

2020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. 0)

本試験はI, II, IIIの三つのセクションに分かれています。セクションを1つ選び、設問に答えなさい。

The exam has three separate sections, I, II, and III. You should select ONE section and answer the questions.

2020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)

I. 次の英文を読み、(1)～(5)の各問いに答えなさい。

Around the time (1)Marty Seligman and Steve Maier were linking hopelessness to a lack of perceived control, a young psychology major named Carol Dweck was making her way through college. Carol had always been intrigued that some people persevere while others in identical circumstances give up. Right after graduation, she enrolled in a doctoral program in psychology and pursued this question.

Marty and Steve's work had a profound influence on young Carol. She believed their findings but was unsatisfied. Sure, attributing your misery to causes beyond your control was debilitating, but where did these attributions come from in the first place? (2)Why, she asked, did one person grow up to be an optimist and another a pessimist?

In one of Carol's first studies, she worked with middle schools to identify boys and girls who, by consensus of their teachers, the school principal, and the school psychologist, were especially "helpless" when confronted by failure. (3)Her hunch was that these children believed that a lack of intellectual ability led to mistakes, rather than a lack of effort. In other words, she suspected it wasn't just a long string of failures that made these children pessimistic, but rather their core beliefs about success and learning.

(4)To test her idea, Carol divided the children into two groups. Half the children were assigned to a success only program. For several weeks, they solved math problems and, at the end of each session, no matter how many they'd completed, they received praise for doing well. The other half of the children in Carol's study were assigned to an attribution retraining program. These children also solved math problems, but were occasionally told that they hadn't solved enough problems during that particular session and, crucially, that they "should have tried harder."

Afterward, all the children were given a combination of easy and very difficult problems to do.

Carol reasoned that, if prior failures were the root cause of helplessness, the success only program would boost motivation. If, on the other hand, the real problem was how children interpreted their failures, then the attribution retraining program would be more effective.

(5)What Carol found is that the children in the success only program gave up just as easily after encountering very difficult problems as they had before training. In sharp contrast, children in the attribution retraining program tried harder after encountering difficulty. It seems as though they'd learned to interpret failure as a cue to try harder rather than as confirmation that they lacked the ability to succeed.

【出典】 Angela Duckworth 2016 *GRIT : Why passion and resilience are the secrets to success* Vermilion pp.178-179.

(1) 下線部(1)を和訳しなさい。

(2) 下線部(2)を和訳しなさい。

(3) 下線部(3)を和訳しなさい。

(4) 下線部(4)は Carol Dweck が行った実験方法の概要である。その内容を簡潔に日本語で説明しなさい。

(5) 下線部(5)は Carol Dweck が行った実験の結果と考察の概要である。その内容を簡潔に日本語で説明しなさい。

2020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)

II. 以下の2つの問いに答えなさい

(1) 以下の文章の要旨を、800字程度でまとめなさい。

Are you a glass half-full or a glass half-empty person? If you're a pessimist through and through, does it really matter? And if it does, can you do anything to change it?

Positive psychology sometimes gets criticized for being only about positive thinking. As you'll know from reading the other chapters in the book, there's far more to it than that! Nevertheless, is the ability to 'think positively' a good thing? Firstly let's look at the research. It turns out that whilst there are some downsides to being an optimist, they seem to be outweighed significantly by the benefits, which are both physical and psychological. In fact there are so many desirable characteristics linked to optimism that positive psychologist Chris Peterson dubbed it the 'Velcro construct'—everything sticks to it!

Benefits of optimism

- Optimists suffer less anxiety, depression and distress than pessimists
- Optimism is linked to more effective coping—optimistic people tend to deal with problems rather than avoid them and use more acceptance, humour and positive reframing
- Optimism is associated with higher life satisfaction and increased well-being
- Optimists have stronger immune systems and a lower cardiac risk
- Optimists recover from surgery more quickly and report a higher quality of life afterwards
- Optimists adapt better to negative events in their lives, such as serious illness
- Contrary to what you might think, optimists don't stick their heads in the sand by, for example, ignoring the warning signs of illness.
 - Optimists don't give up easily even when faced with serious adversity, whereas pessimists are more likely to anticipate disaster and give up as a result
- Optimists are more action-oriented when faced with problems, and more likely to accept the reality of a bad situation than pessimists

Now that we've established some of the many good points about being optimistic, can pessimists learn how to become more optimistic? Well, the answer from positive psychologists such as Martin Seligman is an unequivocal yes. Even if you were born with frown lines firmly etched on your forehead, you needn't stay that way. So, how can we increase our optimism? Surely it's not as easy as simply 'thinking positively'?

Well, you're right, it turns out that there's more to it than simply repeating positive affirmations. These probably won't do you any harm (apart from wasting time), but they won't do much good either. Scientific research points to other, more practical strategies which have been shown to make a difference to people in real life, for example, reducing the risk of depression. Before we take a look at them, let's see how optimistic and pessimistic thinking operates in practice.

2020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)

Explanatory or attributional style

One way of looking at optimism and pessimism is as different explanatory explanatory styles. An explanatory style means the way we explain our experiences or the events which happen to us. Research has found that optimists and pessimists have different explanatory styles. Optimists attribute the cause of negative events and experiences to external, specific and transient factors, whereas pessimists do the opposite; they attribute their cause to internal, global and permanent factors. Before we look at a detailed example, try the following activity.

Think of a negative event or experience you've had in your life, preferably something from which you've now bounced back. Spend 5 minutes writing down your explanation of what happened, and why, in your well-being journal.

Now look at the example in the table overleaf. Can you identify your explanatory style?

Interestingly, these positions are reversed when we explain good events and experiences. Optimists think about them as being personal, permanent and pervasive, whereas pessimists think the opposite. So, now that we have a good understanding of how optimists and pessimists think, and have identified our own explanatory style, how do we go about learning to be more optimistic?

(出典 : Bridget Grenville-Cleave .2012. *Positive psychology*: Introducing Books com.)

- (2) 上記の optimism や pessimism に関する指摘や研究成果をふまえて、こうした心理学的関心事の今後の研究の方向性として、どのようなことが考えられ、また期待されるか。考えを述べなさい。

2020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)

III. Read the following essay on peace education and answer the questions.

It seems reasonable that people should not just accept conflicts as they are, and that we can try to understand the sources of their force. Habermas says:

... conflicts arise from distortion in communication, from misunderstanding and incomprehension, from insincerity and deception ... The spiral of violence begins as a spiral of distorted communication that leads through the spiral of uncontrolled reciprocal mistrust, to the breakdown of communication. If violence thus begins with a distortion in communication, after it has erupted it is possible to know what has gone wrong and what needs to be repaired.

Even though people in the West live in fairly well-ordered and peaceful societies, communication between individuals and groups is permeated by structural violence, strategic action and manipulation. People can, however, develop a greater sensitivity and a critical reflexive approach towards modes of communication with the other and with themselves, in which they can achieve deeper understanding and possibly also revise their distorted self-images and images of the other. People can also widen their perspectives by intersubjectively sharing their understanding in dialogical encounters in which the meanings of utterances are assigned to the intention of the speaker in a mode characterised by care, solidarity, reflection and criticality.

To accept conflicts as they are seems to suggest that there are good reasons for all concerned to accept them, whether conflicts are harmful, or lead to injustice or decreased possibilities to understand or critically reflect upon them. Acceptance also suggests that individuals do not or should not attempt to find alternative solutions to conflicts or ways of understanding and dealing with their sources. Habermas argues – convincingly to my mind – that persons should accept whatever concerns them as morally justified if and only if the consequences are accepted by all concerned and motivated by the force of the better argument, as participants in democratic deliberation.¹ If they are not given good reason as participants in deliberative democratic procedures, conflicts or their effects should not be accepted as valid. It is most likely that many conflicts are not legitimised by all concerned or motivated by the force of the better argument; and that not all participants have deliberated the conflicts, their histories, reasons or effects, on an equal footing.

A conflict and its effects raise certain validity claims either implicitly or explicitly, and a specific validity claim cannot be restricted to either the person raising it or the family or any other group – or a specific nation-state – since validity can be understood as something communicatively and intersubjectively legitimised. The validity of the following utterance: “A conflict and its effects on people ought to be accepted as they are by all concerned” correlates to the two kinds of relations mentioned earlier, i.e. to the other(s) and to you. Normally, people evaluate the righteousness or sincerity of using an utterance by examining the reason given for it. However, since different people view righteousness differently in different social and cultural worlds, and individuals are not always sincere, they cannot

2020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. 5)

always assume from the outset case that people are sincere and have legitimate intentions or reasons for every action or conflict and its consequences; or want to declare them to each other. This suggests that the validity of a specific conflict and its actual and possible effects ought to be evaluated in relation to the speaker's intention or the reason given for it. It also suggests that a deliberative democratic process ought to be the medium through which utterances and their reasons are evaluated and determined acceptable by the force of the better argument. If actual and possible conflicts and their effects have not been evaluated through the medium of such processes and determined acceptable, by those concerned, through the force of the better argument, then they cannot reasonably be said to have been argumentatively legitimised by practically all concerned.

Hence, people cannot take it for granted that conflicts and their effects are argumentatively legitimised, or ever will be, by all concerned. It seems, therefore, that conflicts and their effects cannot be said to be justified by those concerned unless they can evaluate, in democratic deliberative procedures, the reasons given. Does this mean that peace or peace education is futile? Let me note – as suggested above – that it seems reasonable not to ignore conflicts or accept them or the way(s) they are being understood as valid without investigating whether they are motivated by those concerned through the force of the better argument. Peace education and a culture of peace – purportedly having conflicts in focus and their possible resolutions – especially those that people try to solve through non-violent democratic deliberation – do not then seem to be futile aims. However, education or a culture with a more positive and stronger aim, i.e. *perpetual peace* as a state of mind and a state of relations between at least two people in which all actual conflicts are or could be resolved, such an education *is* futile. It is a positive Utopia, and an impossible aim in the sense that we never could achieve such a state of harmony among all living and future human beings. As long as people express different interests, beliefs and values and it is possible to interpret utterances differently, peace as a state of mind and relationship between at least two people is not really an achievable goal. People and nation-states *do* express differences and relate to one other in different ways. It is not even possible that all people should ever come to embrace the same values and beliefs. This will be so at least as long as the utterances people use can be interpreted differently. Davidson says:

Thought is creative because of our ability to combine a limited repertoire of concepts in a potentially infinite number of ways.

This suggests that we can combine an infinite number of sentences, but also *conflicting* sentences. However, while individuals can create an infinite number of sentences they are not always or everywhere permitted or entitled to do so. We learn from history that efforts to make people embrace the same or similar beliefs, knowledge and values – for example within nation-states – have in many cases and places meant, and still mean, people being assimilated or killed, tortured or forced to accept permanent marginalisation. We can also learn that people, especially non-members of a nation-state's majority culture, have not been given and are not being given the same or similar political, civil and social rights as full members enjoy. We can further learn that education within nation-states with a strong assimilationist culture has been used and is still being used to initiate children and young people into the majority culture. Yet further, we can learn from the present situation that making the other embrace the

2020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. 6)

same or similar values and beliefs without the other's consent based on the force of the better argument violates his/her freedom and rights.

The solution to the fact that people express their differences is, then, not to make them similar or less different or deny them rights and opportunities to do so. UNESCO, for example, declares the following as a response to issues of difference:²

As a source of exchange, innovation and creativity, cultural diversity is as necessary for humankind as biodiversity is for nature. In this sense, it is the common heritage of humanity and should be recognized and affirmed for the benefit of present and future generations.

In our increasingly diverse societies, it is essential to ensure harmonious interaction among people and groups with plural, varied and dynamic cultural identities as well as their willingness to live together. Policies for the inclusion and participation of all citizens are guarantees of social cohesion, the vitality of civil society and peace.

It is argued that since diversity is necessary for biodiversity, diversity among human is also necessary for humankind. This, however, does not follow logically from the assertion that diversity is necessary for biodiversity. It has, for example, to be shown that biodiversity includes humankind. But there is no argument given for this, and I am not convinced that the association is successful, since it cannot reasonably be assumed that plants interact harmoniously as human beings can. Only humans are capable of interacting harmoniously and can understand and express their differences as well as what they have in common. Nature, however, does not communicate its intentions to us humans in ways which we can understand. Hence, humans cannot assume that the ascribed necessity is the same in both cases. However, humankind expresses difference in various ways. It has then to be shown why and how people ought to respond to this.³

Q1. The author employs here Habermas's conception of democratic deliberation. Explain how Habermas's argument relates to the author's argument on conflicts and their effects.

Q2. Name the title of the UNESCO declaration quoted here and explain its significance for peace education.

Q3. The author formulates such an argument--how people should handle the issue of difference and conflict--in the next section of the essay. Explicate *your own version* of the argument.