

平成31年度大学院博士後期課程入学試験問題

研究科名	科目名
文学研究科 教育学専攻	英語 (No. 1)

[設問 1]、および [設問 2]のうち、いずれか1つを選択して、解答しなさい。

[設問 1] 以下は、アメリカ合衆国の近年の高等教育改革についての論評の一部である。これを読んで、以下の設問に答えなさい。

Liberal arts education as it is practiced in many of our small colleges carries on in spite of all, in the trenches of the classroom, away from the national spotlight, even though it lacks high theoretical articulation. Liberal arts colleges operate on their own without a rallying manifesto or mission statement. No poet laureate sings their praises. No public intellectual, pontificating from an Ivy League post, puts forth an impassioned plea on their behalf. Rather, these colleges operate in the shadows of the nation's prestigious research universities. They are viewed by many, in and out of academe, as simply smaller and thus evidently less successful versions of the research university. Mom-and-pop grocery stores offer, to be sure, quaintly intimate services, a better person-to-person relationship with their customers; but the modern economy now favors the Wal-Mart superstore, where cost and convenience trump quality and service. So goes the liberal arts college, a relic of the past, a *Gemeinschaft* operating in a *gesellschaftlich* world⁽¹⁾. Accordingly, money and reputation flow these days to support the activities of the university scholar, not the liberal arts college professor. The Guggenheim Foundation bestows few of its grants on persons with college affiliations. The National Endowment for the Humanities, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Fulbright Foundation offer separate competitions for college teachers, a concession that their curricula vitae just cannot compete. It is no secret that young Ph.D.s often regard an appointment in a liberal arts college as a stint in the minor leagues, a way station or steppingstone to the majors. Cutting-edge research is conducted in the universities, and thus careers and names are made there. If you cannot do, you teach, and thus many professors at these colleges labor under the unspoken stigma that, as failed research scholars, they must serve out their days—should the call up to the bigs never come—as glorified schoolmarms⁽²⁾.

America's research universities, largely modeled after the nineteenth century German university, are organized in pyramidal fashion, the uppermost aims of which are to conduct research and prepare graduates for careers in specialized scholarship. America's small colleges, in contrast, are widely viewed as sectarian experiments in undergraduate "teaching," where service minded professors borrow the results of top-level research produced elsewhere and disseminate it in a hands-on and popularized, but derivative, manner. These teacherly instructors interact directly with undergraduates, whereas graduate student teaching assistants (TAs) perform the lion's share of "teaching" and paper grading at universities, freeing up precious time so their supervisory professors can investigate and profess some more. Although some universities have been attempting in recent years to offer something more than lip service with regard to undergraduate teaching, providing material incentives and recognition for exceptional teaching efforts, for the most part, the world of American academe is still divided quite starkly into research scholars versus classroom teachers. The two separate beasts more or less congregate in their respective institutions, the university versus the college.

平成31年度大学院博士後期課程入学試験問題

研究科名	科目名
文学研究科 教育学専攻	英語 (No. 2)

Yet this functional division of labor affects the nature of scholarship produced at both kinds of institutions. It affects the nature of teaching, what is taught and how it is taught, at both kinds of institutions. Moreover, the divide indicates rival philosophies, diverging ever more, on the point and purpose of higher education.

The research university prides itself on producing state-of-the-art, specialized, professional scholarship, whereas a liberal arts education traditionally values some amorphous notion of “well-roundedness” that is admittedly hard to prescript, define, and pass on to others (because it must be appropriated independently and self-critically). However construed, liberal arts well-roundedness entails critical suspicion, almost an aversion toward preprofessional specialization. Liberal arts college students, we sometimes gently remind them, ought to put those workaday concerns in abeyance. Surely specialized training produces discrete marketable skills that usually are rewarded handsomely in the modern economy. So why would a liberal arts ethos actively eschew such preparation? The answer reveals a different philosophy of education altogether. Freedom of inquiry, the life of the mind, cannot be tethered to the freedom of the marketplace, spirited arguments to the contrary notwithstanding. Instrumentalism, gearing one’s efforts toward producing persons and products serviceable to the marketplace of goods as opposed to the marketplace of ideas, kills the spirit of free education. Such freedom, by definition, cannot be productive, or at least cannot be expected to be productive. The freedom of free inquiry, a different concept and practice of freedom altogether, can be absolutely exhilarating when put into practice. Students, suspending their concerns about employment for a precious four years, can pursue ideas wherever they may take them. Their research need not produce immediate results in order to win another round of grants. They can read, brood over, and savor *long* books. They are free to ask probing questions of each other. They can be romantic, searching, or harshly critical of the prevailing norms of society. They are utterly free to be irresponsible, which makes their moments of commitment and responsibility all the more meaningful. More often than not, they act studiously and responsibly, albeit of their own accord. It works. The liberal arts ivory tower works if you structure it well, enlist the energies of the right people, trust that education still matters, and let it be.

出典：以上、John Evan Seery. *America Goes to College: Political Theory for the Liberal Arts* (State University of New York Press, 2002), 2-3.より引用。設問の関係上、語句の一部を省略した箇所がある。

- (1) 下線部(1)(2)は、リベラル・アーツ・カレッジおよびその教員を、本論評の筆者が比喩的に表現したものであるが、それぞれどのような意味か。
- (2) 本文の第2段落 (America’s research universities...) は、研究大学での研究と教育の関係について書かれている。この段落を 500-600 字の日本語で要約しなさい。
- (3) 本文の第4段落の9行目 (Freedom of inquiry,...) からは、リベラル・アーツ・カレッジにおける研究の特質について書かれている。この部分を 500-600 字の日本語で要約しなさい。

平成31年度大学院博士後期課程入学試験問題

研究科名	科目名
文学研究科 教育学専攻	英語 (No. 3)

[設問 2] 以下の英文を和訳しなさい。

Children with ADHD frequently underachieve academically. Within classroom settings, these children often exhibit significantly lower rates of on-task behavior during instruction and independent work periods than those displayed by their classmates. As a result, children with ADHD have fewer opportunities to respond during academic instruction and complete less independent work relative to their peers. The latter may, at least partially, account for the association of ADHD with academic underachievement: up to 80% of children with this disorder have been found to exhibit learning and/or achievement problems. Furthermore, the results of prospective follow-up studies of children with ADHD into adolescence indicate the greatest risks for this population are chronic academic underachievement and higher rates of dropping out of school.

Given the association between ADHD and academic underachievement, it is important for school psychologists and other education professionals to be aware of the potential for learning difficulties among children diagnosed with or suspected of having ADHD. In addition, where warranted, it is incumbent upon these professionals to design and implement effective prevention and intervention strategies to enhance academic functioning. The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of several aspects of the relationship between ADHD and learning problems. First, we provide a review of specific learning problems found to be associate with ADHD. Second, we provide a review of empirical studies examining possible casual connections between learning difficulties and ADHD, from the first edition of this book, along with a section on contemporary perspectives on the relationship between learning and attentional difficulties. The possibility of treating ADHD plus learning disabilities as a subtype of ADHD is discussed in this context. Third, suggestions for assessment and intervention to address academic performance difficulties among students with ADHD are delineated. Here, federal statues regarding the potential eligibility of students with ADHD for special education and other services are discussed. Fourth, suggestions are offered for determining whether a student with ADHD may be eligible for special education or other support services vis-à-vis these regulation.

Differences between children with ADHD and their typically developing peers have been found in several areas of cognitive functioning. First, children with ADHD often display difficulties on tasks that require complex problem-solving strategies and organizational skills. Interestingly, these problems are not necessarily due to lack of problem-solving abilities per se, but rather appear to reflect either insufficient effort or inefficient use of proper strategies during the task itself. A second area of deficit relative to typical peers is frequently observed on neuropsychological measures of executive functioning. Tests that purportedly assess problem solving, response inhibition, and sustained effort have been found to reliably discriminate between children with and without ADHD. Again, the strategies that children with ADHD employ on these tasks are inefficient, frequently impulsive, and poorly organized. Thus, it is no wonder that teachers of these students frequently report difficulties with note taking, completion of long-term assignments, desk organization and study skills.

平成 3 1 年度大学院博士後期課程入学試験問題

研究科名	科目名
文学研究科 教育学専攻	英語 (No. 4)

Another area of functioning in which children with ADHD may be more likely than nondisordered children to evidence difficulties is speech and language development. Although empirical investigations have provided equivocal results regarding possible delays in the onset of speech, there is relatively consistent evidence of expressive language difficulties among many children with ADHD. Specifically, 10-54% of children with ADHD may exhibit expressive language problems relative to 2-25% of the normal population. Furthermore, children and/or disorganized speech on tasks that require verbal explanation.

Problems with fine and gross motor coordination may be associated with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. Group studies have found that approximately 52% of children with ADHD are reported to display nondiagnosed children. Such findings have been obtained rather consistently on tasks such as maze drawings or peg board tests. Here again these results are not surprising, as teachers frequently report students with ADHD to have significant problems with handwriting and penmanship. Several studies also have documented a greater frequency of neurological “soft” signs, including gross motor coordination difficulties and motor overflow movements, among children with ADHD relative to their typically developing and/or learning-disabled counterparts. For example, when asked to perform specific muscle group movements (e.g., toe tapping), children with ADHD may display unnecessary associated movements perhaps indicative of poor motor inhibition.

出典 : George J. DuPaul & Gary Stoner. (2003) ADHD in the schools. : Assessment and Intervention Strategies. New York.: Guilford Press.