to ELEC's relations with Japanese universities. As a result of Fries' resistance, the Summer Seminar was held at Toyoeiwa Jogakuin, a junior high school near International House, not nearly as powerful or prestigious as even a young, private university.
Later, perhaps seeing the need for university support after all, Fries tried to court the favor of Japanese university professors. There is little information on how he did this, but according to one ELEC leader, he tried to do too much too fast. "He tried to convert them all at once," and it was "all in vain." As might have been expected in the "reverse course" years, "the universities were very adamant and independent."301

In 1959, when he was no longer working with ELEC, Fries definitely recognized the crucial nature of university support for any reform effort. He penned, "It has always been my belief that if this kind of work is to succeed finally in Japan and be a permanent contribution it must be supported by the colleges and universities through which the future teachers of Japan must go."302

It is a pity that this realization did not come earlier. Without doubt, support and endorsement from key Japanese universities would have made the story of the Oral Approach in Japan substantially different. Nevertheless, even if ELEC had attempted to establish contacts with Japanese universities in order to gain support for its revolutionary reform campaign, the attempt might have been to no avail. For many years, the universities—especially the most prestigious universities—continued to be "the real centers of conservatism both in their entrance exams and in their classes."303

Professional Journals

In the United States, the University of Michigan had its own journal, Language Learning, "the first journal devoted to the new 'science' of applied linguistics."304 It spread the news of Fries' "Michigan method" across the nation and also lent prestige, power, and credibility to his Oral Approach.

In Japan, ELEC also had a publication, the ELEC Bulletin. Although it was a decent publication, it never approached becoming as influential as Language Learning. Instead of enjoying the prestige which might have come had it been associated with an important university, it seemed more like a commercial, house organ. As a result, in Japan the Oral Approach was not so well supported as it had been in the U.S.A., but at least ELEC had a publication which provided some support.
Official Educational Agencies

Support from educational agencies is the last of Richards' "secret life" implementation factors. He gives as an example the case of France where, in 1902, the Minister of Education "gave official approval to the Direct Method. It became the only approved method for teaching foreign languages in France, and in the same year it also became the approved method in Germany." Without doubt, such official endorsements are very powerful, especially in countries where the school system is highly centralized.

In post-Occupation Japan, re-centralization took place quickly and the Japanese Ministry of Education quickly regained most of its former powers. The support it could have provided to the Oral Approach would have been extremely valuable to the ELEC movement. Nevertheless, as noted in the section on authority and administration, the Ministry of Education was, at best, neutral, and, in the eyes of many, it was antagonistic toward ELEC. Whatever the case may have been, ELEC never enjoyed the benefits which a supporting linkage with the Monbusho could have provided.

In summary, ELEC failed to establish valuable linkages in virtually every one of the above areas. The ELEC Bulletin did provide some outreach to the community of Japanese teachers of English and ELEC's involvement of a few scholars who also had links to other organizations was helpful, but much more could have been done.

It seems that ELEC's American sponsors eventually realized their error in attempting to keep ELEC "independent" of ties with other groups in Japan. Lamentably, that realization came too late to help ELEC. Having learned from their error, the Ford and Rockefeller Foundation representatives found it easier to start over than to backtrack. Therefore, in 1967, as ELEC support was being phased out, they formed the CCEJ (Committee for Cooperation on English in Japan), which, unlike ELEC, hoped "to work closely with existing organizations."
Reward

The "frequency, immediacy, amount, mutuality of, planning, and structuring of positive reinforcements" is, as mentioned in chapter three, an important consideration in change efforts. These rewards may come from the resource system (which thus becomes a reward system) or be intrinsic to the innovation itself.

Given the large size of Japan's ELT program as well as ELEC's lack of power over teachers in the Japanese school system, it was not feasible for ELEC to function as a reward system. Therefore, it was hoped that the "relative advantage" of the Oral Approach would be reward enough to encourage teachers to adopt the Oral Approach. Nevertheless, because of factors such as the nature of the English questions on the university entrance examinations, few teachers saw the Oral Approach as being advantageous.

In fact, because of cultural and school system factors, Japanese teachers' potential rewards for trying the Oral Approach were few, and the personal costs were high. To learn how to use the Oral Approach, they would have had to invest their own time, energy, and money—all three of which few teachers had in excess. Furthermore, if they were to try out the Oral Approach in class, those whose English speaking skills were deficient (that is, most Japanese teachers) would run the risk of embarrassment or losing "face." Naturally then, they would prefer to continue to use methods in which they didn't have to speak English and which did not make them "run the risk of making mistakes" in front of their pupils.307

In short, the classic "teacher's predicament" regarding innovation was especially bad for Japanese teachers during the time of the ELEC campaign. Not surprisingly then, few teachers were willing to take the risks associated with innovation along the lines ELEC recommended.

On the other hand, teachers who did not try to change ran no risks. As one veteran Japanese teacher put it, "Why should they change? They are paid." In other words, teachers' salaries remained the same regardless of the method they used. This was by no means a secret. In 1955, when Bryant did his survey of ELT in Japan, he reported that
under the present secondary school system, young teachers have no real incentive to improve their ability, for both promotion and salary increases depend on seniority and the number of children a teacher has, while opportunities for appointment as leading teacher or principal depend on the applicant's having graduated from a good higher school. Thus, with teacher unions, job security, and no Monbusho pressure to change to the Oral Approach, it would have been truly surprising if many teachers had spent extra time and effort to learn and use the new, unfamiliar, and hence, more difficult Oral Approach.

In sum, there was no real motivation for most Japanese teachers of English to implement the Oral Approach, and there were some powerful reasons for their not doing so.

Proximity

Proximity refers to the distance between the resource system and the user system. This distance may be physical, temporal, or cultural. Whatever the type, Havelock calls this distance a "powerful predictor" of utilization of an innovation, with greater distance decreasing the chances of utilization. To the detriment of the ELEC campaign, the only type of proximity its resource and user systems enjoyed was temporal.

The physical distance between Japan and the United States created a number of problems. Although many of the ELEC workers actually lived in Japan, several of the important leaders, such as Fries and Twaddell, seldom spent more than a few months per year in Japan. Although they worked on the materials and summer seminar programs during the rest of the year, the distance between them and their colleagues in Japan created difficulties in communication. When problems arose, correspondence was a poor substitute for conversation. It took valuable time to write letters, and even by air mail they took many days to travel the distance between Japan and the United States. And with written communication, the potential for misinterpretation was especially great, particularly when the correspondents had different linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

Of course, even when the Americans were in Japan, the cultural distance between the Japanese and the Americans was also great. Because of their experience with students from other nations, ELT educators like Fries were undoubtedly more aware and tolerant of cultural differences, but the American experts' lack of familiarity with Japanese cultural
Synergy

Synergy is the final factor in the innovation-implementation process section of the hybrid model which forms the framework for this chapter. This factor, however, is not as prominent as many of the others. Havelock mentions it only reluctantly even though he feels that the term describes a feature of many implementation movements—that the total influence of a change effort may be greater than the sum of its parts. Of course, synergistic power depends on the number, variety, frequency, and persistence of forces associated with the implementation of the innovation, as well as on the amount of cooperation and communication among them.

Lamentably, there is little evidence of synergy in ELEC's case, probably because there was not much opportunity for it. The number and variety of forces working in favor of the changes which ELEC's leaders desired were few. ELEC encountered lots of problems and obstacles, but the number of its successes was limited. Furthermore, lack of planning meant little coordination among these few supportive forces.

Outcomes

Although the focus in this study has been on process, the analysis of the ELEC effort would be incomplete without at least a brief discussion of the campaign's results. The hybrid model provides for this since its final section is devoted to outcomes.

Regarding the consequences of the Rockefeller Brothers' different projects, Morris notes,

They have, despite excellent coaching, rung up at least the normal number of errors in the box score. They have occasionally thrown the ball to the wrong base and they have sometimes struck out, swinging. They have never quit trying, however, and even the casual observer can see a pattern emerging from their sometimes fumbling, sometimes idealistic but always grimly determined efforts.\textsuperscript{310}
While "idealistic" and "grimly determined" both characterize the Rockefeller-supported ELEC effort, and it is also apparent that the ELEC campaign was far from error-free, the analysis of its outcomes is certainly not as simple as "three strikes and you're out" or deciding whether or not the ball was thrown to the right base.

Following Rogers and Shoemaker's paradigm, the hybrid model allows for the more complex picture of ELEC's outcomes by recognizing several types of consequences and acknowledging that they may be immediate or come later. As explained in chapter three, the outcomes of a change effort may be functional (in terms of what was desired) or dysfunctional (or some combination of these two extremes). They may also be direct (in immediate response to the innovation) or indirect (the result of the reform movement's direct consequences). Yet a third evaluation scale is concerned with whether the consequences were manifest (recognized and intended) or latent. All three of these sets of outcome types can be used in analyzing the outcomes of the ELEC campaign, but the distinction between direct and indirect consequences is most useful. Also worth noting is the provision the model makes for "later adoption" after initial rejection of an innovation.

**Direct Consequences**

Respecting its grand objective of revolutionizing English language teaching in Japan and producing a new generation of Japanese who could speak English as their second language, ELEC would have to be classified as a failure. As noted at the end of chapter two, even Rockefeller's associates and ELEC's faithful supporters recognized that ELEC "was not able to change the grand strategy of English-language teaching in Japan or to bring overall improvement in teaching methods."³¹¹

Relatively few Japanese teachers adopted the Oral Approach in their classrooms—even in the long run. In 1974, nearly twenty years after ELEC's oral English "revolution" began, Edwin O. Reischauer reported that "teaching methods have remained antiquated and inefficient."³¹² Reischauer also noted that "extremely few Japanese...can attempt even a simple conversation in English."³¹³ His opinion was supported by an empirical study conducted a few years later which obtained self-ratings of 123 Japanese students of English regarding their skill in the language. Despite having
studied English for an average of 8.41 years, the highest rating these students gave themselves (on a scale on which 1=not at all and 5=like a native speaker of English) was a far from fluent 2.48 in reading. Writing was next with 2.14, and understanding and speaking were near the bottom of the scale with ratings of 1.96 and 1.80 respectively.314

Even today, "antiquated and inappropriate teaching methods"315 continue to be used in Japanese schools. Just this year, a report on foreign language teaching around the world noted that "teachers in Japan lack experience speaking English; many read Shakespeare aloud in an incomprehensible accent."316 From these reports it is apparent that the "lamentable situation"317 of English language teaching in Japan persists even today.

Nevertheless, as Smith reassured Rockefeller in 1974, it cannot then be concluded that "ELEC was a boondoggle or not useful."318 The campaign produced a number of outcomes that were more latent than manifest in nature but, nonetheless, important. Glicksberg, for one, gives ELEC credit for providing "incalculable aid in the up-grading process." As evidence, he notes,

[ELEC] has brought prominent American linguists to Japan and has produced texts and accompanying audio-visual materials for the three years of junior high school English....In addition, ELEC has a large-scale program of adult English classes at its Tokyo school where much of the teaching is of truly exceptional caliber. ELEC also has a very active summer seminar program which, since its inception, has involved several thousand Japanese English teachers.319

In terms of what ELEC's founders originally intended, of course, each of these activities fell short of its goal. The number of teachers re-trained by ELEC each year reached a peak of 1,169 (which was still only a small proportion of the total potential audience) in 1962, and then declined considerably. The New Approach texbooks were adopted by only about one percent of Japanese lower secondary schools and were in print for only a few years. Perhaps most importantly, ELEC never even attempted to deal with the critically important examination backwash issue. Nevertheless, as an "influence" or "aid in up-grading," ELEC was undeniably useful. That type of outcome, however, is more appropriately located at the other end of the scale—in the area of indirect consequences.
Indirect Consequences

While acknowledging that ELEC failed to revolutionize Japanese ELT, many who worked with the reform campaign were heartened by relatively small changes which took place years after ELEC ceased to actively promote change. For instance, as noted earlier in this chapter, a number of universities now include sections in their entrance examinations which require students to comprehend spoken English. ELEC's efforts may have helped encourage these modifications. In addition, although the New Approach textbooks quickly went out of print, it is reported that they "certainly influenced the development and revision of many of the others." Likewise, changes in the Ministry of Education guidelines regarding English-teaching materials a few years after the ELEC campaign began were "a great encouragement to ELEC" since they were "completely in line with the objectives ELEC had been making great efforts to accomplish."

Nevertheless, because they are indirect, it is impossible to say with any certainty whether these purported secondary outcomes of the ELEC effort actually resulted from the ELEC campaign or were due to other forces. It is most likely that they were caused by a variety of factors, only one of which was ELEC. Nevertheless, it is also impossible to rule out ELEC as a force which helped change ELT in Japan—at least in a latent and indirect way.

Conclusion

This chapter has noted many problems, including a variety of historical, social, cultural, and school-system forces that militated against change in Japanese ELT during the time ELEC was trying to bring it about. In conclusion, however, it should be said that even under the best of circumstances change of the magnitude envisioned by ELEC's founders might have been impossible. As Kleinjans explained, the ELEC campaign was an extremely idealistic one.

Nevertheless, had ELEC's leaders been aware of the many factors discussed in this chapter and the preceding one, it is probably safe to say that their successes would have
been greater and their failures and difficulties reduced. In the sense that "the past is prologue," perhaps other educational reform movements can benefit from this analysis of ELEC's experience.
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CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This final chapter summarizes the previous five as well as the major obstacles which the ELEC campaign encountered. It also arrives at a number of conclusions regarding the usefulness both of a diffusion-of-innovations perspective in general and, more particularly, of the analytical model developed for this study. In addition, it notes the limitations of this study and makes recommendations—both for researchers and for would-be reformers.

Summary of Chapters

Chapter one introduces the study and explains its intended outcomes. It also deals with some fundamental considerations, such as types of change and the desirability of "conscious purpose" in creating change. In addition, it makes a case for the study of the diffusion and implementation of innovations—in formal education generally, in foreign-language teaching, in English-language teaching, in cross-cultural reform efforts, and in Japanese ELT. A review of the literature on these subjects reveals that while there are a great many studies dealing with the diffusion of innovations generally or with curriculum development in education, relatively few studies have been done which not only combine these focuses but also narrow them to the field of English language teaching. Furthermore, despite the importance of English language teaching in Japan and the
frequency of attempts to reform that system, no diffusion of innovations studies dealing with this specialized area have been reported. The rationale for conducting this study of ELEC's effort to reform Japanese ELT stems from the contrast between the importance of the topic of attempted ELT reform (in Japan and elsewhere) and the paucity of studies dealing with that topic.

Since few people are familiar with the story of the ELEC effort in Japan, chapter three provides necessary background and a chronological overview of events in that campaign. Starting generally, with Rockefeller Foundation efforts to bring about reforms in various areas (education, agriculture, etc.) in different parts of the world, the chapter quickly narrows in focus to John D. Rockefeller 3rd's interest in Japan and English language teaching. Subsequently, it traces the history of ELEC, beginning with the early exploratory phase and continuing on through the establishment of the English Language Exploratory Committee, the first ELEC Specialists' Conference, and the involvement of Charles C. Fries in ELEC's campaign to reform ELT in Japan. Apart from Fries' involvement, ELEC's activities in producing textbooks, re-training English teachers, and establishing its English Language Institute are also discussed. ELEC's eventual incorporation (as the English Language Education Council) and the construction of its own building are noted as high points in the organization's history. This chapter draws to a close with a discussion of how even though (and perhaps because) it had achieved stability, ELEC began to lose momentum in its reform campaign, and Rockefeller (and Ford Foundation) support eventually shifted to other organizations for improving English language teaching in Japan.

Although it is informative and establishes a framework for later reference, a chronological account does not lead to the conclusions which can make the ELEC story truly useful. For that, an analysis of the ELEC experience is necessary, and chapter three presents the model and framework used for conducting this analysis. The chapter first discusses the challenge of analyzing the implementation of change and establishes a number of criteria for an adequate analytical model. It then rehearses general theories of social change, and discusses several general perspectives on the implementation of change as well as a number of specific linkage-type frameworks. It then presents the "hybrid" analytical model to be used in the next two chapters to analyze the ELEC effort.
Following this presentation of the model comes a discussion of a number of particulars relative to it, such as the importance of planning for innovation, possible stages in the implementation process, types of innovation decisions, and strategies for bringing about change. The remainder of the chapter is devoted to a discussion of several dozen factors which encourage/discourage change, and which together constitute a major part of the hybrid model. These factors are grouped into four general categories: characteristics of the innovation itself, characteristics of the resource system, characteristics of the user system, and inter-elemental factors.

Since the first major element in the analytical model is antecedents, chapter four discusses the historical development of various characteristics of the Japanese ELT system which ELEC attempted to change. Some of these characteristics date back over a thousand years, to the time when Japan's first contacts with the outside world led to the study of Chinese as a foreign language. Other important characteristics developed later, some as recently as during the post-WWII Occupation of Japan and in the "reverse course" years which followed it (and immediately preceded the ELEC effort).

Chapter five combines the chronological and analytical perspectives of the previous chapters and uses the implementation process portion of the "hybrid" model as a framework for analyzing the ELEC effort to reform Japanese ELT along the lines of C. C. Fries' Oral Approach. Numerous characteristics of the Oral Approach itself, of the ELEC resource system, and the Japanese ELT user system, as well as various inter-elemental factors are discussed as they relate to the outcome of the ELEC effort.

**Major Obstacles**

This analysis reveals a variety of barriers which the ELEC campaign encountered. Many of these still frustrate attempts by present-day reformers of the Japanese ELT system, and plague reform efforts in other countries as well. These factors are discussed in detail in chapters four and five, but a brief summation of the major ones is presented here also:
Size of the Program

A primary obstacle faced by those who would reform English language teaching in Japan is the sheer immensity of the program for teaching English in Japanese schools. After World War II, more Japanese than ever before entered educational institutions, and virtually all of them wanted to take English classes. By the time the ELEC effort began, millions of Japanese pupils (virtually every student in junior and senior high school) were studying English, and around sixty-five thousand teachers, qualified or not, had been drafted to teach the subject.

The rapid expansion of ELT in Japan at this time followed an almost traditional Japanese pattern, and could not have been accomplished without the school-system foundation that had developed over a period of more than a thousand years. Still, the post-WWII English-teaching "explosion" resulted in the country's English-teaching resources being spread very thin. Among other problems, classes were large, teachers' English skills were weak (especially when it came to speaking the language), and their training in language-teaching methods was minimal. The natural result was mediocrity and the continuation of a tradition which treated English more as a subject of analysis than a means of communication. Training (or re-training) such a large group of teachers would have required time and resources far beyond those available at the time.

Thus, the large number of people involved in Japanese ELT became a major reason for the difficulty in reforming the system. As Harasawa noted in 1974: "It has been absurd trying to teach English to the whole population, as we have so far been doing. If this ceases, I shall be more optimistic about the prospects of English in this country."^1

Examination Backwash

Another serious barrier to any oral-English reform effort in Japan is its incongruity with powerful backwash from the university and high school entrance examinations. The English portions of these examinations emphasize knowledge far removed from speaking skills, and yet passing the exams is generally regarded as the major objective of junior and senior high school instruction.
Until these examinations change (and in recent years they have begun to change slightly) it is doubtful that oral English reforms will succeed. Although he recognizes the importance of other "deep structure" factors, such as Japanese students' learning style, which are even harder to change, Harasawa expresses some hope for innovations in the "surface structure" which could bring about the teaching of spoken English in Japan. Of course, the key element is the nature of the entrance examinations. He considers it "all important" that the English portion of these exams be "made to attach 50 per cent weight to the oral-aural skills, thereby ceasing to distort the teaching of English at the junior- and senior-high-school level." Harasawa neatly summarizes the entire examination-reform issue (which ELEC generally tried to ignore) with the following statement:

I consider this [the changing of the examinations to give equal weight to oral-aural skills in English] the only categorical imperative, the minimum that must be required of the policy-makers for English language teaching in this country, for I am convinced that other necessary reforms would naturally follow. For example, high-school teachers would come to be trained or would retrain themselves well enough in a matter of years, because otherwise they would be unable to perform their professional duties effectively; they would willingly ask the authorities to provide them with opportunities for in-service training, even during their vacations.

Nevertheless, as many others could argue back, there are numerous reasons for not changing the examinations. The debate between those who advocate the "practical" objectives of English study, which favor oral English, and those who defend the "cultural" purpose of language study, which is more closely allied with the traditional nature of the exams, is a long standing one and has not yet been resolved. Another less frequently mentioned but nonetheless important function of the English examinations is sorting the examinees. In this regard, the purpose of the tests is to measure students' intelligence (at least, their ability to memorize) and/or their diligence in studying more than their true proficiency in the language. As presently (and traditionally) constituted, the English portion of the exams performs this sorting function very well. Still another factor militating against changing the university entrance exams is the training and professional predilections of most university-level English professors in Japan, who continue a tradition of favoring the more "academically respectable" literary aspects of English to the detriment of speaking skills.
In sum, proposing that the examinations be changed is easy, and many have done it. Overcoming the barriers to change and actually modifying the exams is a far more difficult task, one which has not yet been accomplished. Nor is the prospect for change very bright. As C. P. Snow once said of a similarly entrenched examination system in Great Britain: "Academic patterns change more slowly than any others....I used to think that it would be about as hard to change say, the Oxford and Cambridge scholarship examination as to conduct a major revolution. I now believe that I was over-optimistic."4

In Japan, although favorable backwash from modified examinations could have done a great deal to encourage the changes ELEC sought, ELEC's efforts did not address this point directly.

**Teachers' Inability/Unwillingness to Use an Oral Approach**

A related factor, which might have been solved with time had other obstacles been overcome, was the general inability of Japanese teachers in the 1950's and 1960's (and today also) to speak English. Such teachers, quite naturally, would find it difficult to use Fries' Oral Approach.

Through its Summer Seminars, ELEC set out to provide training for such teachers, but oral proficiency in a foreign language is not easily or quickly gained under even the best of circumstances. It would have been especially difficult during the time of ELEC's reform effort due to a number of discouraging factors: the large number of teachers recruited during the Occupation years, their minimal preparation, their heavy work loads, their lack of exposure to oral English, their lack of motivation to change, etc.

Two additional factors, the strength of tradition and social pressure to conform to the established norm further complicated the problem in Japan. For both of these reasons, teachers were reluctant to experiment with any new method, and because of their weaknesses in spoken English, they were especially unlikely to adopt an oral approach.
Lack of Authority and Support Networks

Many English teachers in Japan might have been persuaded to at least experiment with the Oral Approach had ELEC possessed the power of authority over them, or at least if it had enjoyed the benefit of support networks with institutions that did exercise that power. Such, however, was not the case.

The powerful Japanese Ministry of Education officially maintained a neutral stance regarding ELEC's campaign, and offered no official endorsement or support. Furthermore, in the case of at least one key Monbusho official (who wielded considerable power in the area of English teaching) ELEC's reform effort encountered resistance.

Because of its desire to remain unattached (and thus not become embroiled in "politics"), ELEC purposefully avoided contacts with universities—both in the United States and in Japan. By the time ELEC's leaders realized that this had been a mistake, that the support of Japanese universities could be beneficial to the ELEC campaign, it was too late. ELEC had lost its momentum and patterns of antagonism and resistance had been established.

Relationships with professional English-teacher organizations in Japan could also have been helpful to ELEC's campaign, but for the same reasons, it avoided establishing support networks of this nature, with the exception of a few contacts through influential individuals.

Japanese Learner Factors

One of the critical considerations at what Harasawa calls the "deep structure" level is the nature of Japanese learners. When it comes to foreign language learning, they present a challenging combination of psychological, social, linguistic, and pedagogical factors. Most of these characteristics were poorly understood by the ELEC reformers—especially the Americans—who focused almost entirely on linguistic matters. Likewise, although three decades of research have brought many of these factors to light, they are still ignored by many would-be reformers of Japanese ELT today.
Lack of an Implementation Plan

Reform-movement leaders must take all the above (and other) factors into account as they plan their reform strategies. Unfortunately, there is little evidence that ELEC's planners engaged in such planning. In fact, they seemed to operate with almost no diffusion-implementation strategy at all, other than communicating the news of the Oral Approach innovation to Japanese teachers. Apparently, they subscribed to the traditional American "better mousetrap" idea, feeling that a new, improved teaching methodology would catch on automatically once teachers saw its relative advantages.

This failure to plan and execute an implementation strategy was probably ELEC's greatest shortcoming. A great amount of time and effort was spent in planning the linguistic aspects of ELEC's products (e.g., Japanese-English contrastive analysis, "corpus" preparation, and textbook design), but next to nothing went into plotting strategies for overcoming or working around (or with) the numerous barriers to implementing the Oral Approach in Japan. The ELEC planners could have met with greater success if they had taken such a diffusion-of-innovations point of view.

Conclusions

Larudee acknowledges, "A historical study may not always suggest solutions but it usually contributes to a better understanding of the problems under consideration." Nevertheless, while this section summarizes what has been learned in this historical study, it also ventures to suggest some solutions. These suggestions will be in the form of general principles—based on, but apart from, the particulars of the Japanese ELT situation and ELEC's attempt to revolutionize it.

More than Methods: The Importance of Implementation Factors

The most important conclusion of this study is that the successful spread of a methodological innovation requires more than an apparent relative advantage. In other words, a "better mousetrap" alone is not enough.
Such a conclusion is not really new; others have reached it also. Nearly twenty years ago, for instance, Kelly concluded his historical overview of language teaching with these words: "Every age, in fact, has its rebels whose teaching techniques, though scientifically justifiable, fail to gain acceptance because they did not fit the atmosphere of the time." More recently, Richards has emphasized, "Planning a successful language program involves consideration of factors that go beyond the mere content and presentation of teaching materials." Nevertheless, this counsel is often ignored by language-teaching innovators, who (as noted in chapter one) regularly promote their ideas across cultural boundaries without regard for the numerous components of the target setting. In doing so, they also ignore the danger of trying to bring about "change at the 'surface' levels while leaving undisturbed the underlying approach to language and language teaching." That their efforts meet with such little success should come as no surprise.

A related conclusion, of interest not just to reformers but to all methodologists, has to do with the nature of methods themselves. The purpose of Larudee's historical overview of language teaching methods in the western world was to "discover what major forces influenced language teaching in each period of history." He attempted to disclose "how methods of language teaching are conceived, and why; how they are nurtured, and by what sources; how and why they die out; and why and how they are revived." His findings demonstrate that "in the course of history, language teaching has been affected by philosophical, theological, political, social, scientific, economic, national, and international as well as pedagogical and linguistic factors." The present study of ELEC's attempt to reform English language teaching in Japan has reached a similar conclusion. Contrary to the belief commonly held by language teaching methodologists, that methods are the result of a combination of linguistics, psychology, and pedagogy, a multitude of additional factors influence the form and the spread of methods.
The Complexity of Implementation Factors

A consideration of this variety of factors leads to the sobering conclusion that the implementation factors in a given situation form a complex network. This complexity, of course, leads to difficulty in bringing about change. The realization of how complex the implementation process is may be enough to make reformers want to abandon their hopes and resort to a belief in the classic structural-functional equilibrium point of view. Ogasawara, for instance, holds that before English language teaching in Japan changes, many other elements in the Japanese system will need to change first. Understanding the complexities and difficulties reformers must face is humbling also and might raise questions about the "cosmic impiety" or arrogance of attempting to bring about change.

The realization of this complexity constitutes more than an excuse for failure, however. It can also comprise the beginning of an understanding that may eventually lead to success. As Parish and Arends remind reformers, "We can learn from our efforts...if we view our failures not as resulting from stubborn resistance or bad intentions but instead as ingrained in the complex relationships found in schools."

An awareness of the various implementation factors in a particular situation can also help reformers understand what kind of change is possible and/or desirable in that setting. In addition, it can lead to greater success, as reformers work with (and around) these factors, perhaps even making them work in favor of change.

To understand these inter-related factors and deal with them, a model which represents them accurately and completely is useful. Such a model can profitably be employed in planning as it leads reformers to take into account factors which might otherwise be ignored, and as it helps them realize the effect that "non-school" factors can have on school practices.

The Need for Planning and Power

Another conclusion of this study is that, unless reformers are willing to trust to luck, planning for implementation is necessary. Of course, planning is not a guarantee of success—there may be no way of overcoming some obstacles—but planning for
diffusion and implementation increases the chances of succeeding. Adequate pre-
planning can also help cross-cultural reformers fit or adapt an innovation to the target
situation.

Along with most planned change strategies comes the need for power. In this
respect, a vertical approach (top down or bottom up, depending on the context) to change
is preferable, since it is more powerful than the mere horizontal communication of an
innovation. Regarding ELEC’s attempted reform of ELT in Japan, Yoichi Maeda
expressed the view that although in the 1950’s it was understandably natural for the
Americans to apply a "democratic" principle to the process of change, it was wrong. It
would have been much better for them to take an elitist approach, starting at the top and
working down. Although it happened too late to save their campaign, ELEC’s leaders
seemed to realize this also, and subsequent Ford and Rockefeller Foundation efforts to
change ELT in Japan attempted to start at the top.

Of course, even with power, a reform effort can expect success only if and when
planning is thorough and realistic. ELEC’s campaign was extremely idealistic from the
start, attempting to revolutionize the entire system for teaching English in Japanese
schools. It might have achieved greater success if it had started with less grandiose
expectations and developed specific plans aimed at narrower target objectives.

The Need for a Special Linkage Model

Implementation is much more than mere implantation. Even in cases of directed
contact change, where both the innovation and the idea that change is needed come from
outside sources, there is little hope that implementation and reform will succeed without
the cooperation of the target, user group. Therefore, of the various perspectives on
change discussed in chapter one, a linkage approach is most appropriate.

Nevertheless, because of the complex of factors and forces that affect change, no
simple, single-factor model is adequate—especially when the implementation effort
crosses cultural boundaries. Also, as the ELEC experience shows, success in some areas
(such as the use of authority figures) is not enough to balance neglect of others. To plan
for the success or understand the failure of the diffusion and implementation of an innovation in such a setting, it is necessary to consider a variety of interacting factors. Disappointingly, however, many models employed by diffusion of innovations researchers fail to take into account more than a few school-system variables. Perhaps this approach is adequate when a reform effort is restricted to a limited, single-culture setting. In considering the case of the ELEC effort, however, it became immediately apparent that such models did not include a variety of crucial factors. In fact, even the more complex models developed by other researchers were found to be inadequate for the purposes of this study, and it was necessary to combine components from them into a "hybrid" model.

The hybrid model developed for use in this study was complex, but such complexity was necessary in order to take into account the variety of social, psychological, political, historical, and other factors which affected the ELEC effort. While this model is especially applicable to the case of ELT in Japan, its categories are general enough that it can be recommended for analyzing other cases of cross-cultural, directed-contact change also. Moreover, its successful use in the present study demonstrates that it satisfies the criteria of completeness, cross-cultural applicability, relevance to directed change, and coherence.

Caveat: The Dangers of Over-Planning and Inflexibility

Despite this study's conclusion that planning for implementation is crucial, and its focus on the problems related to ELEC's failure to plan adequately, it is also appropriate to point out that taking this emphasis on planning to an extreme can result in a different set of problems.

One potential danger of this concern with planning is that it is often hard to distinguish between adequate planning and over planning. The desire to plan things carefully may lead to planning which seems to go on endlessly. In such cases, the undesirable result may be that a reform movement becomes paralyzed, never making it to the action stage.
Another possible danger of careful pre-planning is that it may lead to inflexibility on the part of the movement's leaders. After leaders have invested heavily in careful planning, unwillingness to change their plans and make necessary adjustments as the reform campaign develops is a natural consequence. Nevertheless, this tendency must be resisted, perhaps by building formative evaluation into the plan and emphasizing, from the very first stages, the need for adaptability. Because of the complexity of the process of implementing an innovation, it is impossible to plan for all possible contingencies ahead of time, and even the most carefully laid plans will require adjustments. Thus, as critical as the need for planning may be, few aspects of the implementation process are as certain as the need for flexibility. Successful implementers will strike a harmonious balance between these requirements.

The Need for Time to Bring about Change

Another tension experienced by innovator-implementers has to do with time. The complexity of the change effort, the need for planning, the challenges of communicating the innovation, the necessity of preparing members of the user system, the forces of resistance that must be overcome—all mean that change requires time. Based on his experience, Williams warns enthusiastic reformers, "Do not expect major improvements to come quickly." Nevertheless, even the most patient reformers often feel heavy pressure from funding agencies to produce fast, measurable, demonstrable results. Tangible products, such as textbooks, often satisfy the boards of funding agencies, yet as the ELEC experience demonstrates, such products do not guarantee diffusion and implementation of an innovation or real reform. In addition, as the ELEC experience also illustrates, this satisfaction may be only temporary and funding may still be withdrawn before a reform movement has had adequate time to succeed. Perhaps an awareness of the impressively complex process illustrated in the hybrid model developed for this study can help convince those who fund change efforts to be more patient.
Limitations

Although this study has been fruitful in many ways, it is not without its limitations. In the spirit of honesty and candor, these also deserve discussion.

Predominantly Negative Perspective

One drawback of this study is that it has tended to take a predominantly negative view of the ELEC effort. Although it has noted ELEC's successes, it has focused heavily on what did not work. This approach did not stem from any desire to attack or embarrass those who worked so hard trying to achieve ELEC's objectives. As stated several times, given their particular roles and limited knowledge, they generally did the best they could. Rather, the motivation for taking this approach has been the hope of learning from their errors, so that others will not repeat them. In this way, even ELEC's failures can be turned into successes.

The temptation to look back on decisions that were made long ago (without the benefit of present hindsight) and play the "what if" game should also be noted. Thirty years after the fact, it is enticing to make conjectures about what might have happened "if only...." From such a perspective, it is easy to imagine favorable consequences which contrast with what actually did happen, but such imagining may not be fair. Although this study has occasionally indulged in such hypothesizing, it recognizes that other courses of action might have encountered other obstacles and resulted in failures of a different kind. Most importantly, however, as stated above, it has not been the purpose of this dissertation to "second guess" the ELEC leaders, but to learn from what didn't work for them and suggest alternatives.

Limits of a Case-Study

As Yin points out, choosing a research strategy is not necessarily a simple process of moving as far as possible up a methodological hierarchy which has a true experimental design at its apex. Rather, the best approach is to "consider the repertoire of empirical
research strategies from a pluralistic rather than a hierarchical perspective," and then select the method whose strengths are appropriate to a particular research setting and purpose. For reasons previously stated, in regard to the subject of this dissertation a historical case study offered several distinct advantages.

This is not to say, however, that a case study is not without its limitations. Primary among these is its questionable external validity. The extent to which the findings of this case study can be generalized to other cases is unknown. Such problems are not uncommon in diffusion of innovations studies. Wolf notes that "when factors related to diffusion/utilization are studied for the purpose of extracting a set that may be generalized to many diverse situations, problems arise." Success or failure could be due to any one (or more) of a variety of factors: social disorganization, clever marketing, the charisma of the innovator, etc. Because of the multitude of variables in any natural setting, it is nearly impossible to determine with any certainty those which account for the success/failure of a given innovation. In light of this problem, it is difficult to know the extent to which the case of ELEC in Japan thirty years ago may be applicable to other cases—in other countries, at other times.

Nevertheless, although this limited generalizability is a definite weakness of this study, there are some encouraging signs that it is not as serious as one might expect. For example, Palmer and Redman, whose attempt at reforming Japanese ELT preceded ELEC's, and whose experiences were by no means limited to Japan, observed, "In all countries and circumstances...we have encountered identical resistances, expressed though they have been in diverse ways." Closer to the present, and a decade after ELEC's reform movement had run its course, Brosnahan acknowledged that some aspects of the Japanese ELT situation are peculiar to that country but insisted that "on the other hand, many of the problems encountered [in Japan] are also found in one form or another almost everywhere that languages are taught."20

In short, as in virtually all comparative education studies, generalizations from the findings of this case study of ELEC's attempt to reform ELT in Japan must be made with caution. Nevertheless, as Noah affirms, phenomena do not need to be perfectly parallel to be usefully compared. After a "careful analysis of the conditions" which surround a
particular case, it is still possible to learn valuable lessons from that case and apply them to another.  

Qualitative Analysis

A final limitation to this study is its reliance on qualitative (and, therefore, at least somewhat subjective) data and analytical procedures. For instance, there are no objective, quantified measurements of ELEC's successes and/or failures. Such judgements are based on individual's statements and the patterns of evidence which support them.

One reason for not using quantified data is that, because of the historical nature of the study, it is simply not available. But there are other reasons for not relying on an objective, empirico-statistical approach. First, because of the grand scope of the ELEC effort (and most reform movements) it would be impossible to conduct a quantitative analysis of all its features. As shown in earlier sections of this study, the innovation-implementation process is an extremely complex one involving a challenging array of variables, only some of which could possibly be measured objectively. To focus on these variables and ignore the others (which defy quantification) would be potentially misleading. In addition, as noted earlier in this study, the interaction of many of these variables is critical, with the total effect often being greater than the sum of the individual parts. In such cases, even an extremely complex quantitative analysis would fail to capture the true picture.

Qualitative analysis is not merely used as a last resort, however. It offers a number of benefits, which outweigh whatever disadvantages it may have. Primary among these is the case-study's ability to use "real-world" data as opposed to that which might be elicited in a more objective but artificial "laboratory" situation.

In recent years, comparative education and language-teaching/learning studies have both begun to recognize the advantages of a qualitative approach to analysis and moved away from a reliance on empirico-statistical data. For instance, in 1969 Noah and Eckstein published their Toward a Science of Comparative Education, which urged researchers in comparative education to abandon "historical and philosophical
speculation" and adopt a strict social science paradigm which considered only "the facts, preferably quantified." More recently, however, Noah apologized for "talk[ing] up the benefits of the social science content of comparative education a little too vigorously" and explained that he and Eckstein "were trying only to redress an imbalance, and not to cast out history and philosophy lock, stock, and barrel from comparative study of education."  

In 1986, Kelly and Altbach reported on challenges and changes in the comparative study of education over the last decade. They affirmed that since 1977, "others have challenged the field to move beyond quantitative studies of school outcomes to qualitative research on educational processes." Kelly and Altbach note that "scholars such as Masemann, Weiss, Heyman, and Pfau argued cogently that reliance on school outcome data failed to relate outcomes to the processes of schooling and suggested that only through qualitative methods could the nature of educational processes and their outcomes be understood." It is possible to apply this argument in favor of qualitative studies of educational processes to the use of similar methods to study change processes in schools.

Recommendations

This study comes to a close by making a few recommendations. These are addressed to two different audiences: researchers and reformers.

For Researchers

It is common for research studies to conclude with a plea for more research on the same topic. While this study ends on a similar note, it does so not merely because of tradition. There truly is a need for other studies dealing with attempts to reform ELT practices in other countries. As noted in the review of literature in chapter one, few such studies have been done. Furthermore, the generalizability of studies of this nature is severely limited.

Only when a number of studies of this type and dealing with this topic have been conducted will truly useful, generalizable patterns begin to emerge. Such a development
will allow for a full-scale, comparative approach, not just individual area studies. From such a perspective it will be possible to see which approach works best most often and under which sets of circumstances, not just what did or did not work (and which alternatives might have worked) in a particular case.

For example, a brief newsletter article recently noted that educators in Egypt are currently making an attempt to reform English language teaching in that country. Apparently, the approach they are taking is to begin at the top, by reforming the school leaving examination system. Since this type of approach is similar to what many have said would be the key to reforming ELT in Japan, it will be most interesting to see how it works in Egypt. Given adequate information on the setting and the processes, it could be extremely instructive to compare the outcomes of this effort in Egypt and ELEC's campaign in Japan.

Additional studies focusing on different ELT reform attempts which all took place in Japan but at diverse times would make enlightening diachronic comparisons possible also. For example, although it would involve an even greater number of variables than this study did, a triple comparison of the reform efforts of Palmer in Japan before WWII, ELEC after WWII, and present-day reformers of Japanese ELT, would also have some natural controls, and it could be extremely revealing.

For Would-be Innovators and Implementers

This study will conclude by making a few recommendations which might benefit those with new ideas and/or desires to change existing systems.

The Necessity of Considering Implementation Factors

The most important recommendation that can be offered to those who might hope to reform any system—and particularly Japanese ELT—is to pay attention to the many implementation factors which have been noted in this study because of their effect on the ELEC campaign. The model developed for analyzing the ELEC effort can also be put to profitable use in planning. Although the complexity of the situation is intimidating, the
various factors which constitute it cannot be ignored if success in achieving reforms is expected.

**Lessons from History**

The Roman god Janus was typically pictured as having two heads, or one head with two faces. In either case, he had eyes in front and behind, so he could look forward and backward at the same time. Innovators in language teaching, in education generally, or in any area, can benefit from such a dual perspective. This study recommends that they look back into history, to the experiences of others, at the same time that they look forward, making plans for their own innovation and implementation efforts.

Tripp takes a similar view. In reviewing a book on the history of English language teaching, he recommends, "The essay on Palmer...is especially good and should be required reading for any foreigners new to Japan who imagine they are going to reform language teaching."26

**A Disturbing Cyclical Pattern**

Warning about growing "Japanese chauvinism" in linguistic and culural matters, Professor Masao Kunihoro, speaking at a recent JALT (Japan Association of Language Teachers) convention condemned the "'parochial nationalism' which he said was emerging in today's Japan."27 In addition, Ogasawara reports that "younger Japanese these days feel that foreigners should learn and use Japanese because Japan has become the center of the world."28 If such truly is the case, it would conform to the historical Japanese cycle. Unfortunately, if attitudes towards English study head in the direction they went in the nationalistic years prior to World War II, conditions would become inimical to the teaching and learning of foreign languages in Japan generally, and any present-day reform attempts would be doomed. Reformers would be well advised to be alert to these social trends.
A Different Type of Change

In recent years, numerous would-be reformers of Japanese ELT have made proposals such as the following: "A drastic reform should be adopted. Greater emphasis should be placed on oral communication. Training methods involving speaking should be conducted more effectively. The most urgent business is to get really proficient teachers. Every teacher should be required to have adequate oral proficiency."²⁹ "The first thing we should do is to reform the present nature of the college entrance examination."³⁰

Although it is tempting to dismiss these calls for reform as merely more of the same old thing, an important difference offers a ray of hope in the midst of the rather dismal prospects of reforming the Japanese English teaching system. This critical difference is that to an increasingly greater extent, those who are making such proposals are prominent Japanese educators, not visiting Americans. As Suzuki urges, "It is we Japanese teachers of English who must take the lead in bringing forth these necessary changes. For we alone can understand the vast complexities of the Japanese educational system."³¹ It is encouraging to note that, rather than directed contact change, what is now being proposed is more on the order of immanent change. As discussed in earlier chapters, immanent change generally experiences a higher rate of success, and perhaps these Japanese will achieve the success which has eluded outside reformers. Outsiders who wish to see reforms take place would do well to join and support these indigenous movements rather than confuse the scene with their own independent efforts.

Influences Instead of Revolutions

A final recommendation to reformers concerns the scale of their hopes. Even with its considerable resources, ELEC failed to achieve its grand objective of revolutionizing Japanese ELT. Nevertheless, it did enjoy some successes. As noted earlier in this study, these major achievements/accomplishments took the form of "influences": on the Ministry of Education guidelines, on other textbook publishers, on English teaching in Japan in general. In light of the nature of these successes, one conclusion to be drawn from this experience might be that gradual, instead of radical change is not only more
possible but more desirable. Thus, rather than attempting to revolutionize the entire system overnight, those who desire to change the ways English is taught in Japan should be satisfied to aim at influencing teachers, administrators, and examiners to make meaningful but gradual changes.
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