

2021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)

以下の英文は M.Weimer (2013) の *Learner-centered Teaching: Five Key Changes to Practice*, (2nd Ed.)第6章「学習への責任」からの抜粋である。この英文を読み、次の問いに答えよ。ただし、問いと関係の薄い箇所は枠で囲み、斜線を入れてある。

問1 レポートの分量や書式を決め、提出期限を定め、その厳守を学生に求めることで、きちんと学びを進める学生を育てようとする大学教員として当たり前前の学習指導に内在する問題はなにか、説明せよ。

問2 学習を促すための良い風土を作る上で、筆者が留意したい（している）ポイントを説明せよ。

What Needs to Change and Still Hasn't

If you've read the chapters before this one, it probably won't come as a huge surprise that I believe our response to student learning issues ends up being part of the problem. We do deserve lots of credit for being well intentioned. Most of us understand that if problems like those listed in this chapter's opening paragraph persist, significant learning in our courses, success in college, and success in the careers that follow will be seriously compromised. Our concerns have motivated a gradual, usually unconscious realignment of instructional policies and practices.

First, we try to rectify their inadequacies as learners by making clearer and clearer, more and still more explicit the terms and conditions for learning. If they don't know or won't make the decisions necessary to succeed in our courses, we'll make those decisions for them. And so, as already discussed in Chapter Four, we have instituted policies that mandate all manner of details related to learning: mandatory attendance, penalties for missed deadlines, required participation, and no makeup quizzes or exams. We partition assignments and set the due dates in installments to prevent procrastination and to ameliorate the effects of poor time management. We prohibit talking, texting, eating, drinking, coming late, leaving early, and anything else we can think of that diverts attention from course content. We stipulate assignment details: page length, font and margin size, number of and format for references. We employ elaborate strategies to prevent cheating. Most of us are bending over backwards to get students doing what learning requires.

What can't be accomplished with policies and requirements, we go after with an array of extrinsic motivators. We use quizzes to keep students up with the reading, offer extra-credit points if they look up a reference, award bonus points if all the homework problems are correct, and record a check-plus for every contribution in class. Our classrooms have become token economies where students get points for every desirable action, and have points docked for undesirable actions. Our grading systems distribute points across assignments, activities, and classroom behaviors with precise and exquisite detail. In the chemistry course I took, lab reports were only worth 10 points out of 600 points possible in the course. However, each point was divided into tenths, essentially making the lab report worth 100 points, and students were not above passionately arguing for an additional .2 or .3 of a point.

Pike (2011) believes that point systems like these “end up training students to focus on the wrong things” (p. 4). Students think about their course work in terms of the points they will get for it, not because they see assignments as opportunities to learn important material. These systems “distract students from what should be motivating their learning” (p. 4). She calls the belief that grades motivate learning a “dead idea” in teaching. Grades motivate getting grades.

2021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)

Are these ways of responding to passive, dependent learners working well? Do students end up learning in these rule-bound environments and as a result of the motivational sticks we wave about menacingly? They do—sort of. If students expect a quiz, they do the reading. If attendance is mandatory and points are at stake, they show up more often for class. But do these short-term victories lead to the ultimate goal? What kind of students are we seeing in our senior seminars and capstone courses? Are they intellectually mature, responsible learners who will do what needs to be done in the absence of requirements and policies? Can they organize and execute learning tasks on their own? Are they curious, imaginative learners—ones who eagerly anticipate a lifetime of learning?

I wonder why we don't view the ongoing issues with classroom management—including student incivility, disruptive behavior, and the many derogatory characteristics now regularly attributed to millennial students—as signs that these approaches aren't all that effective. The faculty I encounter are eager to talk about classroom management—how many policies they should have, which ones work, does anybody know how to get students to stop texting, and why in the world don't college students go to the bathroom before class? It's not a conversation about less policies and not a conversation that questions the assumptions inherent in the policies. It's usually about adding more policies or finding the ones that work. Shouldn't our continuing preoccupation with classroom management issues tip us off that there might be problems with our approach?

Whether we're trying to prevent disruptive behavior, motivate preparation, or inculcate integrity, exerting more control is not the answer. It locks teachers and students into a vicious circle. The more structured we make the environment, the more structure they need. The more decisions we make, the less able they are to make decisions. The more extrinsic their motivation, the less intrinsic their commitment to learning. The more often we do learning tasks for them, the less likely they are to assume the responsibility for learning. The more control we exert, the more controlled they become. We end up with students who have little commitment to learning and who cannot function in less than totally structured learning environments.

The solution is not to immediately abandon policies, rules, or extrinsic motivation. Again, it is about a different way of thinking, a recognition that rules and requirements may produce results, but they cost us and our learners dearly. We should be relying on them less and using them more judiciously. We should be identifying alternatives—ones that create climates conducive to deep, lasting learning. “Interesting and relevant assignments, timely feedback, connection between student and teacher, connection among students, meaningful use of time—these things motivate learning” (Pike, 2011, p.6). Learner-centered teaching is about creating classrooms in which students begin to mature and act more responsibly about their own learning and toward the learning of others.

2021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)

CLASSROOM CLIMATES THAT PROMOTE STUDENT RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEARNING

The nature of this change begins with an exploration of what is meant by a “climate” for learning. With that understanding, the next question is how teachers create, maintain, and advance climates that motivate students to accept the responsibility for learning and to develop as self-directed learners. Classroom climate is an intriguing metaphor. It simultaneously hinders and helps our understanding of those classroom conditions that promote autonomy in learning.

CLASSROOM CLIMATE: DEFINITIONS AND DESCRIPTIONS

When I work with faculty on defining classroom climate, I start by trying to illustrate how the metaphor obfuscates meaning. Even though we regularly talk about classroom climate—or the “environment” for learning or the “atmosphere” within departments or at the institution—we aren’t referring to meteorological phenomena. When I point that out and ask what the metaphor refers to, the question is usually followed by a period of silence, after which folks start venturing short answers: “feeling comfortable,” “a safe place,” “respect,” “good rapport.” The answers identify characteristics of the climate. They don’t say what it is.

Fortunately, classroom climates have been studied empirically, first at the primary and secondary level, but also at the postsecondary level as well. In the absence of more recent work, I still rely on the excellent research of Fraser. He starts with the premise that classroom climate consists of a series of complex psychosocial relationships that exist between the teacher and the students, collectively and individually, as well as the relationships between and among students. Fraser, Treagust, and Dennis (1986) developed and empirically validated a College and University Classroom Environment Inventory (CUCEI) that measures and compares preferred and actual classroom environments. The forty-nine-item instrument consists of seven subscales that can be thought of as answers to the “What is it?” question:

1. Personalization, defined as opportunities for interaction between professor and students and the amount of instructor concern for students
2. Involvement, defined as the extent to which students actively participate in all classroom activities
3. Student cohesiveness, meaning how well students know and are friendly to each other
4. Satisfaction, defined as how much students enjoy the class
5. Task orientation, being how clear and well-organized class activities are
6. Innovation, defined as the extent to which the instructor plans new and unusual class activities and uses new teaching techniques and assignments
7. Individualization, or the degree to which students are allowed to make decisions and are treated differentially, according to their individual learning needs

2021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)

Winston and others (1994) developed a similar instrument.

When completing the Fraser inventory, students identify the features of their “ideal” classroom and then they provide feedback on the environment in a particular class. Students do not rate as ideal the now common rule-oriented, requirement-driven, and teacher-controlled classroom. Fraser has also used the instrument to measure faculty perceptions of their classrooms and then compared those with student perceptions. The results are a bit troubling: “Teachers tend to perceive the classroom environment more positively than did their students” (Fraser, Treagust, and Dennis, 1986, p. 45).

Research on classroom climate indicates that these psychosocial relationships strongly influence learning outcomes. Fraser writes: “Use of student perceptions of actual classroom environment . . . has established consistent relationships between the nature of the classroom environment and various student cognitive and affective outcomes” (1986, p. 45). When students are in a classroom environment they prefer, they achieve more.

And the “weather” metaphor helps us understand why. Weather influences behavior in direct ways. When it’s cold outside, we put on sweaters, jackets, and socks. Our response is automatic. Come October in Pennsylvania, we store our flip-flops. Certain classroom “climates” can have the same direct impact on learning. Students don’t procrastinate. They aren’t just looking for an answer and satisfied with the first one they find. They aren’t copying somebody else’s work. There is something they need to know. It’s obvious, it’s important, and they are ready to learn. Sounds a bit like instructional nirvana? Yes, well, on most days and in most classes, the temperature for learning probably isn’t this hot.

The metaphor also makes clear that the “climate in a classroom” doesn’t “cause” learning any more than cold weather bundles us up. Rather, it motivates us to take action. We put on coats, gloves, and hats. The objective is to create conditions in the classroom that motivate students to take action. We need to create those conditions that make them want to engage in the hard work of learning.

Despite the fact that the metaphor has complicated the task of defining classroom climate, it offers still more rich insights. Whether it’s a physical classroom or a virtual one, the climates for learning are not created by announcement but by action. If you want a good climate for learning in your classroom, you do not get it by including two lines in the syllabus saying that there will be one. It results from actions (and sometimes from inaction). You do things that help create it and, once it has been created, you continue with actions that help sustain it. And finally, as we are learning about the climate in our physical world, the responsibility for it is shared. Teachers can provide leadership, but the climate in the classroom is cocreated with students. Early in my career, I heard a wise teacher tell a class, “This is not my class; it is not your class; this is our class, and together we are responsible for what does and doesn’t happen here.”