

A New Approach to an English Lecture with a Large Audience: From Peter F. Drucker's Points of View

Tomoyasu KIMURA
Takehiro SATO

I. Introduction

“Japanese are not good at expressing their opinions in public” is a common statement made about Japanese learners of English, especially when they go abroad to study. Many students of the Department of English and Contemporary Society, for example, expressed such an impression after they finished their 3-week summer programme in Ireland and were asked to write about their experiences there. This impression may also reflect the same one as Japanese learners of English in general may have when they go to a foreign country to study, but the writer of this paper is afraid the impression gives a wrong picture of Japanese students. They are just lacking in the number of experiences of exposing themselves to an English-using environment.

In order to help our students expose themselves to an English-using environment, the present writer and Dr. Takehiro Sato, his fellow coordinator, have been in charge of the Special Lecture Series B of the Contemporary International Studies (CIS Special Lecture B) for the past 4 years and had invited staff members of the embassies in Tokyo of 83¹ different countries of the world by January 15, 2018 to our university where each lecturer talked about his or her

own country in English, followed by the question and answer (Q&A) session which lasts for about half an hour. Before each lecture, a 2-page handout of a country² to be lectured on is delivered to all students as well as senior citizens of a nearby city³ who attend the lecture. In addition to the handout prepared by Sato, our students are all expected to study each country beforehand by themselves and send their English questions by email, which are slightly revised by Kimura and made into a list of student questions. This list with the name of each question-maker printed is delivered to all participants before each lecture, so they can listen to the lecture with this list at hand. After the lecture, all students are supposed to make a report either in English or in Japanese, and selected reports are revised and delivered as models to all participants in the following lecture.

Two years ago, back in 2016, financially supported by the university⁴ the writer of this paper belongs to, a new project started. Toward the end of one term of this lecture meeting, a questionnaire is given and one embassy is chosen for a visit. The first embassy chosen in this procedure was the one of Pakistan, the second, Bahrain, and the third, Myanmar. As the fourth embassy for the second term of 2017, the Republic of Moldova was selected, and one student and we paid a visit to its embassy. In this project, all participants are supposed to work together and prepare an English presentation. This presentation is made before a diplomat or diplomats, followed by several questions in English, and the participants should be ready to answer those questions in English as well.

Through this kind of lecture meeting, it is becoming clear that Japanese learners of English can learn to express their opinions in public and that an English lecture with a large audience can be made productive, but how is it made possible? What happens to each member of the audience? And how can each lecture be made more productive? In this paper, we would like to answer these questions by starting with Peter F. Drucker's points of view on teaching and learning, presenting our research questions, clarifying our research method, showing results with comments on them and concluding our research.

II. Peter F. Drucker's Points of View on Teaching and Learning

As a student of management at the university that the present writer entered for his first degree, he was given an opportunity to read *Danzetsu no Jidai* by Peter F. Drucker in Japanese, but since he became a professor of the Department of Kokusai Bijinesu (Department of Global Business from April 2018 on) here at Nagoya University of Foreign Studies (NUFS), he has used its original version, *The Age of Discontinuity*, by the same author, to teach management in English. The 15th chapter of this book is titled “THE NEW LEARNING AND THE NEW TEACHING” (Drucker 2011, pp.334–348). Although this book was originally written in 1968, the content of this chapter seems to be true even now. So, this writer will introduce Drucker's messages in terms of teaching and learning and comment on them.

(Message 1)

We have to make the teacher more productive, have to multiply his or her impact, have to increase greatly the harvest from his or her skill, knowledge, dedication, and effort. Otherwise we shall run out of teachers—even if we do not run out of money for education (Ibid., p.335, ll.10–14).

We tend to think the smaller, the better when it comes to a classroom teaching. When the writer of this paper and Sato were high school teachers⁵, for example, one class usually consisted of more than 40 students, but when they came to university, they found one class there much smaller, usually one of 15 students and sometimes one of 12 students. It is true that a teacher can take care of each student more closely in a small class, but it does not necessarily mean a teacher can teach his or her students better in a smaller class.

Even in a high school with larger classes, there are some teachers who can make their teaching productive. There was a teacher of world history, for instance, at the high school Kimura used to work for. In high school, English is one of the “most important subjects” required by almost all students who want to

go on to university, whether they choose an art or science subject as their major, and many students have to spend much time studying it. World history, however, is not so important as English, but as far as this world history teacher's class is concerned, all students who took his class wanted to spend as much time as possible preparing for his class. One of those students in Kimura's homeroom class even said she did not want to miss any single word in his lecture. To Kimura, the world history teacher seemed to be multiplying his impact on his students, who increased greatly the harvest from his skill, knowledge, dedication and effort each time he gave a lecture.

If a high school has many teachers like this world history teacher, no schools have to worry about running out of teachers, much less running out of money for education. Drucker, however, warns us with the following message that "no one has encountered many 'naturals' in his own school years." The "naturals" somehow know how to teach. The world history teacher may be one of those "naturals."

(Message 2)

Teaching is the only major occupation of man for which we have not yet developed tools that make an average person capable of competence and performance. In teaching we rely on the "naturals," the ones who somehow know how to teach. Nobody seems to know, however, what it is the "naturals" do that the rest of us do not do. No one knows what they do not do that the rest of us do. "Natural genius" is a very scarce resource. No one has encountered many "natural teachers" in his own school years. Indeed there are a great many people around who in twelve or sixteen years of school have not had the benefit of a single good teacher. The further along we go in school, the rarer are good teachers and the drearier, as a rule, is the learning experience (Ibid., p.338, ll.2-13).

The first sentence of this passage is a surprising comment on teaching to

the present writer, for he knows how highly advanced modern technology for education is. Knowing this book by Peter Drucker was originally written in the 1960s, some people may say Drucker should have looked at the present state of affairs in modern technology for education, but this writer still thinks Drucker is right in saying so. Even with highly advanced technology, there seem to be many “average persons” who are not yet made capable of competence and performance.

CIS Special Lecture B seems to be one of the most “challenging” classes at NUFS, but, as was often the case with an English class four years ago, almost all students who asked questions in English in the Q&A session were returnees or those students whose parents are from an English-speaking country and many others were too much overwhelmed by the existence of those students. The main purpose of this class is, however, to help “average students” become globally- minded, and what we mean by the “average students” are those who have studied English hard, but have yet to go abroad to study or learn to speak out in English. Those students may wish they could play an active role in the international community. In other words, this lecture meeting is open to anyone of those average students and should be a great help for them to become capable of making proper English questions and listening to an English lecture without much difficulty (competence) and asking English questions to the lecturer confidently (performance).

At the same page (*Ibid.*, ll.15–18), Drucker says, “There are no measurements for education. There are statistics on how many people are in school and how many graduate. But no one knows whether the students learn anything, let alone how much.”

This paper is now being written in February and March, the two months in which entrance examinations to university are being conducted across Japan. What is the main purpose of those entrance examinations? It is probably to get as many students as possible who are thought to be “good” based on the results

of their examinations. And we usually talk about the students of a particular year in comparison with those of the previous years in terms of the results of the entrance examinations of those years. So it is not difficult to say how many “good” students have entered a particular department, and four years later, it is not difficult, either, how many students are successful in graduating from that department. It is extremely difficult, however, to know whether those “good” students who entered a particular department have learned anything, let alone how much. There are no statistics to show whether the successful students in the entrance examinations have also been successful in their studies in the following four years. Then some teachers may claim there are some measurements for the actual learning of those students, for they can know the results of their learning with their grades for each term. The grades for a small class may reflect the results of students’ actual learning, but how about a large class? There are too many students for a close observation in a large class.

So Drucker suggests this. “What we need are not ‘better teachers.’ Indeed we cannot hope to get ‘better teachers’ in quantity....We get better results by giving the same people the right tools and by organizing their work properly. We need to ‘learn smarter’” (*Ibid.*, 11.20–24). For a large class, especially a lecture-type class with a large audience, we cannot expect “better teachers” but should get better results by giving the same people the “right tools” and by “organizing their work properly”. What do these “right tools” and “organizing their work properly” mean in CIS Special Lecture B? The writer of this paper is confident that a list of questions every participant can have at hand is one of those “right tools.” And our students study by themselves a country to be lectured on before each lecture, submit their questions based on such a study, and make a report either in English or Japanese after the lecture is over. Thus their work is “properly organized.” As a result, almost every student asks his or her question in English, usually starting with one of the questions in the list, but adding one or two more in relation to each lecture

(Message 3)

We have had, since time immemorial, two basic theories regarding learning. The behaviorists asserted that learning is a mechanical process of drill and repetition, forming a mental habit. The cognitive school, on the other hand, taught that learning is understanding, meaning, insight....The two are complementary. Only they are different, dealing with different things. Man is both behavior and understanding, both habit and reflection. And the two together form knowledge. (Ibid., p.339, ll.16–26)

Drucker goes on to explain this in more detail as follows: “‘learning’ is the acquisition of information, and this is largely a mechanical process....We acquire information...by repeating until the response becomes automatic and unthinking, that is, until we have created a ‘memory.’ This is how all of us learned to speak. This is also how all of us learned the multiplication table...” (*Ibid.*, p.340, ll.25–32). Now we can add one more by saying this is how all of us Japanese learners of English are learning English grammar. And this learning of English grammar is usually achieved when, again as Drucker points out at the same pages (*Ibid.*, pp.340–341, ll.35–5), it is presented as a “program.” The material has to be in a sequence in which one piece of information leads to the next piece to be learned...what has been learned earlier has be repeated again and again, and applied again and again; it has to be reaffirmed or else it is forgotten.

What has been learned in many language classes has to be repeated again and again, but how? Of course, this process can be followed in language classes themselves, but it is not so easy for each student to feel it necessary to use a certain grammatical item in actual situations. What has been learned earlier has to be applied again and again, but there are very few opportunities for our students to apply what they have learned earlier in language classes to actual situations. CIS Special Lecture B can be one such actual situation, for all students are expected to listen to a new lecture on a new topic and make new questions about such a lecture.

Repetition is necessary, but students will soon find it boring unless they are motivated. In this connection, Drucker says, “The motivation, the incentive, the reward for the acquisition of information must be built into the program itself. External rewards are not motivators. At every step the learner must receive satisfaction from the act of learning and from doing it right” (*Ibid.*, p.341, ll.24–27). In CIS Special Lecture B, a lecturer from a different country is invited to each class, and all participants in each lecture, including us coordinators, are expected to take a new attitude toward a different lecturer. How does each member of this class receive satisfaction from their act of learning and from doing it right? What data can show our students have received satisfaction?

In its initial stage, CIS Special Lecture B was taken by a large number of students, more than 60 students, but now the number has decreased to more than 10. Does this decrease mean our failure? Honestly speaking, this number was a great shock to us, who prepare much for each lecture, but it could give us a good opportunity to fill the gap between what we want to do and what we should do. As for the questions made by our students, for example, we could not recognize how each question-maker performs in each lecture if more than 50 students registered with this class. In other words, once each lecture has started, it is extremely difficult to know exactly how each participant responds to the lecture, what question he or she actually asks and how many more questions he or she adds to their original ones? We could not observe each participant so carefully in a large class, but we could in a small class (this year, 10 students who registered with this course, 5 auditors, and 15 non-student participants who are senior citizens of Nagakute).

After each lecture, all students are supposed to write a report on that lecture either in Japanese or in English. So, the reports that were submitted by email or handwritten may suggest what each student has learned in each lecture and what part of the lecture has motivated him or her to study more.

The cognitive school looks at different aspects of learning: understanding,

meaning and insight. Drucker claims they are what teaching means, saying this: “Teaching, on the other hand, has to do with meaning and insight. It has to do with application of information, with reaching out, with understanding and enjoyment, and with the insight that cannot be learned. Teaching has a lot more to do with perception than it has to do, apparently, with intellect” (*Ibid.*, p.342, ll.4–8). And he goes on to say this as an important aspect of teaching like this: “And teaching is done by example. Teaching requires a ‘teacher.’ The teacher can be a book, a piece of music, perhaps even the student himself. But it is done best by an older, understanding, guiding, helpful, challenging person. Just as learning is individual, teaching is mutual” (*Ibid.*, ll.8–12).

The last sentence is to the point. Learning itself is an individual act, so, as Drucker says, “Learning can only be done by the learner. It cannot be done by the ‘teacher.’ The teacher can only be a help or an impediment to learning” (*Ibid.*, p.341, ll.28–30). Teaching, however, is mutual. That means any learner can deepen understanding, find meaning or get insights when he or she is trying to do something with the help of his or her teacher. In the case of CIS Special Lecture B, teaching can be done best by a diplomat, whether it is an ambassador, councilor, first secretary or second secretary, “an older, understanding, guiding, helpful, challenging person.” The diplomat can be a challenging person, for, although any lecturer speaks good English, it does not always mean he or she can speak such English as any of our students can understand. Some lecturers speak good English, but others speak with a heavy accent much influenced by their native language: French, Spanish, Portuguese, Swahili or their tribal language. Listening to a lecture itself can be a very challenging job.

(Message 4)

Nothing man learns is half as difficult and complicated as what practically all of us learned in the first few years of our lives—talking, walking, seeing a complex world, complex relationships to people, or even toilet training....

The speed with which any one of these early skills is learned has nothing to do with talent....The correlation is to rhythm of learning, pace, and attention span....If we allow each child to learn whatever has to be learned within his rhythm, his attention span, and his learning speed, he will get there just as surely as any other child. He will be just as “bright,” only in his own best way (*Ibid.*, pp.343–344, ll.18–13).

This message makes it necessary for us coordinators of CIS Special Lecture B to take into account a different rhythm, attention span, and learning speed in a different participant. As far as an English lecture is concerned, teachers tend to expect “good speakers of English” to express themselves in English first as role models for others, but as Drucker has suggested, it must be remembered that some students are quicker to respond to the lecturer than others, but that others are able to think more deeply about the issue addressed in the lecture. Still others do not ask any question during the class, but they write a good report on each lecture based on what they studied beforehand, what they listened to during the lecture and what they further studied after it. In other words, students develop at their own rate.

Drucker mentions another important thing about teaching. He said, “Teachers would like to teach, to be sure, but most of them are not teaching, but baby-sitting. Most of them spend a great deal of their time in custodial activities, aimed at keeping the children quiet” (*Ibid.*, p.340, ll.14–17). According to Drucker, there are some teachers who spend a long time teaching, but what they are doing is not teaching. They are engaged in custodial activities to keep their students quiet.

Many Japanese teachers may like “quiet classes” because those classes seem to be easy to manage. Even so, however, they do not necessarily mean all students in such a class are studying seriously or deeply. Quietness does not always guarantee any active learning on the part of each student.

As far as an English lecture is concerned, how students respond to each

lecture in the Q&A session and what they wrote in their reports on it may suggest whether they have learned anything during and after the lecture.

(Message 5)

...we certainly can already reach two important conclusions. The first one is that the “dumb” child is the shame of the schools. The maxim ought to be: “There are no dumb children; there are only poor schools.” The reason for there being “poor schools” is not the stupidity or incompetence of the teachers. It is the absence of the right tools and of the right methods. Secondly, teaching and learning are bound to undergo tremendous change in the next few decades. (*Ibid.*, p.347, ll.6–14).

We do not know yet what will happen to CIS Special Lecture B in the future, but we would like to expand it a little more, believing that there are no “dumb” participants in this English lecture class. We have already opened it to senior citizens of a nearby city, and we have actually had more than 10 people from Nagakute who have joined our students in listening to a lecture by a diplomat from the embassy of a foreign country in Japan, and so in the future, a much larger audience may join us through such a thing as satellite learning, but we would like to try to keep it interactive, for we believe this kind of class can be made most productive. This is what we believe each lecturer wants from our lecture meeting.

III. Research Questions

As is obvious from our understanding of Drucker’s points of view, the first question we would like to ask in this research is to try to see **whether our students**, especially those who have worked hard but have yet to go abroad to study or learn to speak out in English, **have learned to express their opinions in public.**

Before they can express themselves in English, they must have learned

something about what they listen to in CIS Special Lecture B. How much did our students study by themselves before each lecture? What did they learn from each lecturer during his or her lecture? And what did they begin to think about after each lecture? In short, **what did each student learn during the whole class?** This is the second question we would like to ask.

And we started a new project of visiting an embassy where our students made a presentation or presentations, followed by comments by the diplomats of the embassy. So the third question is what our students learned by exploring a topic of their own choice, making a presentation on it, and receiving comments by the diplomats. In other words, **what did our students learn in a different environment of learning from that at their own university as an extension of their own exploration?**

IV. Research Method

In a lecture-type class, we must adjust our research to each different lecture. What we should study totally depends on what kind of lecture will be given. We even find it difficult to set up each lecture according to our premeditated plan. Generally speaking, there are four personnel changes a year in a foreign embassy, so the lecturer for each class is decided on a short notice. In the second term of 2017, for example, we did not get many lecturers at the beginning, but we actually had 13 lecturers in the end.

Usually, however, at least two weeks before each class, we are informed of what country will be decided and who will be the staff member of its embassy to give a lecture. That means we do not give any language lesson to any participant but ask each student to make English questions, hopefully after he or she has studied the 2-page handout prepared by Sato or studied by himself or herself a country to be lectured on. The questions made in this procedure are slightly revised by Kimura and put together into a list of English questions every participant can have at hand. In order to examine whether our students have learned

to speak out in public, therefore, their questions and how they performed in the Q&A session can be examined.

All the original questions sent by the students to this writer are kept in his computer and how each student performed in the Q&A session are recorded in a CD, so comparison of the original questions and their revised versions over a certain period of time (usually one term of about 4 months) must be helpful for some observation of whether each student has improved his or her competence at making English questions suitable for each lecture. In the Q&A session, many students start asking one of the questions they made before the lecture, but add one or two after it, so listening to the CD can show how well or badly our students performed in a real English-using environment.

All students are supposed to write and submit by email or hand a report on each lecture either in English or in Japanese. Reading such a report must be helpful for the examination of what each student has learned in each lecture. Some students are not good at writing it in English, so they start writing it in Japanese, but even some of those students are found trying writing it in English as well. This writer revises such an English report to give those students some encouragement, but in the process of such revision, he is sure he will see how communicable it is⁶. Some students are already good at writing a report, so their reports are often used as models for other students. Reading Japanese or English reports, this writer can understand how much each student understood the lecture and what they began to think about the issues dealt with in it.

Two years ago, we started to visit an embassy of a foreign country. Except the first one to the Embassy of Pakistan, all the other visits, including the latest one to the Embassy of the Republic of Moldova, required the participants' presentation or presentations. In addition to those presentations, the reports submitted by each participant after each visit are to be examined to see what the participants learned in their visits to respective embassies.

V. Results

Not all students who took CIS Special Lecture B are “average students,” which are defined in this paper as those who have studied English hard but have yet to go abroad to study or learn to speak out in English, so in this paper, we will focus on some of those students by examining all they did in the second term of 2017. For the sake of convenience, let us call the first student “Student A,” who is a female sophomore of the Department of English and Contemporary Society. This is what Student A did in the second term of 2017.

The English questions she made were about Ecuador (1st lecture), Kazakhstan (3rd lecture), Sudan (4th lecture), Moldova (7th lecture) and Albania (10th lecture). The reports she made were only about two countries: Ukraine and Uganda, but they were both written in Japanese, although this does not pose any problem because all participants are allowed to write a report either in English or in Japanese. Participants are expected to ask each lecturer in English, but as far as this student is concerned, she has never asked any questions in the Q & A session.

This student attended most of the classes, but submitted only 5 questions and two reports. Regrettably speaking, these pieces of information do not show any improvement in her learning. We tend to think the more questions or reports students write, the better ones they can produce, but this does not seem to be true with all students. As for the questions, Student A seemed to put into words what came up in her mind, not reading again what she had written or trying to revise her original questions in terms of English grammar. Such sentences as “i googled about Albania” and “in Moldova, how importance English is?” did appear for her last two lectures and suggest her present learning habits. The same is true with her two reports, most of which were written not directly related to what she actually listened to but based on what she found in the Internet.

Different students use the same experience in different ways. Student B is a male student belonging to the same department as Student A. At first, he did not seem to understand what he was supposed to do. He submitted a question written

in Japanese, so this question was translated into English by the present writer. For the second lecture on Honduras, however, he began to write an English question and send it to the writer. The countries he made questions about were Ecuador (1), Honduras (2), Kazakhstan (3), Sudan (4), Iran (5), Ukraine (6), Moldova (7), Uganda (9), Albania (10), Djibouti (12), Iraq (13). As this lecture series went on, he began to ask more questions or write a longer sentence as a question, although his sentences include such careless mistakes as “tention” and “Baced” for tension and Based.

His questions centered on the cultural or economic issues, and when he began to speak out in the second lecture on Kazakhstan, he seemed to have gained more confidence in his use of English. In his email to this writer in the wake of the lecture on this central Asian country, he said, “It is true that I was very nervous before I asked a question in the Q&A session, but when I did, I felt I had dispelled my uneasiness toward an English lecture.” Also, he called a spade a spade, and when he could not understand some lecturers due to their strong accents or difficult talk, he did say so and made no comment in such lectures as those on Ecuador and Ukraine. Like many Japanese, he could make no distinction between Sudan and South Sudan until this writer pointed it out, saying that this student should have been more careful about the name of the country when he made this question: “Dose the Republic of South Sudan have any connections with Japan?” (underlined by the present writer).

This student wrote 5 reports in Japanese: Ecuador, Honduras, Kazakhstan, Ghana and Uganda. Like Student A, he also referred to the Internet for further information on each country, but in all the five reports, he asked himself what he learned from a particular lecturer and mentioned it in each report. In his report on Ecuador, for example, the lecturer, the ambassador, mentioned the country’s new efforts to produce other things as well as bananas and cacaos, on which the country depends too much for its main produce. Mr. Carlos Mendoza from the Embassy of Honduras expressed hope that the country’s efforts to improve

its education will help call back many valuable human resources who have left the country. The ambassador of Kazakhstan said it useless to possess or study nuclear bombs. Ambassador Sylvester J.K. Parker-Allotey of Ghana, from which 80% of cacaos in Japan come, emphasized the fact that cacaos are produced by human hands on farms in Ghana, whose cacao quality is maintained as they are dried by sunlight. Uganda, which is poor itself, makes its constant effort to receive by far the greatest number of refugees from neighboring countries in Africa. This is the very fact that Student B seems to believe Japan should learn from Uganda.

Since CIS Special Lecture B is a lecture-type class, how many times each participant asks a question during the Q&A session may be one important criterion to examine how serious he or she is about the lecture, but the following two students, Students C and D, listened carefully to each lecture and made a long report on each lecture but did not ask any question during the whole term. What does it suggest? Does it show their inability to understand an English lecture or lack of enthusiasm? The present writer does not think so. They just missed an opportunity to ask. Why does he think so? Student C studied a country to be lectured on and made a brief summary of the information she got through the Internet, never failed to make questions in Japanese or English and always wrote a long report in Japanese. Special Lecture B is not an English language class and participants are allowed to submit their report either in English or in Japanese. Student D must have had many kinds of experience traveling around the world before entering NUFS, understood each lecture and made a critical report on it.

Student C, a student of business, always studied the countries to be lectured on when she was not well or busy: Ecuador, Honduras, Kazakhstan, Iran, Ukraine, Moldova, Iraq. With ample information in mind, she asked questions. That is why she could write a long report, ranging from about 500 to more than 800 Japanese characters, on such countries as Ecuador, Honduras, Kazakhstan, Sudan, Iran, Ukraine, Uganda, Albania, Djibouti. Her report on Ecuador, for

example, begins like this: “When I heard the name of Ecuador, I mistook it for an African country. My knowledge about this country was so limited, but as I studied it in the Internet, I found it interesting to know a sharp contrast between Japan and Ecuador: natural beauty and traditional buildings, politics and economy. When I actually listened to a lecture by the ambassador of the country, however, I got a lot more information about it than that information which I could get through the Internet. Famous Japanese Noguchi Hideyo, for example, has a lot to do with Ecuador. It is also interesting to know the fact that Ecuador is now trying to make itself known around the world not only through oil and cacao but through arranged flowers, broccoli and traditional straw hats.”

Student D is a Vietnamese by nationality, but he thinks of himself as Japanese. Recognizing his name as Vietnamese, the present writer once suggested he should express his opinions from a Vietnamese point of view, but he responded to that suggestion as follows: “You said me ‘I hope your idea is seen from Vietnamese, however, I was born in Japan and I went around the world with my grandfather. The days I lived in Vietnam are about 2 years until I was 10 years old. It is shorter than the days I live in Europe and Japan. So I will not play the role as a Vietnamese you hope.

However, I will say my idea and thought from my sight and my experience.”

As for the questions, Student D made several questions on each lecture and commented on it in English like this:

“Moldova is a country which I had been in childhood because I should have followed my parents. They visited to taste and sign a contract of wines’ trade with a company in Moldova, so I know wine in Moldova is important for Moldova. Furthermore, I studied European countries that has relationships with Soviet as a summer assignment in high school. Of course, Moldova is in the list.

In this moment, the price of Moldova wines is very cheap. This is

because most people think wines in France, Spain and other developed countries are delicious and them in other countries which does not has brand of wine is not good. In fact, wines in Moldova is better than other countries. It should appeal more in the world.

Moldova has an important work, tell Soviet's acts people in the future. Most of them is not written in text and elderly people will not be, so telling the story is a very important thing. In addition, they must be true even if Moldova hated Soviet policy.

In conclusion, Moldova is one of the countries which influences and changes the world. Japan need close relationship with the country.”

As he said he would express his idea and thought from his insight and experiences, he commented on other countries as well: Ecuador, Honduras, Kazakhstan, Sudan, Iran, Ukraine, Uganda, Albania, Djibouti. As far as these reports are concerned, the writer does not think Student D was unable to understand any lecture or ask an English question even if he did not ask any questions during each class.

Student D belongs to the Department of World Liberal Arts, and there is another student from the same department: Student E. This student, unlike Students C and D, made a great contribution to a good atmosphere of this lecture class in which participants want to exchange ideas with each other in an international forum. He asked a question or questions (Honduras, Kazakhstan, Sudan, Iran, Ukraine, Moldova, Ghana, Uganda, Albania, Oman, Djibouti, Iraq) and made a short report (Honduras, Kazakhstan, Sudan, Iran, Ukraine, Moldova, Ghana, Uganda, Oman) whenever he could take part in this class.

His English pronunciation is also good, so these facts may have helped some senior citizens of a nearby city feel “the English level of this university students is very high.” A close examination of his original questions and short reports, however, suggest that his English needs to be much improved. “How many

gangs do Honduras have?” “What is the most famous things in Sudan?” “What is the most surprised things in Japan?” and “Does Iraq has a lot of earthquakes occurred?” All the underlined parts are grammatically wrong, and these mistakes are found in many questions.

Since one of the main jobs of this writer is to help all participants feel comfortable in asking an English question, he does not care how many mistakes his students make, but it is also true that he hopes his efforts to correct his students’ grammatical mistakes will be rewarded when he finds some improvement as his students try to make English questions as often as possible.

This wish was granted in the case of Student F, who could not register with this class because she was abroad to study on a registration day but attended this class as an auditor. She began to attend this class when we invited the ambassador of Kazakhstan.

She took part in the following two classes when we invited Sudanese and Iranian diplomats, but she did not ask any question during the classes. So this writer suggested she should try to ask an English question, and she did. Then she became a regular question-maker who asked an English question, listened to each lecturer’s response and asked a few more questions in the lectures on Ukraine, Moldova, Uganda, Albania, Oman, Djibouti and Iraq.

During the spring vacation, we planned a visit to an embassy. The results of a questionnaire we gave toward the end of the second term show the Republic of Moldova was chosen as the embassy of the students’ first choice, so we began to negotiate with the embassy. The date was set, and we were going to visit the Embassy of the Republic of Moldova on March 6, Tuesday. Many students, however, had a previous plan for that day, so we had only two students for this visit: Students E and F. They began to prepare a presentation on their own.

Presentation 1 Republic of Moldova (Student E)

1. Basic information

2. Where is the Republic of Moldova
3. Moldova Wine
4. O-zone

On the day of our visit to the Embassy of Moldova, Student E was the only student that made a presentation as scheduled, for Student F fell ill the previous night and could not pay this visit. After introducing ourselves to Ambassador Dr. Vasile Bumacov, Student E, Sato and this writer sat down at the table. The writer briefed the Ambassador on the purpose of our project and an idea of its expansion, and Dr. Bumacov helped us get relaxed as he said he would like to listen to us as an academic scholar rather than a bureaucrat. Student E's presentation started with some basic information of Moldova and Japan, went on to explain the geographical location of Moldova and the high popularity of Moldovan wines, and finally mentioned O-zone, a world famous music group, who came from Moldova but did their activities in Romania.

The Ambassador found it interesting to listen to Student E, and added more information about two things dealt with in his presentation. Although "Moldovan" is recognized as the official language of Moldova, this recognition itself was imposed by Russia. Romanian is the national language to many people in Moldova. In addition to the "official" language, many restrictions have been imposed on Moldova, including embargos, but, as is often the case, Moldova became stronger as Russian pressure grew stronger. When Student E was a small child, he heard "Dragostea Din Tei," a big hit of O-zone. In those days, the student did not have any idea where that song came from, but he is now thrilled to know that it is one of the big hits of this music group originally from Moldova. The ambassador also said the group has already disbanded.

Presentation 2 Wine of Moldova & Tea of Japan (Student F)

1. Wine and tea strengthen bilateral ties

2. Main industry in Moldova is “wine”
3. The amount of Japanese tea trade has been fourfold in the last decade.
4. Problems and Solutions
5. Build a stronger economic tie

Presentation 2 was made by this writer for Student F, a student of Liberal Arts and Global Studies, who could not visit the embassy. As the idea itself comes from Student F, the ambassador praised her for her comparison of Japanese tea and Moldovan wine, which is a result of her own exploration, for he seems to strongly believe that both beverages are designed to make friends. He hastened to add that, although wine can help people make friends, they should be careful not to drink too much but learn to drink it in a proper sequence. He also emphasized the importance of developing a unique culture in the drinking of tea or wine.

In connection with “a unique culture,” the Ambassador also said he is impressed with the Chinese character for the act of drinking, 飲. This character is composed of two parts: to eat (食) and to want (欠). When we have eaten something, we still want something more. This “something more” can be wine or tea. This has a lot to do with human nature, so, as Student F suggests, he hopes Moldovan wine and Japanese tea will promote cultural exchanges and eventually strengthen bilateral ties.

Both Students E and F learned that, although Moldovan wine is high-quality, it is not well known, so they suggest a greater effort should be made to publicize Moldovan wines. Listening to this suggestion, the Ambassador recommended we should participate in a special event to be held in Kyoto on the evening of March 23rd in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Republic of Moldova and Japan, in which people could enjoy Moldovan wines at the Kyoto City International Foundation. So Sato and Student F attended this special event. Student F seems to have found a unique way of life in the event. In her report, she says, “One woman who was

a cabin attendant of an airline company was so attracted by Moldovan wines that she became an importer of Moldovan wines....I want to find something in my life that I can devote myself to, like her.”

VI. Conclusion

We have been successful in creating a good atmosphere in which all participants feel free to ask their English questions and received favorable comments from almost all lecturers on their attitudes toward CIS Special Lecture B. A close examination of the questions originally made by each student, however, show there is not much improvement in the making of English questions. The list of student questions every participant can have in each lecture meeting is a revised version of the questions grammatically corrected by this writer.

Then did such “error correction” help our students improve their making of English questions? As far as this lecture-type class at this moment is concerned, we cannot prove whether it helped them or not, for almost all students seem to have taken it for granted that, even if they make grammatical mistakes, those mistakes will be corrected by Kimura. In this sense, this writer cannot help agreeing with John Truscott, who argues that “the existing research base provides no evidence that ‘grammatical correction’ ever helps any students,...” (Ferris & Hedgcock 2005, p.263, ll.17–19).

There is something else, however, that matters with CIS Special Lecture B. No matter how sporadically it may happen, we should pay more attention to what happens in the mind of each student who attends such an international forum. A change of attitude toward an English lecture with a large audience was found in Students B and F. So our continued efforts will be made to help as many students as possible follow their examples.

Notes

1. As of January 15, 2018, there were 83 different countries whose embassy staff members in Tokyo

came to our university to lecture in CIS Special Lecture B: Russia, the Philippines, Mozambique, Togo, Canada, Tanzania, Britain, Laos, Finland, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden, the Netherlands, Indonesia, Australia, Peru, Serbia, Latvia, Ireland, Belgium, India, Ethiopia, El Salvador, Chile, Bhutan, South Africa, Cuba, Portugal, Belarus, Denmark, Colombia, Norway, Turkey, Jamaica, Italy, Slovakia, Argentina, Malaysia, Macedonia, Maldives, Mongolia, Tunisia, Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Armenia, Brazil, Zambia, Afghanistan, Slovenia, Germany, Mexico, Kuwait, Croatia, Fiji, Bahrain, Burkina Faso, Estonia, Algeria, Kenya, Tajikistan, Malawi, Czech, Panama, Israel, Botswana, Venezuela, Myanmar, South Korea, Ecuador, Honduras, Kazakhstan, Sudan, Iran, Ukraine, Moldova, Ghana, Uganda, Albania, Oman, Djibouti, Iraq.

2. Dr. Sato always prepared a 2-page handout to be lectured on: Japanese and English. The Japanese handout is based on an article on each country from *Sekai Nenkan 2017* [world almanac of 2017] published by Kyoto Tsuushinsha in Tokyo, while the English comes from CIA's *The World Factbook 2017*. You can refer to "Contemporary International Studies Special Lecture B—A Project Aimed at Promoting Global Perspectives in Students—" (pp.86–88) as one example.
3. The manager of our project is Ms. Yukimi Asai, who posts an application form for non-student participants in CIS Special Lecture B in a public office bulletin board. She once tried to post one in the bulletin boards of three different city offices, but her attempts were all rejected, for the deadline for such an application is January 20, when the final phase of the second term of the university academic calendar is still going on, and we have yet to know what country will be able to come to our lecture meeting which begins in April. One day, however, an enthusiastic former participant in our lecture meeting urged Nagakute City Office to post an application form for our project, and the city accepted this strong request. Since this incident happened, Ms. Asai has been successful in posting an application form of CIS Special Lecture B.
4. This project has received some grant-in-aid from NUFS since 2016. Thanks to this grant, we have made it possible to visit the embassy of a foreign country on a regular basis and published a flyer for this project.
5. Sato and Kimura worked at high schools before becoming university teachers.
6. This writer published a book titled *Kokomade tsuujiru Nihonjin Eigo* [This much can Japanese English be communicable by native speakers of English] from Taishukan Shoten (2002) in collaboration with other researchers, and found "communicable" 77.2% of the English sentences written by Japanese high school students, even though they included various kinds of errors.

References

1. Drucker, P.F. (2011). *The Age of Discontinuity*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
2. Ferris, D.R. & Hedgcock, J.S. (2005). *Teaching ESL Composition*. New Jersey:

Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

3. Kimura, T., Sato, T. & Asai, Y. (2015). "Contemporary International Studies Special Lecture B—A Project Aimed at Promoting Global Perspectives in Students—," *Gendai Kokusai Gakubu Research Bulletin* No. 11, Nisshin: Nagoya University of Foreign Studies.
4. Miyata, M. (2002). *Kokomade tsuujiuru Nihonjin Eigo* [This much can Japanese English be communicable to native speakers of English]. Tokyo: Taishuukan Shoten.