

Nineteenth-Century Literature, *Bunmei Kaika* and Charlotte Brontë Adapted: English Literary Classics in the Japanese University

Neil Addison
ニール アディソン

[**Abstract**] This study will discuss some of the beneficial reasons for the historical employment of English literature in Japanese university education. While works by prominent Victorians such as Elizabeth Gaskell, Edward Bulwer-Lytton, Samuel Smiles, Benjamin Disraeli and Charlotte Brontë were translated into Japanese during the late nineteenth century (Iwakami 93-94), literary classics were also employed in early English instruction at Japanese universities (Harada 2012 8-9). The pedagogic employment of such texts in the late nineteenth century exemplified a classical literary and language education approach that further reflected a national Japanese program of *Bunmei Kaika*, or civilization and enlightenment. Therefore, some of the benefits of employing English literature in such contexts included reading for cultural knowledge (Harada 2012) and for acquiring vocabulary and grammar improvement (Furr 2004). This discussion will also address some of the neo-economic reasons why literature is becoming pedagogically neglected in current Japanese tertiary English education, being subordinated to communicative instruction methods. More specifically, it will be examined how the growth of materials produced by the modern global English language teaching industry, including adapted versions of nineteenth-century literary classics such as Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre*, have affected and potentially imperiled the position of English literature in Japanese university departments.

Introduction

Literature in English has been used in Japanese tertiary education for well over one hundred years, ever since Western literary texts were first introduced during the *Ousei Fukko* (Japanese Restoration) of the mid-nineteenth century. While works by prominent Victorians such as Elizabeth Gaskell, Edward Bulwer-Lytton, Benjamin Disraeli, Herbert Spencer, Samuel Smiles and Charlotte Brontë were translated into Japanese during the late nineteenth century (Iwakami 93-94), literary classics were also employed in early English instruction. Despite being complex, dense, and packed with abstract, metaphorical allusions, the use of literature in English instruction was pursued in order to both help students gain a mastery of the English language and to quickly obtain knowledge of English-speaking countries such as Great Britain and the United States of America. This therefore embodied a mixed approach which combined the study of cultural knowledge with vocabulary and grammar acquisition, and Harada notes that, “for many years English

literary education has been mixed with education for proficiency in English” (33).

Even today, literature is still taught in the liberal arts departments of selected Japanese universities, while the reading components of some Japanese tertiary-level English programs may mandate a set of objectives that include the ability to comprehend a selection of literary texts for the purposes of cultural enrichment and linguistic competence (Parkinson and Reid Thomas 2000). Indeed, the role of English literature as a potentially useful reading tool would appear to possess a great deal of currency in Japanese education. While some Japanese students are extroverted and outgoing, others are introverted, and it is the latter group that often appears to be more academically successful. As Anderson has previously noted, teachers sometimes comment that it is the “shy” Japanese students who appear to meet the demands of the class more than their “extrovert” peers (Anderson 1993). Placing more focus on the quiet study of English literature in a delicate and socially-charged dynamic would perhaps seem more advantageously suited to the needs of lectures and large classes than a communicative approach.

Despite literary texts possessing these possible benefits, the teaching of such works in Japanese universities, and indeed in classrooms around the world, is slowly being marginalized by the growth of the English Language Teaching (ELT) international industry and the widespread use of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach. The efficacy of literature is thus becoming increasingly questioned in Japan, and its status as a pedagogic tool and as a discipline is being placed under threat within tertiary education where primacy is increasingly placed upon the demand for students to communicate more fluently in English. This discussion will therefore examine the beneficial reasons why English literature was historically introduced into Japanese tertiary education in the nineteenth century, and will further address the changing nature of literary education in Japan. This article will also discuss how the growth of simplified materials produced by the modern ELT industry and the rising use of adapted versions of nineteenth-century English classics, such as Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre*, have affected and potentially imperiled the position of literature in Japanese university departments.

English Literature and Humanism in Japan

English literature began to be translated into Japanese during the latter half of the nineteenth century. The *Ousei Fukko* of 1868 saw various European works of literature gradually enter Japan and become popular with the educated classes (Ishikura 3). Such literature also formed the basis for early English instruction; this was initiated in order to access the knowledge and skills of Great Britain and the United States. As Ishikura notes, the most influential figures involved in the introduction of Western literature were “young Japanese scholars educated in European philosophy; in addition to their academic work, many of these scholars became bureaucrats in the new government” (3). Committed to a program of *Bunmei Kaika*, or civilization and enlightenment, these influential figures branched out into a number of fields, including education (3). Acquisition of English therefore became an important part of the Japanese study of Western knowledge, with such literary texts taught in tertiary education as an end to dual cultural and linguistic means. *Yaku-*

doku (translation reading) was the primary method of English classroom instruction (Law 1995). Thus, by the late nineteenth century, classic works of English literature such as Edmund Spenser, Oliver Goldsmith, Edmund Burke and Francis Bacon, were “actually used in the English classes of Japanese universities and high schools” (Harada 2012 8-9).

While literary texts began to be introduced into English classes, foreigners also began to be recruited and employed as English literature and language teachers. Some of these nineteenth-century foreign lecturers, however, had little expertise in teaching literature. In 1871, for example, the journalist Edward H. House accepted an offer to teach at Tokyo Imperial University, which he did “in addition to doing freelance articles for Associated Press and the New York Herald and other American and Japanese publications” (Huffman 177). Yet, while House was a journalist rather than an academic or instructor, his position was prestigious, teaching English literature to the university’s “Upper Students” (177). His successor, James Summers, a professor of Chinese at Kings College, London, taught as Tokyo professor of English literature and Logic from 1873 (Toyoda 96). Toyoda notes that Summers’ extant examination questions from 1873-76 display a heavy emphasis upon the study of English poetry, and in particular the works of William Shakespeare, Edmund Spenser and John Milton (96-97).

The first genuinely-qualified foreign instructor of literature employed at Tokyo Imperial University was an American scholar, William A. Houghton (Harada 2004 115), who used Johnson’s *Rasselas* as an English textbook. This text proved so influential that by 1894 the scholar Roan Uchida remarked, “*Rasselas* is now more familiar to Japanese students than the Nine Chinese Classics” (Harada 2012 9). His successor Naibu Kanda also continued using *Rasselas* as a textbook in English classes (Harada 2004 115). Lafcadio Hearn, having previously taught English language to students at Japanese secondary schools (Guo 106) later held the chair of English literature at Tokyo Imperial University, and taught English through literature (Benfey 226). During his seven year’s lectureship between 1896 and 1903 Hearn created an exhaustive set of notes for his students, published posthumously as the two volumes *A History of English Literature* (226). Hearn was then succeeded by the famous Japanese novelist and scholar of English literature Natsume Soseki, author of *Bochan* (1906) and *Kokoro* (1914). Soseki had previously spent three years at University College, London studying British literature on a government stipend (227), and as a professor of English literature at Tokyo Imperial University Soseki taught literary theory and criticism to his students. During the late nineteenth century, therefore, literature was increasingly used in Japanese university classes, being taught by both foreign lecturers and Japanese scholars. This ensured that the acquisition of English literary knowledge was interconnected with the pursuit of linguistic competence.

English Literary Studies and the Economic Gauntlet

In modern times, literary education used in global English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts has been placed under gradual threat due to the rise of Western-led communicative methods (Brumfit 2001). From the late 1970s, a number of seminal works by pedagogic figures such as Chomsky, Hymes, Widdowson,

Wilkins and Krashen attempted to advance a coherent theoretical and practical CLT approach which would also be quickly adopted and employed by the burgeoning ELT industry (Ellis 77-79). This industry was not humanistic in rationale, however, and was instead more directly underpinned by the growth of a neo-liberal global economy (Brumfit 118).

The commercial expansion of the modern ELT industry, and its economic practices abroad in countries such as Japan, can arguably be connected to a seminal event that took place over 45 years ago. The 1973 Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) oil crisis (Brumfit 118) precipitated a historical economic change, leading to the end of the Bretton Woods protectionist system and the defeat of Keynesian economics. The rise of Western laissez-faire economics also saw ELT policy lean towards the newer oil-based system. Whilst recognizing firstly the importance influence of the CLT movement in this process, Brumfit notes that “the second substantial shift is not linguistic at all, but relates to oil, and the economy associated with it” (118). This modern corporate colonialism oversaw “a period of change which radically altered the scope and structure of ELT” (Howatt & Widdowson 232). In this neo-economic world, English became a valuable commodity analogous to oil; this reference was illustrated quite explicitly in the British Council’s 1987/88 report, which identified that “Britain’s real black gold is not North Sea Oil but the English language” (Phillipson 48). Thus, the commercial and cultural ideology of countries such as the United States and the United Kingdom can be seen as underpinning the modern ELT industry, subtly directing economic policy and rationale.

The sudden expansion of this industry in tandem with the growth of the modern global economy also shifted emphasis away from translation reading in Japanese English education, with literature used far less in schools and university classrooms (Tatsuki & Zenuk-Nishide 40). Although, as previously discussed, the teaching of literature was originally conceived and pursued as a way of obtaining knowledge and skills that would benefit Japanese internationalism, this approach began to be perceived in Japan, as in many English language teaching contexts, as subordinate to communicative language teaching. This is specifically reflected in the increasing employment of native English speakers in Japanese education. Since the late 1970s, a growing number of foreign nationals have been hired to teach English language classes in Japanese universities, and in 2013, *The Japan Times* reported that the Japan Association of National Universities had “set goals for public universities to double the numbers of foreign instructors and classes taught in English by 2020” (Nagata 2013). While English language teaching skills are fully in demand in tertiary education, at the same time the number of English literature specialists within the Japanese academic sector appears to be falling. As of last year, *The Kenkyusha Eigo Nenkan 2015 (Yearbook of English)* recorded in its “Shuyo Kenkyu Dantai” (main research group section) that the English Literary Society of Japan contained 3500 members (2015 190). Yet, according to *The Kenkyusha Eigo Nenkan 2002*, membership of the English literary society of Japan was 4000 (2002 160) a little over a decade ago. A drop of 500 members within that timespan could represent nothing more than a fluctuation in membership, and yet, the same source also records how the last decade has additionally seen a significant drop in the individual memberships of different Japan-based literary societies such as Romanticism, Modernism and Victorian

literature.

While the numbers of literature academics in Japan are likely decreasing, the position of literature as a discipline within liberal arts departments of the Japanese university system is more explicitly under threat. A 2015 report featured in a number of news sources, including the *UK Guardian*, documented a letter sent by Japan's education minister to more than 50 national Japanese universities urging them to downsize their liberal arts and humanities departments and instead offer a "more practical, vocational education that better anticipates the needs of society" (Dean 2015). Twenty six institutions reported that they planned to close, scale back or adapt their humanities courses (Dean 2015), and despite recent governmental backtracking in the face of protests by academics, the fate of a number of humanities departments remains uncertain. Thus an academic expertise in English literature, which may have previously afforded such scholars a great deal of prestige and status, may now potentially carry less currency in a context where possessing knowledge of linguistics or pedagogical procedures is becoming more highly valued. The problems literature teachers in Japan may face in attempting to lead students to study literary texts are therefore compounded by issues of pedagogic policy between teaching groups: namely, those who seek to teach literature, and those who see themselves as language specialists. In EFL environments, some argue that a pedagogic mistrust has set in between the two groups, where "Literary types, in the eyes of applied linguists, are at best bumbler and dilettantes in the language classroom, doing more harm than good" (Chilton 5). This institutional imbalance between vocations appears likely to worsen as literature scholarship and literary education in tertiary institutions continues to decline.

The Dwindling Use of English Literary Texts

While a continuing pedagogic debate over the efficacy of English literature in Japanese universities threatens to undermine its role and use, such problematic issues are compounded by the fact that students often have little or no experience in reading English literature prior to entering university institutions. Both reading and literary practice have increasingly taken a back seat to communication practices in English instruction. Tatsuki & Zenuk-Nishide note that this "state of affairs is in sharp contrast to the 1950s, when reading and appreciating literature was the major aim of English studies" (40) and they further observe that "teaching and learning literature in English has devolved from being a core part of the English language curriculum" in secondary schools to having a "near non-existence" (40). Around 60 years ago "one-third of the readings included in school textbooks were authentic literary texts" (40), yet this has recently "dropped to 5-20% and the texts provided in school textbooks are almost all simplified versions of the original material" (40). Upon reaching university, students are frequently encouraged in the classroom to focus on consolidating and improving their English language skills rather than in utilising and applying these skills towards studying subjects within the humanities such as literature. This may be in part due to the wariness of native speaker instructors of English, who believe that literature cannot be successfully taught in foreign language contexts. Waring, for example, argues that English learners need a general vocabulary knowledge

of around 9000 words to read and understand 98% of most literary classics, while most contemporary Japanese university students have an average vocabulary range of between 1820 to 2460 English words (2012). Japanese students are often considered by such English teachers to lack the vocabulary needed to tackle demanding texts, and this may lead overcautious native lecturers employed with Japanese universities to prioritize English language skills over English literature skills.

With Japanese students having limited opportunities for total immersion in native speaking environments, university English departments often deem frequency of instruction to be the most appropriate pedagogic approach. Students often study a total of fourteen or more classes per week, and this can include the study of English in “4-skills” classes, such as speaking, listening, writing and reading. Such teaching objectives are, according to Howatt & Widdowson, likely to “exclude the cultural values and identities, or expressive and aesthetic characteristics....quite simply because these are now seen as surplus to practical requirement” (357). When literature is employed in such Japanese classroom contexts it is often used as a subordinated part of an English language study program, and this practice has been criticized in the past by humanities scholars as non-literary in its scope. Jonathon Culler, for example, argued that “a true literature syllabus will not be simply the use of literary texts for advanced language purposes, but it must also attempt to develop and extend literary competence” (6). In Japanese English classes, however, literary texts, when used, are often employed to reinforce reading skills such as speed skimming for meaning, and vocabulary gap-fill work rather than to engender literary and cultural knowledge or aesthetic competence. Yet such literature is frequently eschewed altogether as a reading resource; instead, the two major types of reading materials which Japanese students are most frequently exposed to in tertiary English classes are English textbooks and Extensive Reading.

English Literature as an Adapted Medium

A great deal of the English reading work which students undertake in Japanese university study involves the use of Western imported commercial textbooks. Such reading is “treated as a vehicle for the presentation, practice, manipulation and consolidation of language points, rather than the encouragement of reading itself” (Bell 2001). Ironically, although Japanese English students increasingly read less literature, they are likely to encounter the image of various classic writers such as Shakespeare, Dickens and Austen in EFL textbooks. Such figures are often presented in an elitist and yet, paradoxically, diminished and oversimplified way. While the illustrated image of Charlotte Brontë, for example, is introduced to English *Headway* students (Soars & Soars 47) as an idealized exemplar of literary genius, students do not gain an awareness or knowledge of why her work is important and meaningful. Brontë’s *Jane Eyre*, for instance, can be considered as an early attempt to raise serious social issues such as marital and gender equality. Thus, although *Jane Eyre* is a product of the Victorian Era, the work retains a great deal of thematic currency today, and can still prove to be relevant for modern students of English literature. Iwakami notes that *Jane Eyre* was first translated into Japanese by Futo Mizutani in 1896 under the title *Riso Kajin (An Ideal Lady)* (96) and

that the first complete version was finally published in 1930 by Hisako Endo (99). The Shinto Library Press version has sold over 889,000 copies to date, and Iwakami observes that Charlotte Brontë is historically one of “the most popular English novelists in Japan” (99). Clearly the work of Brontë struck a meaningful thematic chord with past Japanese readers, and yet the potential joys and insights that such works can offer current university English students will likely remain untapped unless learners are able to engage personally and critically with such texts inside and outside of the classroom. Teaching a more complete understanding of English literature entails scaffolding the cultural and universal ideas that underpin texts, and such an educational approach should be student centered, so that learners are involved in discovering these ideas and connecting them to their own lives in meaningful ways. Instead, when employed as illustrated symbols in textbooks, literary figures become exploited as idealized yet ultimately superficial symbols, and if students encounter the image of English literary figures without adequate explanation such experiences will likely be wasted.

Just as English textbooks can serve to marginalize and oversimplify literature in the university classroom, so the economically powerful Extensive Reading (ER) industry has emerged to become a regular part of many tertiary language programs in Japan, further pushing the use of classic literature out into the pedagogic margins. A number of educators and researchers such as Day and Bamford (1998) and Grabe & Stoller (2011) have championed the use of ER, maintaining that it should be seen as a crucial factor in language education. Responding to such assertions, ER graded reader publishers with large sales in Japan, such as Oxford University Press, Longman Pearson Penguin and Macmillan boast a large number of graded readers in their catalogues. The selection of such readers available may be wide, but these simplified collections frequently include classic nineteenth-century English literature rather than modern versions of fiction. For example, a glance at the Penguin Readers series reveals titles such as Jane Austen’s *Sense and Sensibility*, Thomas Hardy’s *Jude the Obscure*, Charles Dickens’ *David Copperfield*, Oscar Wilde’s *A Picture of Dorian Gray* and Charlotte Brontë’s *Jane Eyre*. This can, admittedly, have positive results; such graded readers allow students to access ‘high’ literature, smoothing and clarifying more challenging and sometimes antiquated language that might cause confusion. At the same time, while many Japanese universities include works by writers such as Wilde, Hardy, Austen and Brontë in their ER graded readers selection, the teaching of such simplified literature often focuses on mere information retrieval.

Although the works of literary figures from classic literature pervade most ER graded reader selections found in Japanese universities, the focus is placed primarily on reading quantitatively rather than qualitatively. Krashen (1993) has claimed that any extensive reading is profitable, from simple action and romance stories to comprehensible adaptations of literary classics, with students not needing to make any distinction between the two, and similarly, in Japan, EFL practitioners such as Waring argue that the sole aim is to be “exposed to massive amounts of text” (2006 46). The assumption that reading widely improves students’ English comprehension does, however, rather ironically indicate a rather narrow conception of what such comprehension should entail. While students reading abridged literature may understand the general sequence of narrative events they are unlikely to fully understand the cultural, social and personal

themes, or indeed the linguistic aspects, central to such works in their original form. It is through reading deeply and intensely, rather than widely and superficially, where students become fully cognizant of the meaning of what they have read.

Some English teachers, therefore, have “expressed disappointment and even horror at the adapted versions” (Day and Bamford 1998 97) of classic Western books, considering these graded readers to neglect literary depth. One major problem is that the writers of graded readers often cut vital sentences, scenes and passages which may hold the key to understanding the meaning of a text. For example, the Penguin Level 3 version of Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* erases the highly loaded question “Who’s there?” (Shakespeare 870) which commences the play. Bernardo’s opening enquiry is one of the most famous lines in English literature, and can be seen as an important and complex signifier because it is susceptible to multiple interpretations. It presages a number of themes encountered within the play, such as identity, sanity, gender, heroism and autonomy. Instead, the graded reader version commences with the new king’s coronation scene, and opens with Claudius’ speech in memory of Hamlet’s late father: “The memory of our king, my dear brother, is still fresh in all our hearts” (Rice 1). Cutting such an important line from the text undermines students’ full understanding of one of the greatest works of English literature, the grader reader version ultimately reducing *Hamlet* to the level of an episodic adventure story.

Of even more concern is the tendency among graded reader editors to rewrite and thus erroneously misrepresent the original writer’s intentions. For example, the graded reader version of *Jane Eyre* appears to weaken and simplify the empowering feminist meaning underpinning Charlotte Brontë’s famous line “Reader, I married him” (17), rendering the protagonist’s powerful assertion a much meeker “I married Mr. Rochester very quietly” (Attwood 151). It may well be that many native English teachers who adapt literary classics for Japanese university students do not themselves understand the complexity or subtle nuances of the works they are rewriting. This was not historically the case in regard to Japanese nineteenth-century critical reception of English literature at educational institutions. Iwakami, for example, notes that the introduction of Brontë’s works in Japan correlated with the commencement of academic studies of English literature at Japanese universities (92). It is therefore concerning that contemporary Japanese university English students reading the works of Charlotte Brontë and other literary classics are increasingly doing so through oversimplified and distorted versions adapted primarily by native English teachers who may themselves lack a sufficient knowledge of such texts.

Between Literary Theory and Practice

Due to increasing focus on EFL textbooks and ER materials, classic English literary texts are often excluded from Japanese university classrooms. When they are taught, however, they are often approached in the same fashion as graded readers, being employed as a benchmark for developing reading fluency. Closed comprehension questions are frequently employed to test students’ understanding of new vocabulary terms, while additionally requiring students to search for organic textual data such as settings, names,

and episodic events. This may be because, as Harada notes, “the purposes of English literary education are not clearly understood either by students or by those who oversee higher education” (2014 33). It appears, therefore, that English literature studies in Japan will increasingly continue to be chiefly taught as part of a general EFL or EAP (English for Academic Purposes) reading program of study alongside textbook use and ER. Specialist academics helping students to prepare for a literature graduation thesis and tertiary EFL instructors using literature in English reading classes must both address how best to teach literary texts, and do so whilst often working within the confines of specific language educational paradigms. Lee therefore maintains, that “in Japan, literary study cannot go on being regarded as simply some adjunct to language learning” (11), and argues in favor of the “notion of an English department shed of its obligation to teach language” (12) where he imagines a future in which “each campus removed its English language teaching to a Language Center or the like” (11). Such an idea makes a great deal of sense, as the primary focus of a literary education should be an understanding of the themes, voices, and cultural references which inform the text, as opposed to a mere superficial study of the language in which it is written. For literature teachers situated in such an educational paradigm, where English language study is unlikely to take a pedagogic back seat anytime soon, perhaps some form of literary classroom synthesis is more practically desirable. For literature to avoid being consigned to pedagogic limbo, being used in classrooms as a means to linguistic ends, or misunderstood due to students’ language limitations, practitioners from both sides of the fence may need to learn from each other’s disciplines and in doing so find ways to teach both language for literature and literature for language. Chilton notes, “expertise in both disciplines is practically impossible... therefore a kind of rapprochement is necessary” (5).

Such interdisciplinary cognizance may be the best way for EFL practitioners and literary professors to transcend theory versus practice dichotomies. Many EFL instructors who use literature in the English classroom may lack adequate literary knowledge, or, worse still, commit the grave sin of oversimplifying or misreading the texts they use. To remedy this, obtaining a better knowledge or training in ‘literariness’ would allow acquired academic theory to smooth and direct the craft of literary classroom practice. Conversely, those literature professors who possess an urbane knowledge of literary texts may face a different set of challenges when attempting to disseminate and explicate such knowledge in a foreign language context, developing a more practical, language focused, literary pedagogy to help actualize academic theory. Chilton observes this challenge from the perspective of a Japan based literature professor, documenting how many academics in Japan, upon beginning their first literature classes, realized that “graduate training in literary studies had not prepared us to teach literature in this way” (Chilton 4). While acknowledging important books such as “*Literature and Language Teaching* by Brumfit and Carter, *Literature in the Language Classroom* by Collie and Slater,” (4) Chilton also observes, “there is a dearth of research on the matter of teaching literature in foreign-language situations” (4). With the lack of a contextually suitable teaching road map it is little wonder that literature is frequently avoided in English classes. Establishing such a literature teaching methodology, however, will require the type of truly integrated English and cultural studies program successfully initiated at Japanese universities during the late nineteenth century.

Conclusion

English literary texts in Japanese universities were originally employed in the nineteenth century not purely for the purposes of language acquisition but as a way of obtaining knowledge and skills that would benefit Japanese cultural enlightenment and internationalism. More recent neo-economic-led pedagogic rationale has shifted the terrain, moving the focus away from English literature and liberal arts study towards communication and linguistics, and yet, as this discussion has observed, the study of English literary texts can still possess cultural and linguistic advantages for Japanese students. Nevertheless, in order that students may acquire these benefits it is not enough for English language instructors to merely employ literature as a reading resource for language acquisition. Further, if literature is to be used in English classes, simplified literary texts such as graded readers should not be considered as suitable or appropriate substitutes. Instead, those wishing to use literature in Japanese university English education will need to address the central question of how students can be more successfully led to engage with such texts at a deeper level. In order to engender the beneficial cultural, linguistic and personal aspects of literature, teachers will need to accept personal responsibility when seeking to introduce students to literary texts, and this will in turn necessitate English instructors possessing some critical literary expertise in addition to knowledge of pedagogic practice. If universities and colleges wish their staff to both possess and develop literary craft skills this will in turn require such institutions to recruit more foreign and Japanese English lecturers with specialist literary knowledge additional to language teaching ability. Ultimately, for Japan and its education systems to benefit more fully, richly and deeply from their English language programs, it will be necessary to employ more literature experts from at home and abroad to balance the ever growing numbers of native English speakers that work as communicative language teachers in universities.

Works Cited

- Anderson, Fred. E. "The Enigma of the College Classroom: Nails that Don't Stick Up." *A Handbook For Teaching English at Japanese Colleges and Universities*, edited by Paul Wadden. Oxford UP, 1993. pp. 101-110.
- Attwood, Evelyn. *Jane Eyre, Charlotte Brontë Level 5 Penguin Readers*. Longman/Pearson Education, 2010.
- Bell, Timothy. "Extensive Reading: Speed and Comprehension." *The Reading Matrix*, vol. 1, 2001. www.reading-matrix.com/articles/bell/index.html
- Benfey, Christopher. *The Great Wave: Gilded Age Misfits, Japanese Eccentrics, and the Opening of Old Japan*. Random House, 2003.
- Brontë, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. 1847. Penguin Classics, 2006.
- Brumfit, Christopher. *Individual Freedom in Language Teaching*. Oxford UP, 2001.
- Chilton, Myles. "Making Lit Matter: An Introduction to Lit Matters: The Liberlit Journal of Teaching Literature." *Lit Matters: The Liberlit Journal of Teaching Literature*, vol. 1, 2014. pp. 4-9.
- Culler, Jonathan. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature*. Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.
- Day, Richard and Julian Bamford. *Extensive Reading in the Second Language Classroom*. Cambridge UP, 1998.
- Dean, Alex. "Japan's Humanities Chop Sends Shivers Down Academic Spines." *The Guardian*, 26 September 2015.

- <https://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/2015/sep/25/japans-humanities-chop-sends-shivers-down-academic-spines>
- Ellis, Rod. "Informal and Formal Approaches to Communicative Language Teaching." *ELT Journal*, vol. 361, 1982. pp. 73-81.
- Grabe, William Peter and Fredricka L. Stoller. *Teaching and Researching Reading*. Pearson, 2011.
- Guo, Nanyan. "Interpreting Japan's Interpreters: The Problem of Lafcadio Hearn." *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies*, vol. 3, 2001. pp.106-118.
- Harada, Noriyuki. "Johnson in Japanese Culture." *Kyorin University Review*, vol.16, 2004. pp. 113-136.
- _____. "Translation or Transformation: Japanese Reception and Adaption of Eighteenth-Century English Literature." *Essays and Studies in British and American Literature*, vol. 58, 2012. pp. 1-22.
- _____. "Teaching Eighteenth-Century English Literature in Japan: Purposes, Curricula and Syllabi." *Lit Matters: The Liberlit Journal of Teaching Literature*, vol. 1, 2014. pp. 33-44.
- Howatt, Anthony Phillip Reid and Henry Widdowson. *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford UP, 2004.
- Huffman, James. L. *A Yankee in Meiji Japan: The Crusading Journalist Edward H. House*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2003.
- Ishikura, Waka. "The Reception and Translation of Wordsworth in Japan." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, vol.8, 2006. *Purdue University*, doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.1309
- Iwakami, Haruko. "The Brontës in Japan: How *Jane Eyre* was Received in the Meiji Period (1868-1912)." *Brontë Studies: The Journal of the Brontë Society*, vol. 27, 2002. pp. 91-99. *Taylor & Francis Online*, doi.org/10.1179/bst.2002.27.2.91
- Kenkyusha Eigo Nenkan 2002: The Kenkyusha Yearbook of English 2002*. Kenkyusha Press, 2002.
- Kenkyusha Eigo Nenkan 2015: The Kenkyusha Yearbook of English 2015*. Kenkyusha Press, 2015.
- Krashen, Stephen. *The Power of Reading*. Libraries Unlimited Inc, 1993.
- Law, Graham. "Ideologies of English Language Education in Japan." *JALT Journal*, vol. 17, 1995. pp. 213-224.
- Lee, Robert. "English Department in the Japanese University: What's in the Title?" *Lit Matters: The Liberlit Journal of Teaching Literature*, vol.1, 2014. pp. 10-15.
- Nakata, K. "Universities to Boost Classes in English." *The Japan Times*, 14 March 2013. <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2013/03/14/national/universities-to-boost-classes-in-english/#.VSTNgmuCjIV>
- Parkinson, Brian and Helen Reid Thomas. *Teaching Literature in a Second Language*. Edinburgh UP, 2000.
- Phillipson, Robert. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford UP, 1992.
- Rice, Chris. *Hamlet, William Shakespeare Level 3 Penguin Readers*. Longman/Pearson Education, 2006.
- Shakespeare, William. *Shakespeare Complete Works*, edited by W. J. Craig. Oxford UP, 1966.
- Soars, John and Liz Soars. *New Headway Elementary Students' Book*. Oxford UP, 2012.
- Tatsuki, D., Zenuk-Nishide, L. "Literary Texts in ELT in Japan." *The Journal of Literature in Language Teaching*, vol. 1, 2012. pp. 40.
- Toyoda, Minoru. *Shakespeare in Japan: A Historical Study*. Iwani Shoten for the Shakespeare Association of Japan, 1940.
- Waring, Rob. "Why Extensive Reading Should be an Indispensable Part of all Language Programs." *The Language Teacher*, vol. 30. 2006. pp. 44-47.
- _____. "Why Most EFL Teachers Don't Teach 'Literature': What Can be Done About It?" *Rob Waring Presentations: Liberlit Meiji Gakuin University*, 2012. <http://www.robwaring.org/presentations/index.html>