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Introduction

The success of Japan’s education system since the end of World War II has engaged the attention of American politicians, academics, educators, and the larger public. Although there have been a handful of polemical studies describing the dark side of Japan’s educational enterprise (Schooland 1990), most tend to dwell on the great strengths perceived by most students of Japan and its schools. One the most influential of this later group is Ezra Vogel’s Japan as Number 1. This bestseller was followed by highly favorable documentaries and numerous magazine and newspaper accounts that have planted the perception that Japanese education is without peer.

Although it would be foolish not to recognize the considerable strengths of the Japanese education system, it is equally important to understand that the system is not without faults. The question of how and why Japanese education has achieved its high rank in international competition is an open one. The historical evidence clearly suggests that the Japanese traditionally have been amenable to adapting foreign ideas and practices,
but it is equally clear that the Japanese have not blindly copied foreign models. Regardless of the reasons one assigns to Japan’s educational prowess, it is not unreasonable to assume that the role of the teacher is a key ingredient in Japan’s school success. If this is the case, then one should ask if the way in which Japanese teachers are educated may have something to do with the results achieved in the classroom. However, before attempting an explanation of that question, it is necessary to provide a brief historical sketch of the origins and development of Japan’s teacher education.

Few would challenge the assertion that Japanese culture and traditions are important elements in explaining the apparent success of Japanese education. Others might point to the pro-education policies of a succession of governments (however retrograde they may have been in other ways) as a source of the success enjoyed by Japan’s schools. While recognizing the importance of these elements, it appears likely that the most important element in building world-class schools in Japan has been the talented, dedicated, and well-trained teachers. These teachers have been instrumental in educating the children who have enabled Japan to rise from the ashes of defeat in 1945 to become, if not the ranking economic power in the world, at least one of the top two or three.

Such teachers did not appear by accident. For the most part, they have been products of Japanese teacher education programs. This is not to suggest that all Americans need to do in order to solve our considerable education problems is to mindlessly copy the Japanese.
methods of preparing teachers. As I have argued elsewhere: "An educational system is an organic outgrowth of a specific cultural context and that, removed from that context, elements of the educational superstructure lose their raison d'être." Thus Japanese teacher education "cannot be uprooted and planted in a radically different American culture" (1991, pp. 321-23).

What we can do is to try to understand the intellectual and pedagogical assumptions underlying the principles and practices of Japanese teacher education, compare them with those underlying our own, and reflect on how we might do things differently in the context of our own cultural and educational traditions. That is to suggest that the most important value of international studies is not the data that one picks up, but the opportunity to step outside of our own everyday concerns and look back at our familiar environment through a different set of lenses.

What follows, then, is a brief look at how Japanese teacher education has developed since Japan took its first faltering steps on the road to modernity in the late 19th century and especially since the end of World War II. I will then review the organization, structure, and curriculum of today's teacher education and, finally, examine Japan's current problems and attempts that are being made to solve them.
Teacher Education in Japan, 1868-1945

Teacher education in Japan reasonably dates to the early years of the Meiji Restoration (1868). Prior to that time it was assumed that occupations were hereditary and that parents would instruct their children at home or through one of a variety of other education arrangements. Teachers would naturally be found among those who had been educated and were inclined to teach others. As a result, the best teachers in pre-1868 Japan often were charismatic or eccentric private teachers who taught the Chinese classics, military arts, calligraphy, ethics, and other subjects. As Richard Rubinger has clearly demonstrated, the "private academies" of pre-Meiji days "covered a bewildering array of institutional arrangements," but they were invariably "privately run, in most cases in the home of an established scholar who attracted students by his scholarship or his views on politics, philosophy, or education and whose personality and teaching style determined the character and atmosphere of the school." Under this highly de-
centralized arrangement, the curriculum “was free from official control and dependent solely upon the particular interests and training of the headmaster” (Rubinger 1982, p. 8).

The private academy and similar arrangements met the needs of Japanese society until the radical changes that were brought about by the Meiji Revolution of 1868, when Japan determined to become a modern nation. The Meiji leaders recognized that more formal educational opportunities were needed. Thus the nation required a more formal mechanism to train teachers. However, the form that these new arrangements should take was a matter of considerable dispute.

The forces that contended in the larger framework of Japanese modernization included Western ideas, orthodox Confucianism, and nativism. These currents also were reflected in the great education debates of the day. The Western faction was dominant in the early days of Meiji, but it was replaced by Confucianism in a conservative reaction that began about 1880. Nativist forces were never strong enough to carry the day, but one ignored them only at considerable risk.

Thus, from the very beginning of Japan’s modern period, the national government focused special attention on the education of teachers, recognizing that broad educational progress depended on an adequate supply of competent, well-trained, and “politically reliable” teachers. This last point deserves emphasis, for teachers in Japan traditionally have played more than an intellectual role in society. Indeed, they always have been viewed primarily as shapers of character; and this
is a major factor in understanding Japanese teacher education.

**Development of Normal Schools**

Initially, the universities of the time took the lead in developing Japan's teachers. However, the normal schools were to play an increasingly important role in Japan's quest for development. Too few universities existed to supply all of the nation's human resource needs, and as a leading student of Japanese education has pointed out:

The normal school ... was the target not only for aspiring educationalists, but for ambitious provincial youth hoping to get ahead in the world as well. Since the universities could take so few students, many aspirants turned to the normal schools as their stepping stones to government, political and business... [Indeed,] the class of 1887 of the Fukuoka Normal School... produced many famous educators, but also a prefectoral governor, some mayors, and a number of military officers. (Passin 1965, p. 91)

The normal schools took center stage as a result of an influx of Western ideas in the early 1870s. Shortly before the legal framework of a new education system was promulgated in 1872, the Meiji oligarchs sent a high-level mission to the West. Led by Prince Iwakura Tomomi (hence, the "Iwakura Mission"), the group's purpose was to examine Western institutions with an eye to bringing useful ideas home. An important member of this mission was Tanaka Fujimori, who would become
Minister of Education soon after the mission's return home. When the Iwakura Mission arrived in Washington, D.C., it was received by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, John Eaton, who gave it a considerable number of documents on American education, arranged for visits to various schools and other educational institutions, and made a personal gift of a small education library that included the works of Horace Mann, Henry Barnard, and other prominent education thinkers.

Shaped in large measure by this mission, the single most important education document of the early Meiji period was the Gakusei, or Educational Ordinance, of 1872. This document laid down regulations requiring that teachers receive formal training in order to know "how to teach . . . [as well as] what to teach." The Department of Education, the predecessor of the Ministry of Education, established a normal school in Tokyo for this purpose and, in July 1872, began to recruit students for the new school.

In order to enter the new teacher training program, one had to be at least 20 years of age (although some of the original entering students were in their mid-30s) and pass a rigorous entrance examination. Since few of the first students admitted to the normal school possessed even a rudimentary knowledge of mathematics and science, they were taught not only how to teach but also what to teach. Successful candidates received a modest government subsidy and, on completing the program, were awarded a teaching license and sent out to teach.

By 1880 one out of ten teachers had graduated from a normal school; the remainder had only older types of
schooling and knew little about how to teach. Article 33 of the 1880 Education Order sought to speed up progress by requiring each prefecture to establish a normal school. And, in August 1881, new regulations were issued that standardized normal schools into three courses: the four-year higher normal school for teachers of all courses of elementary school; the 2½-year intermediate course for teachers of primary and intermediate courses; and the one-year primary course for intermediate education.

The initial graduates of normal schools commonly were former samurai. These former warriors rejected the world of commerce as beneath their dignity, while teaching offered a secure position with a modicum of status. Between 1878 and 1887, for example, 80% of the students at Kumamoto Normal School in southern Japan were of samurai origin. However, beginning in the later Meiji period, farmers increasingly sent their eldest sons to prefectural normal schools. Upon graduating and serving for a period in the classroom, these young men often became principals of local elementary schools. By the 1908-1917 period, those of samurai background constituted only 34% of the total; and by the end of World War II, normal school teachers and students were predominantly non-samurai.

**Tokyo Normal School**

The Tokyo Normal School, Japan’s first modern teacher education institution, opened its doors to 54 male students (chosen from about 300 applicants) in
September 1872. It is ironic that the newly established normal school, designed to promote the modernization process by producing competent primary school teachers, was situated in a building that once housed the Shoheiko, the orthodox neo-Confucian academy supported for more than 200 years by the then-recently deposed Tokugawa government.

The Tokyo Normal School, patterned after Western-style institutions, was first headed by Morokuzu Nobuzumi (1849-1880). However, it was an American educator, Marion M. Scott (1843-1922), who perhaps influenced the new school’s program as much as anyone. Scott, a former San Francisco primary school teacher, originally had been brought to Japan to teach English. But when the new normal school opened, he was appointed by the Ministry of Education as a foreign instructor at the school. His theoretical approach stressed a methodology of teaching that discarded the old individual tutoring/reciting methods. He was one of the earliest teachers to introduce Pestalozzian principles into Japan. He also imported American-style textbooks, teaching materials, and school furniture so that a typical Japanese elementary school bore a striking resemblance to those found in Boston, Chicago, or San Francisco.

Scott, who later enjoyed a distinguished career as an administrator in the schools of Hawaii, wielded great influence. Among the other innovations he brought to Japan was an “attached” elementary school, where teachers in training could observe real classrooms and put into practice the pedagogical principles they had been taught. This school opened in 1873. In a typical term,
Scott was responsible for teaching 24 teacher trainees, whom he divided into six groups, each responsible for instructing a group of 15 pupils enrolled in the attached elementary school. Scott spoke little Japanese, and so his instruction was in English; but the students’ teaching was in their native tongue.

The initial teacher training program lasted one year, and the first year’s graduates were not assigned to elementary schools as originally planned. Instead, they served as teachers in newly created teacher training institutes, providing “crash” courses for even less-qualified teachers in other parts of the country. In 1873 other normal schools for men were established in Osaka and Sendai and, the following year, in Aichi, Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and Niigata. In 1874 the Tokyo Women’s Normal School was founded. It not only was the first teacher training institution for women but also served as the national government’s organ for the education of women.

Rapid expansion of teacher training schools was characteristic of the early Meiji period, and by 1876 there were a total of 95 normal schools scattered throughout the country. However, this rapid expansion was difficult to sustain. In 1877, in the face of serious financial problems, the national government was forced to close many of the new schools, leaving many prefectures again without institutions for teacher training.

The Tokyo Normal School was responsible for more than training teachers. It also was assigned the formulation of school regulations, the creation of a course of study for elementary schools, and the editing of textbooks. Many of the graduates of this institution received
advanced graduate education in the United States, while others directly became education leaders in the new public schools that were set up throughout the country.

Scott’s direct influence was complemented by an influx of American education ideas, which in turn were influenced by ideas from Europe. For example, in the United States, the education theories of the Swiss pedagogue, Johann Pestalozzi (1746-1827), enjoyed widespread popularity during the 1870s. A hotbed of Pestalozzian reform ideas was the Oswego (New York) Normal School, to which the Japanese authorities, with characteristic determination to seize the newest ideas, dispatched three of their brightest young specialists to analyze these ideas firsthand.

By the end of the 19th century, the education theories of the German educator, Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776-1841), had become fashionable and also played an important role in shaping Japanese secondary education. Both Pestalozzian and Herbartian ideas were reflected in teacher education; the latter being especially popular because Herbart’s emphasis on moral training and values was congruent with traditional Confucian values of sincerity, justice, and integrity. This congruence was essential during the last 20 years of the century.

The Conservative Reaction

The decade of the 1880s was a time of conservative reaction to early Meiji’s infatuation with things Western. As early as 1879, the Emperor’s “Imperial Instruction
on Education" criticized those who "in their eagerness to adopt Western ways make light of the virtues of harmony, justice, loyalty and filial piety." The following year, legislation isolated teachers from social and political controversy by making it illegal for them to become involved in political matters. Western ideas and practices were not abandoned, though they were scrutinized closely as orthodox Confucian thought made a comeback. Loyalty to the imperial state (especially as reflected in reverence toward the Emperor) and filial piety were emphasized as the bases of moral education. In 1881, the Ministry of Education issued teacher manuals and textbooks promoting moral education.

The ascendancy of Mori Arinori as Minister of Education in the mid-1880s brought to center stage his conviction that public education was the key to Japan's transformation into a modern, world-class power. Indeed, Mori believed that teachers had a critical role to play in the development of Japan's population. Naturally, the ideological shift toward Confucian values and Mori's uncompromising belief in the efficacy of education as a tool for attaining national goals were reflected in teacher training. In 1883, new teacher training standards, emphasizing Confucian precepts, were promulgated.

Mori's nationalist sentiments were reflected in the normal schools during his regime. Ivan Parker Hall, in his biography of Mori, wrote:

The students were given state grants and placed under military discipline. Like a British public school they
aimed at character-training as much as intellectual development. Each teacher training college had to arrange six hours of military drill each week and many of the principals were regular army officers. Much was made of the virtue of obedience. (1973, p. 432)

In the spring of 1886, Mori promulgated four new ordinances: the Imperial University Order, the Elementary School Order, the Middle School Order, and on 10 April 1886, a new Normal School Order (along with several related regulations). Together they formed the heart of the prewar Japanese education system and provided the legal framework for a normal school system independent of elementary, middle, and higher education. This Normal School Order served as the basic underpinning of Japanese teacher education until 1945.

Article I of the new order required that “normal schools will be the place of training those who will become teachers, and attention ought to be paid to ensuring that students are those possessing a good and obedient, faithful and respectful character.” They must, Mori argued, be trained to “cultivate the spirit of Obedience, Symphony and Dignity. They must be filled with the spirit of loyalty and patriotism and made to realize the grandeur and obligations of loyalty and filial piety, and to be inspired with sentiments proper to our nationality” (Hall 1973, p. 427).

Mori’s desire to meld military training with teacher education was reflected in the day-to-day life of normal school students. The goals that Mori wanted to achieve were expressed in military terms:
The things we hope to achieve by means of this training are three: first, to instill — with the sense of urgency possessed by regular soldiers — those habits of obedience which are appropriate in the classroom; secondly, soldiers are always formed into squads, each squad possessing its own leader who devotes himself heart and soul to the welfare of the group, and thirdly, every company has its commanding officer who controls and supervises it, and who must comport himself with dignity. By the same token, our students . . . will build up the traits of character appropriate to each of these roles. (Hall 1973, p. 430)

As a result, normal schools under Mori were conducted as quasi-military institutions, carefully designed to indoctrinate the principles of nationalism through a strict program of physical, moral, and mental training of the future teachers who, in turn, were to inculcate the young with these principles. One observer’s comment that “traditionally Japanese teachers have been well-trained. A few have even been well-educated” was on the mark.

**Changes in the Normal Schools**

Under Mori, the normal schools were divided into higher, ordinary, and women’s normal schools. Graduates were required to teach and held the status of low-level civil servants, limited in their right to academic freedom. Normal schools were *not* treated as part of the more liberal university system, though some were later upgraded to this level. Ordinary and women’s normal schools required that entering students undergo four
years of training. Higher normal schools required applicants to be graduates of ordinary normal schools.

In April 1886 Tokyo Normal School was transformed into Tokyo Higher Normal School, funded directly by the national government and administered by the Ministry of Education. The charge of the higher normal school was to prepare teachers and principals for the ordinary normal schools established in each prefecture and supported by local taxes. The latter’s task was the training of teachers and principals for local public elementary schools.

As Japanese society became increasingly dominated by authoritarian and nationalistic elements, these social and political factors were reflected in the evolution of teacher education. Teachers were taught according to a uniform curriculum, designed by Ministry of Education bureaucrats, that focused on moral education, military drill, and nationalism, in addition to more academic subjects. During the last years of the pre-1945 period, normal school students were required to live in strictly supervised dormitories under Spartan conditions. These normal schools were almost universally remembered by those who attended them for their stern, military-like atmosphere, in which gymnastics and military training were central to the curriculum.

In these schools the students’ tuition and living expenses were paid by the government. In return, graduates were expected to “reimburse” the government for their “free” education by teaching for varying periods — up to ten years for men and five years for women in 1886. These terms were later reduced, according to the
amount of financial aid that the government had invested in each student.

Hall described the results of these changes:

The normal school from 1886 onward went by the bugle. Sometimes the bugle brought the teacher trainees, who were now required to live on campus, tumbling out of their drafty, barrack-like dormitories in the dead of night for an emergency roll call. A shoe unlaced, a button missing, a cap askew, a bayonet unfixed, or a salute sleepily delivered could entail confinement to quarters, segregation at meals, last turn at a common bath, or even a humiliating trial before the entire student body. (Hall 1973)

It is not surprising that having been trained in ways similar to army recruits, the normal school-trained elementary teachers were often, in Hall’s words, “fanatic nationalists.”

Critics argue that prewar normal schools operated on the assumption that the loyalty and patriotism of their graduating teachers had to be guaranteed. The 1892 “Regulations for the Lower Normal School,” for example, focused on loyalty, filial piety, and obedience. The authors of the Ministry of Education’s assessment wrote:

It is of the utmost importance for the teacher to possess an exuberant spirit of reverence for the Emperor and love of his Fatherland. Accordingly, the pupil shall be fully inculcated (in the virtues of) loyalty and filial piety. . . . It is of prime importance for the teacher to have dignity worthy of the respect of others by observing the
rules and social order. Therefore, it is of absolute necessity for the pupil to obey his superiors and listen to their advice, and behave straight in his daily life. (Ministry of Education 1980, p. 131)

However, it should be emphasized that not all normal school graduates were “hard-driving, tight-lipped instructors.” One normal school student described his Saitama Prefectural Normal School teacher, Yosaburo Shimonaka (1878-1961) as follows: Shimonaka’s “teaching method was most unique.... He never used an official textbook,” but one day he arrived in class with a copy of Natsume Soseki’s A Stormy Day, which in “a quiet but rich voice he read from... for the next several days. We were deeply moved by it” (Shiro, nd.).

There was no particular discrimination intended in separating teachers-in-training from other students, only a conviction that their role was a sensitive one that called for specialized attention. However, if they wanted to transfer to the academic ladder, they were penalized by having to drop back two years and start a higher school from the beginning. They were not allowed to enter the university directly.

Into the 20th Century

At the turn of the century, the salary, supply, and status of Japanese teachers was very low. Teacher salaries in the 1890s compared unfavorably with those of other workers. Economic hardship, coupled with poor prospects, led to a serious shortage of teachers at a time of rapidly rising enrollments. The two most com-
mon characteristics of those attending normal school were poverty and draft evasion. Poor students received government scholarships; and normal school graduates were required to serve only six weeks, rather than two years, in the army.

In 1908, when the number of teachers slowly began to increase, only 26% of licensed teachers were normal school graduates. But by the time of World War I, the teachers of Japan were mostly country boys, peasants' sons fresh from normal school or military service who burned with high ideals and disciplinary zeal.

Teaching, like the army, began to attract many of the brighter rural youth. Entry to the prefectural normal schools was on a recommendation from a prefectural governor, county head, or ward mayor. Each entering student underwent a three-month probationary period. The normal school principal possessed the power to dismiss students, which would bring shame on their families. Then, after graduation, because the state had provided financial support, new teachers were required to teach up to ten years at a place of the state's choosing. This requirement gave the authorities considerable leverage over the political behavior of the future teachers; indeed, it served as an implied threat, as few graduates were eager to be assigned to remote areas.

For a brief period following World War I, some "progressive" education methods found their way into Japan (Kobyashi 1964). By the 1920s, Japan's teacher training programs already had developed to a higher level, including a greater emphasis on graduate pedagogical research and more student teaching in attached schools.
The prestigious Tokyo Imperial University offered courses in the history and philosophy of education and educational psychology. But despite the consistent efforts of the Ministry of Education to limit foreign learning to technical matters, liberal ideas continued to seep in. During the 1920s, for example, the liberalism of Woodrow Wilson and the radicalism of the Russian Revolution could not be kept out of Japan.

The relative freedom of this post-World War I era encouraged a revival of interest in democratic education. It became a second period of American influence, though that influence was not as strong as it had been in the 1870s. For example, a number of younger Japanese scholars studying in the United States discovered progressive education and were attracted to it. In John Dewey’s writings they found a systematic education theory based on democratic principles. Several of Dewey’s Japanese followers translated *School and Society, The Child and the Curriculum, Democracy and Education*, and *Reconstruction in Philosophy* into Japanese. Indeed, Dewey was invited to lecture in Japan, first in 1918 at Waseda University, where he spoke on “The Philosophical Basis of Democracy,” and again in 1919 at Tokyo Imperial University, where he outlined his instrumentalist philosophy. His writings and lectures had a marked effect on Japanese education, especially in the higher normal schools.

Eager to learn about the latest methods, the Japanese continued to bring to Japan such democratically oriented educators as Helen Dalton (originator of the Dalton Plan), William H. Kilpatrick of Teachers College, and
Carleton Washburne, superintendent of the noted progressive school district of Winnetka, Illinois. As the level of democratic opinion increased, a number of private school educators (and a handful in government institutions) began to provide an alternative to the government’s approach by creating the internationally popular “New Education Movement.” Experimental schools became popular.

The official reaction to these developments is reflected in the comments of Ryohei Okada, the Minister of Education, who warned as early as 1924 that:

There have lately been appearing in succession [radical thinkers] who inculcate in people’s minds their novel principles of education under various names, and what is still worse not a few teachers are sympathizing with them, actually trying them out in the classroom and what is worst of all . . . some are often going so far as to disregard the regulations of national law. (Beauchamp 1992)

At about this time, the educational use of radio became popular; and the government’s education network, NHK, maintained a busy program schedule, published a series of teacher manuals, provided inservice programs for teachers, and even conducted some research on education questions. However, American progressive influences continued in teacher training until the early 1930s, when the military seized control and totally rejected education that was fitted to the individual and not to the needs of the state.
Military Control

Political control by the military followed the Manchurian Incident of 1931. This change meant that the education system was subjugated and used to support ultra-nationalism and militarism.

However, Karl van Wolferen points out that this subjugation did not result in a sharp change for the schools:

Ever since the closing decades of the last century, [the schools] had been the chief civilian channel for the spread of nationalist ideology, and in the 1930s the authorities had relied upon them for the propagation of beliefs and attitudes designed to make young Japanese want to sacrifice their lives for Japan’s expanding empire. (1989, p. 75)

The right wing struck out at liberal and radical ideas among teachers and students and sought to substitute faith in the national policy and “Japanese spirit.” From about 1928 forward, a special agency of “thought control” had been organized within the Ministry of Education to suppress anything that might be considered subversive. Particular attention was devoted to the training of teachers, the larger portions of the school curriculum, and moral education. Beginning in 1927, graduates were required to serve five months in a military unit to better understand and appreciate the “military spirit.” Under military rule, normal school students’ indoctrination in ultra-nationalism was stepped up.

Variously called the “Bureau of Thought Supervision” and the “Bureau of Education and Training,” the ministry agency was divided into two parts. An inves-
tigative section surveyed "thought problems" in schools and social education institutes and examined books. This section produced the basic texts of Japanese ultranationalism, *Kokutai no Hongi* (Cardinal Principles of the National Entity) and *Shimmin no Michi* (The Way of the School). Another section, in cooperation with the Secret Police, conducted propaganda campaigns and tried to control thought in schools by punitive measures.

During World War II, normal schools continued to produce teachers and, indeed, three new higher normal schools were established: two for male students at Okazaki and Kanazawa and one for women at Hiroshima. But the government's tight control over education in general and teacher education in particular can be seen in the placing of all prefectural normal schools under the direct supervision of the Ministry of Education. The regulations for the higher normal schools in 1942 proclaimed that:

> the essence of the national entity must be clarified, and together with a keen consciousness of loyalty must be fostered, and leadership training in national accomplishments stressed . . . inculcating in the student a fervent interest in the teaching profession, faith in the national entity, and in imperial administrative policies. (Shiro, nd.)

Thus in the prewar and wartime period, the curriculum, teaching methods, textbooks and, indeed, the entire teacher training process were under the tightly centralized control of the Ministry of Education. Teachers taught the approved texts according to the carefully prescribed
instructions in their teachers' guides. Drill was the uniform method for all subjects. Classroom discipline reflected the larger authoritarian society. Young people learned to read, write, and cipher; but they also learned to accept the myths and traditions of Japan's ultra-nationalistic "history."

On 8 March 1943 another "Normal School Order" stipulated that normal schools were government institutions, and the length of all regular courses was standardized into three years. Middle-level graduation was made a requirement for entrance into the regular course. And for the first time in its history, the normal school was elevated to the status of a college.

It might be asked, to what extent was the prewar Japanese teacher education system successful? Certainly, the philosophy of education as contained in prewar documents was virtually synonymous with Japanese nationalism. Loyalty and patriotism were the highest values. Individualism, internationalism, and pacifism were seen as threats. The state was absolute and, to many, divine. On the basis of these factors, the prewar system was highly successful. It produced loyal, efficient teachers who, in turn, produced loyal, efficient workers. Two generations of moral education resulted in a united and patriotic citizenry, obedient to authority, and willing to follow their leaders into war. In short, teacher education accomplished its goals. However, therein were sowed the seeds of disaster.
Postwar Teacher Education, 1945 to the Present

World War II ended in August 1945. Not only was Japan in ruins, but so was the country’s education system. The total number of teachers in Japan stood at 520,000, but many were demoralized and others would be purged as supporters of the wartime regime. Among the first acts of the U.S. Occupation authorities was to purge teachers known to be militaristic, ultranationalistic, or antagonistic to the objectives and policies of the Occupation. More than 100,000 teachers and administrators left the education system, many resigning rather than risk being formally purged. The result was an immediate and urgent need to recruit and train thousands of replacements. One positive outcome of Japan’s postwar teacher shortage was that opportunities for women to enter teaching were increased as never before.

Teachers in postwar Japan were expected to introduce democratic practices in the schools and to model
positive democratic behavior. With this in mind in 1947, the American authorities introduced a series of seminars, workshops, and short radio courses whose purpose was to re-educate teachers in democratic concepts and methods. Each veteran teacher, in order to receive recertification to teach, was required to attend an approved inservice retraining course.

Reforming Teacher Education

Fundamentally, Japan desperately needed an entirely new system of teacher education. Thus one of the earliest American postwar actions was to commission a distinguished group of American educators — the first United States education mission to Japan — in March 1946. The purpose of this mission was to advise the Japanese authorities on how to democratize their schools. The Japanese government appointed the Japan Education Reform Committee (JERC) to serve as a counterpart to the U.S. mission. This committee, comprised of young, anti-authoritarian scholars, played an important role in working with the Americans and drafting final recommendations for reform legislation.

Not surprisingly, the U.S. mission’s report concluded that even if the militarists had not controlled the education system in the 1930s, revision of the Japanese school system was long overdue “in accordance with the modern theory of education.” Thus, in contrast to the prewar normal school, where teachers were taught in a quasi-military atmosphere exactly what to teach and how to teach it, postwar teacher education took on the
character of modern professional preparation as experienced in a university atmosphere.

In 1948, the American authorities also introduced the Institute for Educational Leadership (IFEL) Program, staffed by a wide variety of Japanese specialists and a number of American experts imported to broaden the perspectives of Japanese teachers. The IFEL Program continued beyond the end of the U.S. Occupation in 1952 and played an important role in changing teacher attitudes, introducing new approaches, and making other reforms.

One result of American-inspired reforms was that the normal schools were absorbed into universities in the form of education faculties (Tsuchimochi 1991). Authorities decided that every prefecture should have at least one national university with a faculty or department of teacher education. Therefore, in 1949, a new National School Establishment Law consolidated 249 institutions of higher education into 68 national universities, each containing a faculty of education. At the same time, private universities were encouraged to establish teacher education programs within their institutions. Critics argued that such moves would lead to an over-expansion of the system and a decline in quality. But they were somewhat quieted when, also in 1949, the Japanese Diet enacted a national teacher certification law in an effort to more closely regulate teacher certification.

Japan’s teacher education system also abandoned the differentiated scheme in which teachers had been trained in a variety of institutions according to the type of school in which they planned to teach. The U.S. education mis-
sion recommended an open system that would allow any college or university to offer a program of teacher education without the Ministry of Education’s control. This recommendation would have significant results. Indeed, by the late 1970s, more than 95% of Japan’s institutions of higher education certified teachers at various precollegiate levels.

By the 1950s, teacher education in Japan largely had broken with its prewar past. The normal school model had vanished as such, as normal school faculties had been absorbed into the new universities. However, critics of “open education” continued to question the adequacy of the professional training received by prospective teachers. In 1958, for example, the important Central Council on Education (CCE) concluded that certification standards were not adequate and blamed this situation on the reforms “imposed” by the U.S. Occupation. Although discussion of this problem continued for some time, for a variety of reasons little was done to significantly alter the system.

From Shortage to Surplus

In 1961, Prime Minister Ikeda launched an audacious plan to double the income of average Japanese workers that was so successful that individual income in fact tripled by the end of the decade. As industry clamored for more and more well-trained workers and technicians, the demand for upgrading education also grew. Between 1960 and 1970, high school enrollment soared from 57% to 82%, and college enrollment increased from
9% to 20%. These increases naturally increased the demand for more teachers.

Thus, beginning in the 1970s, an increasing number of college and university students, in order to expand their post-graduation career options, took the minimum professional preparation needed to secure teaching certificates. This trend produced a surge in the number of student teachers, and it was not uncommon for some supervising classroom teachers to have charge of three or more student teachers at any given time. Consequently, the pool of available teachers soon far outstripped the available job openings; and a large group of "paper teachers" was created.

In 1971, the Central Council on Education (CCE) issued an important report, the first serious attempt at reform since the U.S. Occupation. The report, based on research begun in 1967, urged a wide range of changes that would affect all levels of schooling. However, the recommendations were far too ambitious for the conservative forces that controlled both the Ministry of Education and the ruling Liberal Democratic Party (LDP). As a result, the CCE's proposals were only partially implemented.

The teacher education reform proposals "were, by and large, elaboration's of the previous reform proposals. . . . [suggesting] that the government's views of teacher education had changed very little since the 1950's" (Shimahara 1995, p. 169). The CCE report reiterated earlier concerns and identified teacher education as seriously in need of reform, especially the need for teachers to receive their preparation at institutions whose primary mission was teacher education. This no-
tion, of course, went to the heart of the controversy over the "open certification" system that was put in place following World War II.

One recycled proposal — perhaps the most interesting — was that beginning teachers serve a one-year internship under an experienced teacher as an effective means of socialization into the profession and to enhance teaching practice. That proposal was not implemented. However, another key recommendation, significantly higher salaries for teachers, became law in 1974 with the passage of the Human Resource Procurement Bill, which effectively raised teacher salaries between 30% and 40%.

The leftist Nikkyoso, or Japan Teachers Union (JTU), to nobody's surprise, vigorously opposed many of the CCE's proposals. Shimahara Nobuo, in his recent analysis, comments:

All in all, the 1971 education reform report did not receive broad support . . . but intensified conflicts between the government and the JTU on those recommendations that were implemented. Due to lack of funding, internships, which became a focal issue in education reforms in the 1980s, also failed to receive legislative support despite the government's sustained interest. (1995, p. 171)

Several years later, in 1978, another CCE report urged further teacher education reform. Other agencies made numerous reform recommendations similar to those of the CCE, but it was not until the formation of the Provisional Council on Educational Reform (Rinkyoshin) in 1983 that public support for teacher education reform appeared possible.
However, on 17 June 1978 the Diet did pass legislation authorizing the establishment of two new institutions of teacher education: The Joetsu University of Teacher Education in Niigata prefecture and the Hyogo University of Teacher Education in Hyogo prefecture. Since that time a third institution, the Naruto University of Teacher Education, has been established on the island of Shikoku. The rationale for establishing these institutions was, in the words of the enabling legislation, "to cope with the social demand for upgrading the quality and ability of teachers for elementary education," and to "encourage practically useful research on school education" (NIER 1982, p. 1). Each new teacher education university serves as a "university for practicing teachers" to enable students and professors to do creative research in education theory and practice and to improve education. Approximately two-thirds of the graduate students admitted to these institutions are practicing teachers with at least three years of experience.

By the early 1980s, the Ministry of Education was determined to get rid of as many of the "paper teachers" of the 1970s as possible in order to upgrade the quality of those who were teaching. Thus in 1984 a proposal to reform the 1949 certification law was put forward in the Diet. Among its more important provisions was the establishment of a differentiated system of teaching certificates. That is, one could secure a higher (therefore more valuable) teaching certificate by taking more graduate-level courses.

Another reform proposal at the same time was to increase the number of professional courses required of
teachers. This bill was unsuccessful, but it did serve to engender a great deal of discussion and controversy that played a role in raising people's consciousness about the need for reform.

Prime Minister Nakasone's Reform Strategy

Also by the early 1980s, despite all the praise heaped on Japan's schools by pundits and politicians, Japanese public opinion expressed increasing dissatisfaction with the education system. Prime Minister Nakasone, gearing up for a difficult election campaign, saw education as a key issue on which to design his campaign. Normally, a reform-minded Japanese prime minister would have used the Central Council on Education as his vehicle for soliciting recommendations; but in August 1984 Nakasone took the unprecedented step of creating a National Council on Educational Reform (NCER) with standing outside the traditional government structure.

The prime minister personally appointed NCER's 45 members for a three-year period, after which the NCER would go out of existence. Perhaps the most significant aspect of this model was that the NCER reported directly to the prime minister. In an approach reminiscent of the dictum that "war is too important to be left to the generals," Nakasone appointed only one teacher out of the 45 members. The rest were academics, economists, government officials, union leaders, and "opinion makers."

Although teacher education was only part of the NCER's work, the group did propose a series of poli-
cies aimed at improving teacher qualifications. Among the major teacher education reform recommendations were: 1) strengthening of preservice education, 2) instituting one-year internships for all beginning teachers, 3) developing an alternative route to certification, 4) devising better procedures for hiring teachers, and 5) systematizing inservice education (NCER 1988, p. 37). The first three of these reforms merit further description.

First is the strengthening of preservice education. To improve teachers' subject matter competence, students were required to take more credits, up to 30% more than previously required. A similarly substantial increase in required professional studies also was instituted. And, for the first time, students were exposed to such professional fields of study as student guidance, classroom management, and information technology. The student teaching experience also was enhanced. Finally, the NCER reform proposal led to a clearer designation of qualifications using a three-level system: an initial certificate requiring completion of junior college, a standard certificate requiring university graduation, and an advanced certificate requiring a master's degree or equivalent.

Perhaps the most important change related to this reform is Japan's increased emphasis on graduate education for teachers. This emphasis has resulted in an increase in graduate programs from three in 1985 to 43 in 1991.

Second is the internship program. There was a widely held view that the open certification system allowed college students to secure certification without a suffi-
cient background in professional education. For example, previously one could be certified at the secondary level with only 14 credits of professional studies and a mere two weeks of student teaching. In a system facing increasingly serious social and behavioral problems, the lack of professional knowledge was a problem that needed to be addressed. Public recognition of the problem translated into public support for improving the quality of teaching.

Thus, as a direct result of NCER recommendations, the prestigious Teacher Education Council drafted legislative studies in 1987. The following year, two bills addressing certification and internships were passed. Indeed, the Ministry of Education had placed so much importance on the internship idea that it had begun an experimental pilot program even before legislation was enacted.

A broad outline of the year-long internship notion is described best by Shimahara:

The internship program emphasizes development of a sense of mission, referring to an awareness of purpose in teaching and a broad social and cultural perspective. The program is organized by each prefectural board of education, based on a model suggested by the Ministry of Education and locally created plans. A full-time supervisor is appointed by a local superintendent of schools from among experienced teachers to provide mentoring for beginners. . . . In essence, the program consists of three components: in-house, in-service education under the supervision of a mentor, to which about ten hours are devoted a week; a program of about twen-
ty lectures and workshops developed by each local education center; and retreats and summer workshops that total about ten days. (1995, p. 179)

Both the concept of an intern program and the concrete reality have been points of contention between the leftist Japan Teachers Union and the conservative Ministry of Education, which have been in conflict throughout the postwar period. The former views teacher internship as merely a government ploy "for training teachers to fit stereotypical official expectations," and "a managerial tactic designed to weaken union opposition to government control of teacher training" (Shimahara and Sakai 1992, pp. 150-51).

Finally, with the goal of opening an alternative route to teaching and taking advantage of talented people who do not possess formal qualifications, the government established a system for issuing "special certificates" to selected individuals with special talents or skills who passed an examination given by a prefectural board of education.
Conclusion

Regardless of its dominant political system, government-sponsored education invariably is designed to advance the interests of the regime in power. This is true not only of Japanese government, but of all governments. Japan's first national government, established in 1868 following the long feudal period of the Tokugawa dynasty (1603-1867), clearly embodied this principle. Recognizing the need to modernize and protect the nation against Western predators, the Japanese leaders in the mid-19th century quickly set up a "modern" school system that melded Western science and technology with Japanese morality and ethics.

The notion of "national development," whether defined as modernizing to protect against "dangerous" Western ideas or physical threats from abroad, to build national unity, or to sell more goods overseas, required Japan's schools to inculcate a particular ideology or set of values in the young. Success depended on teachers who could carry out the government's plans. Thus the training of teachers was closely linked with national development.
Japan’s early adoption of a French model of centralization was a key step, as it made it easier to control education in general and teacher education in particular. The old saw about the French Minister of Education sitting in his Paris office, glancing at the clock, and thinking, “Every third-grader is now turning from page 123 to page 124 in the grammar book,” might as easily have been applied to Japan until the postwar period.

Since that time, of course, much has changed. And Japan, like the United States and many other countries, continues to examine its institutions and to seek reforms. Theodore Sizer observed in his important but generally neglected book, *Places of Learning, Places of Joy*, that we Americans have the education system we want because, if we seriously wanted a different system, we would find a way to achieve it. In other words, our rhetoric expresses our dreams and our ideals, but convenience and our wallets determine our actions. That has been as true of Japan as for the United States.

Every country determines what it wants its education system to accomplish and sets about to devise curricula and to prepare teachers able to accomplish those ends. Several years ago in an essay, “What Can We Learn from Japan?,” I concluded that “our two very different cultures have given birth to two very different educational systems.” But an examination of Japan’s approach to teacher education might lead us to look more closely at our own education system and the notions that shape it.
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Phi Delta Kappa Fastbacks

Two annual series, published each spring and fall, offer fastbacks on a wide range of educational topics. Each fastback is intended to be a focused, authoritative treatment of a topic of current interest to educators and other readers. Several hundred fastbacks have been published since the program began in 1972, many of which are still in print. Among the topics are:

Administration       Mainstreaming
Adult Education       Multiculturalism
The Arts              Nutrition
At-Risk Students      Parent Involvement
Careers               School Choice
Censorship            School Safety
Community Involvement Special Education
Computers             Staff Development
Curriculum            Teacher Training
Decision Making       Teaching Methods
Dropout Prevention    Urban Education
Foreign Study         Values
Gifted and Talented   Vocational Education
Legal Issues          Writing

For a current listing of available fastbacks and other publications of the Educational Foundation, please contact Phi Delta Kappa, 408 N. Union, P.O. Box 789, Bloomington, IN 47402-0789, or (812) 339-1156.
Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation

The Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation was established on 13 October 1966 with the signing, by Dr. George H. Reavis, of the irrevocable trust agreement creating the Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation Trust.

George H. Reavis (1883-1970) entered the education profession after graduating from Warrensburg Missouri State Teachers College in 1906 and the University of Missouri in 1911. He went on to earn an M.A. and a Ph.D. at Columbia University. Dr. Reavis served as assistant superintendent of schools in Maryland and dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Education at the University of Pittsburgh. In 1929 he was appointed director of instruction for the Ohio State Department of Education. But it was as assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction in the Cincinnati public schools (1939-48) that he rose to national prominence.

Dr. Reavis’ dream for the Educational Foundation was to make it possible for seasoned educators to write and publish the wisdom they had acquired over a lifetime of professional activity. He wanted educators and the general public to “better understand (1) the nature of the educative process and (2) the relation of education to human welfare.”

The Phi Delta Kappa fastbacks were begun in 1972. These publications, along with monographs and books on a wide range of topics related to education, are the realization of that dream.