
THE PALMER-HORNBY CONTRIBUTION TO ENGLISH TEACHING IN JAPAN

Richard C. Smith: *Tokyo University of Foreign Studies (4-51-21 Nishigahara, Kita-ku,
Tokyo 114-8580)*

Looking round we see our Institute not as a dominant influence in English teaching but simply as an important one; and we venture to think and hope that influences such as this one have a quality of permanence which is denied to those seeking or even acquiring dominance at any given time.
(Palmer 1933a: 2).

Abstract

This article situates the important work of Harold E. Palmer (1877-1949) and A.S. Hornby (1898-1978) in Japan in the 1920s and 1930s in relation to the establishment and overall research and reform programme of the IRET (Institute for Research in English Teaching). Two strands (and conceptions) of applied research are identified, one leading from Palmer's early work in Japan into the continuing development of 'appropriate methodology' by Japanese teachers themselves, the second leading from later lexicological research work by Palmer and Hornby - itself originating in a concern to reform the content of instruction in the Japanese context - into world-wide pre- and post-war developments as well as ultimate, partial application in Japan in the form of the *Idiomatic and Syntactic English Dictionary* (published by Kaitakusha in 1942). In tracing the history of the Institute, this article attempts to evaluate the contributions of Palmer and Hornby to the reform of English teaching in Japan, and to assess their related lexicological achievements.

1. Introduction

The pre-war work in Japan of Harold E. Palmer (1877-1949) and A.S. Hornby (1898-1978), as 'brought back' to the U.K. and further refined by Hornby, in particular, would appear to have had a profound and abiding influence on British or British-influenced English language teaching (henceforth, ELT (UK)) in the post-war years. As Cowie (this volume, and forthcoming) demonstrates, this legacy has been maintained, augmented and spread partly by means of successive Oxford University Press (OUP) imprints and revisions of the (*Advanced*) *Learner's Dictionary*, based originally on the *Idiomatic and*

Syntactic English Dictionary (ISED), published by Kaitakusha, Tokyo, in 1942. Cowie also describes in detail and on the basis of primary sources how *ISED* itself emerged from a wider programme of lexicological research – involving work on vocabulary limitation, phraseology and sentence patterns – which was pursued from the late 1920s onwards, within the Institute for Research in English Teaching (IRET) in Tokyo.

This research programme itself came to connect up increasingly with a wider, international movement which gained pace in the mid-1930s in favour of ‘vocabulary control’ (see Howatt 1984: 214–15, 255–58; Cowie, forthcoming), and it is perhaps largely due to his work on this world stage (as well as the recent ascendancy of the ‘lexical approach’ in ELT (UK)) that Palmer’s name is associated nowadays, in Britain at least, mainly with work on vocabulary control (see, for example, recent citations by Cook (1998: 62) and Meara (1998: 290)). Indeed, Palmer’s contribution to the ‘Carnegie Report’ of 1936 (whose word-list was republished in a revised version as the *General Service List of English Words* (West 1953)) should not be neglected, while the influence of this publication on post-war ELT (UK) materials design also deserves to be recognized.

Other strands of influence leading from the IRET, and the work of Palmer and Hornby within the IRET, to post-war ELT (UK) via Hornby are perhaps less well understood outside Japan, for at least two reasons: firstly, the general unavailability of primary source material, including the numerous pre-war IRET publications (see Smith forthcoming (b) for an overview) and, secondly, an absence of widely diffused secondary accounts in English of IRET activities.¹ One strand which *can* be clearly discerned leads from Hornby’s editorship of issues 123 to 178 (from April 1936 to November 1941) of the IRET’s *Bulletin* to the foundation at his suggestion in 1946 – on this pre-war, Japanese model – of the British Council’s *English Language Teaching*, now published by OUP as *ELT Journal* (Hornby 1966: 3–4; Hornby [and Ruse] 1974: 6–7). Pending further in-depth enquiry into back issues of the *Bulletin* and other IRET publications similar to that which Cowie has already carried out in the field of lexicology, the probable influence of IRET work on the overall methodology, as well as the lexical and syntactic content of post-war ELT (UK) can only be hinted at. The widespread influence of Hornby’s own series of articles in the ‘new’ journal on ‘Linguistic Pedagogy’ (1946–7) and ‘The Situational Approach in Language Teaching’ (1950), as well as his later publications for OUP, including the ‘Hornby Course’ – *Oxford Progressive English for Adult Learners* (1954–6) – and *The Teaching of Structural Words and Sentence Patterns* (1959–66) has already been recognized (see Howatt 1984: 260–63), and deserves to be re-emphasized here. However, the way in which the ideas expressed or given concrete form in these publications may, paradoxically, have been partially ‘imported’ to Britain from Japan by Hornby to be further developed by him prior to reincarnation and re-export, through the agency primarily of The British Council, as the *British* ‘situational’ approach to ELT must remain, for the time being, an untold tale.

Rather than pursue this particular line of enquiry, I shall in this article attempt simply to provide an overview of the pre-war contributions of Palmer

and Hornby to English teaching in the Japanese context, as a basis for future broader treatments, as well as to provide a corrective to previous brief accounts by, among others, Redman (1966, 1967) and Yamamoto (1978). I shall devote most attention to the nature of the Japanese invitation to Palmer in 1921, the setting-up of the IRET in 1923, and its activities until around 1931, ending this account with only a relatively brief summary of subsequent pre-war developments. In emphasizing the earlier period of IRET activity, and the increasingly important role of Japanese teachers in appropriating 'reformed' teaching methods, I hope to complement Cowie's enquiries into the mainly lexicological work carried on by Palmer and Hornby throughout the 1930s. This later, apparently 'autonomous' work will thus be contextualized within the broader reformist aims and activities of the IRET, the experimentation with teaching and materials design which these aims and activities entailed, the contributions to this work of personalities (including Japanese personalities) other than Palmer and Hornby, and the prevailing educational, social and political climate in Japan at the time.

It is hoped that this story will be of interest not only for the insights it might provide into the history of lexicological and lexicographic developments in the pre- and post-war years, but also for the implications it might hold for the contemporary and future development of appropriate English teaching methodology (see Holliday 1994) in the Japanese, and perhaps other non-European, secondary school contexts.

2. The work of Harold E. Palmer and A.S. Hornby in Japan

2.1. *The setting-up of the Institute for Research in English Teaching (1923)*

Harold E. Palmer appears to have been 'head-hunted' in autumn, 1921, to advise on the overall reform of English teaching in Japanese 'middle' (i.e. secondary) schools, just as Hornby was to be, two years later, for his first teaching post, in a small 'higher school' (i.e. university) in Kyushu (see Cowie, in this volume). Palmer, the senior of the two by twenty-one and a half years, had just turned forty-five when his ship landed in Kobe, on March 27th, 1922 (Imura 1997: 43), and had already established a reputation (in Japan as well as Britain) as an innovator in the field of language teaching methodology, via publication of *The Scientific Study and Teaching of Languages* (1917), *The Principles of Language-Study* (1921), and *The Oral Method of Teaching Languages* (1921).² According to Redman's widely diffused (1966, 1967) accounts, Palmer (at the time a full-time lecturer in Daniel Jones' Department of Phonetics, University College London) was invited to Japan by a dynamic and wealthy businessman, Matsukata Koujiro, to recommend improvements to the 'old-fashioned and inefficient' teaching of English in Japanese schools. Matsukata 'offered' to pay for Palmer as a 'gift' to the Japanese Department (i.e. Ministry) of Education, which accepted the offer but did not quite know what to do with this 'problem child'. The Department (Redman implies) then created the IRET, to divert Palmer's energies into research activities and thus

away from making proposals for drastic reforms which might upset the 'apple carts' of various vested interests.

While dramatic, Redman's account nevertheless appears to be flawed, in the following major respects:

(i) Rather than Matsukata, the driving force behind the invitation to Palmer was a prominent and progressively-minded educationalist, Sawayanagi Masatarou. A former Vice Minister of Education who retained close contacts and at least some 'pull' with the Department of Education, Sawayanagi met Palmer in the autumn of 1921, and proposed to him and – it must be presumed – to the Department of Education in Japan that a position be created for him as 'linguistic adviser' (Sawayanagi 1924; Matsukata 1933; Palmer 1934a; see also Mizuuchi 1989 on Sawayanagi, and Imura 1997 on the invitation to Palmer).

(ii) Far from encouraging Palmer to engage in immediate recommendations, Sawayanagi repeatedly stressed that he should 'inquire first into the history of English teaching in Japan and secondly [...] inspect the prevailing methods and their results, in the hope of ultimately devising some new methods which would be suitable to Japan' (Sawayanagi 1924: 5). While Sawayanagi thus emphasized the need for initial research, Matsukata (as reported by Stier 1950: 14) appears to have recommended that Palmer should have a 'free hand in the development of his program', encouraging him therefore to 'avoid entangling alliances, [...] with *government officials*, teachers, publishers, university academicians, and even businessmen who were cocksure that Japan needed 'practical' English' (emphasis added). The politically aware advice of both Sawayanagi and Matsukata may be seen, then, to have been consistent with, and to have backed up, the foundation of the IRET one year after Palmer's arrival in Japan as an independent, or at least semi-independent (see (iv) below), research-based organization.

(iii) On his arrival in Tokyo, Palmer was given an office in the Ministry and left to pursue his own investigations, under the nominal supervision of a committee composed largely of academics appointed to look after him (Imura 1997: 46–7). These arrangements, in combination with Sawayanagi's initial advice that he might 'spend the whole period of three years in his research' (Sawayanagi 1924: 5), must have been at least to some extent congenial to Palmer himself, who used the first half of this period partly to complete *A Grammar of Spoken English*, published in Britain in 1924 (Imura 1997: 46–7), and to work on his applied linguistic interpretation of the ideas of de Saussure, the *Memorandum on Problems of English Teaching in the Light of a New Theory* (1924; first presented at a special lecture to prominent Japanese educationalists in December, 1923).

(iv) Most importantly, the impetus for the establishment of the IRET by no means came from within the Department of Education itself but from a small (largely non-Japanese) band of Palmer's supporters, with his own approval, and perhaps even encouragement. The most active of these supporters, W. Rudolf F. Stier, was later to claim, indeed, that the idea for an Institute first germinated in the course of conversations with himself and other non-Japanese

coll
repe
gro
hou
'An
fir
buti
exis
wor
V
spa
Jap
seer
to j
gain
per:
Dej
Adi
Edu
Pre
to u
– in
the
in t
to
refe
tha
tap
finc
A
(IR
givi
orig
the
pri
ann
me.

2.2.
As
larg
ling
son
to
Enj
rep

colleagues during Palmer's very first week in Japan (Stier 1948: 8). As is reported in the first issue of the IRET *Bulletin*, 'on February 19th, 1923 a group of Mr Palmer's friends on their own initiative called on him at his house', and at the ensuing meeting formally drew up a resolution to create 'An Association for the Promotion of Research in English Teaching', in the first instance to meet the 'immediate need' of 'compilation, printing and distribution of various types of English Language Courses', in order to encourage existing reform efforts and to provide an impetus to 'research and experimental work' on the basis of their use (Anon. 1923: 2).

Whatever its immediate origin, the Association in fact became, within the space of a few months and at the request of its members, a fully-fledged Japanese institution. As the concept of an independent 'Research Institute' seemed to chime in with their initial advice to Palmer, Matsukata was quick to provide additional financial backing, and Sawayanagi equally prompt to gain Department of Education approval for the new venture. Sawayanagi also persuaded an array of prominent, reform-minded academics as well as a Department of Education representative to serve on a 'Board of Administration' which he agreed personally to chair. Later, the Minister of Education himself was prevailed upon to become the Institute's Honorary President (Imura 1997: 62-63, 76). Permission was also granted for the Institute to use Palmer's premises within the Department of Education, a factor which - in the long run - may be seen to have assured the prestige of its activities in the eyes of Japanese teachers, even though it always remained, by statute and in the tone of its activities, an independent, or, as Palmer (1934a: 1) preferred to describe it, a 'semi-official' body. In sum, it was the desire of Palmer's reform-minded supporters and mentors, as well as - in all likelihood - himself, that the Institute should be 'sufficiently unofficial to be unhampered by red-tape and yet so closely in touch with the Department of Education that its findings should receive the maximum of official support' (Palmer, 1934a: 2).

At the end of May 1923 the Institute for Research in English Teaching (IRET) formally came into being. Palmer was appointed Director and approval given to the setting-up of an 'administrative committee' composed of the original 'friends' who had gathered at his house in February. Stier's employers, the Y.M.C.A., agreed to offer his services free of charge for a year and to print the Institute's publications, and the first issue of the IRET *Bulletin*, announcing the establishment of the new Institute and appealing for new members, appeared on June 1st, 1923.

2.2. Palmer's initial activities (1922-3)

As has already been implied, Palmer's initial activities in Japan were confined largely to background research of a somewhat individualistic, theoretical or linguistic nature (leading to publications in 1924), combined, however, with some school visits and numerous public lectures. In these lectures, he appears to have refrained from making specific recommendations for the Japanese English teaching situation, preferring instead to stay at the level of generalities, repeating ideas from his previously published works which 'might serve to help

him and his future work to be understood' (Sawayanagi 1924: 5). Certain 'non-negotiables' do emerge from these lectures, however, including the importance of 'thinking in English' (as opposed to mentally translating into or from English), the value of teaching language as 'Speech' rather than as 'Code' (see below), the value of phonetics to language teachers, and the importance generally of 'oral work' in the classroom (see Ozasa 1995a: 91–107). This period came to an end with the publication in 1924 of the *Memorandum*, a document of some importance both in global, applied linguistic terms (for the way it combines pedagogical implications with an original interpretation of de Saussure's distinction between *langue* and *parole*, latterly termed 'Code' and 'Speech', respectively, by Palmer) and – in local terms – for its conceptualization of 'multiple lines of approach' for further research, and ultimately reform in the Japanese context. Thus was put into place a top-down 'scientifically based' model which emphasized the need to develop 'Speech habits' for enhancement of the ability to 'think in English' (whether in speaking, listening, reading or writing). At the level of practice, on the other hand, the model allowed for an eclectic range of possible teaching procedures ('Forms of Work'), potentially encompassing 'grammar and structure' work, reading and writing, as well as listening and speaking.

2.3. The 'Standard English Course' (1924–5)

Whereas the IRET's first (1923) publications, under the dominant influence of Stier, had been designed – it would appear – to meet the needs of non-Japanese as much as Japanese teachers, the Great Kanto Earthquake of September 1, 1923, effectively resulted (with Stier's recall to New York and the appointment of a Japanese executive secretary) in the further Japanization of IRET activities (Palmer 1934a: 3). In December Palmer instigated a survey of Japanese teachers' views in order to establish, in particular, the problems and aims of English teaching in the middle-school context (Imura 1997: 70). Following his completion of the *Memorandum* (at the end of 1923), he also set about writing a variety of teaching manuals and learning materials aimed at Japanese as much as non-Japanese teachers of English, to reflect in concrete form the 'multiple lines of approach' indicated as available in that document. Together, these publications were intended to form a 'Standard Course of English composed specially for use in Japanese schools', a course which would not be centred on a particular (reading) text but assembled by teachers themselves, in the light of local needs and with the aid of IRET resources (Palmer and Palmer 1925: 5, 8). Thus appeared, in rapid succession, manuals or learning materials corresponding to the following lines of approach: Grammar and Structure (Palmer 1924–5); Reader (Palmer 1925a); Oral Ostensive (Palmer and Palmer 1925); Pronunciation (Palmer 1925b); and Writing (Palmer 1925c). The function of these publications appears to have been to encourage existing reform efforts by individual teachers, and to provide an impetus to 'research and experimental work' on the basis of their use (Anon. 1923: 2, as cited above). Universal adoption, then, was not necessarily predicted at this still early stage.

Nevertheless, Palmer's original three-year period of employment was to

come
he de
alway
Depa
seen,
need
and i
appe
the I
gone
expe
of E
tural
orga
of r
stros
'plai
liste
whil
gene
the
was
exte
and
thes
abo
of 1
Hov
ignc
Jap
less
9),
wor
anc
bac
his
imp
ent
the

2.4
In
me
qui
wit
Co

come to an end in March 1925, and – although it is clear that at some stage he decided to continue with his work in Japan – his original intention had always been to present a report containing specific recommendations to the Department of Education at the end of this three-year period. As we have seen, however, his own and the Institute's engagement with the specific, local needs of Japanese secondary school teachers was somewhat late in starting, and it was not until the autumn of 1925 that, together, Palmer and the Institute appear to have been ready to present reform proposals of a general nature, at the IRET's second Convention.³ At this conference, the Institute seems to have gone beyond its original remit (to engage in methodological research and experimentation) and – in response to an explicit request from the Department of Education for suggestions – it proposed a four-point programme for structural reform, involving smaller class sizes, liberalization of textbook approval, organization of in-service teacher training by the Department, and employment of more non-Japanese teachers in the middle-school system. There were also strong calls for university entrance examinations to be reformed to involve 'plain English' and the testing of English as 'Speech' (i.e. direct testing of listening, speaking, reading and writing) in counterweight to translation tasks, while stress was also laid on the need for teaching procedures to reflect, in general terms, Palmer's views on second language acquisition as expressed in the *Memorandum*. The 1925 Convention's response to the Ministry's request was not Palmer's alone but appears to have been drawn up on the basis of extensive consultations and discussions within the Board of Administration and among IRET members prior to and at the Convention. As a result of these deliberations, IRET perhaps began to be seen – for a period of only about three years, though (Ozasa 1995a: 69–89) – as a forum for discussion of reform proposals which would go beyond the 'merely' methodological. However, the IRET Convention's 1925 and subsequent proposals were largely ignored by the government, despite the public support they had gained from Japanese teachers and educationalists associated with the Institute. This, doubtless, was a source of continuing frustration to Palmer himself (Palmer 1938: 9), but was perhaps only to be predicted by those more familiar with the workings of the Japanese bureaucracy, including – presumably – Sawayanagi and Matsukata themselves. It can reasonably be assumed that *without* the back-up of the Institute, similar suggestions made by Palmer individually in his capacity as 'linguistic adviser to the Department' would have had even less impact. Between 1925 and 1928, then, it must have become increasingly apparent to Palmer that his efforts would have little effect unless directed through the Institute, as opposed to the Department's more labyrinthine channels.

2.4. The 'Reader System' (1926–7)

In line with the increasing influence of its Japanese members, another development was occurring in Palmer's own thinking which was to contribute to a quite radical change of direction in IRET publication and research activities, with wider (international) consequences. Already in his report to the 1925 Convention, and in a February 1926 article in the *Bulletin*, Palmer had indicated

a shift away from the 'Standard Course' conception and towards a 'Reader System', whereby a reading text would form the core around which a variety of 'Speech' (including Direct Method writing) activities could be built, with the support of 'satellite' publications (Palmer 1926). This coincided with a recognition on Palmer's part that the primary overall goals of English teaching in the Japanese context were generally considered to be literacy-oriented, with 'conversation' being considered to be of only superficial value. These developments may be seen to have derived from Palmer's growing understanding of the Japanese middle-school context, where the textbook (approved by the Department, now Ministry, of Education) still forms the centre of teaching in all subjects, and where the focus in first as well as second language education and, importantly, university entrance examinations involving these subjects has always tended to be on the written language. The shift in emphasis which was to occur in Palmer's and the IRET's pedagogical suggestions and publications away from their initial focus on the spoken language did not mean that oral work ever lost its central place, however. On the contrary, Palmer was always keen to emphasize (in opposition to Michael West and devotees of the 'reading method' in the U.S.A.) that a basis of oral work constituted the only methodologically sound approach to the development of second language literacy skills. Indeed, as early as February 1926, Palmer had discussed a technique which he later termed 'oral introduction' (involving initial oral presentation of Reader contents), and which was to become a cornerstone of the IRET approach, as increasingly appropriated and adapted by Japanese teachers in the ensuing and, indeed, post-war years (Palmer 1926: 3).

In the years from 1925 to 1927, then, the IRET began to put into place its 'Reader System', issuing over this period ten volumes (for the five years of middle-school) of 'Standard Readers', authored by Palmer himself, which were submitted for and awarded Department of Education approval (alongside textbooks of other publishers) in March 1928. These were increasingly accompanied by a variety of innovative supplementary materials to support teachers' engagement in oral work, including books of questions and answers based on the contents of the texts and (latterly) scripts for oral introduction and gramophone recordings, as well as graded exercises in written composition intended to replace Japanese to English translation exercises (see Smith forthcoming (b)).

2.5. *Achievements and frustrations (1922–27)*

By the spring of 1927, Palmer had been in Japan for five years, and believed that significant progress had been made in clarifying appropriate (literacy oriented) aims of English teaching in Japan, in identifying 'scientifically based' and (yet) apparently appropriate means to be used in order to attain these aims, and – through the establishment of the Institute – in replacing previous factionalism with a focused reform movement (Palmer 1927: 3). (Indeed, in a retrospective account of 1933 (Palmer 1933a), he was to emphasize the latter as having been *the* major achievement of the previous ten years.) Nevertheless, misunderstandings – he felt – had plagued his own and the IRET's efforts at

every stage had failed to may, perhaps involve him motivated (middle-school 108–12). *Pa Schools* rep of 'appropri Japanese co (perceived) it seems to teachers are for you – it your own

As we sh with the I materials v further to with a view the Japanese line' of re linguistic, hobby' (Pa interest in research a below: first 'reformed' selves, and Palmer's publicatio

2.6. *Toward Sawayana to Japan 1927. His succeed is much pro ultimate ;*

As we core read Sawayana to be det added to was rece necessary

every stage of the way (Palmer 1927: 3), while the Department of Education had failed to heed successive IRET Convention 'appeals' for reform. What may, perhaps, have seemed even worse (although Palmer was careful not to involve himself overmuch in this politicized debate) – nationalistically motivated calls for the reduction or even abolition of English teaching in middle-schools appeared to be growing apace (Kawasumi 1979; Imura 1997: 108–12). Palmer's (1927) *The Reformed English Teaching in the Middle-Grade Schools* represents, then, a definitive and authoritative-sounding restatement of 'appropriate' principles worked out – in co-operation, it is clear, with Japanese colleagues – with a view not only to learning theory but also to the (perceived) constraints of the existing education system; at the same time, it seems to sound a note of completion, as if Palmer is saying to Japanese teachers and the education authorities 'this is what the IRET has developed for you – now it's your responsibility to understand it correctly and to make it your own!'

As we shall see below, from this point onwards Japanese teachers associated with the IRET do appear to have increasingly appropriated the ideas and materials with which they had been provided, and to have adapted these even further to their own local situations. At the same time, Palmer himself – still with a view, at least initially, to further improvement of English teaching in the Japanese context – seems to have retired to some extent from the 'front line' of reform in order to concentrate on background research of a more linguistic, code-focused nature (see his *Bulletin* editorial, 'Lexicology as a hobby' (Palmer 1928b) for a somewhat tongue-in-cheek account of his growing interest in this area). From 1927–28 onwards, then, two strands of IRET research and development appear to emerge, which we shall treat separately below: firstly, the further evolution up until the Pacific War of appropriate 'reformed' methodology through teacher-research by Japanese educators themselves, and, secondly, a shift to a concern with learning 'content' evident in Palmer's and, latterly, Hornby's own more linguistically-oriented research publications for the IRET over the same period.

2.6. *Towards and beyond the Fukushima Plan (1928–41)*

Sawayanagi Masatarou, who had done more than anyone else to bring Palmer to Japan and to provide him and the IRET with guidance, died in December 1927. His ultimate hope for Palmer (cited in 2.1 above) had been that he would succeed in developing 'new methods which would be suitable to Japan'. How much progress had in fact been made, or was still to be made, towards this ultimate goal when Sawayanagi died?

As we have seen, a 'Reader System' ranging 'satellite' materials around a core reading text had begun to be offered to Japanese teachers by the time of Sawayanagi's death, but the appropriateness of this model in practice was yet to be determined. Over the next few years, as supplementary materials were added to the already published 'Standard Readers' themselves and feedback was received from teachers, it became clear that slight modifications were necessary, but the system remained in place fundamentally unchanged until

the outbreak of the Pacific War. At the same time, an increasing number (although never a large number) of schools and teachers appear to have adopted IRET principles and/or materials, further adapting them to local needs. The increasingly important role of Japanese teachers in 'appropriating' Palmer's ideas will therefore constitute the focus of this section.

As Palmer himself was later to emphasize, while the IRET's primary role had always been to engage in research and the formulation of general principles, it was largely 'for the schools and the teachers themselves to find the interpretation of these principles [. . .] likely to be the most suitable for their pupils'. Palmer's further recommendation – in line with his belief in the validity of 'multiple lines of approach' – was that 'many different sorts of combinations of these principles should be tried out according to the various conditions of various types and grades of schools' (Palmer 1933b: 1).

Indeed, as we have already indicated, the Department of Education turned a largely deaf ear to the proposals for reform which were made by the IRET between 1925 and 1928, and it *was* therefore largely due to the efforts of individual schools and teachers (as well as the influence of loyal supporters such as Ishikawa Rinchirou, who became head of the English Department at Tokyo's leading teacher-training college in 1925), that IRET ideas did take root and develop within the Japanese middle-school context.

The best barometer of this appropriation by Japanese teachers of IRET methodology, as has been indicated by Ozasa (1995a, 1995b), may be reports of demonstration lessons at the IRET's Annual Convention in the *Bulletin* and elsewhere. Ozasa (e.g. 1995a: 39–68) has shown how these lessons clearly progressed from being taught by foreign teachers in the early years to (almost always) being taught by Japanese middle-school teachers from 1926 onwards, and how in the years up to the Tenth Convention in 1933 a variety of means of relating traditional Japanese ways of teaching to 'reformed methods' were seen to have been attempted by the different demonstrators. The most apparently successful and influential among these adaptations was the so-called 'Fukushima Plan', this being a curriculum developed along IRET lines at Fukushima Middle School (Ozasa 1995a: 50–67). Lessons based on this curriculum were demonstrated at the Tenth Convention, attended by more than 600 participants (Imura 1997: 172), and the curriculum was subsequently published by the IRET (Isoo and Shimizu 1934). While the Fukushima Plan clearly shows a development from general learning principles as expounded by Palmer to specific (sometimes original) classroom procedures involving much 'rapid-fire' oral work, it places – at the same time – a greater emphasis not only on reading and writing but also on explicit grammar instruction and translation than Palmer himself had initially recommended. Ozasa (1995a: 66) explains this with reference to the need to prepare students for university entrance examinations and describes the 'Fukushima Method' as therefore constituting 'an excellent adaptation of the Palmer Method in the Japanese context'. Imura (1997: 169–75) also recognizes the importance and subsequent influence of the Fukushima Plan, but complements his own description with analysis of a subsequent modification demonstrated at the Twelfth Convention in 1935 by teachers of Shounan Middle School, which was also highly evaluated by other

Japanese
that if s
unlikely
willingn
by Japa
Sawayan

2.7. Lexi

While t
most of
Palmer's
from th
'backgr
year 19
English
on the
of Engli
Hornby
its own
concent
appeara

As w
Palmer'
pointme
impossi
mentati
misunde
reductio
however
him aw:

Witho
can be c
the devo
to the
increasi
the IRE
taken at
primari
(in the
school c

Thus,
demand
the req
Palmer
in the J
ground,

Japanese teachers at the time. Imura (1997: 117) concurs with Ozasa in noting that if such modifications had not occurred the IRET's influence would be unlikely still to be felt today. It was, then, more than anything else, the willingness actively to appropriate and adapt Palmer's ideas that was shown by Japanese teachers after his first five years in Japan which ensured that Sawayanagi's original intentions were ultimately achieved.

2.7. *Lexicology in context (1928-31)*

While the Convention itself became rapidly 'nationalized' after 1928 (with most of the proceedings being carried out in Japanese from that year onwards), Palmer's own focus may appear around the same time to have turned away from the Japanese middle-school context and towards research of a more 'background', linguistic nature. Thus, Palmer was himself to recall that the year 1927-8 saw 'The realizing of the need for an objective survey of the English linguistic symbols', which was to involve henceforth 'research not only on the psychology of language-learning but also on many baffling problems of English lexicology' (Palmer 1933c: 4). The work carried out by Palmer and Hornby as a result of this 'lexicological turn' has been effectively analysed in its own terms by Cowie (this volume, and forthcoming). Here we will therefore concentrate only on ways in which it *can* be seen – perhaps in spite of appearances – to relate specifically to the Japanese context.

As we have already implied, it is possible – with hindsight – to connect Palmer's shift in focus to background linguistic issues after 1927-8 with disappointments in more self-evidently political areas (relating to the apparent impossibility of government-sponsored structural reform and wide-scale implementation of reformed English teaching, but also, more generally, to persistent misunderstanding of his suggestions and increasingly strident calls for the reduction or abolition of English teaching). It is only in the years after 1931, however, that Palmer's lexicological work can be seen clearly to have taken him away from Japan and into apparently less troubled international waters.

Without the benefit of hindsight, then, the 'lexicological turn' of 1927-28 can be explained wholly in terms of Palmer's perception of local needs within the development of the overall IRET reform programme, and with reference to the role of the IRET, as originally conceived. Not only does Palmer's increasingly linguistic work appear, in this light, to be more consistent with the IRET's originally intended research role than the campaigning 'side-turn' taken at the 1925-27 Conventions, but it also appears to have been undertaken primarily with a practical eye to the provision of more appropriate 'contents' (in the first instance, lexical contents) for learning, in the Japanese middle-school context.

Thus, drawing on his experience of writing the 'Standard Readers' with the demands of 'plain English' (as emphasized at the 1925 Convention), and with the requirements of oral work based on reading texts subjectively in mind, Palmer may have considered that the IRET's next area of appropriate research in the Japanese context should be to tackle traditionalists on their own home ground, questioning prevalent conceptions of what should be allowed to 'stand

for' written English and, indeed, grammar. While his own Readers had been written in a plain, colloquial style, offering clear appended examples in illustration of major grammatical rules, other textbooks available at the time (and, even more importantly, university entrance examinations) tended to include many old-fashioned, literary, or esoteric words and constructions. Palmer's 'lexicological turn' (itself following on from his earlier shift towards a greater focus on the twin aims of reading and writing in English) resulted – at the end of its first phase – in the *Interim Report on Vocabulary Selection* of 1930, a number of further supplements in 1931, and the second major *Interim Report* in 1931. These documents should be viewed, we would suggest, primarily as tools for building upon the achievements of the 'Reader System', being intended to provide further guidelines for the writing, in the Japanese context, of reader materials and, importantly, entrance examinations in 'plain English'.⁴

In parallel, Palmer was beginning to tackle the problem of grammatical contents for learning, as is shown most clearly by a cluster of 1928 publications (e.g. Palmer 1928a) published in Japanese only (this linguistic choice is significant, for Palmer's intention was surely to reach the most resistant teachers in Japan). Here, Palmer attempted to offer a replacement approach to the traditional parsing of sentences, terming this alternative 'mechanism grammar' (or, later, 'pattern-grammar'). In an expansion of his earlier London work on 'ergonics' and substitution tables (see Howatt 1984: 236–39; Smith forthcoming (a)), he indicated how construction-patterns could be taught as a basis for (spoken and written) production, accompanying theoretical explanation and sample exercises with a patented 'Automatic Sentence Builder' (see Tickoo 1986: 55 for further details). These considerations were later returned to in collaborative research with Hornby (Palmer 1934b).

Returning to the 1930–31 IRET reports on vocabulary selection, it is clear not only that the research work embodied there *was* undertaken with a view to the perceived needs of the Japanese context, but also that the results were immediately applied, not only in the production of revised, abridged editions of the (core) 'Standard English Readers' (Anon. 1932) but also in the writing of the supplementary graded readers which began to be issued in great quantities from 1931 onwards by the Institute, with Hornby becoming involved – still, at this time, in Kyushu – in the writing of a large number of these.

Palmer's (1929a) editorial on the 'Development of Our English Course' provides some indication of the place these supplementary readers were intended to have in the evolving 'Reader System' for middle-schools. It appears that, on the basis of feedback received from teachers, the 'System' was considered by the beginning of 1929 to be in need of refinement in particular through the provision of extra companion books. Thus, a detailed teaching plan for the 'First Six Weeks of English' (Palmer 1929b) was produced to indicate 'how best to bring the pupils to that point at which they learn to spell, read and write' (Palmer 1929a: 1). A series of elementary texts (side readers) was also planned which would 'contain no word that is not already familiar to the pupils, thus the reading will be true reading and not deciphering'. On a similar basis of ongoing research into vocabulary control, side readers were additionally promised for supplementary rapid reading. These promises go some way

towards explaining quantities due to limitation research teaching of reading in the *Bulletin*

2.8. Lexicology

It is at this point that a partial research program. It is evident that in debates of control in general time, lexicology (forthcoming), a path of per-define 'the word phraseology, dictates of particularly Japanese contextual material. Japan in 193 liberalism and ultra-national

In June 19 to result in a correspondent Leonard Bloch of IRET men which was to the U.S.A., and Ogden (of BASIC English, a threat to the control) and Palmer shared priorities following as important, mind had been his eight months in Manchuria

towards explaining both why graded readers began to be produced in such quantities during 1931, on the basis of the Institute's 1930-1 vocabulary limitation research reports, and why questions of text simplification and the teaching of reading began to receive so much attention in Palmer's editorials in the *Bulletin* and supplementary memoranda in 1932.

2.8. *Lexicology decontextualized (1932-36)*

It is at this point, however, that we need to consider seriously the possibility that a partial *severing* of connections occurred between the IRET's lexicological research programme, led by Palmer, and the Japanese middle-school context. It is evident that from 1931-32 onwards Palmer became increasingly involved in debates of an international nature regarding 'BASIC English', vocabulary control in general, text simplification and the teaching of reading. At the same time, lexicological research within the IRET may have begun to obey, as Cowie (forthcoming) has discerned, an autonomous momentum of its own, following a path of perceived 'universal' relevance which was to lead from attempts to define 'the word' to the consideration of collocation and other aspects of phraseology, and thence to questions of syntax, rather than following the dictates of particular needs within the local context. These moves away from specifically Japanese priorities may have been linked indirectly, in a negative contextual manner, to a sudden worsening in the political circumstances in Japan in 1931-2 which marked the definitive end of a period of relative liberalism and the entry into what has been termed the 'dark valley' of domestic ultra-nationalism leading up to the Pacific War (Storry 1990: 182).

In June 1931, Palmer embarked on an eight-month world tour which was to result in a number of (for him) fascinating first meetings with long-time correspondents such as Otto Jespersen, Albert Sècheyay, Michael West and Leonard Bloomfield, all of whom had been included by Palmer on the roster of IRET members since its foundation (Naganuma 1934: 210-13). The tour, which was to take him, via the Soviet Union, to the U.K., Switzerland and the U.S.A., also brought him into somewhat more abrasive contact with C.K. Ogden (of BASIC fame), and - in the U.S.A. - with Algernon Coleman (the doyen of the 'reading method' in that country), as well as a number of statistical lexicologists (though not E. L. Thorndike, whom Palmer had especially wanted to meet) (Bongers 1947: 79-82). It was in particular his meetings with West (a supporter, like Coleman but - as we have seen - unlike Palmer, of the need to approach reading *through* reading as opposed to oral work), Ogden (whose BASIC English was to be increasingly perceived by both Palmer and West as a threat to their own more pedagogically influenced schemes for vocabulary control) and the American statisticians (with whom, again, both West and Palmer shared differences), which appear to have most affected IRET research priorities following Palmer's eventual return to Japan in February 1932. Just as important, perhaps, in establishing new international priorities in Palmer's mind had been the rapid worsening in the domestic political situation during his eight months outside Japan. Following on from the outbreak of fighting in Manchuria in September 1931, and its subsequent occupation by the

Japanese Army, Shanghai – where Palmer's wife had been visiting their daughter – was bombarded by Japanese naval forces (Storry 1990: 186–91). Fortunately, both his daughter and his wife were safe, but Palmer had received a shock, and from this time onwards he may have been looking for ways to leave – or at least look beyond – Japan.

These factors may all help to explain why, following his return to Japan, editorials and articles by Palmer in the IRET *Bulletin* increasingly adopt internationally oriented, 'universalist' positions (in relation, in particular, to BASIC and the effective teaching of reading); why – apart from the production of Readers for girls' schools (1933) and (with Hornby) direct method composition exercises (1934) for a range of school levels – no new initiatives appear to have been taken with regard to middle-school course design; and, finally, why such energies appear to have been devoted to international propaganda on behalf of the Institute as it approached its tenth anniversary (e.g. Naganuma 1934; Palmer 1934a). From 1932 to 1934, also, the *Bulletin* – as in its earliest days – became the focus for intense debate among *non-* Japanese teachers, this time on the merits and demerits of BASIC. The debate ranged Hornby (who thus gained a certain presence on the IRET stage) against William Empson and other Ogden supporters, and while doubtless of intense interest at the time to those concerned, cannot have seemed to be of great relevance to Japanese middle-school teachers, who by now – anyway – had their own pages (in Japanese) in the IRET *Bulletin* and their own forum in the shape of the Annual Convention.

Whereas his previous (post-1923) work under Institute auspices had not only developed out of but had consistently been funnelled back to serve perceived needs in the Japanese middle-school context, Palmer's two-month absence to attend the 'Carnegie Conference' in New York in 1934 and his seven-month absence for the reconvened 1935 conference in London cannot be seen to have directly benefited Japanese teachers via new publications. As in the case of Michael West, Palmer's interest and expertise with regard to text simplification and thence the 'contents' of instruction had originally developed within a particular, non-European school context; indeed, despite their differences with regard to approaches to reading, it was perhaps ultimately their common appreciation of the demands of second language pedagogy 'in difficult circumstances' which united the two men in their opposition both to Ogden and to the 'word counters'. West had already been engaged to work in Canada, then in London (as a consultant and materials writer for Longmans, Green) on the back of his earlier research work in India. For Palmer himself, the Carnegie conferences were to become not only a showcase more fitting, perhaps, than that of the Annual IRET Conventions for his increasingly 'autonomous' research into collocations (Palmer 1933d) and construction-patterns (Palmer 1934b) but also a platform for his finally leaving Japan: rather, that is, than a springboard for renewed activity in that context.

Receiving many accolades (including the award of a D.Litt. from Tokyo Imperial University), Palmer in fact departed from Japan with his family in March 1936, to take up an offer of employment probably secured for him by West the previous year, at Longmans, Green in London.

Lest this depa
what arrangeme
research work, in
Hornby first beg

Until work be
for the report o
largely been car
with an eye to hi
amount of work
Board of Resea
middle-school to
become very mu
his base in Kyu
materials for th
commissioned
around 1930 (I
proposal' for a
difficult texts (I
work on colloc
to have identifi
more closely in
of continuing r
Palmer arrange
with faculty su
as to take over
frequent absen
Hornby first ca
tion, decontext
and constructi
broader IRET
the nature of F
perhaps beyon

2.9. The Ishikaw

On Palmer's c
influential ally
of the IRET, v
chief editor of
of Education'
office inside th
In Hornby's
previous achi
research (Hor
it reveals of Pa
entirely on Pal
attention on

Lest this departure appear too sudden, we shall now retrace our steps to see what arrangements Palmer had put in place for the continuation of IRET research work, including consideration of when and under what circumstances Hornby first began to make his mark.

Until work began in earnest on the collection and analysis of collocations for the report of 1933, it seems that 'background' IRET research work had largely been carried out by Palmer alone. On July 28th, 1933, perhaps partly with an eye to his eventual departure, partly, too, in recognition of the immense amount of work which still needed to be done, he had, however, instituted a Board of Research Associates, composed entirely of Japanese university and middle-school teachers (IRET *Bulletin* 96: 9). Hornby himself seems to have become very much involved in research on collocations in the same year, from his base in Kyushu. As Palmer later noted, Hornby, who had begun to write materials for the IRET as early as 1928, and whom Palmer seems to have commissioned to write simplified readers for relatively advanced learners around 1930 (Palmer, 1931: 1), had come to him in 1933 with a 'definite proposal' for a 1,000 word vocabulary for the simplification of relatively difficult texts (Palmer, 1936: 21). Involving Hornby in the ongoing research work on collocations (which Hornby was later to take over), Palmer appears to have identified him as someone with whom he would like to collaborate more closely in Tokyo and, perhaps, as a potential successor for the leadership of continuing research efforts. With effect from the beginning of April 1934, Palmer arranged for Hornby to come to Tokyo to teach at two universities with faculty supportive of the IRET research and reform programme, as well as to take over the management of IRET research during his own increasingly frequent absences abroad. The particular stage (after 1931–32) at which Hornby first came to collaborate closely with Palmer, a time of internationalization, decontextualization and concentration (on investigation of collocations and construction patterns) of the lexicological strand of research within the broader IRET programme, may be seen to have been crucial in determining the nature of Hornby's subsequent contribution in the Japanese context, and perhaps beyond.

2.9. *The Ishikawa-Hornby years (1936–41)*

On Palmer's departure, Ishikawa Rinchirou – who had been a loyal and influential ally throughout the years he had been in Japan – became Director of the IRET, with Hornby being appointed technical adviser to the IRET and chief editor of the *Bulletin* (the post of 'Linguistic Adviser to the Department of Education' appears not to have been filled, although the IRET retained its office inside the Department right up until the outbreak of the Pacific War). In Hornby's first editorial for the *Bulletin*, he both summarizes Palmer's previous achievements and indicates his own objectives for forthcoming research (Hornby 1936). His summary is itself instructive for the conception it reveals of Palmer's legacy in the Japanese context. Thus, Hornby concentrates entirely on Palmer's work as a 'linguistic expert' or 'technician' (p. 4), focusing attention on his 'analytical' research in the fields of Speech Psychology,

New-Type Grammar, Lexicological Research, Syntax and Synthesis (Hornby refers here to Palmer's (1934c) suggestions regarding how to produce 'a dictionary that is more than a dictionary'). Hornby also mentions achievements in phonetics and intonation, but leaves out a number of aspects which Palmer himself – in 1934 – had seen fit to include in his own summary of the previous ten years of work. Thus, Palmer's own (1934a) list of IRET 'Research' achievements (which itself takes its place alongside description of other contributions, in the areas of 'Propaganda', 'Publications', and 'Teacher Training') mentions the following: Research on Speech Psychology, Phonetic Research, Research on Grammar, Research on Vocabulary Limitation and Texts [*sic*] Simplification, Research on Composition Exercises, Research on Classroom Procedures, Research in Reader-Compiling, Research on Examining Procedures, Research on Higher School Problems, Research in Educational Gramophone Records. The last six or seven of these clearly show a difference between Palmer's underlying conception of research and that of Hornby's in 1936: whereas Palmer (even as late as 1934) had placed the focus on the solving of practical problems in the Japanese context, with research being seen as an adjunct to that priority, for Hornby the emphasis appears to have shifted to a conception of research as an end in itself, with a clear duty on the part of the researcher, though, to make the results available to the practitioner. Hornby was, in particular, aware of his *own* duty to diffuse the results of recent collocational and syntactic research, and, on the basis of his summary of Palmer's achievements, he defines his own task as 'the application of the work that has been done'. The three areas that he prioritizes are: (i) decisions as to which collocations to include in a well-graded middle-school course; (ii) an investigation of which construction patterns are of greatest utility and importance to beginners, co-ordination of this with work on new-type grammar, and presentation of the results for classroom use; and (iii) preparation of further handbooks for the use and guidance of teachers anxious to teach English 'as Speech' (Hornby 1936: 5). As we shall see below, the first two of these aims rapidly became subsumed within work towards 'new-type dictionaries' (not mentioned at all in Hornby's 1936 editorial), as opposed to reaching full fruition in syllabuses or classroom materials for the Japanese context, while the third objective was partially achieved, by means of numerous short articles in the *Bulletin*. It was perhaps to be only with his post-war work in the U.K. (see our Introduction) that Hornby ultimately succeeded in fully achieving the applications to classroom work which he had envisaged in this programme.

Entering fully into the IRET research programme at a time when Palmer's research was starting to become uncharacteristically divorced from priorities in the Japanese context, Hornby's attitude regarding the need to 'apply' research results (as opposed to basing research on specific practical problems) is wholly understandable. Just as Palmer himself (with his parting 'new-type dictionary' suggestions) seems to have recognized that the recent achievements in collocational and syntactic research would eventually have to be reconnected with the Japanese context in order to become fully justified, so Hornby took his responsibilities to Japanese teachers and students seriously. At the time Hornby became seriously involved, Palmer's lexicological research had already

taken on itself having ongoing a

Thus, I be character apply in 1 into lexis Palmer's however, nationalis gical indc system) fo 1937. At of 1937 (research had alwa work ha Hornby's made cle rather, th had envis three yea leagues, ; succeeded (see Cow and synt context.⁵ than a n

Cowie Harbor (to leave of *ISED* Japanese Hornby, however OUP in be a spriv volume) Holland and from Novemb

2.10. Ep

The IRI as an a Japanes

taken on a life of its own, with resulting needs for 'application', rather than itself having been constituted (as with the pre-1932 research efforts) as an ongoing attempt to solve predominantly pedagogical problems.

Thus, Hornby's own research over the ensuing five and a half years was to be characterized, as he had envisaged in 1936, by an attempt to synthesize and apply in the Japanese context (and refine by means of this attempt) research into lexis and syntax which had been left in only a semi-finished state on Palmer's departure. Efforts to connect this work with the middle-schools, however, were to be severely hampered by a further upsurge in domestic ultra-nationalism and militarism (involving, among other things, a growth in ideological indoctrination and further pressures on English teaching in the education system) following the outbreak of full-scale war with China in the summer of 1937. At the same time, as Ishikawa apologetically noted at the Convention of 1937 (Anon. 1937: 18), neither he nor Hornby could spare the time for research work which Palmer, with his freedom from full-time teaching duties, had always enjoyed. Later in the same report (p. 20), Ishikawa notes that work had begun on an English-English dictionary, and in both his and Hornby's reports to the Convention of the following year (Anon. 1938), it is made clear that a decision had been taken to focus on dictionary-writing, rather, that is, than on the more classroom-oriented applications which Hornby had envisaged in his first *Bulletin* editorial of 1936 (see above). Over the next three years Hornby, with the help he had requested from other IRET colleagues, and under the guidance of Ishikawa and Naganuma (of Kaitakusha), succeeded – against all the odds – in making two of the dictionaries a reality (see Cowie forthcoming), and so in relating the 'autonomous' lexicological and syntactic work of the years after 1932 back again, finally, to the Japanese context.⁵ By now, however, the dictionaries could only be a conclusion, rather than a new departure for more classroom-oriented work in this context.

Cowie (this volume) describes how – following the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor (November 1941) – Hornby was at first interned and then permitted to leave Japan in August 1942, without – it appears – even having seen a copy of *ISED*, which had been published by Kaitakusha in April 1942 under the Japanese title of *Shin Ei-Ei Dai-jiten* ('New English-English Dictionary'). Hornby, it seems, did not see a bound copy until after the war. He had, however, sent a set of proofs – under an arrangement with Kaitakusha – to OUP in London (Hornby [and Ruse] 1974: 10). For Hornby the war was to be a springboard for further activity in contexts other than Japan (Cowie, this volume). For Palmer, however, the news of his only son's death in action over Holland in July 1942 represented a shock from which he never really recovered, and from then on his health deteriorated (Anderson 1969). Palmer died on November 16th, 1949, at the age of 72.

2.10. Epilogue

The IRLT (as the IRET is now called) has survived to this day, still continuing as an active association with around 1,000 members, most of whom are Japanese secondary school English teachers or university teachers involved in

teacher-training.⁶ The IRLT has been wholly independent of the Ministry of Education since the end of the war, and is now one among many organizations for such teachers, although – with its long history – undoubtedly the most ‘eminent’, if not ‘pre-eminent’ among them.⁷ Some idea of the IRLT’s current activities, and the importance to its members of pre-war IRET work, may be given by describing its most recent Annual Convention, held on November 8th–9th, 1997. The programme included: a plenary lecture on ‘University Entrance Examinations and English’ (indicating the strength of the pressure these examinations still exert on secondary level English teaching); a discussion between Professors Imura Motomichi and Ozasa Toshiaki (whose important recent studies have greatly informed the present article) on ‘How should Palmer’s work be interpreted today?; a demonstration lesson (exemplifying characteristic IRLT features including ‘oral introduction’, oral ‘story reproduction’ and ‘writing’, as opposed to Japanese to English translation, all on the basis of textbook contents); parallel workshops presenting the results of teacher-research; and a report on a major IRLT research project concerning the introduction of oral work to teachers who have not previously been using English in their classes (IRLT 1997: 4–6). The IRLT publishes less itself than its pre-war predecessor, although articles written by its various research groups do appear regularly in magazines for secondary school English teachers, notably *Eigokyouiku* (*The English Teacher’s Magazine*), published by Taishukan, and *Gendai Eigokyouiku* (*Modern English Teaching*), published by Kenkyuusha. Both independently and collaboratively, however, many of its members are active in the production of teachers’ guides, textbooks and other materials. Recent work has included, for example, the writing – under the strong influence of Palmer’s (1929b) *First Six Weeks of English* – of a widely-used series of NHK radio programmes with supporting materials, for beginning students. Mention should also be made of the editing by an IRLT committee over a number of recent years of *The Selected Writings of Harold E. Palmer*, issued in ten volumes by a Tokyo publisher in 1995, without which work (as in the case of that by Imura and Ozasa) this article could not have been written.

3. Conclusion

As we have seen, Palmer’s original intention (based on advice from Sawayanagi and Matsukata) appears to have been primarily to engage in independent investigation and research in the Japanese context, with a view to *ultimately* (Sawayanagi’s word) developing appropriate methodology in and for this context. Palmer stressed many times following his arrival that his role was not directly to engage in reform himself, or even to suggest reforms until thorough investigation had been undertaken. At a lecture to Japanese students in 1923, for example, he justified the foundation of the IRET by saying, ‘exactly what the new methods are likely to be we do not yet know [...] we must enquire into all the problems [...], we must experiment’ (Palmer 1923: 23). Thus, the IRET was to be primarily a research institute, and not (*pace* Yamamoto 1978) a conduit for the diffusion of pre-determined methods or techniques.

M:
usefu
– as
ence
expe
root
Japa
deve
ach
men
the I
ultir
crea
the
the
It
that
sign
and
info
emb
Jap
an
(wh
late
con
whi
tha
gic
ong
suc
anc
a r
pol
par
res
He
pu
con
Po
als
to
res
Jap
thi
int
dif

Many of the ideas and materials developed within the IRET were found to be useful by Japanese middle-school teachers who came into contact with them, and – as we have emphasized – it was IRET-influenced (as, nowadays, IRLT-influenced) teachers who were largely responsible for ensuring, through continuing experimentation of their own, that Palmer's ideas on methodology began to take root in secondary school practice. The continuing presence of the IRLT in the Japanese context as an influential forum, primarily for teacher-research and development, is evidence that Sawayanagi's aim has been, at least partially, achieved. In this connection, it is apparent also that Redman's (1967: 14) assessment – based, as we have seen, on a flawed conception of the origin and role of the Institute – that because IRET work never really involved the government it ultimately had little effect, fails to take account of the way in which the IRET created a role for itself not only in developing but also in diffusing and ensuring the continued use and further development of 'reformed methods', a role which the Japanese government has never tended to assume for itself.

It is because of, then, rather than in spite of the establishment of the IRET that Palmer and, latterly, Hornby were enabled to develop and diffuse their significant contributions to English teaching in Japan (and, both simultaneously and subsequently, the world), contributions which were themselves largely informed – as we have been at pains to emphasize – by an ongoing, all-embracing 'mission' to develop appropriate suggestions for reform within the Japanese context. In our account of the IRET's history we have distinguished an initial period of research and development lasting from 1924 until 1931–2 (which took in the first part of the lexicological research programme) from a later (1932–41) period which saw a move away from specifically Japanese concerns into the more 'autonomous' collocational and syntactic research which has been analysed in detail by Cowie (forthcoming). We have suggested that whereas research in the first period, inspired as it was by specific pedagogical problems, was continuously related back to the Japanese context on an ongoing, experimental basis, research in the second period – with its roots in such problems but with an international relevance, an internal momentum, and a complexity of its own – could only be related back after some time, in a rather more top-down, 'applied' manner. We have attempted to show how political, social and educational developments in Japan may have had their part to play in this apparent shift in conceptions of what it meant to 'do research' in this context. Finally, we have emphasized the significance of Hornby's own achievement in refining and synthesizing, still for practical purposes in the Japanese context, the (1933–35) research into collocations and construction-patterns which had been carried out in collaboration with Palmer. Political, social and educational developments may have played their part, here also, in defeating Hornby's original intention of applying these research results to syllabus and course design for Japanese middle-schools; however, the research *was* – finally – both synthesized and applied, in two dictionaries for Japanese learners, one of which was reissued by OUP and found to be useful throughout the world. Hornby's original, more classroom-oriented applied intentions were also to be fulfilled in post-war British publications which were diffused world-wide (see our Introduction). Thus, the influence of Palmer and

nt of the Ministry of
g many organizations
ndoubtedly the most
of the IRLT's current
: IRET work, may be
a, held on November
ecture on 'University
length of the pressure
eaching); a discussion
aki (whose important
cle) on 'How should
a lesson (exemplifying
, oral 'story reproduc-
translation, all on the
senting the results of
ch project concerning
previously been using
ublishes less itself than
arious research groups
English teachers, not-
olished by Taishuukan,
hing), published by
however, many of its
s, textbooks and other
e writing – under the
'English – of a widely-
materials, for beginning
y an IRLT committee
s of Harold E. Palmer,
ithout which work (as
l not have been written.

advice from Sawayanagi
engage in independent
th a view to *ultimately*
ology in and for this
al that his role was not
reforms until thorough
anese students in 1923,
y saying, 'exactly what
v [...] we must enquire
er 1923: 23). Thus, the
(pace Yamamoto 1978)
or techniques.

of the IRET was extended far beyond the Japanese context in the post-war years, although it had been – primarily – both *for* and under the influence of this context that Palmer and Hornby had made their impressive pre-war contributions.

Notes

¹ Thus, Howatt (1984), while emphasizing both the influence of Palmer (p. 327) and the overall impact of Hornby's work on post-war 'British' ELT (p. 317), recognizes that relatively little is known about how Palmer's ideas matured during his time in Japan (p. 236).

² These and all other cited works by Palmer which are not included in our list of references are reproduced in IRLT (1995). Back issues of the *Bulletin* of the IRET, to which reference is frequently made in the text, are reproduced in IRLT (1985).

³ The first IRET Convention, held in October 1924, had been attended by over 300 participants (*Bulletin* 8: 1). Already, by the beginning of 1924, 186 Japanese, 272 non-Japanese and 37 overseas members had been registered as members of the Institute (Imura 1997: 76). This total of 495 had risen to more than 700 by the time of the (first) 1924 Convention (*Bulletin* 8: 3) and to 761 by the time of the (second) 1925 Convention (*Bulletin* 19: 8), which was itself attended by 314 teachers and educationists (*Bulletin* 19: inside cover). The proportion of Japanese to non-Japanese members may be assumed to have risen by this time, although precise figures are unavailable.

⁴ Thus, the first *Interim Report* contains the suggestion that a final report should classify the selected words into *radii* corresponding to the needs of the five years of the Japanese middle-school course, and this was in fact attempted (tentatively) in the second *Interim Report* issued in 1931.

⁵ The first of these dictionaries, the *Beginners' English-Japanese Dictionary* (Japanese title: *Kihon Eigo Gakushuu Jiten* ['Fundamental English Learner's Dictionary']) was compiled jointly with Ishikawa and published on March 30th, 1940. Mention should be made here, also, of Palmer's own learner's dictionary, *A Grammar of English Words*, and of his *New Method Grammar* (both of which were published in London by Longmans, Green in 1938). These works constitute Palmer's own attempt to relate previous IRET research work on construction-patterns to the needs of foreign language learners, although without specific reference to Japan. *A Grammar of English Words* pays special attention not only to construction-patterns (including verb-patterns) but also to the distinction between countable and uncountable nouns, collocations and the peculiarities of the 24 'anomalous finites' (see Cowie forthcoming for a detailed assessment; also, Nakao 1998: 42–3).

⁶ In March 1942, the IRET metamorphosed, under force of circumstances, into *Gogaku Kyouiku Kenkyuujō* [the 'Institute for Research in Language Teaching' (IRLT)] (Imura, 1997: 232). The Institute still retains this name (often shortened to *Goken*), having also retained its connections, to some extent, with the teaching of Japanese as a Second Language. This field has itself been very much influenced by the pre-war work of Palmer and Hornby, via their collaborator and publisher Naganuma Naoko, and his post-war Tokyo School of the Japanese Language (see Hiratake 1992: 94).

⁷ Indeed, JACET [the Japan Association of College English Teachers], which is to host the 1999 AILA Conference in Tokyo, was itself originally formed, in the early 1960s, as an 'off-shoot' of the more secondary school-oriented IRLT (IRLT 1994: 106–7).

References

- Anderson, Doroti
Harold E. Pal
Mackin (ed.),
Anon. 1923. 'His
of the Institute
Anon. 1932. 'The
in English Tea
Anon. 1937. 'Th
Research in E
Anon. 1938. 'The
in English Tea
Bongers, Herma
the Teaching
and II). Woer
Cook, Guy. 199
52/1: 57–63.
Cowie, A. P. For
Clarendon Pr
Hiratake, Fumi
Sociology of
Holliday, Adria
Cambridge U
Hornby, A. S. I
Research in E
Hornby, A. S. I
Hornby, A. S. I
Dictionary [E
Press.
Howatt, A. P.
University Pr
Imura, Motomi
English in Ja
IRLT (eds.). 19
duced in 7 v
IRLT (eds.). 19
History of I
Tokyo: IRLT
IRLT (eds.). 19
Hon no Ton
IRLT (eds.). 19
Forum: 1997
Isoo, T. and S
Middle Gra
Volume 7].
Kawasumi, Tet
over the Co
et al. (eds.),
English Ed
Kenkyusha

References

- Anderson, Dorothee.** 1969. 'Harold E. Palmer: A Biographical Essay.' Appendix to Harold E. Palmer and Vere Redman, *This Language-Learning Business*. (Ronald Mackin (ed.)), London: Oxford University Press, 133-66.
- Anon.** 1923. 'History of The Institute for Research in English Teaching.' *The Bulletin of the Institute for Research in English Teaching* 1/1: 2-3.
- Anon.** 1932. 'The Abridged Standard Readers.' *The Bulletin of the Institute for Research in English Teaching* 88: 5.
- Anon.** 1937. 'The Fourteenth Annual Convention.' *The Bulletin of the Institute for Research in English Teaching* 139: 15-29.
- Anon.** 1938. 'The Fifteenth Annual Convention.' *The Bulletin of the Institute for Research in English Teaching* 148: 11-37.
- Bongers, Herman.** 1947. *The History and Principles of Vocabulary Control as It Affects the Teaching of Foreign Languages in General and of English in Particular* (Parts I and II). Woerden, Holland: Wocopi.
- Cook, Guy.** 1998. 'The Uses of Reality: A Reply to Ronald Carter.' *ELT Journal* 52/1: 57-63.
- Cowie, A. P.** Forthcoming. *English Dictionaries for Foreign Learners: A History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hirataka, Fumiya.** 1992. 'Language-spread Policy of Japan.' *International Journal of Sociology of Language* 95: 93-108.
- Holliday, Adrian.** 1994. *Appropriate Methodology and Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hornby, A. S.** 1936. 'Editorial: Looking Both Ways.' *The Bulletin of the Institute for Research in English Teaching* 123: 1-6.
- Hornby, A. S.** 1966. 'Looking Back.' *English Language Teaching* XXI/1: 3-6.
- Hornby, A. S. [and Christina Ruse].** 1974. *Hornby on Hornby and the Advanced Learner's Dictionary* [audio-cassette and interview transcript]. Tokyo: Oxford University Press.
- Howatt, A. P. R.** 1984. *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Imura, Motomichi.** 1997. *Palmer to nihon no eigokyouiku (Harold E. Palmer and Teaching English in Japan)*. Tokyo: Taishuukan.
- IRLT (eds.).** 1985. *The Bulletin of the Institute for Research in English Teaching* [reproduced in 7 volumes]. Tokyo: Meicho Fukyuukai.
- IRLT (eds.).** 1994. *Zaidanhoujin gogakyouiku kenkyuujo nanajusshuunen kinenshi* [A History of IRLT to Commemorate the Seventieth Anniversary of its Foundation]. Tokyo: IRLT.
- IRLT (eds.).** 1995. *The Selected Writings of Harold E. Palmer* [ten volumes]. Tokyo: Hon no Tomosha.
- IRLT (eds.).** 1997. *Goken FORUM: 1997 kenkyuu taikai puoguramu, shiryoushuu* [IRLT Forum: 1997 Convention Programme and Collected Materials]. Tokyo: IRLT.
- Isao, T. and S. Shimizu.** 1934. *The Fukushima Plan of Teaching English in Schools of Middle Grade (Supplement to the Bulletin No. 96)*. Tokyo: IRET. [in IRLT 1985, Volume 7].
- Kawasumi, Tetsuo.** 1979. 'Eigokyouiku zonpairon no keifu' [A Genealogy of Arguments over the Continuation or Abolition of English Education] in Takanashi Kenkichi et al. (eds.), *Gendai no eigokyouiku 1: Eigokyouiku mondai no hensen* [Contemporary English Education 1: Transitions in Problems of English Education]. Tokyo: Kenkyuusha, 92-136.

- Matsukata, Koujirou.** 1933. 'Mr. Matsukata's Address' [to the Tenth Annual Conference of English Teachers and Convention of the I.R.E.T.]. *The Bulletin of the Institute for Research in English Teaching* 98: 3.
- Meara, Paul.** 1998. 'Review of James Coady and Thomas Huckin (eds.). *Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition: A Rationale for Pedagogy*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.' *Applied Linguistics* 19/2: 289-92.
- Mizuuchi, Hiroshi.** 1989. 'Sawayanagi Masataro [sic]' in Benjamin Duke (ed.), *Ten Great Modern Educators in Japan*. Tokyo: International Christian University, 149-165.
- Naganuma, Naoe** (ed.). 1934. *A Commemorative Volume Issued by The Institute for Research in English Teaching on the Occasion of The Tenth Annual Conference of English Teachers Held under its Auspices*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Nakao, Keisuke.** 1998. 'The State of Bilingual Lexicography in Japan: Learners' English-Japanese/Japanese-English Dictionaries.' *International Journal of Lexicography* 11/1: 35-50.
- Ozasa, Toshiaki.** 1995a. *Key Aspects of Palmer's Methodology*. Hiroshima: Keisuisha.
- Ozasa, Toshiaki.** 1995b. *Harold E. Palmer no eigo kyoujyuhou ni kansuru kenkyuu: Nihon ni okeru tenkai o chuushin to shite* [The English Teaching Methodology of Harold E. Palmer, with an Emphasis on its Development in Japan]. Tokyo: Dai-ichi Gakushuusha.
- Palmer, Harold E.** 1923. *To the Japanese Students of English (Nihon no Eigaku-sei ni)*. [in English, with translation into Japanese by Kamo Shou'ichi]. Osaka: Bun'yuuudou.
- Palmer, Harold E.** 1924. *Memorandum on Problems of English Teaching in the Light of a New Theory*. Tokyo: IRET [reproduced in IRLT 1995, Volume 2].
- Palmer, Harold E.** 1924-5. *Systematic Exercises in English Sentence-Building. Stage I* [1924]; *Stage II* [1925]. Tokyo: IRET [reproduced in IRLT 1995, Volume 5].
- Palmer, Harold E.** 1925a. *A Standard English Reader for Beginners*. Tokyo: IRET.
- Palmer, Harold E.** 1925b. *Progressive Exercises in the English Phrases*. Tokyo: IRET [reproduced in IRLT 1995, Volume 8].
- Palmer, Harold E.** 1925c. *Graded Exercises in English Composition*. Tokyo: IRET.
- Palmer, Harold E.** 1926. 'The Reader System.' *The Bulletin of the Institute for Research in English Teaching* 21: 2-3.
- Palmer, Harold E.** 1927. *The Reformed English Teaching in the Middle-grade Schools*. (Supplement to *The Bulletin of the Institute for Research in English Teaching* 32). Tokyo: IRET [reproduced in IRLT 1995, Volume 10].
- Palmer, Harold E.** 1928a. *Kikouteki Bunpou (Mechanism Grammar)*. (transl. Naganuma Naoe). Tokyo: IRET [reproduced in IRLT 1995, Volume 6].
- Palmer, Harold E.** 1928b. 'Editorial: Lexicology as a Hobby.' *The Bulletin of the Institute for Research in English Teaching* 49: 1-2.
- Palmer, Harold E.** 1929a. 'Editorial: Development of our English Course.' *The Bulletin of the Institute for Research in English Teaching* 53: 1-2.
- Palmer, Harold E.** 1929b. *Eigo no rokushuukan (The First Six Weeks of English)*. (transl. Naganuma Naoe). Tokyo: IRET. [reproduced in IRLT 1995, Volume 4].
- Palmer, Harold E.** 1931. 'Editorial: New Munitions.' *The Bulletin of the Institute for Research in English Teaching* 73: 1-2.
- Palmer, Harold E.** 1933a. 'Editorial: Ten Years of Team Work.' *The Bulletin of the Institute for Research in English Teaching* 97: 1-2.
- Palmer, Harold E.** 1933b. 'Editorial: General Principles and Particular Interpretations.' *The Bulletin of the Institute for Research in English Teaching* 98: 1-2.

Palmer, I
English
Researc
Palmer, I
Tenth
Resear
Palmer, I
and W
Palmer,
'Sente
Englis
Palmer,
possib
Palmer,
Vocat
Teach
Palmer,
Lunc
Instit
Palmer,
[repr
Redmar
Toky
Redmar
Engl
Saway:
lated
Teac
Smith,
Publ
Smith,
Tok
Stier,
'
for
for
Stier,
Sch
for
Storr
in l
Ticko
Joi
West.
fre
log
Yam:
of

- Palmer, Harold E. 1933c. 'Director's Report' [to the Tenth Annual Conference of English Teachers and Convention of the I.R.E.T.]. *The Bulletin of the Institute for Research in English Teaching* 98: 4-5.
- Palmer, Harold E. 1933d. *Second Interim Report on Collocations* [...] Submitted to the Tenth Annual Conference of English Teachers under the Auspices of the Institute for Research in English Teaching. Tokyo: IRET [reproduced in IRLT 1995, Volume 9].
- Palmer, Harold E. 1934a. *The Institute for Research in English Teaching: Its History and Work*. Tokyo: IRET.
- Palmer, Harold E. 1934b. *Specimens of English Construction Patterns: These Being 'Sentence Patterns' Based on the General Synoptic Chart Showing the Syntax of the English Sentence*. Tokyo: IRET [reproduced in IRLT 1995, Volume 6].
- Palmer, Harold E. 1934c. *An Essay in Lexicology (in the form of Specimen Entries in a possible New Type Dictionary)*. Tokyo: IRET [reproduced in IRLT 1995, Volume 9].
- Palmer, Harold E. 1936. 'The History and Present State of the Movement towards Vocabulary Control' [Part II]. *The Bulletin of the Institute for Research in English Teaching* 121: 19-23.
- Palmer, Harold E. 1938. 'The English Language in Japan: An Address Given at the Luncheon Club of the Japan Society, London, March 17th 1938'. *The Bulletin of the Institute for Research in English Teaching* 145: 6-10.
- Palmer, Harold E. and Dorothee Palmer. 1925. *English through Actions*. Tokyo: IRET [reproduced in IRLT 1995, Volume 3].
- Redman, [H.] Vere. 1966. 'Harold E. Palmer's Impact on Japan.' *Asahi Evening News*, Tokyo, April 7 and 8, 1966, as extracted in Anderson (1969), 146-49.
- Redman, [H.] Vere. 1967. 'Harold E. Palmer: Pioneer Teacher of Modern Languages.' *English Language Teaching*, XXII/1: 10-16.
- Sawayanagi, Masatarou. 1924. 'Dr. Sawanagi's Preface to the "Memorandum," translated from the Japanese text.' *The Bulletin of the Institute for Research in English Teaching* 5: 3-5.
- Smith, Richard C. Forthcoming (a). 'Harold E. Palmer's London Lectures and Related Publications (1915-21)'. *IRLT Bulletin*.
- Smith, Richard C. Forthcoming (b). *The Writings of Harold E. Palmer: An Overview*. Tokyo: Hon no Tomosha.
- Stier, W. Rudolf F. 1948. 'Mr. Stier's Address [at the Spring Convention of the Institute for Research in Language Teaching, 1948]'. *Gogaku Kyouiku (Bulletin of the Institute for Research in Language Teaching)*, 204: 5-9.
- Stier, W. Rudolf F. 1950. 'Harold E. Palmer, Phonetician, Entertainer, Philosopher, Scholar, Teacher, Traveller, Author, Friend.' *Gogaku Kyouiku (Bulletin of the Institute for Research in Language Teaching)*, 210: 12-14.
- Storry, Richard. 1990. *A History of Modern Japan*. London: Penguin [First published in Pelican Books, 1960].
- Tickoo, M. L. 1986. 'Prendergast and the "Mastery Method": a Reassessment.' *ELT Journal* 40/1: 52-58.
- West, Michael. (ed.). 1953. *A General Service List of English Words, with semantic frequencies and a supplementary word-list for the writing of popular science and technology*. London: Longmans, Green.
- Yamamoto, Norman Y. 1978. 'The Oral Method: Harold E. Palmer and the Reformation of the Teaching of the English Language in Japan.' *ELT Journal*, XXXII/2: 151-58.