

Using Literature in Foreign Language Learning :
A Case Study with Chinese JFL Students

David R. Bogdan

Ehime University

松 山 大 学
言語文化研究 第32巻第1 - 2号 (抜刷)
2012年9月

Matsuyama University
Studies in Language and Literature
Vol. 32 No. 1-2 September 2012

Using Literature in Foreign Language Learning : A Case Study with Chinese JFL Students

David R. Bogdan

Introduction.

On August 27, 2012, researchers from Japan and China, specializing in Japanese and Chinese literature, conducted, and gave presentations at, a workshop entitled “Foreign Literature in Japanese Literature/Japanese Literature as Foreign Literature [translation mine]”. This workshop, subsidized through a Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT) Grant-in Aid for Scientific Research (KAKENHI Grant# : 23520243), took place at the Harbin Institute of Technology (HIT) and was attended by about 60 students studying Japanese as a Foreign Language (JFL) at HIT. One of the goals of the workshop was to familiarize the participants with Japanese literature and to help them recognize the importance of culture and literature, including classical as well as that which may be considered more modern and “up-to-date”, in Japanese language teaching. In this paper, we will discuss this workshop and how it fared with respect to this and other goals.

The members of the working group for the grant had been conducting research related to the “acceptance” (or “popularity”) of vernacular Chinese literature (*hakuwa* in Japanese) in the Japanese early modern period (Edo Period), but, as their research progressed, they came to realize that Chinese culture had penetrated Japanese literature and the arts, especially with respect to the early modern period,

to a much greater degree than previously thought. They therefore decided to present this research in the form of a workshop based on a broader perspective which, while concentrating on the early modern period, also includes other periods and shows the connections between Japanese and Chinese literature, along with Chinese culture.

In the planning stages of this experimental workshop, the organizers quickly realized that, even though, for the Chinese JFL learners who were to attend the workshop, this could actually be construed as an exercise in intercultural communication, there were no specialists in intercultural communication among the project members. With this in mind, the author (hereafter, DRB), who works on intercultural communication in addition to his specialization in linguistics, and who has previously worked with one of the members of the project, Yasunori Fukuda, on other research projects, was asked to give the opening speech and take part in the workshop. He was also asked to observe and report on his observations of the workshop itself and the how it was perceived by the Chinese JFL students and the presenters from Japan.

The Workshop.

The workshop included a general open symposium in the morning and an afternoon session consisting of research presentations and discussions. Due to time considerations, the afternoon presentations and information exchange were divided into two separate groups, and participants chose one or the other to attend.

Presentations ran the gamut from classical through modern literature and touched upon a wide variety of topics, including: written vernacular Chinese in modern literature, character formation in Japanese and Chinese literature, narrative twists in Chinese boudoir poetry, Bunpa Oe's moral thoughts and literature, Chinese

classics and *The Tale of Sagoromo* (*Sagoromo Monogatari*), Tairiku Tsuga's *The Three Kingdoms* (*Sangokushi Engi*), Akinari Ueda's *Tales of Moonlight and Rain* (*Ugetsu Monogatari*), and Chinese classics, such as *Inshitsuroku*, concerning ethics. There were discussions on moral and ethical issues in the literature and how this was reflected in culture and language. For example, the keynote speech during the morning session discussing *Inshitsuroku* (based on Liao Fan's teachings) stressed how a person's fate, or destiny, could be changed through their actions. A person could improve their lot through good deeds, such as showing kindness, reverence, love, and respect. This provided a prime example of the influence of Chinese culture and literature found in Japanese literature.

Pedagogical Considerations.

Sell (2005) mentions that literature faculty sometimes find it difficult to "justify their professional existence" and that it is natural that foreign language (FL) teachers may also find including literature in their curriculum difficult or even unnecessary. Part of this may be construed as an artifact from the history of FL teaching, which, in the nineteenth century had been weighted in the direction of using literature in the grammar translation method. The pendulum then, however, swung far in the opposite direction. Subsequent communicative language teaching (CLT) based on a structuralist approach, such as the direct and audiolingual methods, often tended to ignore or discard literature in their language syllabi. (Khatib & Rahimi : 2012)

McKay (1982), in giving possible counterarguments to the use of literature in ESL, suggests that there are those who feel that literature might not contribute much to helping students in their academic or occupational goals (a concern also expressed, it might be added, in the presenters' comments). She then, however, goes on to dispel this concern. One of the goals of foreign-language teachers is to

raise the students' consciousness of the structure of the language. She notes that linguistic knowledge can be divided into two levels—*usage* and *use*—with the former involving the knowledge of linguistic rules and the latter, the knowledge of how to use these rules. McKay then gives examples of how literature can help to extend student knowledge on both levels. The way literature is often used to help extend language *usage* is fairly clear-cut; it encourages vocabulary expansion through “extensive and subtle vocabulary usage” and knowledge of grammar by providing “complex and exact syntax”. On the *use* level, literature presents language in context, i. e., in discourse, where the “parameters of the setting and role relationship are defined.” Having the social context, you get a better grasp of why a particular form might be chosen, sharpening your awareness of language use. Along these same lines, Paesani (2007) also talks about an input-rich inductive grammar instruction which encourages students to look at grammatical forms and their meaning in context.

In a similar vein, let us look at the author's (DRB's) research. It deals with tense and aspect in Slavic languages, which, on the surface, appears to be firmly based in theoretical linguistics. However, as he approaches it through discourse analysis, he uses both oral and written text to provide context in which tense and aspect operate. For example, his book on tense and aspect in Polish narrative (Bogdan and Sullivan : 2009) employs excerpts from works in Polish literature—in this case, Stachura (1962) and Herling-Grudziński (1991)—to show the interplay of tense and aspect with other discourse elements. Similar use of samples from Polish or Russian literature are also seen in many of his articles.

Premawardhena (2007) discusses research conducted in a FL program with students studying six different foreign languages and states that the students tend to be more concerned with developing language skills and to devote less time to reading literature. This is, of course, a common phenomenon in FL programs.

Premawardhena also suggests that the lack of competency at the beginning of their studies greatly hinders the integration of literature in the program, and that students need to develop critical and analytic skills, along with an ability to work on their own and present their own arguments. One could assume, however, that this will be beneficial to them because they will be able to draw upon such skills and abilities, not only in other subjects, but also in life after they graduate.

Literature provides context for language use, and it presents language used for specific purposes. Historically, it shows how the culture in which the language is spoken has developed into what it is today. Also on the historical side, specifically with respect to historical linguistics, “classical” literature gives clues to language change and where certain linguistic relics come from. For language learners, it induces them to make hypotheses and guess unfamiliar expressions. It also connects the FL learners with the speakers of the language they are learning—including the teacher—by giving them a glimpse into their culture. One does not learn one’s native language in isolation ; this should also hold true for foreign language learning.

Methodology.

As noted above, we want to discuss the workshop and whether it was a success, at least far as showing the importance of literature and research about literature and in promoting an interest in literature among the Chinese students attending. This may sound a bit trite, but the best way to determine whether it was successful or not was to just ask. And that is what was done. Three questionnaires were run. The first was given to the attendees and the other two to the presenters, one before they saw the results of the student questionnaire and one after.

The student questionnaire was in Japanese. After the conference was over and the presenters had returned to Japan, it was sent as a PDF to be printed out and

completed by the student attendees. An English translation of the questionnaire can be seen in Appendix 2. The first part asked for personal information, including year in school and length of Japanese language study, which might play a role in how well the students understood the content of the presentations.

Following this, the students were asked to give five 5-point Likert scale evaluations mainly concerning how they felt about the presentations and the workshop as a whole, but there was also one question asking them to what degree they felt literature played a role in language learning. Remember that these were JFL students whose major goal was to learn the language.

The final section consisted of two “open-ended” questions; the first asked about what things they found difficult in the Japanese which was used during the workshop, and the second just asked them to comment on how they felt about the workshop in general. The term “open-ended” occurs in quotes because the questions were not entirely open-ended. For example, for the first, they were provided examples of answers, such as “I couldn’t understand because it was too fast.” Naturally, the many of the respondents often chose to use these examples because they were right there in front of them. In some ways, therefore, it was a mix between an open-ended question and a multiple-choice one. The second question gave fewer examples, but some of the students did use them in their responses. While it would have probably been more revealing if the students could have answered freely without any hints, it was decided that, because they were answering in Japanese, a foreign language to them, and their abilities in that language varied greatly, it would be better to supply them with the examples.

There were also some other concerns about the structure of the questionnaire. For one thing, the example used for the Likert questions had the wrong end of the scale used for the sample response (totally the fault of the author). There was also one other case of miscommunication. If you look at the Likert questions (5) and

(8), you will no doubt notice that they are essentially mirror images of each other ; the first asks whether the students found the content easy to understand, and the second, whether they found “it” difficult. The reason the “it” is in quotes is that there was not really a subject in the Japanese version, so “it” could have also covered an aspect of the workshop, including the question and answer and discussion portions.

Even though there were some inherent concerns about the make-up of the questionnaire, it did give some interesting data to examine, and a discussion of the results can be found in the section below.

The other two questionnaires were directed at the 16 presenters from Japan (minus the author, as he is acting as an outside observer). The first, seen in the top half of Appendix 3, consisted of five 5-point Likert scale questions, in a similar format to the student questionnaire, but with different questions. The first of these asked the presenter to rate how much they thought, prior to leaving Japan, the students would be able to understand. The next two concerned how much they thought the students had understood, but after the fact. Following this, the presenters rated the students’ level of participation. The final Likert question was the same one asked of the students ; they were to indicate how much they thought literature was important in FL learning.

Results and Discussion of the Surveys.

Student Questionnaire :

Of the 60 or so students who were there at the beginning of the workshop, 43 responded to the survey. The demographics are fairly straightforward. 16 were sophomores, 5 were juniors, and 22 were seniors. (The “seniors” may have included a couple of graduate students.) There were more than double the number of

females as males : 29 to 14. The length of Japanese study averaged 28.5 months, with the amount of time essentially directly related to the year in school, as one might expect.

The averages of the students ratings for the five Likert questions are seen in Table 1, ranked from highest to lowest, and with the question number on the left. A “higher” average here represents a lower level of agreement with the statement, which may lead to some confusion in this discussion. For example, Question 8 was a “negative” question asking about how difficult the students found the workshop, so having a high average is actually desirable. On the other hand, the lower numbers for Questions 4 and 7 indicate that the students agreed to a relatively great extent that the workshop was a good learning experience and that literature is important for FL learning, respectively—again, remember that the lower the number, the more they agree—and the responses relating to both in the open-ended comments in Question 10 were also often positive. We will see a discussion of the open-ended results below. Remember also that Question 5 could be construed as a mirror image to Question 8 because it asked whether the students thought they understood. Both averages are close to the medium.

Table 1 : Student Likert Results :

8 Difficulty	2.93	Less Agreement  More Agreement
5 Understanding	2.9	
6 Interesting	2.70	
4 Learning	1.81	
7 Importance of Literature	1.76	

The fact that the students felt that the workshop was a good learning experience and, perhaps more importantly, that they gave their most favorable response regarding the importance of literature in foreign language learning should be

heartening to the organizers and presenters. As stated at the outset, both were important goals of this undertaking.

The responses to Question 9 of the student survey are translated into English and organized in Appendix 4. Most of them have been abbreviated in order to save space. Recall that the responses to were handwritten and then the forms were scanned and sent as e-mail attachments. Because both the students and the author are non-native speakers of Japanese and, in fact, speak very different languages to boot, the transcriptions were checked by two native speakers of Japanese for accuracy. The abbreviated English translations (and mistakes therein) are the sole responsibility of the author, although they were made available to the presenters prior to the writing of this paper. The same holds for Question 10, minus the abbreviation. The unedited Japanese originals are also given in separate appendices for all the open-ended responses to allow the reader to compare them with the translations.

Back to Question 9. Remember that, although it resembles an open-ended question, it was in essence a multiple-choice question with negative choices. It asks what things the students found difficult about the Japanese used in the speeches, presentations, and question and answer sessions. Similar responses (owing to the examples given) are tabulated in Table 2, ranked from having the most to the least number of occurrences for each item. The dual answer for “Accent/Dialect” stems from the ambiguity of a response.

Table 2: Student Responses to Question 9(Occurrences) :

Technical Terms	15
Too Fast	12
Accent / Dialect	4 (5)
Honorifics & Attitudinal	4

The presentations dealt with some very deep, complex subject matter and concepts, and many presenters indicated that they found it difficult to talk about them in a simpler, easier-to-understand language. As will be seen in the discussion of the second survey given to the presenters, most of them had little, to no experience in JFL instruction and / or presenting to non-native speakers of Japanese. This was reflected in other items, too. The presenters themselves noted that they had difficulty in adjusting to the level of the audience. Also, as one of the presenters pointed out, the students themselves had widely varying levels of Japanese learning experience and language ability.

Appendix 6 lists translations of the responses to Question 10 (with the original unedited Japanese version following in Appendix 7). The numbers indicate the number of the respondent based on the order found in the PDF file and should match up with the respondent numbers seen in Appendix 4. The blank lines indicate places where there were no responses.


One of the two examples given to help the students answer Question 10 was on the positive side and may have added a bit of bias to the answers, but, as only six of the students used that particular phrase in their response, it was probably not a major factor.

First Presenter Questionnaire :

All 16 of the presenters were kind enough to respond to the first survey, and Table 3 shows the averages of the ratings for the five Likert-type questions. The order of the first three items is interesting in that the presenters felt that the students' comprehension of their own presentations was greater (again, a lower number implies more agreement) than that of the general comprehension level, and the degrees to which they felt both of these were true were greater than that which they had expected prior to the workshop. The highly positive rating for the importance

of literature in foreign language teaching was not surprising, considering that these were literature people. However, the fact that the students had also come away with a positive judgement toward the importance of literature—at 1.76, their rating was even better than that of the presenters’ 1.88—was icing on the cake. One of the presenters had commented in their response to Question II of the First Presenter Questionnaire (Appendix 8) that they themselves had not needed knowledge of Chinese literature in order to carry on everyday conversations when they were first learning Chinese. However, they then go on to say that a knowledge of literature is necessary when a person wants to reach a certain level in the language, not just the ability to carry on a conversation.

Table 3 : Presenter Likert Results :

1 Expected Comprehension	3.47	Less Agreement  More Agreement
3 Overall Perceived Comprehension	3.0	
2 Perceived Comprehension (own presentation)	2.6	
5 Importance of Literature	1.88	
4 Participation	1.53	

The presenters gave a rating of 1.53 for student participation—the best of the ratings for all of the items—which suggests that they were quite happy with the participation. Although some of the presentations resembled short lectures, in general, the presenters seemed to feel that the students did a good job, especially in the follow-up Q & A portion, where they had a chance to participate. It must be pointed out that not every presenter conducted their talk in the same way; there were those who did not follow a lecture format and would address questions to the students at various times during their talks and who would “talk to” rather than “talk at” them.

As mentioned earlier, there was a communication problem with Question II in the first presenter survey, and only five of the presenters responded to it. The

responses, therefore, are inconclusive, but they are given in Appendix 8 just in case the reader might find them interesting. We will not, however, discuss them any further here other than to say that they are generally positive about the value of literature.

The presenters gave detailed responses to the open-ended Question III of the first survey, and, unfortunately, there is not enough time and too much material in Appendix 10 to discuss in any great detail here. Briefly, however, the comments are generally favorable, and they underscore the positive attitude shown in the responses to the Likert items about participation and literature. Some presenters recognized they might have done more to adjust their presentations to the audience, but, in general, they were encouraged by the outcome and response from the students, and many indicated their interest in continuing such endeavors.

Second Presenter Questionnaire :

Due to time factors, only eight of the 16 presenters were able to respond to the second questionnaire (although more may follow). The same time constraints do not allow a similar translation and analysis of the results for this paper, and so we will have just a brief look at some of the responses.

Of the eight presenters, only two had had experience teaching Japanese as a foreign language, and that was for only six months each for both of them. As far as having given presentations overseas, one of the respondents had done so twice prior to the workshop. Therefore, based on these preliminary results and unless these eight (half of the total) were all outliers, it is quite obvious that this type of workshop was a new experience for most of presenters.

Again, there is no time to carry out a detailed translation of the comments in the third question, but, as there was a lot of overlap, we can give a brief description of them here which should give some general indication of how the presenters felt.

Remember, this was the question which asked the presenters to comment on the students' responses once they had seen them.

Most of the respondents noted the fact that many of the students had indicated that they had trouble understanding, but many took heart in the fact that there were students who had written that they now had an interest in Japanese literature. This led them to take a positive attitude and to consider the workshop a success.

Conclusion.

Throughout this article, I have attempted to refrain from using the first person singular in keeping with practices often found in academic papers, but I will dispense with that in this final section.

The organizers of the workshop asked me to participate and give the opening speech, not because of my area of research, which is quite afield from literature, but mainly due to my experience in teaching intercultural communication and my awareness of the importance of culture in foreign language learning. They also asked me to act as an "outside" observer, a role which has provided the data for this paper.

From my observations and from the comments and ratings given by both the participants and presenters, I have to consider this workshop to be a success, and I feel a person would be hard put to argue in any other way. The presenters were able to overcome language barriers and communicate their enthusiasm for the subject and, based on the student comments, instill in the students some of that enthusiasm. Additionally, the language barriers themselves had a beneficial effect; they gave students more incentive to learn the language in order to better understand in the future. I look forward to the organizers continuing in the endeavor they have begun here.

Acknowledgments.

First of all, I would like to thank Dean Yushen Zhu, all the faculty and staff, and the students in the Japanese Language Department of Foreign Languages at the Harbin Institute of Technology for hosting and attending the workshop, and for all the kindness and consideration they showed us while we were there. Because of them, it was an illuminating and rewarding experience. I also appreciate the help from the faculty in conducting the student questionnaire and from the students in completing them.

I would also like to express my gratitude to all of the participants from Japan for the kindness they showed me while we were there and to thank them for taking the time to provide all the wonderful and insightful feedback in their responses to the questionnaires.

Not being part of the original project required me to secure funding from a different source in order to take part, and I am very grateful to the Faculty of Education at Ehime University and Dean Kazunao Miura of that faculty for providing funds to help allay the costs involved in allowing me to participate in the workshop.

Finally, I especially need to thank Professor Noriko Konoye of Komazawa University, first for inviting me to take part in the workshop, and then later on in all the assistance she and Professor Yasunori Fukuda gave me in conducting the questionnaires and in writing this paper.

References

- Bogdan, David R. & William J. Sullivan. 2009. Tense and aspect in Polish narrative: a discourse and cognitive approach. Lincom: Munich
- Herling-Grudziński, Gustaw. 1991. *Zapiski Sowieckie* (Soviet notes). Part One: Witebk-

- Leningrad-Wologda, 11-33. Kraków : Wydawnictwo Anczyna.
- Khatib Mohammad & Amir Hossein Rahimi. 2012. "Literature and language teaching". In *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies Vol. 2 (6)*, June 2012, 32-38. <http://www.academians.org/Articles/June 4.pdf>. [Accessed September 2012.]
- McKay, Sandra. 1982. "Literature in the ESL classroom". *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 4. 529-536.
- Paesani, Kate. 2005. "Literary texts and grammar instruction : revisiting the inductive presentation". *Foreign Language Annals* 38. 1, 15-24.
- Premawardhena, Neelakshi Chandrasena 2007. "Integrating literature into foreign kanguage teaching : a Sri Lankan perspective". *Online Journal Novitas-ROYAL*, Vol. : 1(2), 92-97. <http://www.novitasroyal.org/Neelakshe.pdf>. [Accessed September 2012.]
- Sell, Jonathan P. A. 2005. "Why teach literature in the foreign language classroom ?" *Encuentro* 15. Alcalá de Henares, Spain : University of Alcalá. http://www.encuentrojournl.org/textos/11_Sell.pdf. [Accessed September 2012.]
- Stachura, Edward. 1962. *Jasny pobyt nadrzeczny (A bright riverbank sojourn)*. In *Polska nowela współczesna*, vol. 2, 351-371. Kraków : Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Sullivan, William J., and David R. Bogdan. 2002. "Tense, aspect, and the organization of Polish narrative". *WORD* 52. 357-58.

Appendix 1: Workshop Announcement

科学研究費助成事業（学術研究助成基金助成金（基盤研究（C）））

研究課題名「日本近世期における中国白話受容の研究－『陰騭録』を中心に－」（課題番号 23520243）

日本文学の中の外国文学， 外国文学としての日本文学

期日 2012年8月27日～28日 10:00～17:00

場所 ハルビン工業大学

○ 1 日目

挨拶 祝 玉深（ハルビン工業大学）
近衛典子（駒澤大学）

第一部 公開シンポジウム（10:10～12:10）

オープニング・スピーチ

David R. BOGDAN（愛媛大学）

シンポジウム

「陰騭文享受の一樣相－高崎庚申寺刊『庚申祭式』を読む－」

福田 安典（日本女子大学）

「大江文坡の教訓思想と文芸」

田中 則雄（島根大学）

「『雨月物語』と善書」

近衛 典子（駒澤大学）

「『陰騭録』とその周辺」

川上 陽介（富山県立大学）

司 会

木越 治（上智大学）

コメンテーター

入口 敦志（国文学研究資料館）

第二部 研究発表・交流会（13:00～17:00）

A会場 「狭衣物語における漢籍の受容」

一文字 昭子（日本女子大学(非)）

コメンテーター

胡 秀敏（昭和女子大学）

「日中韓勸誡図刊行考」

入口 敦志（国文学研究資料館）

「東アジアの善書と江戸初期文学」

花田 富二夫（ノースアジア大学）

コメンテーター

近衛 典子（駒澤大学）

「近世小説における二人称表現－読本表現史のために－」

丸井 貴史（上智大学(院)）

「都賀大陸の『絵本三国志』について」

木越 秀子（金沢大学(院)）

コメンテーター

田中 則雄（島根大学）

B会場 「近世作品に見られる白話受容のあり方について」

中村 綾（愛知学院大学）

「絵入根本の造本－発生から定着まで」

木越 俊介（山口県立大学）

コメンテーター

閻 小妹（信州大学）

「日中文学作品における人物造型」

申 英蘭（京都産業大学(非)）

コメンテーター

今川 英子（北九州市立文学館）

「閨怨詩の物語的変奏」

胡 秀敏（昭和女子大学）

コメンテーター

一文字 昭子（日本女子大学(非)）

「『平家物語』の魅力」

林 嵐（東北師範大学外国語学院）

「宮沢賢治の近代批評」

周 異夫（吉林大学外国語学院）

コメンテーター

福田 安典（日本女子大学）

○ 2 日目 交流会

ハルビン市内 文学踏査

Appendix 2 : Student Questionnaire (Translated)

Please complete the questionnaire regarding the 8/27 workshop.

A. Please fill in your year in school, gender, and length of Japanese language study.

1. Year in school ()
2. Sex (M F)
3. Length of Japanese study () years () months

B. Please choose the applicable number for the following.

- (1=agree, 2=agree somewhat, 3=can't really say one way or the other,
4=disagree somewhat, 5=disagree)

Example :

(*Before*) I think Harbin Institute of Technology is a great school : ()

(*Completed*) I think Harbin Institute of Technology is a great school : (1)

Regarding the workshop :

4. I learned something : ()
5. The content was easy to understand : ()
6. In general, it was interesting : ()
7. Japanese literature is important in learning Japanese : ()
8. It was difficult and I didn't really understand : ()

C. Please answer the following two questions.

9. What Japanese was difficult? (Please answer in Japanese)

(Examples : I didn't understand the technical terminology / I couldn't understand because I was not used to the dialect / accent. / I couldn't understand because it was too fast. / etc.)

10. Any comments. (Examples : I'm glad I took part in the workshop / future plans (dreams) / etc.)

Thank you for your cooperation.

Workshop Coordinator : Noriko Konoye, Professor : Komazawa University

Appendix 3 : Presenter Questionnaires (Translated)

First Questionnaire :

Please complete the following.

I . Regarding the workshop

Please choose the applicable number for the following.

(1=agree, 2=agree somewhat, 3=can't really say one way or the other,
4=disagree somewhat, 5=disagree)

Regarding the workshop :

- 1 . Prior to the workshop, I felt the students would be able to understand the content . :
()
- 2 . For my session, I felt the students understood : ()
- 3 . In general, I felt the students understood : ()
- 4 . The students took an active part : ()
- 5 . Japanese literature is important in Japanese language learning : ()

II . Why did you answer the way you did in (5) ?

[*Intended : There was a problem with the wording on this one. Please see the discussion.*]

III . Any comments :

Second Questionnaire :

- 1 . How much JFL teaching experience have you had (in months) ?
- 2 . How many times had you presented overseas prior to the workshop ?
- 3 . Please comment on the results of the student questionnaire :

Appendix 4 : Student Responses to Question 9 (Translated and Abbreviated)

- 1 . Japanese vocabulary items hard to learn and easy to forget.
- 2 . Technical terms.
- 3 . Technical terms / Too fast.
- 4 . Honorifics & Attitudinal Language
- 5 . ——
- 6 . Technical terms.
- 7 . Technical terms.
- 8 . Accent / Dialect.
- 9 . Accent / Dialect.
10. ——
11. Technical terms. Accent / Dialect / Too fast.
12. Honorifics & Attitudinal Language
13. Technical terms.
14. Technical terms.
15. Youth expressions / Honorifics & Attitudinal Language
16. Honorifics & Attitudinal Language
17. ——
18. Not acquainted with technical terms relating to classical literature.
19. ——
20. Technical terms.
21. Japanese culture, literature, and politics hard to understand. / Honorifics & Attitudinal Language
22. Japanese Language in General Honorifics & Attitudinal Language / I'd hear words that I had heard before, but I didn't understand them right away. After some time, I finally recalled what they meant.
23. I was not familiar with the content and didn't understand
24. Couldn't comprehend.
25. Accent / Dialect. Too fast.
26. Technical terms, hard to understand.
27. Comprehension and conversation difficult
28. Technical terms. Too fast.
29. Pronunciation, comprehension
30. Technical terms. Too fast.

31. Too fast.
32. Technical terms. Too fast / Difficult (deep) content, hard to understand.
33. Hard to understand vocabulary from classical literature.
34. Technical terms, hard but good pronunciation.
35. Too fast.
36. Technical terms. Too fast. There was so much vocabulary that I couldn't understand / Way of speaking hard for me to understand.
37. Comprehension.
38. Foreign terms.
39. Technical terms / Proper names.
40. Too fast.
41. Too fast.
42. Honorifics & Attitudinal Language
43. Too fast / Japanese Grammar.

Appendix 5: Student Responses to Question 9 (Unedited Original)

(原文そのまま)

1. 日本語の単語が覚えにくいですが、忘れやすいです。
2. 専門用語がわからなかった。
3. 専門用語がわからなかった。／早すぎて聞き取れなかった。
4. 敬語
5. ——
6. 専門用語がわからなかった。
7. 専門用語がわからなかった。
8. 聞き慣れない方言があって、聞き取れなかった。
9. 聞き慣れない方言があって、聞き取れなかった。
10. ——
11. 専門用語がわからなかった。聞き慣れない方言があって、聞き取れなかった。早すぎて聞き取れなかった。
12. 尊敬語と謙譲語の使い方よくわかってない。
13. 専門用語
14. 専門用語がわからなかった。
15. 若者言葉が難しいと思う。／敬語も難しいと思う。
16. 日本語の尊敬語が難しく、理解できません。
17. ——
18. 日本文学に関連した専門知識にあまり詳しくないので、なかなか聞き取れなかった。
19. ——
20. 専門用語がわからなかった。
21. 日本文化・文学・政治など理解することが難しかった。／敬語が難しかった。
22. 日本語の言葉や敬語が難しいです。／いつもある言葉を聞いて、すぐ分かることができません。長い時間を過ごして、その言葉をやっと思い出します。
23. 内容があまり知らなくて、理解できなかった。
24. 聞き取れなかった。
25. 聞き慣れない方言があって、ちょっと早すぎて聞き取れなかった。
26. 専門用語がたくさんあって、分かりにくかったです。
27. 聞き取りと会話が難しいです。
28. 専門用語がわからなかった。早すぎて聞き取れなかった。
29. 発音、聞き取り

30. 専門用語がわからなかった。早すぎて聞き取れなかった。
31. 早すぎて聞き取れなかった。
32. 日本語の専門用語と発音のスピードが難しかった。／内容が深かったので、わかりにくかった。
33. 古典文学の中の単語がわからなかったから、理解しにくかった。
34. 専門用語がわからなかったです。でも先生の発音がきれいと思います。
35. 早すぎて聞き取れなかった。
36. 専門用語がわからなかった。そして、早すぎて聞き取れなかった。単語の積み重ねはあまり多くなかったので、言い方の話はよく理解できなかった。
37. 聞き取れなかった。
38. 外来語がわからなかった。
39. 専門用語がわからなかった。／人の名前と場所の名が多すぎてわからなかった。
40. 早すぎて聞き取れなかった。
41. 早すぎて聞き取れなかった。
42. 敬語を使うことが難しいと思う。謙譲語もそうです。
43. 日本語は聞き取りが早すぎて一番難しいです。／日本語の文法は難しいです。

Appendix 6 : Student Responses to Question 10 (Translated)

1. ——
2. ——
3. ——
4. I learned about various things. I've become more interested in Japanese culture.
5. I want to fulfill my future dream.
6. Because of the workshop, I am becoming more interested in Japanese culture.
7. I am interested in literature. In the future, I want to become a teacher who does research in literature.
8. ——
9. ——
10. ——
11. NA
12. ——
13. I learned a lot.
14. Through Japanese language, I want to be involved in helping promote cooperation between the countries.
15. In the future, I think I would like to do work using or related to Japanese language.
16. I'm majoring in Japanese, but I have no idea what kind of work I will be able to do. When I am a senior, I will have to figure out whether to continue my studies or look for work.
17. ——
18. I would like to take an active role in some industry with a Sino-Japanese connection, or in events concerning cultural exchange.
19. ——
20. ——
21. I'm glad I took part in the workshop, but in the future, I'd like something a bit more related to our daily lives. I want to enter grad school. I'll do my best !
22. It was good attending the workshop and hearing Japanese presenters talk.
23. I would like to learn about Japanese literature and history.
24. ——
25. I want to learn about Japanese history and classical literature.
26. I'm glad I took part in the workshop. There were many things I didn't understand, but I did learn a lot about Japanese culture.

27. I learned a lot. I'd like to set up a school. And protect children.
28. My dream is to become good at Japanese.
29. Working in an international accounting firm.
30. I'm glad I took part in the workshop. But I'm bad at Japanese. I don't study. Now I will study hard.
31. I want to become good at Japanese in the future.
32. The workshop was a good experience. It was interesting. I want to go to Japan in the future. I'm going to be studying harder.
33. I'm bad at Japanese and want to become much better. My dream is to be able to give a speech in Japanese someday.
34. I'm glad I attended the workshop. I realized how bad I am at Japanese. I'm going to be studying harder from now on.
35. I learned a lot. In the future, I'd like to find work related to Japanese.
36. For me the workshop was difficult and not so interesting. However, I'd like to have a better knowledge of Japanese literature and I'm going to be studying as hard as I can.
37. This workshop was a lot of fun and I'm glad I took part in it. My dream is to become good at Japanese. Also, I need to study Japanese literature.
38. My future goal is to work at a job which promotes a better relationship between China and Japan.
39. This was my first time to attend such a workshop. It was good experience. I want to get better at Japanese and take part in similar activities.
40. I'm glad I took part in the workshop.
41. I'm glad I took part in the workshop.
42. It's better to live the simple life, having a woman, children, friends, family. That's good, right?
43. My dream is to go to Japan.

Appendix 7 : Student Responses to Question 10 (Unedited Original)

(原文そのまま)

1. ——
2. ——
3. ——
4. いろいろな勉強になりました。日本文化にますます興味を持つようになりました。
5. 将来自己の夢を叶えたいよ。
6. ワークショップに参加することを通して、日本文化について、だんだん興味を持ってきます。
7. 文学に興味を持っています。将来文学について研究したい。先生になりたいんです。
8. ——
9. ——
10. ——
11. なし
12. ——
13. とても勉強になった。
14. 日本語を利用して、国と国との交流に自分の力を与えたい。
15. 将来、日本語に関する仕事をしたいと思う。
16. 専攻は日本語で、将来どんな仕事ができるか、今、全然分からない。4年生になって、就職するか、進学するか、大きい問題だ。
17. ——
18. 中日関係の企業や文化交流イベントで活躍したいと思う。
19. ——
20. ——
21. ワークショップに参加してよかったと思いますが、今後もっと私たち生活に近い話題を講座開いてくれてほしいです。将来は大学院生になりたいです。頑張ります。
22. ワークショップに参加して、日本人の発表を聞いて、よかったと思います。
23. 日本文学も歴史も知りたいです。
24. ——
25. もっと日本の歴史と古典文学の知識が知りたい。
26. ワークショップに参加してよかったと思っています。たくさん内容が分かりにくかったです、日本語の文化にはいい勉強になりました。
27. いい勉強になりました。学校を立てることは夢です。子供を守る。

28. 私の将来の夢は日本語の上手になると思います。
29. 国際的な会計士の事務所で働きます。
30. ワークショップに参加したことがいいです。でも、私は日本語が下手です。よく理解できないです。勉強しないです。今、一生懸命勉強しましょう。
31. 将来の夢は日本語上手になります。
32. ワークショップがいい経験でした。面白かったです。将来も日本へ来たいです。今から日本語の勉強をもっとがんばることにします。
33. 日本語がまだ下手で、ずいぶん上手になりたいです。いつか、日本語でスピーチをすることができるのが私の夢です。
34. ワークショップに参加してよかったと思っています。私が日本語の能力はとっっても下手と分かりました。今から、もっと頑張ろうと思います。
35. いい勉強になりました。将来は日本語について仕事をしたいです。
36. このワークショップはわたしにとっても難しく興味は深くなかった。でも、日本文学の知識はよく理解したいと思って、今から絶対に一生懸命勉強していきます。
37. 今度、ワークショップに参加してよかったこと、とても楽しいです。私の夢は日本語が上手になることです。それから、日本文学を勉強するのは必要です。
38. 将来の夢は、日本と中国の関係がよくなることのできる仕事したいです。
39. このようなワークショップに参加しているのに初めてでした。いい経験になりました。日本語をもっと上手になると、ぜひこのような活動に参加してほしいです。
40. ワークショップに参加してよかった。
41. ワークショップに参加してよかった。
42. 簡単に生活したの方が一番いいです。いい仕事があるし、彼の女もいるし、子供とか、友人とか、家族のみんな全部います。それはいいね。
43. 私の夢は日本に行かれることです。

**Appendix 8 : Presenters' Responses to Question II
in the First Presenter Questionnaire (Translated)**

- 1 . With respect to the Japanese language, it depends on what kind of Japanese you're talking about, I think. I studied Chinese, but I didn't need a knowledge of Chinese literature in order in order to learn how to carry on basic everyday conversations in Chinese. For example, having read something like Lu Xun would not bring about a rise in one's communicative ability in Chinese. On the other hand, if you want to go beyond a certain level in Chinese, knowing the literature is, of course, necessary. Language and values are closely connected, and the connection is clearly represented in literature. I believe the same goes for learning Japanese ; the question is what level or quality of Japanese you want to learn.
- 2 . I answered (4) rather than a (5). I didn't realize that so many students would attend and that it was going to be a research presentation for mainly students, so I regret that my own talk was very much a presentation of a specialized nature.
- 9 . Because in literature the way people think of things is expressed in a straightforward manner, having a knowledge of the literature in a language makes it easier to understand not just what something means on the surface, but also why it was said that way. I think you can also obtain a deeper understanding because quotations and literary works have a great influence on the way things are said. Accordingly, because the Chinese students have such a good command of Japanese, I feel that learning about literature would be of great assistance to them.
10. I answered with a (4), but it was essentially the same as a (5). Even though some of the material had some connection to China, it was very technical material, and I feel that, even in Japan, third- and fourth-year undergraduate students would have a difficult time understanding it. I had the sense before going that it might be quite difficult for the Chinese students studying Japanese.
16. I think it was because there were respondents who felt that you didn't really need a knowledge of Japanese literature in order to be able to carry on a conversation in Japanese.

Appendix 9: Presenters' Responses to Question II
in the First Presenter Questionnaire (Unedited Original)
(原文そのまま)

1. 「日本語」と一口に言っても、それがどのような種類の日本語であるかによって変わってくると思います。私は中国語を学びましたが、中国文学の知識がなくても、日常的な会話なら何とかこなせるようになります。逆に、鲁迅を読んだからといってコミュニケーションのための中国語能力が高まるわけではありません。ただ、その段階を超えたレベルの中国語を理解しようとすれば、中国文学の知識は当然必要になると思います。言葉と価値観は密接な関係にあり、文学においてはそれがよく表れているからです。日本語の場合もそれと同じで、どういうレベル（質）の日本語を学ぼうとするかが問題なのだと思います。
2. 質問1, 2は, (5)ではありませんが, (4)と回答しました。
発表の場にあんなに学生さんが参加して下さり、学生主体の研究発表の場であるとは思わなかったため、自分でも専門的な発表をしてしまったと思います。
9. 文学にはものの考え方が端的に表れるので、その言語による文学の知識があると、言葉の表面的な意味だけでなく、どうして、そのように表現したかまで理解しやすいため。また言い回しにも引用や、文学作品からの影響のあるものが多いので、より理解が深まると思われるため。中国の学生さんの語学レベルが相当に高いので、より深く日本語を理解するには、やはり文学を知ることが一番と思うため。
10. 4ですが、まあ5に准ずるとして回答しておきます。
内容がいくら中国に関しているといっても、かなり専門的なので、日本でも、学部三、四年生以上でないと理解できないのではないかと感じていました。
まして、中国の日本語科の学生では、かなりきついだらうというのが、行くまでの予想でした。
16. 日本文学の知識がなくても言語（日本語）自体は会話をはじめ充分理解できると思われるから。

**Appendix 10 : Presenters' Responses to Question III
in the First Presenter Questionnaire (Translated)**

- 1 . Whether they understood or not varied with each student, but I feel that the presenters and commentators made every effort to present and comment on the material in an easy-to-understand way, and, therefore, I feel that the content was probably understood relatively well. The students may have had some difficulty in expressing themselves or asking questions and the like, but there were students who were able to express their opinions following the presentations and get some stimulus from the workshop. I was very pleased with the response, especially considering that many of them were not majoring in Japanese literature. However, I do have a bit of a concern that my own presentation was not as clear as it could've been and may have confused some of the students.
- 2 . I believe that there are different motives for studying Japanese. When I was studying Chinese, it was Chinese literature that influenced me and helped pique my interest in Japanese literature. Therefore, I do believe that a knowledge of literature plays an important role in foreign language learning.

Witnessing the enthusiasm with which the students listened to the presentations at this workshop, I feel that having more functions like this will cause more students to develop an interest in literature, which provides a background for the Japanese language.

- 3 . Because there was such a difference in the level of the students (for example, some of the students had started studying Japanese when they were in junior high and they were in the same class as students who were just starting), there is naturally going to be a difference in the level of comprehension.
- 4 . It really bothered me that some of the students were talking with each other during the presentations in the afternoon session. However, as a whole, I felt the sincerity that most of the students had in wanting to learn Japanese. I would really like to encourage those students who have such a desire to learn.

In addition, I feel that we presenters should make more of an effort to be able to present our specialized knowledge in a way that is interesting and easily understood by as many people as possible.

- 5 . I felt that the workshop was beneficial and that we should continue with such activities.
- 6 . Having contact with undergraduate students is important, but I feel that we also need to have contact with graduate students and teachers of Japanese literature.
- 7 . As a whole, I thought the students understood fairly well, especially since they were able to ask relevant questions which showed that they must've had some understanding. Everyone ready made an effort to talk and explain things in a simple manner, but I did feel there were some parts that were not understood. I feel that this was not a question of a lack of comprehension, but rather was due to a lack of the specialized knowledge in that field. Therefore, I feel it is important to look at what is meant by "understanding" and "not

understanding”.

8. Undergraduate students studying Japanese tend to concentrate on practical Japanese which is useful for everyday life. I was concerned whether it was understood that these presentations were going to concern Japanese literature, with all its different periods and genres, rather than Japanese language study. However, I was able to observe the students listening seriously, asking probing questions, and making every effort they could to understand. Their questions following the presentations were also relevant and to the point.

If presenters make an effort to use Japanese which can be easily understood (avoiding double negation, cutting down on the honorific language, etc.), speak slowly, repeat important technical points, etc., the students are capable of understanding presentations even on highly specialized topics.

9. I know there were a lot of factors involved, but I think it would've been nice if not just the Chinese faculty members, but also the students could have attended the welcoming party / ceremony. I found everyone there to be extremely helpful, especially for someone like me who was attending their first research conference overseas. I was very surprised and pleased because the students there had a much better command of Japanese than I thought they would. The students were excellent, but I also realized there's a lot to be considered in a language learning situation. While the content of the presentation may have been difficult, I still feel that it was very useful in conveying information about Japan.
10. I recognize the enthusiasm that they showed by even wanting to listen to such technical presentations. I am fully convinced of the importance of our talking about China, and China and Japan in front of the students.
11. It was very impressive observing the students trying so hard to understand.
12. I'd like to think that being able to listen to presentations by Japanese leading researchers greatly stimulated the intellectual curiosity of the students majoring in Japanese language and Japanese literature, but, on the other hand, there is the concern about how much they actually understood. However, whether they understood or not, I feel that is enough that it somehow piqued their interest and got them started thinking.

As for myself, I found the presentations by the other researchers to be quite stimulating and I wanted to say thank you for such a great experience.

13. As was noted in the opening session, because these were not meant to be lectures, but rather presentations of academic research, it's only natural that the content would be quite difficult. If, however, the students understood even a little bit, or realized that, if they only study some more, they will be able to understand, then I feel this was a very meaningful event. Keeping in mind the “research” nature of the event, I believe this was a successful experiment. I believe that the enthusiastic attendance by the Chinese students shows that what we accomplished what we intended.
14. The presenters were conscious of trying to make things easier to understand without watering

down their presentations, but there is a concern of whether the background of literary works and research into them was understood by the attendees. However, I feel that, even with Japanese students, even if they don't understand all the content, they can understand that research is interesting. I feel that research conferences overseas are quite important.

15. I was surprised by the fact that attendance was greater than I expected. There was also the feeling that the students were quite enthusiastic about learning Japanese because of how seriously they listened to the presentations. They also responded quite positively during lunch and the break when they were addressed by one of us. One really felt they wanted to learn Japanese. Because these were to be "research presentations", I wasn't quite as conscious as I should've been of the fact that it was going to be students listening.

In my case, I prepared my presentation thinking that the listeners would have some knowledge of the original story behind the "Three Kingdoms", but I was not so sure with the attendees during my presentation. I realize now that it might've been better had I used the projector and AV material more, talked slower, and maybe reduced the amount of material I wanted to cover.

The students may have expected more language than literature from us. I think that, because the presentations this time were so much about literature, and especially early modern (Edo Period) literature, they may not have been exactly what they expected.

When I think back to my own foreign language learning experience, literary works could be enjoyable, but, because you had to translate in your head before talking, giving presentations on them was not so useful in everyday conversation.

However, judging from the fact that there were students were asking questions, I feel that this experience was useful in promoting an interest in Japanese literature among the students.

16. To be honest, before leaving Japan, I was quite concerned about whether the Chinese students would be able to understand, but I was determined to focus on the main points and speak in as plain of a language as possible. In addition, I planned on using a lot of pictures and images. I figured that if I was able to get the meaning through, they would understand to some extent. Of course, not everything would be understood, but don't a lot of ideas get passed between, for example, Korea and Japan ?

Due to time constraints, the afternoon presentations were were split into two groups, but it probably would've been better for everyone to have been able to attend all of them in one place. I feel it would've been nice to have been able to listen to some of the presentations I wasn't able to. From all my heart, I would like to say thank you for all the consideration shown to us by the Chinese hosts and students. I would like to do my part in helping so that such friendly cooperation can continue. HIT was even bigger and more Impressive than I had imagined. We are very grateful.

Appendix 11 : Presenters' Responses to Question III
in the First Presenter Questionnaire (Unedited Original)

(原文そのまま)

1. 学生の理解度は人それぞれですが、発表者・コメンテーターともに、彼らができるだけ理解できるようにと工夫して発言されていまして、おおよその内容については比較的よく理解してもらえたのではないかと感じています。学生たちと活発な議論や意見の交換をすることは叶いませんでしたが、発表の後、意見を述べてくれる学生も数名おり、彼らに何らかの刺激を与えることはできたのではないのでしょうか。日本文学を専攻している学生ばかりではなかったのですが、彼らからあのような反応があったことは大変嬉しいことでした。ただ、自分の発表があまりまとまっておらず、学生に混乱を与えたのではないかと、その点に関しては反省しきりです。
2. 日本語を勉強する動機はいろいろあると思います。
 私自身は、中国語を勉強して、中国文学のこと、その影響を受けた日本の文学のことに興味を持つことができ、文学の知識も語学の習得にとっても役立っていますので、外国語の学習に文学の知識は大事だと考えています。
 今回のワークショップは学生さんがとても熱心に聞いてくれましたので、このような催しが多く開かれ、日本語の背景にある文学のことに興味を持つ学生が増えたらいいと思います。
3. 学生によって、レベルの差が大きい（中学から日本語を勉強した学生と大学に入ってから日本語の勉強を始めた学生が同じクラスに在籍しているので、そもそも基礎が違う）ので、理解にもその差が出てくるのではないかと、思います。
4. 午後、一部の学生が私語をしているのが、非常に気になりました。
 しかし、全体としては、日本語を学びたいという学生たちの真剣な思いを感じることができました。学生たちの学習意欲に心から声援を送りたいと思います。
 また、私たちも、いかに専門的な話であっても、誰にでも分かるように説明し、研究の面白さや意義深さを多くの人に理解してもらえるよう、さらにいっそう努力する必要があるように思いました。
5. 有意義であったと思う。今後もこのような発信をするべきだと思う。
6. 学部生との交流が重要ですが、院生や日本文学を教える教員との交流も必要だと感じています。
7. 全体として、学生にもよく分かっていたように思います。それは、学生からの質問内容が的外れではなかったことから分かったと思います。皆さんかなりかみくだいてお話しされていたようです。ただ、部分的には分からないところもあったと思います。そ

れは、理解できないというよりは、内容についての知識がないためではないかと思えます。そういう意味では、分からないと言うことがわかることも大事だろうと思います。

8. 学部生であれば、学んでいる日本語は実用的なものであろう。今回のようにさまざまな時代・ジャンルの、「国語学」ではなく「文学」の発表が理解されるか、心配であった。しかし、学生たちは真剣に聞き入り、促すと質問も出て、懸命に理解しようと努力していることが伺えた。質問も、発表に即した、的外れでないものであった。発表する側で、より理解しやすい日本語を用い（二重否定は使わない、敬語は省略、など）、ゆっくり話す、重要な専門用語については繰り返す、などの工夫をすれば、高度に専門的な内容であっても、十分に理解されるのではないかと思う。
9. いろいろと事情はあると思いますが、歓迎会に先生方だけではなく、学生も参加できると、よかったのではないかと思います。私にとっては、初めての海外での研究集会でしたので、相手の方々以上に有益でした。向こうの学生さんの日本語は私が想像していた以上に上手で驚きました。優秀な学生さんであるとは思いますが、語学習得の工夫がなにかあるのかと思います。こちらの内容はかなり難しかったとは思いますが、それはそれで日本の様子を伝えるのに、意義があるとは思いますが。
10. 専門的な内容でも、聴くつもりのある人には、その熱意だけでも伝わるものだなとちょっと認識を新たにしました。我々が、中国のこと、日本と中国のことについて、真剣に討議しているというのを学生の前でやるというのは、大切なことなのだとつくづく思いました。
11. 一所懸命理解しようとする学生たちの真剣な眼差しがとても印象的でした。
12. 日本語や日本文学を学ぶ学生にとって、日本人の研究者による最先端レベルの発表を聴けたことは、彼らの知的好奇心を大いに刺激したと思いたいが、一方で、実際はどのくらい理解できていたのかしらと危ぶむ思いもある。しかし、理解できてもできなくても、何か彼らのアンテナにひっかかっていたら、それで十分ではないかと考えている。
私自身が、先生方のご発表に大いに刺激を受けたことを申し添えます。とても貴重な体験をありがとうございました。
13. 普通の講義（授業）ではなく、研究発表というところに今回の意義があったのですから、開始の言葉のなかでも述べていただいた通り、難しい部分があって当然だったと思います。
その中で、少しでもわかる、あるいは今後さらに勉強を続ければわかるように思える、という部分があったなら、大変有意義だったということになると思います。
「研究」という点を外さないという点に、今回の試みの意義があったと思っています。

中国の学生さんたちの熱心な聴講は、我々の意図が伝わったことの証しであろうと肯定的に理解しています。

14. 研究のレベルを落とさずに、説明を分かりやすくという点に配慮した。
 ただ、日本文学の作品や研究の背景がどこまで伝わったかがやや心もとなかった。しかし、日本人の学生の場合も、発表の内容全てが分からなくても、研究というものの面白さは伝わると思うので、海外の方に、研究発表をするというのはとても意義のあることだと思う。
15. 学生の出席が予想より多く、驚きました。講義を聞く態度はかなり真面目で、生の日本語に熱心に耳を傾けているふうでした。
 お昼の休憩時間などのとき、こちらの話しかけに前向きに応えてくれました。このことから、日本語を学ぼうとする姿勢が感じられました。
 今回、“研究発表”ということで、学生さん向けだという理解をもっていませんでした。私の場合、原話の三国志演義に関して聞き手にある程度の知識があることを期待しての準備でしたが、そのあたり、学生さんにはどうだったか、心配です。
 プロジェクターを使ったりなど、視覚的資料の用意をすればよかったということ、もう少し内容を少なくしてもっとゆっくり話すべきだったということ、反省しています。学生は私たちに文学的なことより語学的事実を期待していたかもしれません。そういう意味では、今回の発表は日本文学、特に近世のものについてのものが多く、学生の期待とずれていたかもしれない、と感じました。
 自分の外国語学習をふり返るとき、作品を手がかりにしたのは楽しかったけれど、どうしても頭の中で翻訳してから話そうとするので（というほど話したことはありませんが）、会話にはあまり役立つ発表ではなかったかもしれません。
 ただ、質問してくれた学生の様子などから考えて、今回の交流で日本文学に興味をもってくれた学生がいたように感じました。
16. 渡中前は正直のところ中国の学生たちが理解できるか、不安であったが、こちらでもできるだけかみくだいて話そうと思い、ポイントだけに絞ることにした。さらに、画像を多く用いようと計画した。もし、こちらの言葉が通じているなら、ある程度は理解できたのではないと思う。もちろん、すべてというわけにはいかないが、朝鮮や日本にまたがって流布したことは分かったのではなかろうか。時間の関係で2会場に分かれたのであるが、できれば1会場で皆が参加できたほうが良かったのではないと思う。せっかくなので、他の方の発表も聞きたいと感じた。中国側の配慮が有難く、心から感謝したい。この友好を今後もなんらかの形で続けられることに努力していきたい。ハルビン大学は想像以上に大きく、素晴らしい大学であった。御世話になりました。