Reviews

Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture. Harlow: Longman, 1992; F32+1528+B28 pp., HB: ¥5900, PB: ¥5500 (incl. tax). *Worksheets* (16 pp.) distributed free on request.

Reviewed by
Francis Britto
Sophia University

Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture (LDELC) is a medium-sized dictionary meant for intermediate and advanced learners of English. Containing approximately 80,000 words and phrases, of which 15,000 are "cultural entries," the dictionary encompasses, according to a Longman ad, "Everything students need to know about British and American language and culture." Other features of the dictionary as advertised are "32 pages of detailed, full-color illustrations; e.g., scenes from literature, history, entertainment," 16 "special feature pages" giving "detailed information on cultural aspects of British and American life; e.g., educational systems," over "500 black and white illustrations including photographs," and about "400 Cultural notes at entries such as *Declaration of Independence* and *lawyer.*"

The definitions are written in a variety of British English that uses only the "Longman Defining Vocabulary" of 2,000 elementary words. Words not included in the Defining Vocabulary are used sparingly, and are either printed in small capitals, warning learners that they must look them up elsewhere, or defined briefly, as in the entry kittiwake: "a kind of GULL (=a seabird) with long wings."[1] Most entries and sub-entries, there are sample sentences or phrases illustrating usage. Differences between American and British varieties in spelling, usage, and pronunciation are clearly marked. Unlike LDELNE and LDEL, which use unwieldy non-standard symbols to show pronunciation (cf. Masuda et al., 1994, p. 35), LDELC uses the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA), making it more convenient for learners. There are no etymologies, which is not unusual, given that most dictionaries for learners; e.g., COBUILD, OALD, OALDEE, and WNSOD, do not have them.

The main body of the dictionary is preceded by introductory items, such as Grammar Codes and A Guide to Using the Dictionary, and followed by tables under the following seven headings: Numbers, Weights

and measures, Military ranks, Word formation, Longman Defining Vocabulary, Irregular verbs, and Short forms and labels. However, LDELC fails to include a list of the headwords which have been annotated with a usage or cultural note. Such a list, like the one found in OALDEE (pp. viviii), would have been very useful for learners and given an idea as to the areas covered by the notes. Another missing feature is a list like the "Corpus Acknowledgments" found in COBUILD (pp. xxii-xxiv). Such a feature is necessary since LDELC contains very little information about the "Longman Corpus Network," on which it is based. There is no formal "Introduction" comparable to the one by Sinclair for COBUILD, though Summers, the Editorial Director, has written a one-page preface. The lack of an introduction from the editors is lamentable, since readers have no way of knowing what the editors mean by *culture,* what criteria they have used in selecting the headwords, or what priorities they have given to the diverse "cultural" topics. The need for an introduction seems all the more urgent given that the blurb on the back-cover and the sales-pitch in advertisements generally tend to make ambiguous or exaggerated claims (e.g., "*Everything* students want from an advanced dictionary"; "Special feature pages tell students *all about many cultural aspects of British and American life*" [emphasis added].

Special Conventions

LDELC adopts a few unusual conventions which are worth mentioning. On page F29, it states that syllabic divisions are shown by means of dots and that these dots "also show where you can break a word (or 'hyphenate' it) at the end of a line of writing." The syllabic divisions, however, seem unreliable for the purposes of hyphenation. Consider examples from LDELC and equivalents from three other dictionaries:

LDELC	*OALD* (British)	*AHDEL* (American)	*WNSOD* (American)
auc.tio.neer	auc.tion.eer	auc.tion.eer	auc.tion.eer
bu.reauc.ra.cy	bur.eau.cracy	bu.reauc.ra.cy	bu.reau.cra.cy
cat.e.chis.m	cat.ech.ism	cat.e.chism	cat.e.chism
dis.sem.i.nate	dis.sem.in.ate	dis.sem.i.nate	dis.sem.i.nate
ex.tem.po.ra.ne.ous	ex.tem.por.an.eous	ex.tem.po.ra.ne.ous	ex.tem.po.ra.ne.ous
in.ad.ver.tent	in.ad.vert.ent	in.ad.ver.tent	in.ad.vert.ent
las.civ.i.ous	las.ci.vi.ous	las.civ.i.ous	las.civ.i.ous
man.y	many	man.y	man.y
sec.ond.a.ry	sec.ond.ary	sec.on.dar.y	sec.ond.ar.y
spas.m	spasm	spasm	spasm

LDELC seems more American than British as regards hyphenation, though in most other respects it is more British than American. Learners would have found it useful if LDELC had stated whether the divisions shown for hyphenation are typically British or typically American (cf. Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik, 1972, p. 1613). The wisdom of showing hyphenation dots in *-chism*, *many*, and *spasm* seems questionable, for most style sheets would discourage hyphens in the positions suggested (e.g., Fowler, Aaron, & Limburg, 1992, pp. 471-474). Dividing words such as *chasm* and *spasm* into two syllables and showing *m* alone as a syllable may baffle even native speakers. Since most learners of English find hyphenation difficult, it would have been better if LDELC had followed the lead of OALD, which ignores unnecessary syllabic divisions.

Another unusual feature of LDELC is that if "a noun is always used in the plural form in one of its meanings, the meaning is shown as a separate headword" (p. F10). The special meaning of words such as airs, basics, and pits, therefore, are not listed under air, basic, and pit, but as separate headwords. Most dictionaries (e.g., COBUILD, OALD, OEED, WNSOD) do not separate singular and plural forms, though they make exceptions when the plural form has a meaning entirely unrelated to the singular (e.g., *bends* 'pains suffered by divers'). It seems to me that separating singular and plural forms such as *air* and *airs*, sometimes interrupted by more than 40 other headwords, blurs the semantic relationship between the words. Also, it is inconvenient for learners, for without knowing that plural forms such as *airs* and *basics* are special, they are likely to look them up first under entries for the singular.

Finally, LDELC treats *Mc* equivalent to *Mac* and lists a headword like McCoy before Macdonald and after Macbeth. Among dictionaries, some, especially those intended for native speakers (e.g., OEED, LDEL), treat *Mc* equivalent to *Mac*, and some, especially those intended for learners, do not (e.g., AHDEL, COBUILD, DCL, OALD, OALDEE). Learners might find the convention of LDELC throwing them off, since they have no way of knowing that McCoy, pronounced as if it were written *MacCoy*, is listed ahead of Macdonald. Moreover, the logic for this convention is tenuous. After all, a word like *FBI*, even though pronounced as if it were written *efbeeai*, is never listed under *E* or *e*; so why must McCoy be listed before Macdonald? Are not the principles of orthographic sequencing and phonetic sequencing confused here?

Entries

Perhaps the distinguishing feature of LDELC is its concern for introducing the *culture* of native English speakers. As a dictionary of *lan-*

guage, it is not novel, for the language part of LDELC is essentially the same as LDCE, published about seven years ago.[2] As Summers says in the preface, "The full text of the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* [LDCE] is the basis for the book, but we have included a further 15,000 people, places, events and institutions in order to provide advanced learners of English with a full reference resource in one book." Numerous notes and figures have been added, and many language-related entries modified. Unfortunately, some highly useful features of LDCE, such as "A Quick Guide to Using the Dictionary," "Language Notes," and the table of "Geographical names," have been omitted.

According to a Longman ad, the cultural entries included belong to the following 14 categories: (1) Newspapers and magazines (e.g., The Sun), (2) Fairy tales and nursery rhymes (e.g., Cinderella), (3) Institutions and organizations (e.g., C.I.D., Smithsonian Institution), (4) Companies and products (e.g., Mars Bar), (5) Quotations and sayings (e.g., All that glitters is not gold), (6) Cultural associations (e.g., First Amendment, bowler hat), (7) Real people (e.g., John Major), (8) Real places (e.g., Sunset Boulevard), (9) Literature (e.g., Romeo and Juliet), (10) The Bible (e.g., the good Samaritan), (11) Entertainment (e.g., Monty Python), (12) Sport (e.g., Super Bowl), (13) Shops and banks (e.g., Bank of America, Harrods), and (14) Classical mythology/history (e.g., Hercules, the Boston Tea Party). Unfortunately, these categories are solely for advertisement purposes, not for identifying or grouping the cultural entries. In fact, there is no formal reference to these categories in the dictionary. No information has been provided regarding the relative percentages of these entries either. Most users would like to know what importance or priority has been given to each category.

To get a rough idea as to the relative size of these categories, I counted and classified the entries beginning with the letter B. Since most cultural entries begin with a capital letter, I counted only headwords that begin with a capital *B* (excluding about 10 entries such as *B* and *BA*, which seemed to defy classification). Assuming that the proportion of cultural entries under each alphabet character tends to be similar, though not identical, the results, shown in Table 1, suggest that place names and items related to entertainment (movies, pop music, TV shows, actors, and actresses) are given greater importance than, say, literature, mythology and history, or fairy tales. The reason just one entry for "Quotations and sayings" appears seems to be because LDELC generally includes them under another headword or under the name of the person who said them. The rule and exceptions given for finding them (p. F12) seem difficult to interpret and cumbersome to apply. It would have been much simpler if the saying or quotation had been

Table 1: Cultural Entries Beginning with a Capital *B*

Category	UK	US	Other	Total	(%)
Real places	55	15	93	163	(22.79)
Entertainment	40	45	15	100	(13.99)
Real people	41	10	35	86	(12.02)
Cultural associations	48	13	20	81	(11.33)
Companies and products	37	16	17	70	(9.79)
Literature	43	8	10	61	(8.53)
Institutions and org.	36	7	11	54	(7.55)
Sport	20	7	6	33	(4.62)
Classical mythology/history	12	3	6	21	(2.94)
Newspapers and magazines	11	8	1	20	(2.80)
Fairy tales and rhymes	4	2	5	11	(1.54)
Shops and banks	5	1	2	8	(1.12)
The Bible	0	0	6	6	(0.84)
Quotations and sayings	0	0	1	1	(0.14)
Total	352	135	228	715	
(%)	(49.23)	(18.88)	(31.89)	(100)	

treated as a headword, as in DCL. It seems odd that lengthy titles (Around the World in Eighty Days and Joseph and the Amazing Technicolor Dreamcoat) are headwords but quotations are not.

The data also suggest that there are more UK- than US-related items. The "Equal coverage of British and American vocabulary" referred to on the back-cover of LDELC, therefore, must be strictly interpreted as applying to "vocabulary," rather than to "cultural entries." Since much of the British heritage is shared by Americans, the dominance of UK-related entries is to be expected; what seems unbalanced is their relative insignificance. Many UK-related items seem too provincial; e.g., exotic resorts for the rich and famous, outdated music groups, and TV programs and domestic products little known outside the British Isles.

In general, the cultural entries included seem predominantly of objects, persons, places, and events one might come across while reading People, The National Enquirer, Sun and such magazines. On comparing just a few pages of LDELC with OEED, I observed that the cultural entries found exclusively in OEED tend to be such academic ones as *Bacchanalia*, Roger *Bacon*, *Bactria*, and William *Baffin*, whereas, the entries found exclusively in LDELC tend to be media-related ones such as Burt Bacharach, Badminton Horse Trials, Joan Baez, and Bailey's Cream. Similarly, when I arbitrarily checked the entries beginning with "Max" in both DCL and LDELC,

I found in DCL James Clerk *Maxwell* (Scottish Physicist) and *Maxwell's Equations* (four equations relating electric and magnetic waves); whereas in LDELC, Max Factor (cosmetics), Maxim's (night club), Robert Maxwell (British publisher), and Maxwell House (instant coffee). Although these are just a few random samples, they reveal accurately the academic and cultural level of LDELC. The consumers targeted for LDELC do not seem to be academically oriented learners, but those who want to learn English by watching movies or reading tabloids.

Perhaps the most striking weakness of LDELC concerns consistency. Many cultural entries seem mechanically or randomly chosen, unfiltered by any process that consistently graded potential entries in terms of their significance. For example, the dictionary includes such entertainment lightweights as Jeremy Beadle, Michelle Pfeiffer, and Peter Fonda, but excludes eminent Oscar winners such as Jodie Foster, William Holden, and Jack Lemmon, great veterans such as Anthony Quinn, Peter O'Toole, and Sammy Davis, Jr., and even sensational stars such as Nastassja Kinski, Brooke Shields, and Bruce Willis. It cares to mention Player's and Marlboro, but ignores Camel, Dunhill, and Winston; there is Bell's, but not Chivas Regal, Glenlivet, or Wild Turkey. It gives nearly 15 lines to Magic Johnson, who contracted HIV through loose living, but dismisses Stephen Hawking, one of the greatest living scientists, in two. Stand-up comedian Johnny Carson receives 12 lines, but major political leaders like Fidel Castro and Cho En-lai are disposed of in two. It is up-to-date as regards Jim Bakker and Jimmy Swaggert, the scandalous preachers, but quite oblivious to Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, the Myanmar heroine of democracy and Nobel Laureate. Further examples of the inconsistency of the selection, and the insignificance of many of the selected entries, can be found throughout the dictionary.

Definitions

One finds some informative ones definitions or explanations especially for items related to fairy tales, nursery rhymes, children's games, and celebrations (e.g., Arthurian legend, Jack and the Beanstalk, Nativity, Red Light Green Light). Entries for legendary and historical persons (e.g., Davy Crocket, Abraham Lincoln, Helen of Troy) too are reasonably good, though relatively unimportant details are often included or sensationalist information overshadows more important details. For instance, the opening sentence about Henry VIII is, "The most well-known fact about Henry VIII is that he had six wives," and much of the information deals with his love life and murders rather than his political, religious, or social reforms. The silly phrase "not tonight, Josephine," which Napoleon "is believed to have

used" is repeated three times, once under Napoleon, once under Josephine, and once with a color picture.

Entries regarding actors and actresses generally tend to be of the tabloid variety, most often containing some sensational tidbit about the person; e.g., "known for her unusually large breasts" (Dolly Parton), "became famous for swearing" (Sex Pistols), "it is known that he has had a drink problem" (George Best). This tabloid style is sometimes quite upsetting, as, for example, when we read that the Aga Khan is "a very rich Arab leader who is known for owning many race horses." That is the only bit of information the dictionary can give on a person whom the OEED describes, among other details, as a Moslem religious leader who heads "an enormous complex of services and welfare provisions for members of the community." As another reviewer (M. G., 1993, p. 320) observed, "On occasions the compilers [of LDELC] talk down to students; this is evident not only in the lexis used in the definitions, but also in the facts considered useful for the education of the readers' minds."

The cultural notes, often entered separately but sometimes as part of the definition, are by and large informative, and most learners would find them fascinating (e.g., Congress, Dred Scott Case, dog, job). These and usage notes are probably the most valuable parts of LDELC. To introduce to learners the associations that native-speakers of English have with certain words (cf. p. F7), there are in some entries not only factual descriptions but also stereotypes, perceived images, or outdated associations (e.g., secretary, barmaid, dunce's cap).

Sometimes LDELC seems to challenge taboos by mentioning even politically incorrect or potentially offensive stereotypes. For example, the note under cannibal reads: "Many people are familiar with an old STEREOTYPE of cannibals, which show [*sic*] them as black African men...cooking an EXPLORER or a MISSIONARY"; under health food: "Other people laugh at people who eat it and say that they are CRANKS." The editors, however, are not reckless, for they avoid giving stereotypes for more influential groups.

At other times, LDELC seems to overstep its boundaries as in, "In the past sex between people who were not married was seen as wrong. Sex before or outside marriage is now very common, although some people, esp. people who are religious, still think it is wrong" (sex). While it may be within bounds to observe that premarital and extramarital sex are common, one wonders on what evidence it implies that these acts are no more seen as wrong. LDELC seems to be on shaky grounds when it says that these acts are thought to be wrong only by "some people, esp. people who are religious," for it contradicts itself by saying elsewhere that "many people

do not approve of people who COMMIT adultery" (adultery). LDELC could have been less biased by stating what, in the view of its writers, is common or uncommon and setting aside moral conundrums. Its ambiguous statements may reinforce the prejudices held by some learners that Britain and the US are morally decadent or even lead to the belief that it is acceptable to proposition people while visiting these countries.

There seem to be several flaws and oddities in LDELC, especially in the "cultural" entries. These include:

1. The pronunciation given for Mother Theresa is inaccurate: the theta symbol for the *th* in *Mother* has to be replaced by the symbol for the *th* in *then*. In the "Grammar Codes" printed on the inside of the front cover, certain explanations do not correspond to the codes. Typical US pronunciation is not shown for several words such as banal and rapport. Indira Gandhi was not murdered by *one* of her bodyguards; *two* bodyguards gunned her down (see Johnson, 1993, p. 122; Watson, 1984, p. 15). The dictionary gives Neil Armstrong's words as, "One small step for a man, one giant leap for mankind"; whereas, the *Worksheets* gives it without the article before *man*. Josephine is identified as Napoleon's "lover" in the entry for Napoleon, but as "wife" in the entry for Josephine. An "infelicity" pointed out by Fillmore (1989, p. 79) in his review of LDCE still remains uncorrected: the definition of sphere as "solid figure all points of which are equally distant from a centre" is inaccurate. The description of hell as "a place full of darkness and fire," while theologically tenable, would be a bewildering oxymoron to most learners, since the nature of fire is to give light and dispel darkness. The sample sentence "*I could never buy into that Scientology stuff*" (buy) may seem offensive to Scientologists.

2. While the entries for most persons include the year of their birth, some entries do not; e.g., Roseanne Arnold, Dalai Lama, Doctor Ruth, Maharishi Mahesh Yogi.

3. While the entries for most persons give their full name, some entries do not; e.g., (Josip Broz) Tito, (Phineas Taylor) Barnum, (Herbert Ernest) Bates.

4. No year of first publication/release or foundation is mentioned in various entries where the year is necessary in order to place them in a historical perspective: for example, after names of plays (e.g., The Rivals), books (e.g., Doctor Zhivago, Oliver Twist), religions (e.g., Baha'i Faith), television programs (e.g., Fawlty Towers, Miami Vice), cartoons (e.g., Dan Dare, Peanuts), and groups (e.g., Bee Gees, Sinn Fein).

(5) The dictionary introduces controversial or questionable assertions with a phrase such as "Many people think..." or "For many

people...," making users wonder whether it is giving impartial observations or propagating its own bias under a seemingly objective phrase (e.g., abortion, euthanasia, feminism).

(6) Some sentences are vague or vacuous. In the entry for Paul Robeson (1898-1976) we read that his "wide success in Britain and the US was unusual for a black person at that time" and remain puzzled which period of his long life the "that time" refers to. Under Blondie we read that she gets an advantage over Dagwood "by using old-fashioned FEMININE tricks" but cannot make out what these old-fashioned feminine tricks are, or even what the phrase means. Of René La Salle we read, "He was killed by his companions after getting lost," and wonder what the relation could be between his getting lost and getting killed.

Illustrations

Some of the illustrations from LDCE, the prototype of LDELC, are included but new ones have been added. There are, however, marked differences between the older and newer illustrations, both in the style of drawing and in the functions they perform. The older ones (e.g., ape, baseball, gardening equipment), drawn as in academic publications, are highly informative and admirably complement the written definitions. The newer ones (e.g., absent-minded professor, director, yuppie), drawn as in Japanese *manga* (comics), contribute little to enhance the definitions. Their primary function seems to be to offer comic relief (e.g., postman, mouse), or, in some cases, to show stereotypical images (e.g., prisoner). In addition, the mixing of entirely different styles makes the dictionary look like a poorly edited work, having no individual character, consistent quality, or coherent style.

The arbitrary mixing of humorous and serious illustrations may also confuse learners, since they have to be constantly on guard against misinterpreting the significance. The figure for teacher, for example, shows the teacher dressed in cap and gown. Is a learner to assume from this picture that in English-speaking countries, teachers wear such attire while teaching? Or, does the figure of dunce, showing a kid seated in an elevated chair and wearing a cone-shaped dunce's cap, illustrate the way students are currently punished in British schools? One also wonders why the dictionary is so inconsistent as to illustrate a police officer with four photos of officers in uniform and to illustrate a postman by a ludicrous cartoon.

A few other problems related to LDELC's figures may be pointed out. (1) There are no references to some figures when the entry ends on a page and the figure appears on the reverse side (e.g., Hollywood, solar system). (2) Some fictional characters are identified by both the character's name and

the actor's name (e.g., Godfather, Hunchback of Notre Dame, Indiana Jones), whereas some are not (e.g., Norman Bates, Superman). (3) A large number of pictures are too small or too poor in quality (e.g., graffiti, Heath Robinson's Pit Head, hopscotch, London Marathon). (4) Multiple pictures of the same person (e.g., Stallone as Rambo and Rocky) and multiple figures for the same headword (e.g., ice-skating, p. 654 and p. 1212) seem redundant; the space could have served more useful purposes. (5) Some important persons are left unidentified (e.g., the Pope [no cross-reference under *John Paul II* either!], the Archbishop of Canterbury). (6) Some figures seem to have little to do with the comments made about them. Why is Archimedes holding on to a towel when the entry says he ran "with no clothes on"? Why is the Loch Ness Monster like a dragon/snake when the comment says it is usually pictured as a dinosaur? (7) Field positions and playing positions (e.g., baseline, slip, forward, tight end) are shown for some sport items (e.g., tennis, baseball), but are not shown for some others (e.g., cricket, American football, soccer). (8) In several cases, the headword, title, and comments related to a figure do not match (e.g., a comment appropriate for the figure titled *dunce* is found not under the headword dunce, but under dunce's cap; a comment appropriate for the figure *teacher* is found not under the headword teacher, but under mortarboard).

The impression I got as I browsed through LDELC was that it has too many pictures of actors, actresses, and "stars." To find out whether my impression was well-founded, I counted and classified all the figures of persons (fictional or real) and characters (e.g., mythical, legendary), found in the first 946 pages (about 62%) of the dictionary. The headwords corresponding to these figures are all proper names except for angel and devil. Color photos appearing on special pages, five of them showing entertainers, were not included. The results, shown in Table 2, clearly suggest that LDELC has opted to attract consumers by showing the figures of actors, actresses, and other media stars rather than those of artists, educationalists, philosophers, scientists, thinkers, writers, or Nobel laureates.

Non-sexist Usage

Like most of the recently published dictionaries (e.g., COBUILD, OALDEE, OALD), LDELC appears sensitive to non-sexist linguistic usage. In the entry for person, for example, it is stated: "Many people, especially women, do not like the use of words such as *chairman* or *spokesman* to refer to both sexes. They also dislike the use of these words to refer to women. They prefer to use words which can refer to both men and women." A similar note under man points out the growing use of *humans, human beings, the*

Table 2: Classification of Figures for Persons and Characters (pp. 1-946)

Category	Frequency (%)
Entertainment-related figures (actors, et al.)	40
Mythical and historical figures	17
Politicians and rulers	11
Sportsmen and sportswomen	6
Cartoon characters	6
Religious figures	6
Literary characters	5
Scientists	4
Painters and sculptors	2
Writers	1
Nurses	1
Criminals	1
Classical musicians	1
Total	101*

*Note: All figures were rounded to the nearest full percentage point.

human race, and *people* in place of the generic *man*. There are valuable notes regarding non-sexist usage under several other entries, such as *he*, *Mr.*, *Mrs.*, *Ms.*, and *everyone*. Entries such as New Man, men's movement, feminism, and wife point out current social changes and problems related to women's liberation. In sample sentences too, LDELC tries to avoid stereotyping women and men to fixed roles or temperaments; for example, under sweep we read, *"He swept the room/the path. She swept the floor clean"*; under shy, "He's shy of women" as well as *"She's camera-shy...,"* and under study, *"He studies French. She is studying to be a doctor."* Non-sexist items such as firefighter, chairperson, chair (in the sense of 'chairperson') are included, though their non-sexist connotation is not always highlighted. There are also sentences that exalt women in non-traditional ways; e.g., *"She has been given full executive powers in this matter"* (executive), *"a woman of superior intellect"* (intellect).

The generic third person pronoun LDELC uses when referring to singular subjects is *they, their, them*, etc., as in: "a person admired only because they are sexually attractive, and not for other qualities they may have" (sex object). The use of *he or she* and *his or her* in such contexts is stated to be formal (cf. *everyone*). Rather radical innovations found occasionally in current literature have not been included. In general, LDELC is slightly more conservative than COBUILD. Whereas COBUILD, as a matter of policy, has "abandoned the convention whereby *he* was

held to refer to both men and women" (Sinclair, 1987, p. xx), LDELC has sentences such as *"If anyone finds my pen I hope they/he will tell me"* (anyone). The moderate stand of LDELC may be more suitable for learners aspiring to master non-sexist usage.

Committed feminists might find examples such as the following sexist, since they appear to reinforce stereotypes or belittle women (cf. Kaye, 1989): *"The* females *are often more aggressive than the* males" (female); *"the* female *of the species is more deadly than the* male" (quote from R. Kipling, female); *"She had to live in her father's shadow"* (shadow); *"She put her sewing away in the basket"* (sewing); *"They've only just got married, and already she's started cheating (on him)!* (cheat).

Comparisons

To give readers an idea as to how LDELC fares in comparison with other dictionaries, let me briefly point out some similarities and differences between LDELC and two other dictionaries, namely COBUILD and OALDEE.

There are several similarities between COBUILD and LDELC: both are dictionaries based on large databases; both are written in simple, easy-to-understand English; both strive to make grammar codes intelligible rather than mystifying; and both, in paperback form, are about the same physical size (23.5 cm x 15.5 cm), though COBUILD contains 140 pages more. It also is more in depth than LDELC in its treatment of entries, which are more detailed and contain more examples; its attention to basic words, which are treated even in greater depth than the other words; and its academic seriousness, revealed, for example, in Sinclair's conscientious "Introduction." LDELC, on the other hand, is more readable than COBUILD (the size of characters is slightly larger and the pages look less cluttered); it has many more entries (especially of the "cultural" variety, which are lacking in COBUILD); it has many illustrations (COBUILD has none); it shows American and British differences in greater detail, and includes more Americanisms; and it shows syllabic/hyphenation divisions (COBUILD does not show them at all). In general LDELC excels, especially in quantity as measured by the number and diversity of entries. In quality, though, it varies widely. Its cultural entries rank from "excellent" to "poor," with many falling below average. Its linguistic entries are generally better than the cultural entries, though not as detailed as in COBUILD. COBUILD, priced much cheaper and five years older, is acknowledgedly limited in scope, but it does more justice to the entries and is more sharply focused.[3]

Although OALDEE does not have the word *culture* in its title, Crowther, the Editor, says in his foreword, "we have attempted to get 'under the

skin' of the language for those foreign learners of English who wish to know more of our culture." Because of its encyclopedic nature, OALDEE contains many scientific, technical, computing, literary, geographic, and biographical entries. The physical size (26.5 cm x 20.5 cm) is significantly larger than that of LDELC. Though it has only 1,060 pages excluding the appendices, entries are listed in three columns, including about the same amount of information as LDELC (1528 pages in two columns). OALDEE too is meant for learners of English, but the English used is slightly more advanced, though not difficult. OALDEE has about the same number of illustrations as LDELC, but each of them is informative; LDELC can do without many of its illustrations (cf. McCarthy, 1993, p. 281). The five color maps in LDELC are a far cry from the numerous black and white maps in OALDEE. Perhaps the most significant difference between the two dictionaries is that OALDEE is academic and scholarly, whereas LDELC is not. Whether in the selection of entries or in the definitions, OALDEE is much more concerned with imparting serious knowledge to its users; it does not concern itself so much with soap opera stars or racy tidbits. LDELC, on the other hand, is a hodge-podge of items: some academic, some not so academic, some blatantly banal. Perhaps LDELC's hallmark is its relative simplicity and light-heartedness. It is much easier to use, the English is more elementary, the fields and language varieties covered are more numerous. It has more Americanisms and colloquialisms, and it shows syllabic divisions. LDELC is probably targeted for learners who might find OALDEE awesome, unwieldy, or overly academic.[4]

Conclusion

In their introduction to DCL (pp. ix-x), the editors state that "cultural literacy falls between the specialized [known only by experts] and the generalized [e.g., names of colors or animals]." Based on this premise, they formulate three rules to guide them in selecting entries and information for their dictionary: (1) the entry/information must be within the level of cultural literacy; (2) it must be widespread; and (3) it must have lasting significance. They set a memory span of 15 years as indicative of "lasting significance" and eliminate most of the people and events in the fields of sports and entertainment, since they are "too ephemeral to take a permanent place in our cultural heritage." By stating their assumptions and policies, the editors establish rapport with the users and inform them what to expect and what not to expect from their dictionary.

The editors of LDELC, on the other hand, do not tell the users anything significant about their assumptions or policies. Users are left in the

dark as to what the editors mean by *culture* and what guidelines they have used in selecting entries and writing the definitions. As a result, the dictionary appears to be a confused jumble, lacking balance and orientation. Sometimes it builds up expectations, sometimes it disappoints; sometimes it is serious, sometimes it is frivolous; sometimes it excites, sometimes it depresses.

LDELC is an ambitious dictionary that tries to do too many things in too few pages. Its aim—to introduce the language and culture of native English speakers—is highly commendable, and non-native speakers would be grateful to find a dictionary that fulfills that aim. Longman surely deserves praise for having attempted to produce such a dictionary. Unfortunately, LDELC looks like a premature product that was hastily dispatched to bookstores.

Its shortcomings notwithstanding, LDELC seems to be one of the very few dictionaries available for learners who would like to have both cultural and linguistic information in one volume. It is probably the only dictionary that includes a large number of nonacademic entries and defines both cultural and linguistic entries in simple English. There is no question that LDELC excels other comparable dictionaries in diversity, quantity, and make-up. It is ideal, therefore, for those who like to see in a dictionary a little bit of information on all sorts of topics. It may be adequate for students whose learning material is primarily media-related (e.g., movies, videos, tabloids, newspapers), though, because it is already two years old, its entries concerning contemporary trends, popular stars, movies, and television programs may seem passé. It may be recommended to learners who have not begun using an English-English dictionary, since its content, as well as style, is light and its color illustrations may remind them of elementary school textbooks. The dictionary may also come in handy for teachers who would like to conduct conversation classes using questions such as "Who's the British comedian 'known esp. for telling jokes about his mother-in-law'?" Advanced learners, as well as native speakers, are likely to be disappointed with the dictionary's lack of depth, unbalanced selection and treatment of entries, and banal tidbits, though they might find some portions quite entertaining. Such learners may have to acquire special dictionaries (e.g., OALDEE or OEED for general reference, DTCWB for biographical reference, DCL for cultural reference, WNGD for geographical reference, Katz [1994] for movie reference, etc.) if they want in-depth information on the variety of subjects superficially covered by LDELC.

Surely, a dictionary that puts so much emphasis on recording contemporary trivia has to be revised almost annually like an almanac, even

though most of its contents are not trivia. In fact, some bits of information given in LDELC are already outdated (e.g., Mia Farrow working with Woody Allen; the ordination of women in the Anglican Church), and the dictionary itself looks rather old, without reference to recent cultural trends such as *Jurassic Park* or *The Lion King*. The cautious, therefore, may do well to wait until Longman puts out a revised edition, with substantial improvements.

Notes

1. Words and phrases appearing as headwords in LDELC are shown *sans serif*.

2. Put in the form of a simplistic equation, LDELC = LDCE + Cultural Entries. Since several reviews of LDCE have already appeared; e.g., Carter (1989) and Fillmore (1989), this review deals with the cultural, rather than the language-related, aspects of LDELC. Readers of this review are urged to consult reviews of LDCE to know more about how LDELC fares as a "dictionary of language."

3. For detailed comparisons between COBUILD and LDCE —the basis for LDELC —see Carter (1989), Fillmore (1989), and Hausmann & Gorbahn (1989).

4. For a side-by-side comparison of specimen columns from OALDEE and LDELC, see *English Today 34* (9[2], April 1993, pp. 60-61).

Dictionary Abbreviations

AHDEL: Morris, W. (Ed.). (1969). *The American heritage dictionary of the English language*. Boston: American Heritage and Houghton Mifflin.

COBUILD: Sinclair, J. (Ed.). (1987). *Collins* COBUILD ENGLISH *language dictionary*. London: Collins.

DCL: Hirsch, Jr., E. D., Kett, J. F., & Trefil, J. (1988). *The dictionary of cultural literacy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

DTCWB: Briggs, A. (Ed.). (1993). *A dictionary of 20th century world biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LDCE: Summers, D. (Ed.). (1987). *Longman dictionary of contemporary English* (New Ed.). Harlow: Longman.

LDEL: *Longman dictionary of the English language*. (1984). Harlow: Longman.

LDELC : Summers, D. (Ed.). (1992). *Longman dictionary of English language and culture*. Harlow: Longman.

LDELNE: *Longman dictionary of the English language* (New Ed.). (1991). Harlow: Longman.

OEED: Hawkins, J. M., & Allen, R. (Eds.). (1991). *The Oxford encyclopedic English dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

OALD: Cowie, A. P. (Ed.). (1989). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary* (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

OALDEE: Crowther, J. (Ed.). (1992). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary: Ency-*

clopedic edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

WNGD: *Webster's new geographical dictionary.* (1988). Springfield, MA: Merriam Webster.

WNSOD: *Webster's new school and office dictionary* (Rev. ed.). (1974). Greenwich, CT: Fawcett.

References

Carter, R. (1989). LDOCE and COBUILD. [Review of Longman dictionary of contemporary English and Collins COBUILD English language dictionary]. *International Journal of Lexicography, 2*(1), 30-43.

Fillmore, C. J. (1989). Two Dictionaries. [Review of Longman dictionary of contemporary English and Collins COBUILD English language dictionary]. *International Journal of Lexicography, 2*(1), 57-79.

Fowler, H. R., Aaron, J. E., & Limburg, K. (1992). *The little, brown handbook* (5th ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

Hausmann, F. J., & Gorbahn, A. (1989). COBUILD and LDOCE II: A comparative review. [Review of Longman dictionary of contemporary English and Collins COBUILD English language dictionary]. *International Journal of Lexicography, 2*(1), 44-56.

Hirsch, Jr., E. D., Kett, J. F., & Trefil, J. (1988). *The dictionary of cultural literacy.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Johnson, O. (Ed.). (1993). *The 1993 information please almanac.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Katz, E. (1994). *The film encyclopedia* (All new ed.). New York: Harper Perennial.

Kaye, P. (1989). 'Women are alcoholics and drug addicts,' says dictionary. *ELT Journal, 43*(3), 192-195.

Masuda, H., Takebayashi, S., Akasu, K., Yamamoto, F., & Nakao, K. (1994). [Review of Longman dictionary of the English language (New ed.)]. *International Journal of Lexicography, 7*(1), 31-46.

McCarthy, A. (1993). [Review of Longman dictionary of English language and culture]. *The Indexer, 18*(4), 280-281.

M. G. (1993). [Review of Longman dictionary of English language and culture]. *English World-wide: A Journal of Varieties of English, 14*(2), 319-320.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language.* London: Longman.

Sinclair, J. (Ed.) (1987). *Collins COBUILD English language dictionary.* London: Collins.

Watson, R. (1984, November 12). Special report: After Indira. *Newsweek* (Pacific Ed.). 10-20.

Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What categories reveal about the mind. George Lakoff. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987. 614 pp.

Reviewed by
Stewart Hartley
Tokyo Gakugei University

WF&DT is a 'big' book in all respects: it has reached a large audience, well beyond the usual readership for a work in linguistics; it is physically, at over 600 pages, a substantial volume; and it offers the possibility of a new way of looking at language and its relation with external reality. It is a work no one interested in language or philosophy can afford to ignore, and, for the language teacher, teacher trainer, and materials writer it opens up an exciting vista of new avenues to explore.

For over 30 years linguistics has been constrained by the assumptions of generative grammar; for over 100 years our views of meaning have been defined by concerns for truth and reference; for over 2,000 years Western thought has embodied a view of rationality which isolates us from what our bodies tell us about the world we inhabit. Lakoff challenges our assumptions in all these areas and invites us to rethink the nature of this pervasive mode of thought he calls objectivism. He takes as the focal point of his attack one of the central pillars of that doctrine: the nature of categorisation.

The book is organised into three main sections. Part 1, Categories and Cognitive Models, analyses the classical theory of categorisation and offers an alternate view. Part 2, Philosophical Implications, provides a frontal attack on the objectivist paradigm and shows it to be both empirically untenable and theoretically incoherent. Part 3 consists of three extended case studies, each larger than many linguistic monographs, which illuminate the types of descriptions and results which Lakoff's alternative approach can provide.

Part 1, easily the most accessible to the non-specialist, begins with a discussion of the importance of categorisation and then traces the historical development of Lakoff's new model, based on prototypes and basic-level categories. The classical theory under attack is based on three assumptions: that a category is defined by necessary and sufficient conditions for membership—a list of criterial attributes; that category membership is an all-or-nothing affair—either you are in or you are out; and that all members of a category share equal status—categories are amorphous. The studies reviewed here, including those of Wittgenstein (1953), Austin (1961), Zadeh (1965), Berlin and Kay (1969), Brown (1965)

and Rosch (1978), demonstrate, on the contrary, that category membership does not depend on shared characteristics (Wittgenstein); that category membership is graded (Zadeh), and that categories do in fact have internal structure (Rosch). Class membership is typified by central members (prototypes), while other less central members are included by reason of some relationship to the prototype. Psychological studies have revealed the special salience of basic-level categories within a taxonomic hierarchy (e.g., dog is more salient than either the superordinate animal or the subordinate Irish Setter). Basic-level categories are perceived holistically, are more easily remembered, are morphologically simpler, and are learned first by children.

Lakoff then introduces the central tenet of the work: "that we organize our knowledge of the world by means of structures called idealized cognitive models, or ICMs, and that category structures and prototype effects are by-products of that organization" (p. 68). An ICM is roughly equivalent to a frame (Fillmore, 1982), a script (Schank & Abelson, 1977), or a schema (Rumelhart, 1975). An ICM is a type of knowledge base in relation to which a notion can be characterised. Thus, bachelor presupposes a society in which one is expected to marry around a certain age, and the anomaly of calling the Pope a bachelor, despite meeting the criteria of maleness, adulthood, and never having married, can be explained by the special conditions attached to the Roman Catholic priesthood. Mother is a term around which a number of ICMs cluster and is not limited to an aggregation of necessary and sufficient criteria such as post-pubertal, female, and having given birth to a child. Thus we have the genetic model, the nurturance model, the marital model, and the genealogical model, among others. Lakoff proposes four types of ICM which differ in their structuring principles: propositions, image-schemas, metaphorical mappings, and metonymic (part-for-whole) mappings. Although the detailed working-out of these cognitive models remains vague and rather confused (in particular the notion of proposition calls for further thought), Lakoff has provided an agenda for others to explore and refine.

The remainder of Part 1 is devoted to further development of the theory of categorisation, and two key notions are introduced. The first of these is motivation. This is contrasted with strict predictability. One type of category organisation is radial: members are related to the prototype either directly (as the next link in a chain) or indirectly (through intervening links in the chain). Each one-to-one (link-to-following link) connection is motivated in that it is a natural connection (natural, that is, in cognitive, cultural, or linguistic terms). When we compare distant

items there is no way of knowing whether their connection is arbitrary or not and hence motivation is necessary to explicate the connections. Dixon's (1982) analysis of categories in Dyirbal (an Australian aboriginal language), from which the book takes its title, is used to explore and explicate the notion of motivation in detail. The second key notion introduced is the role played by ICMs, especially folk models and metaphors, in circumscribing the scope of scholarly enquiry. Linguistics, for example, is strongly constrained by the conduit metaphor (Reddy 1979). According to this metaphor, meanings are packaged in containers (linguistic expressions) which are then transmitted through a conduit (i.e., speech) from speakers to hearers. As a container has a fixed capacity we are constrained to consider lexical meanings as being the same as dictionary entries, rather than recognising that their scope is in reality potentially infinite. Likewise, the building block metaphor leads us to see lexical items as being the building blocks of sentences, which in turn leads us to believe that sentences are fully compositional. This in turn leads to the pervasive belief among linguists (and language teachers) that acquiring language skill is a matter of 'putting the bits together'. Cognitive linguistics, on the other hand, teaches us that meanings are open-ended and that the meaning of a sentence is more than the sum of the meaning of its parts.

A notable example of Lakoff's method, and of particular interest to readers in Japan, is his analysis of the work of Downing (1984) into Japanese classifiers, most notably *hon*. This, of course, has as its prototype long, thin objects such as pencils and cassette tapes (when unwound). However, it is also used to classify many other things, among them runs in baseball. This may seem capricious at first sight, but a moment's reflection à la Lakoff will show how natural this extension is. It is in fact doubly motivated: metonymically it belongs to the same experiential domain as the baseball bat—a prototypical long, thin object; metaphorically it is similar to long, thin objects by virtue of its trajectory.

Part 2 of *WF&DT* can prove heavy going, devoted as it is to the philosophical implications of objectivism, but, as Lakoff reminds us, "philosophy matters" (p. 57). A number of statements are used to define classical objectivism:

- All of reality consists of entities, which have fixed properties and relations holding between them at any instant (p.160).
- All the entities that have a given property or collection of properties in common form a category. Such properties are necessary and sufficient to define the category (p. 161).

- The entities in the world form objectively existing categories based on their shared objective properties (p. 161).
- All properties are either atomic or consist of logical combinations of atomic properties (p. 162).
- Thought is a manipulation of abstract symbols. Symbols get their meaning via correspondences to entities and categories in the world. In this way the mind ... can be said to "mirror nature" (p. 163).
- Existence and fact are independent of belief, knowledge, perception, modes of understanding, and every other aspect of human cognitive capacities. No true fact can depend upon people's believing it, on their knowledge of it, on their conceptualization of it, or on any other aspect of cognition (p. 164).

While admitting that no-one is likely to subscribe to all these statements as they stand, that they represent an idealisation of objectivism, Lakoff convincingly shows that they are individually and collectively open to serious question. He employs arguments from contemporary biological thinking to refute classical categorisation and arguments from psychology to undermine the classical view of perception. Lakoff's ultimate weapon is "a bomb that threatens to devastate the realist philosophy we know and love" (Lewis, 1984, p. 221), from Putnam (1981) which he uses for an attack on model-theoretic semantics. Putnam's theorem shows two of the major claims of model-theoretic semantics to be mutually inconsistent: that it characterizes how symbols are related to entities in the world, and that it characterizes meaning. Putnam's critique of what he calls metaphysical realism yields the remarkable conclusion that, "the relationship between symbols and the world does not characterize meaning" (p. 229). The argument runs as follows: If the meaning of a sentence is a function which assigns it a truth value in every possible world, then a basic constraint on any theory of meaning—that we cannot change the meaning of the parts without changing the meaning of the whole—cannot be maintained. Putnam shows that it is possible to change the meanings of parts of a sentence in such a way that the sentence necessarily remains true in the same set of worlds. Lakoff considers a range of possible defenses of objectivist semantics and comes to the conclusion that they fail, as "meaningless structures cannot give meaning to meaningless symbols" (p. 252).

The remainder of Part 2 explicates Lakoff's alternative to objectivism, what he calls experiential realism. In this, meaning is characterised in terms of, "the nature and experience of the organisms doing the thinking" (p. 266). This leads naturally to a discussion of linguistic rela-

tivity. Lakoff points out that our capacities and experiences as individuals and as members of communities do not differ all that much, and hence we are not committed to extreme relativism. The crucial difference is one between our capacity to conceptualize and the actual systems which emerge in different communities. A common capacity can actualize into many possible systems under different conditions; the same capacity allows the learning of another system (e.g., another language) and of translation between systems. According to Lakoff, the possibility for meaningful, structured experience depends on two types of preconceptual structure: basic-level categories and image-schemas. The former are defined by the convergence of gestalt perception, a capacity for bodily movement, and an ability to form rich mental images. Image-schemas are simple structures that we encounter daily in our bodily experience. They include containers (we wake out of a deep sleep), links (we make connections and break social ties), and exist in various relations, such as up-down (things are looking up), front-back (in the weeks ahead), and part-whole (we need some new blood).

Part 3 consists of three detailed case studies which allow us to observe cognitive linguistics in action. The first is a revealing analysis of the metaphorical bases of expressions of anger in English. A number of metaphors can be seen at work: anger as insanity (to have a fit), anger as a dangerous animal (like a red rag to a bull), and primarily anger as the heat of a fluid in a container. This central metaphor is based on the folk theory (an ICM) of the physical effects of anger: increased body heat, agitation, interference with perception, and increased internal pressure. Thus we find expressions such as the following: to reach boiling point, to seethe, to blow your top, to have an outburst, to let off steam, to make your blood boil, and to be heated. All these examples are taken from the Longman Language Activator (1993) entry for the term *angry*.

The second study examines the many senses of *over* and it neatly demonstrates one of the tenets of cognitive linguistics, namely that lexical items are typically polysemous and that the various meanings are interrelated and form a network based on a prototypical value. Further study reveals that what appears to be arbitrary, a quirk of the lexicon, is in fact motivated—thus the fact that we use over for both mass and multiplex (e.g., There are paint spots all over the rug. versus There is paint all over the rug.). This may be explained by the fact that they share the same motivation—that as one steps back one ceases to perceive individuals and sees an undifferentiated mass.

Case study three is a massive, 122 page study of both deictic and existential there-constructions in English. The study reveals the outlines

of what a cognitive linguistics may look like. Very briefly, the analysis is centred on the notion of a grammatical construction. This is considered as, "a form-meaning (F, M) pair, where F is a set of conditions on syntactic and phonological form and M is a set of conditions on meaning and use" (p. 467). There-constructions form a typical linguistic category, whose members are motivated extensions from a prototypical central construction. Each construction derives its meaning from some cognitive model (ICM). The prototype Central Deictic—There's Harry with his red hat on.—gets its meaning from the Pointing-Out ICM. More peripheral constructions, e.g., the Perceptual Deictic are based on the prototype and share all the form and meaning parameters consistent with their own ICMs. Existential there-constructions form a category parallel to the Deictic, with the Central Existential construction based on the Central Deictic. Existential *there* designates a mental space in the sense of Fauconnier (1985), where the posited entity is to be located. Thus just two specifications are needed to describe Existential *there*: it is based on the Central Deictic, and the element corresponding to location in the Central Deictic is identified as a mental space.

WF&DT has already become a classic and a source of controversy. Many will quibble with the details, but Lakoff has presented us with the big picture which allows us to see the rationale behind the undertaking. It is a source of intellectual excitement for the breadth of its enquiry and a source of challenge with its polemical tone. It is, above all else, a work of great humanity, restoring us human beings to our rightful place in the scheme of things.

References

Austin, J. L. (1961). *Philosophical papers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Berlin, B. & Kay, P. (1969). *Basic color terms: Their universality and evolution*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Brown, R. (1965). *Social psychology*. New York: Free Press.

Dixon, R. M. (1982). *Where have all the adjectives gone?* Berlin: Walter de Gryuter.

Downing, P. (1984). Japanese numeral classifiers: Syntax, semantics and pragmatics. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Berkeley, University of California.

Fillmore, C. J. (1982). *Frame semantics. Linguistics in the morning calm, 111-138*. Linguistic Society of Korea, Seoul: Hanshin.

Fauconnier, G. (1985). *Mental spaces*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Lewis, D. (1972). Putnam's paradox, *Australian Journal of Philosophy 62*(3), 221-236.

Putnam, H. (1981). *Reason, truth and history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reddy, M. (1979). The conduit metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and*

thought (pp. 284-324). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rosch, E. (1978). Natural categories. *Cognitive Psychology, 4,* 328-50.
Rumelhart, D. (1975). Notes on a schema for stories. In D. G. Bobrow & A, M. Collins (Eds.), *Representation and understanding: Studies in cognitive science* (pp. 211-236). New York: Academic Press.
Schank, R. C. & Abelson, R. P. (1977). *Scripts, plans, goals and understanding.* Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
Summers, D. et. al. (1993). *Longman language activator.* Longman: London.
Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigations.* Oxford: Blackwell.
Zadeh, L. (1965). Fuzzy sets. *Information and Control, 8,* 338-53.

Educational Thought and Ideology in Modern Japan: State Authority and Intellectual Freedom. Teruhisa Horio. (Steven Platzer, Trans. & Ed.). Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1988. xxvi + 410 pp.

Education and Examination in Modern Japan. Ikuo Amano. (W. K. Cummings & F. Cummings, Trans.). Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1990. (Original work published 1983) xxiii + 234 pp.

Education Reform in Postwar Japan: The U.S. Educational Mission. Gary H. Tsuchimochi. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1993. (Original work published by Tamagawa University Press, 1991) xx + 375 pp.

Reviewed by
Thomas L. Simmons
Tokyo JALT Chapter

Comprehending the recent changes in education policy in Japan and coping professionally with the policies and attitudes manifest in public and private schools requires a working knowledge of the social context and historical development of modern education in Japan. The history of modern education begins during the early Meiji era (circa 1868) when the drive to meet the western technical and industrial standard compelled successive Japanese governments to form and reform the education system. While these different administrations were finding their way in a new world and developing their answers to late 19th century industrialism they were also attempting to construct an education system that would provide them with the leadership needed to guide their vision of Japan into the 20th century.

In language education, the professional impetus placing the overall social context at the front of the issues that concern language educators is succinctly put by Dr. William Grabe:

> It is no longer possible to presume that LPP [language policy and planning] is a relatively separable enterprise undertaken by well-meaning applied linguists. Political issues related to LPP decisions must be accounted for, and responsibility for policy making must include the political ramifications for the decisions made. (1994, p. viii)

An in-depth review of the social, philosophical and pedagogical evolution of education in Japan from the perspective of Japanese academics has largely been ignored in the language education literature printed in English. This oversight needs to be constructively and comprehensively addressed. Practice and research in language education without an understanding of the relevant social and historical context of the education environment can be likened to sailing, without a clear knowledge of navigation—it becomes an aimless and futile endeavour in an extended journey.

In *Educational Thought and Ideology in Modern Japan*, Teruhisa Horio examines this evolution in education from the beginning of the modern era in the late 1860s till the late 1980s. Horio is superbly qualified to present a fundamental study of the social and political context of education in Japan. A professor emeritus at Tokyo University (currently a professor at Chuo University), an elected member of the Science Council of Japan's Central Committee, and the current president of the oldest educational research *gakkai* in Japan, the *Nihon Kyouiku Gakkai*, his involvement and influence in the academic world is considerable. Reading Horio's scholarship is a step in the very necessary direction of reaching an understanding of education in Japan.

The text is a collection of edited lectures and interviews that were primarily given from 1967 to 1987. It is organised into different sections to show how related issues developed and how they affect educators and students today. Each section is introduced with an extensive overview. Some of the material is dated but is amended to some extent and the information can be considered current to the late 80s. The reference section cites publications exclusively in Japanese literature but does not include references to other studies that can be used for comparison and contrast. Many of the references in the text are not included in the reference section and often the year of publication and the publisher is omitted. There is occasionally some contextual information in the footnotes but they are inadequate for a reference text. While we are being given information that is not readily available to the international community, we are also presented with potential obstacles in continuing enquiries into the issues presented.

The book begins by establishing the current context in the educational environment. Horio's preface gives a thumbnail analysis of the shortcoming of the domestic and international view of Japanese education. Platzer's preface introduces the process whereby this collection of essays was compiled, translated and edited and includes a brief biographical sketch of Horio's credentials and an overview of the book's conceptual format.

In the introductory chapter, The Crises in Japanese Education Today, Horio gives a call for changes in the fundamental issues currently plaguing education. Horio argues that the current state of affairs in education specifically and Japan in general is evidence of the bankrupt philosophy of government control and the requisite passive compliance of the average person. Rather than cultivating the potential of the individual in a system that encourages them to negotiate for themselves, there has been an inexorable return to the administrative control of the earlier modern era wherein individuals are meant to suppress their own unique qualities so that they serve a system that expects them to negotiate their education by themselves.

The Intellectual Legacy of Japan's Educational History, Chapters 2 through 11, is adapted from publications between 1967 and 1986. Here Horio delineates an historical overview of the intellectual and the legal development of the modern system. In his description of the philosophical genesis of the ideologies of "education" and "enlightenment," he points out that early scholars and statesmen recognised the potential that a national system of education had for control of the population through propaganda. He then analyses the development of the relative political agendas for education on both sides of this issue.

In Chapter 5, Education and Law in Postwar Japan, Horio begins a clear account of the legal and social conflict that has taken place beginning in 1955 when the Law Concerning the Management and Operation of Local Educational Administration was put into effect. Following the resultant revocation of the local autonomy of the elected boards of education the *Monbusho* (Ministry of Education) was able to re-establish boards of education that they appointed. This centralisation and a resultant lack of objectivity or shared accountability has arguably had a profound effect on the nature of language education in Japan. Other scholars support this view. For example, the authority of the *Monbusho* to enable or obstruct educators was considered directly responsible for the failure of one of the most innovative attempts at language education in Japan—the English Language Education Council under the direction of Charles Fries, the founder of the Oral Approach. Tamotsu Yamabe believed the *Monbusho* did not understand the Oral Approach and was

primarily responsible for the failure of this innovative approach to take hold in Japan (cited in Heinrichsen, 1989, pp. 155-56).

In the third section, Education in the Courtroom and Teachers' Struggles for Professional Autonomy, comprised of Chapters 6 through 11 taken from publications from 1971 to 1986, Horio elucidates some of the pivotal legal decisions concerning the source and structure of educational authority. The revision of the official "Course of Study" in 1958 led to major reinterpretations of the initial Fundamental Law of Education, the focal point of many of the policies that affect classroom teachers. This was quickly followed by profound changes that continue to control the classroom environment today. These changes involve the designated course of study, the textbook screening system, the system of secret reports of the students' behaviour (*naishinsho*), the attempts to establish national testing in the 60s, and the imposition of certain aspects of teachers' in-service training. This section suffers the most from the date of the material since some of the central issues have been decided or are being addressed in Supreme Court and the recent nationwide changes promoted by the *Monbusho* are still being studied to determine the extent of their effects.

Briefly, chapters 6 to 11 deal directly with the underlying parameters of language pedagogy. It would aid in setting the context of these chapters to point out that an educator's role and responsibilities—before one even begins to teach in the classroom—are established by social and legal considerations. The fundamental values and goals of an administrative body within an institution or throughout an entire national system will impose, with varying degrees of authority, parameters of methodology and practice that effect what teachers do in the classroom as well as their research concerns. To give an example, there is arguably no practical reason to design an innovative language curriculum for a high school when the ultimate end is to pass a test that does not reflect any attempted evaluation of communication competence. Failure to understand predetermined priorities and comprehend their ramifications is failure to comprehend the significance of what teaching can and can not accomplish in a given system. Horio places the classroom within its historical social context by analysing the legal conflict that established many of the parameters of educators' actual role in education.

In 1947, an official "Course of Study" was devised as a guide to provide teachers a framework within which to deal with, "the problems [teachers] encountered when attempting to fashion a curriculum which would be responsive to the related demands for a new kind of society

and a new kind of child" (p. 171). This "Course of Study" was fundamentally altered in 1958. The *Monbusho* was endowed with legally binding control over classroom preparations and instructions. Moreover, textbooks were henceforth to conform to standards set forth in the revised "Course of Study." In a single stroke, the Fundamental Law of Education, the basic premise of democratic process embodied in the Constitution, the teachers' ability to function as professionals, and the content and goals of the educational system were profoundly reinterpreted without national legislation or due process in the courts of law. The resultant conflict has been marked by a long series of expensive and sometimes violent confrontations involving teachers, courts, and the various political parties of the National Government, confrontations that often have directly involved parents and students.

Horio discusses the issue of textbook control in Chapters 6 and 7. As a textbook author, Horio is able to give a detailed account and a thorough analysis of the situation and discuss the impact the most prominent legal issues involving the suits initiated by the historian Saburou Ienaga. Horio recounts several of the central court cases and examines their effect on education, teachers, textbook writers, and publishers. The most commonly known censorship issues have been those of the history texts. For example, in the 1980s, the word describing the "invasion" of Asian countries, *shinryaku*, was changed to "advance," *shinshutsu*. In addition, there have been numerous, little known episodes wherein innovation and accuracy in educational materials has been obstructed. Shin'ichiro Tomonaga, a Nobel Laureate in physics, attempted to develop a new style to provoke students to think—this was unacceptable to the *Monbusho* censors who declared that textbooks must conform to a strict style. A poem, "The River," was forbidden because the onomatopoetic words used for the sound of the river were not strictly those prescribed by the *Monbusho*. In another case, *kenka*, the word for "brawl," was unacceptable and the word for a wrestling match, *sumo*, was the only acceptable substitute. Traditional stories also have been revised. As these examples show, not only does the control deal with internationally controversial affairs, it also focuses of the mundane as well as the truly innovative.

In Chapter 8, The Ministry of Education's Scholastic Achievement Test: The Economic Growth and the Destruction of Education, we see an interesting twist on the concept of student assessment. In 1961 the test was instituted to evaluate the extent to which textbooks were taught uniformly and the attitudes and opinions conveyed by the teachers to the students.

This was primarily designed to reinforce control over classroom organisation, textbook material, and overall educational content. Like the issue of censorship, the Scholastic Achievement Test (SAT) has been embroiled in conflict. There was civil unrest as the Japan Teachers Union resisted control in the classroom, followed by numerous court cases resulting in decisions that have often contradicted each other. By 1976 the test had been ruled legal in seven cases and illegal in 10 others. This series of conflicts led to rulings regarding who controlled the curricula.

In Chapter 9, The Structure of Educational Authority: A Critique of the Supreme Court's Ruling in the Scholastic Achievement Test Case, Horio analyses the Supreme Court's decision regarding the SAT. The issue of school autonomy is a primary principle involving the relation between responsibility and authority. The Sendai High Court decision of 1969 placed authority to organise and control curriculum with the schools and local public bodies precisely because they were ultimately responsible for carrying out educational activities. For this reason, it was ruled that the *Monbusho* was not the ultimate authority since they were not responsible for fulfilling educational goals—those who make the rules must also be responsible for carrying them out.

In 1976, the Supreme court overturned the earlier rulings that declared the SAT illegal. However, the ruling did not reject the principle of educational freedom and the authority of the society to determine its concerns. For this reason, the *Monbusho's* intervention was to be tempered in a reasonable and necessary manner. This decision has had implications that are manifest in classrooms today.

The Struggle to Control Teachers' In-service Training, Chapter 10, illuminates a paradox that drags on professionalism in education. For years, the Japan Teachers' Union has advocated education reform but has had to fight an uphill battle with a contradictory government policy that does not recognise them as professionally competent to engage in research or influence training. The Ministry's concept of in-service training is void of any independent research in this interpretation of the Law of Fundamental Education. This is ironic because the government controls both teacher training and appointments to educational positions yet does not regard the teachers as fit to conduct studies of the process of education and learning. Additionally, Horio describes numerous measures in use by the central government to further the quality of education but which, Horio argues, constitute nothing more than infringements upon academic freedom, constitutional rights and the Fundamental Law of Education.

In Chapter 11, Student Evaluation and Personal Control: The *Naishinsho* Decision, Horio details what is probably the bleakest aspect

of education. Horio shows some of the drawbacks to the present system of closed student evaluations that are used primarily to screen students when they seek admission to high school. Horio does not argue that the concept of student evaluations be abandoned but rather that they be placed in the hands of professional educators and that a process for dispute be provided so that students or their families can seek redress in the event of punitive and inappropriate evaluations. At the present time, there are schools in Japan which grant full or limited disclosure to the families but the system has garnered a great deal of adverse attention in and out of court for a number of years.

The primary cause of many of these problems is, according to Horio, the lack of a professional infrastructure to deal with the inevitable contingencies that result when a person's life is decided by the procedure of education and evaluation. Horio demonstrates that it is this lack of professional commitment and disregard for those who would and could shoulder the burden that has resulted in the many courtroom confrontations that would best be dealt with in a professional educational context.

In the fourth section, Individualism and Egalitarianism in Japanese Education: Myths and Realities, developed from lectures and interviews from 1971 to 1987, Horio discusses the issues of individual rights and universal equality. He analyses the Japanese industry's influence over education in the last 30 years and develops the thesis that this is the process of domination of economic values over educational values. Horio sees the development of "high" academic achievement as the deterioration of values rather than the improvement of education. He argues against the use of Japanese education as a model for other countries.

In the last chapter, Conflicting Approaches to the Reform of Japanese Schooling: Economic Liberalization versus Educational Liberation, Horio deals with the findings of Prime Minister Nakasone's Ad Hoc Council on Educational Reform. He dismisses the assertions that this council was a serious attempt to initiate an educational environment that would encourage the individual creativity essential to innovation in science and art. Horio's view is that rather than supporting individualism, the Ad Hoc Council was fundamentally cynical and represents the increased restriction of individual freedom and the continued deterioration of education.

Horio concludes with his philosophic blueprint for reform in education, a reform that would institute a value system that encourages and enhances individual differences and creativity. Horio presents the struggle for academic freedom that was the government's impetus for modern education during the Meiji era in the late 19th century and the primary intentions of the Japanese and U. S. American Education Missions in 1946.

In the final section, we are given the translation of the Imperial Rescript on Education written in 1890 and the Fundamental Law of Education of 1947, arguably the two most important documents in the history of education in Japan. Sections two, three and four are introduced with extensive overviews of the chapters in that section. The book is organised to show how related issues developed and how they effect educators and students today.

In Horio's preface he makes it clear why professional educators must give considered study to the historical development of the educational environment:

> The character of [the Japanese] educational system has been strongly influenced by the nature of modern Japanese history itself. The modern Japanese education system got off to a late start and even then its formation was tightly circumscribed within the framework laid down by a generation of statesmen who viewed it as an effective tool to be used to realize their own political and economic agendas. This historical tradition has been carried down to the present day; in fact, the state's manipulation of our schools is even stronger today than it was in the prewar era. (p. viii)

In *Education and Examination in Modern Japan*, Ikuo Amano has addressed the competitive examination system in education and the marriage of school and state which were established during the modernisation drive initiated by the Meiji era administrations to develop the technologies and leadership needed in an industrialised country.

Amano's work is an excellent extension of Horio's book because it describes in detail the concrete aspects of one of the central themes of the new education system. In the first three chapters, Amano describes the historical background of competitive exams as they became institutionalised. In what is arguably an elaboration of Horio's treatment of the political foundations of the period, Amano establishes through numerous primary and secondary sources the social impact that exams had on this new society. In Chapters 4 and 5, Amano develops the history of the schools system from elementary through higher education. In Chapters 6, 7 and 8, Amano goes into specific detail about the impact the exam system has on the professions, the growth and prevalence of the credential system and the basic structure and purpose of the Imperial University and its descendants. In Chapters 9 and 10, Amano gives a critical overview of the system as it was and is and where he believes it is taking education and Japan. A forward by the historian Ronald Dore and the preface by Amano serve to place the book in its social and historical context and as such should not be

overlooked. The book was translated by William Cummings, a lecturer at Harvard in the Graduate School of Education, and Fumiko Cummings, a graduate of Doshisha University. They have extensive knowledge of issues in education in Japan and are able to bring their specific expertise to this complicated task.

Competitive exams, when they are used without regard for social position and heritage, have been at odds with the privileged classes in virtually every society where they have been implemented. The first experiments with exams in Japan in the 18th century failed when they were successfully opposed by the upper level samurai families who refused to allow the sons of non-samurai families to compete for the same privileges.

Teruhisa Horio has also described the challenge to traditional privilege in the Meiji era that made profound changes in traditional Japanese thought and practice. It was a basic struggle between unequally privileged classes constituting a primary focus of much of the change at the beginning of the Meiji era. This transformation represented a radical departure from traditional "Confucianism" which justified authoritarian control through the notion of a benevolently managed state (1988, p. 24). But, as Amano points out, by the Meiji era, exams represented a political mechanism that enabled the central government to consolidate its power (i.e., the motives of the new authorities were identical to those of the former) and exams were only nominally a pedagogical tool facilitating any standards of quality in the classroom. This political dimension is illustrated by the *Tetsugakukan* Incident of 1902. *Tetsugakukan*, the predecessor of Touyou University, had received approval for exam exemption. This meant that its graduating students were granted the privilege of teacher certification without the need to take the odious certifying exam. In 1902, the school was deprived of exam exemption status for using questions on the in-house ethics exam that were based on "a subversive theory that is not acceptable to the national policy" (Amano, 1990, p. 183).

The political nature of the exams themselves are not the only fundamental issue that Amano addresses. Amano complements Horio's work by providing additional information about the evolution of state control of education, the basic principle which must be understood to comprehend the process of education in Japan. As modern education developed in Japan it drew largely upon the Prussian model. The German practice was to administer exams after the completion of a prescribed education programme. Thus, university graduation became a condition of civil service. This marriage between the university and the examination system also meant the consolidation of the state and the university.

These are the aspects of the European models that the Meiji government incorporated into the education system.

Between the beginning of the Meiji era in 1868 and the early 1900s, the schools had gone from a fragmented disorganised collection of facilities with tremendous variation in quality and purpose to a nationally controlled system to provide the civil service with competent officers. Exams, formally promulgated in 1872, had been instituted in every level from elementary school through university, middle schools had been formed and reformed, the Imperial University (later Tokyo University) had been organised and the recently established private universities and colleges had been placed under the authority of the Imperial University.

Amano describes the Ministry of Education's rise to authority over the school system in Chapter 7, The Government Officials and Educational Credentialism. Many of the government ministries had established their own universities but after financial setbacks and a series of political and military confrontations the central government moved to consolidate all schools under the Ministry of Education to control political opposition and insure that civil servants conformed to a political norm. Horio also gives detailed insight into this period; by 1890 when the Imperial Rescript on Education (*Kyouiku Chokugo*) was established, the central authorities had convinced the new ruling class that the earlier egalitarianism of the reformation was a deadly threat to the "nation" and the purpose of education was, in the rationale of the first Minister of Education, Arinori Mori, to be reconfigured to provide good and loyal subjects of the empire in ways that befit their position and station in life (Horio, 1988, pp. 65-70). Education was reduced to mere schooling and the new nationalism was the curriculum.

The concept of credentialism, *gakureki*, is of special interest to Amano. In Chapters 7 and 9 he describes and analyses this phenomenon. Credentialism is represented by the graduation certificate that describes the person's course of study, level of attainment, and institution from which the student graduated. These are elements that are evident in any western curriculum vitae. *Gakureki*, is certainly common throughout many countries. Amano takes the position that in Japan *gakureki* does not have intrinsic value but rather manifests its value only when it is used in the process of socialisation and the selection for positions in society and work. Modern industrial society in Japan has developed the attitude that academic credentials indicate ability and thus the academic credential literally forms the passport to economic affluence and thence to relative social levels. This is the legacy of the early Meiji period focus on examinations and the prerequisite schooling. As industries developed alongside the modern

schools they looked to the schools to provide the new skills not found in the feudal society and the credentialism developed during the drive for competent civil service employees spread to industry—something that has maintained its own momentum to this day.

The earliest manifestations of credentialism became apparent in those occupations that Amano defines as the "professions." In Chapter 6, Qualifying Exams for the Professions, Amano traces the development of professions in Europe to the autonomous guilds, *universitas*, and trade associations of the medieval era. However, the lack of similar unions that consolidated control of practice and standards, training and membership in the professions in Europe had no historical equivalents in Japan. Blauch (cited in Dinham & Stitter, 1986) describes three stages in the development of professional education. First, there is training based on apprenticeship; second, the professional is trained in a formal setting separate from the professional practice; and third, the model we see now based on the combined stages of the first and second. Apprenticeship in medieval Europe was controlled and requirements were standardised within the different associations and guilds. In Japan, however, the use and practice of apprenticeship was not controlled or standardised and there were a great many who claimed expertise but had never undergone an apprenticeship. This is the environment in which the Meiji government asserted its authority and for this reason the relatively greater organised central authority of the state has displaced and obstructed professional growth and development resulting in centralised control to a much greater degree than in Europe and those countries whose professional traditions descended from the European model. The modernisation of professional education was, as Amano explains, a political endeavour of the central government from the beginning.

As Amano explicates, lawyers, medical doctors, teachers, civil servants, and diplomats were developed as limited professions along with the development of the schools and the exams to which they were bound. The rise of the private schools formed the only constructive contrast to the Imperial University and they were eventually taken over by the state as opportunities for lucrative civil service were awarded to the schools in exchange for greater central control. These early schools, government and private, were to undergo tremendous changes in a short period of time and the teaching profession was to come under stricter and stricter control through the examination system. By the early 1900s, competitive exams had become a major feature on the educational landscape. In the field of education alone, mandatory teaching licenses proliferated into 36 subject areas with their respective exams.

Eventually, however, competitive exams began to show such negative influences they were abolished in elementary schools. In Chapter 8, The Road to the Imperial University, Amano details the adverse effects competitive exams manifest in education. Drawing on teachers' journals and official histories from the 19th and early 20th centuries, Amano provides anecdotal insights into the maze of examinations. They had become obstacles to be dealt with to get into school, get through school and get out of school, all to enter the professions and civil services. All of these exams were administered by the government who handed out exemptions for these exams to schools who met approved guidelines in the public and private sector. These exams, in the opinion of Hirobumi Itou, the first Prime Minister under the Cabinet system established in 1885, were to screen those students who demonstrated superiority in the civil service entrance exams and thus qualified to participate in the political process that determined the national welfare (Horio, 1988, p. 41). All others were restricted in their access to participation in the government and the education system was thus used to preserve full citizenship for the selected few. These are same public exams which Amano and Horio both identify as a measure that has forestalled the growth of professional self-regulation.

It is Amano's opinion that the exams now are more competitive than ever because the prewar school stratification (*gakureki shakai*) has remained unchanged. Postwar reforms were unable to effect an increasingly rigid structure that places newer high schools and universities at a distinct disadvantage. These new schools which form the bottom ranks of education, were built to handle the postwar population boom. They are insufficiently endowed and have very little income other than student tuition.

Amano gives very little information about the process of design and validation of the exams themselves. His description of the quality of exams is somewhat ambivalent. At times, he conveys the perspective that the ability to pass exams is an indication of the students' intelligence or academic ability. At one point he negatively compares the current situation with the examination for promotions of the late Tokugawa and early Meiji eras; mastery had to be demonstrated then but mere attendance seems to be sufficient for promotion now (p. 57). Whereas at other times he conveys doubt that success in exams has a positive relation to the academic qualities of a student.

Amano's discussion of exams is directed primarily at the purpose of the exam system rather than the structure and design of the exams. His emphasis is the social rather than the pedagogical aspects of exams. His

whole discussion of the modern education system from the late 19th century to the early 20th century reflects this emphasis as he traces the socio-political origins and role of exams and their place in education. Rarely leaving the aspect of political influence and control of education he exhaustively develops the major thesis of this book—exams have been used in Japan as a primary tool of control of the education system by government authorities, and as a secondary means of providing trained and educated people for business and industry. If the education system was, as a whole, the means of preventing the common people from becoming autonomous and inquisitive, as a tool with which to domesticate the Japanese people (Horio, 1988, pp. 48-49), then the examination system was a primary mechanism of that system.

This thesis however seems to run counter to his relatively shorter discussion of credentialism. While Amano describes the steady takeover of the formal education system and the development of the credentials bestowed through the diplomas and certificates, he places examinations in a positive light near the end in his short comparison of academic ability and academic credentialism:

> During the period when the schools system was in chaos, pure ability made the difference. No matter where an individual studied, he had the opportunity for further studies and could obtain professional qualifications if he was able to succeed in the relevant examinations. However once the school system was set in order and the various academic tracks established, the situation changed. 'Ability' came to be tested and evaluated everyday by the school system, and the result summed up in certificates. Further academic opportunity and access to professional qualifications came to depend on the correct 'academic credential' rather than on an examination that directly measured ability. (pp. 179-180)

There are mixed messages in this view. Multiple evaluation ("tested and evaluated everyday") is a sound principle of reliable evaluation. We are led to believe, however, that this was a characteristic of an undesirable state of affairs. On the other hand, the continued opportunities for further studies, regardless of where previous studies had taken place, is an indication of an open system that allows flexibility to accommodate the changing characteristics and needs of individuals and their attempts to adapt to their environment—certainly a freedom that is essential in an open society that allows for individual variation and goals. Then there is Amano's admonition that "correct" academic credentials bestowed opportunity and privilege while examinations took a back seat. This is ambiguous in light of the frequent discussions Amano engages in as he addresses the lack of quality and standardisation during the for-

mation of the education system. His account of early education in Japan clearly delineates the poor quality of education and the lax attitude that students had for real academic endeavour over the centuries and particularly when the system was forming in the early days of the Meiji era. The standardised credentials were meant to represent the culmination of years of study as the process of study, testing and promotion was gradually instituted by law. These laws were in part a response to the cram schools which developed a thriving industry in the 1870s and 1880s to take advantage of the market to prepare the students for exams. They were also a direct retaliation against the blossoming political movements that were making their way in the private schools. In this way the basic issues of the overtly political purpose of credentialism and the pedagogically advantageous design of the credential system overlap and Amano's critique sends mixed messages.

At times it is difficult to tell when Amano conveys the opinions of his subjects or when he gives his own opinion. He takes the credentialism hierarchy to task but then he says:

> There was a long period when, at each level of the system, the schools had to reevaluate the academic ability of the applicants for the admission because they could not trust the diplomas of the lower levels. But that period of uncertainty was coming to an end. The age when one could take the regular course in order to move up socially, to advance step by step along the main road, had arrived. (p. 180)

It is difficult to know if he endorses the system or if he is engaging in irony.

There is a constant dichotomy running throughout Amano's work—the dichotomy of political control and improved quality in education. As the government's administrations passed law after law making ever stricter requirements for school admissions in the public and private sector, the issue of political control for the sake of political agendas becomes blurred with the issue of the need for quality in education. Many of the private schools had open enrollment and made it possible for anyone to enter. The public schools, on the other hand, developed stricter control of the admission and promotion requirements which manifest in a tremendous drop out rate as student were unable to maintain the pace. Unfortunately, we are not given an analysis of the quality of education except in the historical chronicle of entrance, promotion, and graduation procedures. We are left to speculate as to the actual quality. This may be oversight or it may simply be outside of Amano's purpose in writing this history.

Another limitation of this work is the absence of any discussion of

some of the major historical changes that took place during this period, other than a few off-hand references to the changes outside of Japan. Amano does make one very interesting comment about the use of the military draft exemptions that were given to approved schools in exchange for more government control: "The majority of private schools could not have survived if they had not been able to offer exemption from conscription, for they depended solely on student fees for their income" (p. 175).

The Meiji period was heavily invested with the political agenda of the "the clique from Satuma and Choshu that was running the country" (Amano, p. 180), yet there is no discussion and only a few anecdotes about the actual impact of these specific political interests on the education system. Arguably the mere standardisation and systematic control of a situation in chaos is a constructive development but we are left to engage in mere speculation as to the constructive or destructive nature of these developments.

Amano illuminates these basic assumptions embodied in the social approval of competitive exams in Japan at the beginning of the Meiji era and now:

1. The students' ability/intelligence/knowledge can be reduced to a score on a test.
2. The score on an entrance exam is an indication of the students' ability to function in the system/institution they are entering.
3. The chance to score adequately on exams is equally divided among all the members of society as they approach the time of testing.
4. The ability to score well on an exam is a direct result of the students' perseverance and not the environment or innate/congenitally endowed characteristics.

The basic assumption of imbuing test scores with social acceptance and scholastic credibility has been analysed by S. J. Gould (1993) in his work on the intelligence quotient debate in psychometrics. Gould points out that numerical representations portrayed by tests do not necessarily construe a corresponding innate cognitive ability, or in this case, the students' relative ability or level of learning. In the absence of any sociological or physiological evidence it is capricious to stratify people on the basis of their relative test scores. From Amano's description of the evolution of competitive exams in the Japanese education system we may infer that competitive tests are regarded as evidence of the student's ability relative to other students, thus the argument for the validity of the test becomes the test itself. This argument is obviously circular. The

assertion that these exams measure the student's achievement or level of learning rests on the assumption that the tests do in fact measure what the students have learned.

Amano is thorough in conveying the historical foundations of the credential system and the pivotal role played by exams. Exams are as much a part of the system of modern education as any other aspect. We do not, however, have a clear picture of the actual nature of exams and we are left with the impression that exams are here to stay but they are ambiguous in nature and haphazard in design and administration. Rather than being a measure of learning and a predictor of potential they are an administrative obstacle to be placed in the path of students at the discretion of the various administrative bodies who control their content and use.

When Masao Terasaki encouraged Gary Tsuchimochi to submit his dissertation for an external doctorate at Tokyo University, that effort brought to professional educators a significant work that goes far in illuminating the philosophical, social, and legal underpinnings of the education system in Japan today. Tsuchimochi's scholarship displayed in *Education Reform in Postwar Japan* forms a part of continuum of the context developed by Amano and Horio. As Horio, a member of Tsuchimochi's dissertation examination committee, and Amano have argued, the original prewar system of education in Japan, it's goals, benefits, disadvantages, and the problems that eventually crippled it were plainly the work of those that placed authoritarian control over educational precepts, a policy that obstructed the growth and development of a professional infrastructure in education. With a great deal of previously unrevealed documentation, Tsuchimochi describes in detail the process whereby the 1946 U. S. Education Mission to Japan and their Japanese counterparts made the first major attempt to redress the problems that had resulted from this authoritarian system.

The book is organised to follow the events of the mission chronologically in Chapters 1 through 3, and then presents the primary aspects of the Mission's reports on language reform, school reform, higher education reform, and a comparison of the Japanese Mission with the Mission to Germany in Chapters 4 through 7 respectively. Tsuchimochi then gives a very useful synoptic conclusion with comments for future studies. This last section could very well provide beginning students with the conceptual outline to be read before tackling Chapters 1 through 7. A significant amount of the text is devoted to primary research materials; the appendices comprise 126 pages of biographies, draft papers

composed during the developing stages of the Mission, and the personal reminisces and records of the members of the mission, some in distant retrospect. The notes are extensive, 35 pages. In fact, the only thing that is not extensive is the index. This may represent a fundamental flaw to those who use this as a reference source for future research.

Carol Gluck, Tsuchimochi's professor at Columbia University, provides the foreword to establish the context and significance of this work. She observes that "the thesis of this book has two parts: first, that the postwar education reform was based on Japanese initiative; and second, that it 'originated in the dynamic correlation' between prewar and postwar movements in Japanese education"(p. x). Mindful of the monumental challenge this endeavor posed, Gluck points out, "The Fundamental Law of Education of 1947 in Japan embodied the result of the interaction between prewar and postwar educational visions, between American and Japanese educators in contest with their own sides and with each other" (p. xv). As Horio has stated, and Gluck quotes, the Fundamental Law of Education is "a new constitution for education," which bears the significance of a "complete transformation of the entire structure of Japan's educational enterprise" (Horio, 1988, p. 129).

In 1945, when Japan emerged from the legacy of the prewar modern education system, there were far fewer education opportunities then there are at present. The education system had multiple tracks that favoured the select few and created barriers for the less advantaged. Women had significantly fewer opportunities than men and minorities fewer still. Language education was strictly controlled—forbidden to most people and used primarily for military purposes. The system closed many occupations to all but the economically advantaged and the elite. The ultimate purpose of the entire system was to serve the political goals of the ruling elite. Academic freedom was impossible under military law. Immediately following the war, the remaining prewar bureaucrats prolonged the debate over the authoritarian nature of the education system for more than two years. This was changed after the 1946 U. S. Education Mission to Japan. The changes had far reaching impact and their philosophical basis are firmly established in political goals that were expressed at the time of the mission and in the years since.

One of the more controversial points about the current education system in Japan is that it is alleged to be an Allied Powers' product of the post-war occupation. Tsuchimochi present us with sufficient evidence to refute this view of a forced reform, a view that does serious discredit to the strong intellectual history of legal and philosophical scholarship in education in Japan since this "victims" point of view es-

sentially considers Japanese educators helpless and incompetent to deal with change. Horio states it bluntly when he says, "Those who attempt to dismiss direct popular control over education as an American Occupation strategy designed to weaken Japan...hold the Japanese people in utter contempt" (1988, p. 8). Tsuchimochi's work has placed this issue solidly in front of us and has given educators reason to reconsider the paramount influence the Japanese educators had on the current system and the results of the reform. Tsuchimochi accomplishes this by illuminating the process whereby the changes were made possible and the people, primarily Japanese scholars and statesmen, who made these changes. It is here in Japan that the problems occurred and it is here that the problems will or will not be resolved.

Terasaki has said the American contribution to the Mission's report was the influence of John Dewey and the democratic tradition developed from the beginning of the 20th century. The two major aspects of this influence, "the child-centered ideas of Pragmatism and Realism in the New Deal, can be understood as the direct reflection of American educational ideas at the time of World War II" (Tsuchimochi, 1990; p. 12).

A central concern for some members of the Mission was that democratisation could be realised only if encouragement was given to emphasise the differences in regional subcultures and environments and personal freedom and individualism could only be established by safeguarding local differences to counter centralised autocracy in Japan. Horio (1988) draws attention to the intellectual tradition of popular control in Japan by rephrasing Hiroyuki Katou's work, *Shinsei Taii*, written in 1870:

> A truly enlightened state, he insisted, is not one in which wise leaders attempt to manage every facet of national life, but one in which they work to defend the rights of all citizens to live and work on a fair and equal basis. (p. 25)

The individual freedom perspective is certainly not an outdated approach to education reform. In the 1980s the Ad Hoc Education Reform Council deliberated the need for more individuality and creativity (Dore, in Amano, 1990, p. x). Terasaki has described those institutions who evince a lack of regard for individual creativity, "schools that are breeding grounds for the 'victors' in the competition for university seats do produce cookie-cutter curricula lacking in personality" (1994).

The 1946 Mission goal to establish greater freedom in school was strongly endorsed by liberal members of Japanese societies and as such represented a complete reversal of the long methodical process of greater and greater control and centralisation during the Meiji era.

Another major point of contention during the 1946 Mission was language reforms. One of the U. S. American members, R. K. Hall, wanted to eliminate the traditional writing system and use *romaji* (an alphabet) because he was under the impression that it was an impediment to censorship and business as well as an advantage to the dissemination of prewar propaganda. Additionally, some members felt that learning 2000 or more kanji was so difficult that it represented a serious detriment to the development of children (Bowles, in Tsuchimochi, 1990). There was at the time, in the eyes of some, data to support this radical measure since a majority of the Japanese were illiterate despite the official claims of high literacy (p. 111).

This attitude was not an external phenomena and has an historical basis indigenous to Japan. During the early Meiji era, language reforms in education were occasionally drastic. Takato Oki, the first Minister of Education, went so far as to enforce a strict Western-style campus atmosphere at the developing national university with instruction in foreign languages and many of the early universities conducted their classes in foreign languages (Amano, 1990). Mori Arinori, another Minister of Education, gave serious consideration to making English the national language of Japan (Amano, 1990). The language difficulty point of view had parallels among the academics and bureaucrats. During the colonial era, non-Japanese children were thought to be incapable of learning kanji because they were linguistically backward (Tsurumi, 1984).

In the end, the effect of the reform was not so radical as to eliminate kanji and reduce the written language to kana and romaji; the final adoption was to implement the use of romaji and later developments were to see the simplification of the number of standard kanji.

An interesting insight that Tsuchimochi makes regards R. K. Hall. Hall was an enthusiastic proponent of the radical language simplification reform which Tsuchimochi opines may have been due to the fact that Hall was a graduate student of Charles Fries at the University of Michigan. Fries, one of the primary educators at the English Language Exploratory Committee—now the English Language Education Council (ELEC)—was a specialist in language simplification. Ten years later, Hall became involved in ELEC and the *Monbusho* allegedly became the primary obstruction to the language innovation attempts by Fries and his colleagues (Heinrichsen, 1989). The juxtaposition is intriguing. However, Heinrichsen does not mention Hall, and Tsuchimochi's reference to Hall's connection to Fries is brief.

The most significant reform introduced was the 6-3-3 school system. At the beginning, the American Mission were in favour of retaining the pre-

war 6-5 system (six years elementary school and five years secondary school). The Mission was primarily concerned that the existing system was to be free to all children regardless of gender, co-educational, and compulsory for nine years. The primary concern was to make the system more democratic and to counteract the former military regime's ultra-nationalistic, military propaganda emphasis (pp. 124-25). New evidence shows that, contrary to statements made by Japanese politicians and business people in the past thirty years, the idea of the 6-3-3 system was, in fact, the suggestion of the Japanese members of the study groups. The American Mission members were not even under the impression that the reform of the school system was even theirs to decide but was in fact that for the Japanese Education Committee to deal with (pp. 125-127). The abolition of the multi-track in schools established largely during the Meiji era (Amano, 1990) and its replacement with the single track 6-3-3 plan for all students was proposed as far back as 1936 by Shigetaka Abe (pp. 130-31, 135) and in 1937 by the *Kyouiku Doshikai* (p. xiv).

More important was dealing with inadequate facilities, poor programmes, and the lack of leadership in schools (p. 128). Tsuchimochi's discussion of the evidence indicates strong reasons for retaining the prewar system, reasons that were both pedagogical and administrative in nature (pp. 128-29). But Shigeru Nambara, Chairman of the Japanese Education Mission and President of Tokyo Imperial University informed the chairman of the American Education Commission that the American plan was to be the model for the Japanese system (pp. 129-30). A major prewar flaw was the low status of the youth schools (*seinnen gakko*) which received elementary graduates. They were merged into middle schools and girl's schools and the discrepancy in status was formally eliminated. As Tsuchimochi points out, the plans for this restructuring were publicly proposed before the American Mission ever reached Japan.

The chapter on higher education reform, Chapter 6, has perhaps the most critical and crucial observations to make. The modern education system, as Horio and Amano have pointed out, was originally designed to serve the Imperial University and the government services. Higher education had been under the control of the government longer than any other area and the greatest damage to Japanese society had been traced to the universities by more than a few scholars. However, the greatest hope for reform was also expressed for education within the parameters of higher education. This section, more than the others, has the greatest interest for language educators because this is the "be all and the end all" of much of the focus in language education. The primary observations, military critique aside, were that there were needs for greater communication and

personnel exchange between universities and a greater emphasis on applied research. Teachers' academic freedom was of particular importance in these observations as was the crucial role to be played by adequate and independent teacher education and more flexible graduate programmes that gave students exposure to more perspectives rather than the paternal role played by a single advisor.

In his memoir for Tsuchimochi's work, the late Gordon Bowles, a member of the 1946 U.S. Mission to Japan, reiterated that the purpose of the mission ostensibly was to advise General MacArthur. The report was written with respect to revision of the entire education system so as to conform to the spirit and objectives of the Potsdam Agreement (the declaration adopted by the Allied powers as the basic pattern for democratization). Any and all recommendations submitted in their report were to be addressed to the future, and current problems—economic and others—were to be ignored (p. 309). But Bowles relates an even more significant insight: "[T]he greatest service rendered by the Mission was unquestionably to provide an opportunity for a sizable number of Japanese educators to meet and converse at length, on a person to person basis, with their American counterparts" (p. 312). In retrospect, Dr. Bowles also points out that,

> Only to the extent that the Mission provided opportunity to Japanese educators to express themselves and to utilize the Report as a foundation for realizing their hopes and convictions and strengthening their position does the Mission deserve any credit for lasting results. (p. 313)

Teaching is an occupation that demands a great deal of time, effort, preparation and thought. In the process we get so caught up in its dynamics and demands that we tend to forget something rather crucial—when the students get through it all, they are supposed to be ready for much more than "reading, 'riting and 'rithmetic," in any language. They will have to take a responsible, constructive role in society. To put it another way, these schools and the entire system have a very definite purpose in the society that built them. It is imperative that we acquaint ourselves with the works of those professionals who see past the day-to-day concerns and address education in the context of the society it is to benefit.

References

Dinham, S. M., & Stitter, F. T. (1986). Research on professional education. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.) *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.). (pp. 952-970). New York: Macmillan.

Gould, S. J. (1993). *Mismeasure of man.* New York: Norton.

Grabe, W. (1994). Forward: ARAL XIV Rationale. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics: Language Policy and Planning. 14.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Terasaki, Masao (1994, October). The position of teachers in modern Japan: Academic freedom, classroom freedom, and job security. In T. L. Simmons (Moderator), *Professionalism: Issues in practice.* Roundtable conducted at the 20th International Japan Association of Language Teachers' Conference in Matsuyama, Japan.

Tsurumi, E. P. (1984). Colonial education in Korea and Taiwan. In R. H. Meyers & M. R. Peattie (Eds.) *The Japanese colonial empire.* (pp. 275-311) Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Heinrichsen, L. E. (1989). *Diffusion of innovations in English language teaching: The ELEC effort in Japan, 1956-1968.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.